

Co-community Structure in Time-Varying Networks

Shihua Zhang,* Junfei Zhao, and Xiang-Sun Zhang

¹*National Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences,*

Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

(Dated: June 15, 2021)

In this report, we introduce the concept of co-community structure in time-varying networks. We propose a novel optimization algorithm to rapidly detect co-community structure in these networks. Both theoretical and numerical results show that the proposed method not only can resolve detailed co-communities, but also can effectively identify the dynamical phenomena in these networks.

PACS numbers: Valid PACS appear here

Networks consisting of vertices and edges connecting some pairs of vertices are powerful abstractions of relational data, hence have become very popular tools in many fields including sociology, biology and physics [1]. The characteristic of community structure in networks, i.e., networks are naturally divided into modules or communities, has attracted huge attention in the past decade which can provide insights into the structure and dynamic formation of networks. Many methods for community detection in one network have been developed and studied even including the fuzzy community structure identification problem [2] and the more challenging community detection problem in directed networks [3] (see Ref. [4] for recent comprehensive reviews).

However, previous studies have concentrated on uncovering community structure in a static network which only represents a summarized picture of all possible relations. A typical example is the protein interaction network in biology which represent all proteins of an organism and all interactions regardless of the conditions and time under which interactions may take place [5]. In reality, most of relationships modeled by networks evolve with time or conditions [6].

Several recent studies have touched on the analysis of dynamic networks including analyzing changes of global properties, detecting anomalous changes, mining dynamic frequent subnets, and discovering similar evolving regions in evolving networks [7] and even the dynamic communities by combining the information of communities in each network using traditional community detection methods. However, the community structure in two or more slices of a series of time-varying networks has not been well addressed directly [8, 9].

In this report, we propose the concept of co-community structure in two or more networks of a series of time-varying networks. The basic assumption is that an essential and common community structure may exist in two or more networks, and local dynamic changes may happen. This is very realistic in time-varying networks of many robust systems.

Suppose that we are given the structure of two or

more networks of the same vertices, we aim to determine whether there exists any co-community structure, or say similar groups or communities in these networks. Moreover, along this goal, we attempt to uncover the dynamic characteristics of some vertices. Mathematically, the co-community structure and dynamical characteristic are stored in matrices which can be determined by an efficient optimization procedure.

Let us focus initially on the problem in two networks that will be more useful in analyzing time-varying networks. To formulate the problem easily, we consider the common notation of clustering or community structure detection problems. The objective of classical community detection in networks is to partition the vertex set V of the graph $G(V, E)$ with $|V| = N$ into K distinct subsets in a way that puts densely connected groups of vertices in the same community. In this case, a convenient representation of a given partition is the partition matrix $U = [u_{ik}]$ (or $[u_i]$, u_i is a membership vector) with size of $N \times K$ [10]. And $u_{ik} = 1$ if and only if vertex i belongs to the k th subset in the partition, otherwise it is zero. From the definition of the partition, it clearly follows that $\sum_{k=1}^K u_{ik} = 1$ for all i . The generalization of the hard partition follows by allowing u_{ik} to attain any real value from the interval $[0, 1]$, and the corresponding matrix is also called membership matrix.

In the following, we adopt the popular membership matrix representation to formulate the problem. Like Nepusz *et al.* [10] have suggested that an edge between vertex v_1 and v_2 implies the similarity of v_1 and v_2 , and likewise, the absence of an edge implies dissimilarity, i.e., $a_{ij} \simeq u_i u_j^T$ or $A \simeq U U^T$, where $A = (a_{ij})$ is the adjacency matrix of a network. At the same time, the same vertices in two networks should have similar membership vectors. These considerations can be formulated as:

$$\min \sum_{g=1}^2 \|A_g - H_g H_g^T\|_F^2 + \lambda_1 \sum_{g=1}^2 \|H_g - H\|_1 + \lambda_2 \|H\|_1 \quad (1)$$

$$s.t. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{k=1}^K (H_g)_{ik} = 1; (H_g)_{ik}, H_{ik} \geq 0; \\ g = 1, 2, i = 1, \dots, N, k = 1, \dots, K. \end{array} \right.$$

where A_g is the adjacent matrix of network $G(V, E_g)$, H_g is the membership matrix of network $G(V, E_g)$, H is the

*Electronic address: zsh@amss.ac.cn

virtual co-membership matrix representing the membership of nodes reflected in all networks, $\|\cdot\|_F$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ are the entrywise matrix norm ($\|\cdot\|_F$ is known as the Frobenius norm). To solve the problem easily, we remove the constraints $\sum_{k=1}^K (H_g)_{ik} = 1$ ($g = 1, 2; i = 1, \dots, N$). Then the magnitude of $(H_g)_{ik}$ reflect the intensity of vertex i belonging to the community k in the network $G(V, E_g)$. This formulation allows us to map the communities of two networks as well as their co-communities.

The non-convexity and the non-smoothness of the objective function of Eq.(1) make it a more challenging mathematical programming problem. To practically solve the problem (Eq.[1]), we employ a decomposition technique. We can easily find that, given the co-communities matrix H , the technique leads to two symmetrical non-negative factorization matrix (SNMF) problems [11] coupled with a penalty term as follows:

$$\min \sum_{g=1}^2 \|A_g - H_g H_g^T\|_F^2 + \lambda_1 \sum_{g=1}^2 \|H_g - H\|_1. \quad (2)$$

Fortunately, it can be divided into two independent sub-problems which can be solved in a symmetric NMF manner with the following updating rule:

$$(H_g)_{ik} \leftarrow (\widetilde{H}_g)_{ik} \left(1 - \beta + \beta \frac{(A_g \widetilde{H}_g)_{ik}}{(\widetilde{H}_g H_g \widetilde{H}_g)_{ik}} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\widetilde{H}_g = H_g + \Delta(H_g - H)$, and $0 < \beta \leq 1$ (we find $\beta = 1/2$ is a good choice). The first term of Eq. (2) may dominant the optimization procedure, then the columns of the two decomposition matrices may be inconsistent in terms of their membership profiles. So we reorder their columns by maximizing their corresponding correlations to facilitate the optimization procedure.

While given the community matrix H_g of each network, it leads to the following problem:

$$\min \lambda_1 \sum_{g=1}^2 \|H_g - H\|_1 + \lambda_2 \|H\|_1. \quad (4)$$

This formulation with positive combination of L_1 norm of variables, can be transformed into a large-scale linear programming problem through a well-known procedure. More interestingly, it can be solved efficiently by a further decomposition technique [12]. We should note, owing to L_1 norm, generally the optimal solution has an excellent property, i.e., there are as many zeros for $\|H_g - H\|_1$ and $\|H\|_1$ as possible. This point exactly serves the final goal, i.e., consistency and sparseness of the membership of each vertex.

Therefore, we have the following algorithm for discovering co-communities in two undirected networks. We first set the parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \beta$ and K ; and initialize the membership matrices H_1 and H_2 , and set $H = H_1 + H_2$. For the subproblem Eq.(2), we use the update rule Eq.(3) to update H_1 and H_2 respectively. Then using the new H_1 and H_2 we solve the subproblem Eq.(4) to obtain the new H , by subdividing it into $N \times K$ one-dimensional




FIG. 1: The co-community entropy for each testing network system in the following analysis: (A) The simulated networks; (B) The karate club networks; (C) The U.S. senate networks.

optimization subproblem. We iteratively solve the sub-problem Eq.(2) and Eq.(4) until H doesn't change too much (e.g., $\frac{\|H_{new} - H_{old}\|_F^2}{\|H_{old}\|_F^2} < 10^{-5}$, where H_{new} and H_{old} are the H in current step and last step respectively). The final H, H_1 and H_2 store the co-communities and dynamical information. The H (H_1 and H_2) can be considered as a fuzzy partition of the network(s) directly [13]. It can also be employed to determine a hard partition by assigning a node into a single community according to the maximum value in each row of H (H_1 and H_2) [14].

The time complexity of the proposed algorithm is $O(TKN^2)$, where T is the number of iterations. The efficiency of the method can also be seen in its application to networks with size of 10000 (see Appendix). Note that the method can be applied onto a single network by minimizing the criterion: $\|A_g - H_g H_g^T\|_F^2$ and it shows competitive performance with two popular algorithms (see Appendix).

The formulation for two networks can be easily extended to more than two networks as follows:

$$\min \sum_{g=1}^G \|A_g - H_g H_g^T\|_F^2 + \lambda_1 \sum_{g=1}^G \|H_g - H\|_1 + \lambda_2 \|H\|_1, \quad (5)$$

where all the H_g and H are non-negative matrices. The algorithm can also be easily extended.

The key issue in community detection is the proper choice of K . Here, we employ the stochastic nature of the proposed algorithm to achieve this. We should note that a similar strategy has been used to determine the number of clusters in gene expression studies [14]. The differences and similarities of these realizations is employed to evaluate the robustness of a partition of given K . Specially, for each run, the vertices assignment can be defined by a connectivity matrix C of size $N \times N$, with entry c_{ij} if vertices i and j belong to the same com-




FIG. 2: Illustration of a toy example to show the major idea. (A) The system under the first condition where the links were marked with solid lines; (B) The system under the second condition with links of some vertices changing, where dotted lines mean links exist in previous condition, but disappear in current condition; while double lines mean new links. (C) The dynamic index shows the dynamic properties of vertices, of which with high values affecting the community structure. The horizontal line was drawn to indicate several distinct S values, whose corresponding nodes have been marked in (B). Similar line has been drawn in Figure 3C.

munities, and $c_{ij} = 0$ if they belong to different clusters. We can then compute the consensus matrix, \bar{C} , defined as the average connectivity matrix over many runs. The entries of \bar{C} range from 0 to 1 and reflect the probability that vertices i and j belong to one community.

From a more global point of view, we adopt the entropy as a measure of the stability of the co-community structure. We assume that the c_{ij} are independent of each other and we define the average Co-Community Entropy (CCE) score as:

$$CCE = -\frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{(i,j)} [c_{ij} \log_2 c_{ij} + (1-c_{ij}) \log_2 (1-c_{ij})],$$

where the sum is taken over all edges and m is the total number of edges in the network. If the network is totally unstable (i.e., in the most extreme case $c_{ij} = 0.5$ for all pairs), $CCE = 1$, while if the edges are perfectly stable under noise ($c_{ij} = 0$ or 1), $CCE = 0$. We have demonstrated that the CCE score can help to select the number of communities in the time-varying networks (Figure 1). For example, the CCE score for the simulated networks corresponds to very small value for $K = 3$ which indicate that the system have three distinct communities. We should note that the parameters λ_1 , λ_2 and β can also be evaluated with the CCE score by running the method with many trials.

The membership matrix H_g for each network represents the community structure of each network, and the features of H can be employed to describe the dynamic




FIG. 3: (A) The original karate club network. (B) The artificial evolving network with 12 links' difference compared with the network in (A). (C) The dynamic index shows the dynamic properties of vertices.

structure of these networks. For each run, we can define the following index S for vertex i as the ratio between the second maximal value and the maximal value of row i of H . The ratio is a positive value less than one. In reality there is no rigid threshold for significant S -score due to the diversity of networks, but we can select top ones based on the popular Z -score (i.e., $Z = \frac{S - \mu(S)}{\sigma(S)}$, where $\mu(S)$ is the mean of S and $\sigma(S)$ is the standard deviation of S). By removing the active dynamic vertices according to this index, we can define the stable co-communities of these networks.

We first test the proposed method using a pair simulated toy networks representing a time-varying system under two time points with 16 links' difference (Figure 1A and B). In the system, there are three clear communities, however, in the two conditions, the links of some vertices have changed due to some perturbation. We aim to identify these communities, and at the same time, uncover those link dynamics that can affect the community structure. We note that the link dynamics happened within and between communities. The dynamics happened within a community doesn't affect the community structure, while that between communities can affect it. For example, the absence of links (15,11) and (15,20) and the emerging links (15,28) and (15,26) make the vertex 15 move to another community. Our method can not only well identify the community structure, but also can accurately distinguish the link dynamics that affect the community structure (Figure 2C).

We next apply our method to the karate club network and its variants with 12 links' difference compared with the original one. The original karate club network was constructed based on the observed social interactions between members of a karate club, in which, a dispute arose and the club split into two clubs. We assumed there are some changes upon the members' relationship as shown in Figure 3B. Our method can well identify the core com-




FIG. 4: (A) The U.S. Senate networks at different time points: (A) $t = 1$, (B) $t = 5$, and five vertices show distinct dynamic characteristics. (C) The dynamic indexes show the dynamic properties of vertices. Vertex shape show the two political parties: square means Democrat and circle means Republican.

munities which corresponds to the two real sub-clubs (Figure 3A and B). At the same time, we can uncover the vertices whose link dynamics can affect the community structure. For example, the links of vertices 10 and vertices 20 have great difference, and the two vertices are located at the boundary of two communities. These two nodes have evolved into opposite communities which can well be reflected by the measure S (Figure 3C).

We further apply our method to the set of time-varying networks consisting of 100 vertices (senators), and 8 time points (i.e., 8 time-varying networks) corresponding to 3-month epochs starting on Jan 1st 2005 and ending on Dec 31st 2006. The network data were created using the method developed by Kolar *et al.* [15] based on the United States 109th Congress voting records and analyzed in Ho *et al.* [16]. An edge between two senators in such network indicates that their votes were mostly similar during that particular epoch. We observed that two successional networks have relatively small changes. As an example, we show the networks ($t = 1$ and $t = 5$) and identify the co-community among them (Figure 4A and

B). Our method can well identify the two co-communities which perfectly capture party affiliations - Republican senators are almost always in community 1, while Democratic senators are almost always in community 2. More interestingly, we can also identify the dynamic changing of some vertices which reflect the changes of political opinions of some senators (Figure 4C). For example, the votes of Democrat Nelson were unaligned with either Democrats or Republicans at $t = 1$, while his votes were gradually shifting towards Republican which can be found by the index.

In this report, we investigate the common community structure in time-varying networks. Rather than treating each slice of a series of time-varying networks independently, we consider them simultaneously by defining a common community structure among them. We have proposed a new framework for recovering the common community structure and exploring the dynamic changes in these networks by solving an elaborate mathematical programming problem via existing decomposition techniques. We have applied the method to both real and simulated networks, demonstrating that it is able to recover known co-community structure and reveal dynamic changes among them. The nondeterministic characteristic of the method allows it for the selection of number of communities and quantification of the stability of the community structure. We should note that our framework can shed lights on the situation that dramatic changes appear in time-varying networks. Specifically, by applying our method on each network respectively, we can detect the community structure of the two networks. And by calculating the consistency of the two community structure with a measure like normalized mutual information (NMI) index, we can see how similar the community structure are in the two networks.

In summary, the main purpose of this report is to propose the new concept and theoretical framework to analyze the common community structure of multiple slices of a series of time-varying networks which shed lights on the network's dynamics and stability. Hope it can become a promising method to analyze real-world networks. We need to point out that the adjacency matrix A used in this framework can be replaced by some *similarity* matrix based on the connectivity like kernel matrix.

This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 11001256, 11131009, 60873205, the 'Special Presidential Prize - Scientific Research Foundation of the CAS, and the Special Foundation of President of AMSS at CAS for 'Chen Jing-Run' Future Star Program (to S.Z.). The authors thank Professor Eric P. Xing for providing the network data.

[1] Freeman, L.C. (1992) Am J Sociol 98:152; Eriksen, K., Simonsen, I., Maslov, S., Sneppen, K. (2003) Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 148701; Zhang, S., Jin, G., Zhang, X.-S., Chen,

L. (2007) Proteomics, 7(16), 2856.
[2] Reichardt, J. and Bornholdt, S. (2004) Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 218701; Palla, G., Derényi, I., Farkas, I. and Vicsek,

- T. (2005) *Nature* 435, 814; Zhang, S., Wang, R.S. and Zhang, X.S. (2007) *Physica A*, 374(1), 483.
- [3] Leicht, E.A., Newman, M.E.J. (2008) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100, 118703.
- [4] Newman, M.E.J. (2004) *Eur. Phys. J. B* 38, 321; Danon, L., Diaz-Guilera, A., Duch, J., Arenas, A. (2005) *J Stat Mech*, P09008. Fortunato S (2010) *Phys Rep* 486:75-174.
- [5] Rachlin, J., Cohen, D.D., Cantor, C., Kasif, S. (2008) *Mol Syst Biol.* 2, 66.
- [6] J. Leskovec, J. Kleinberg, and C. Faloutsos. In ACM SIGKDD, 2005; G. Palla, A. Barabasi, and T. Vicsek. (2007) *Nature* 446, 664-667.
- [7] Chan, J., Bailey, J., Leckie, C. (2008) *Knowl. Inf. Syst.*, 16, 53-96.
- [8] Mucha, P.J., Richardson, T., Macon, K., Porter, M.A., Onnela, J.P. (2010) *Science*, 328, 876-878.
- [9] Rosvall, M. and Bergstrom, C.T (2010) *PLoS ONE*, 5, e8694.
- [10] Nepusz, T., Petróczki, A., Négyessy, L., Bazsó, F., (2008) *Phys. Rev. E* 77, 016107.
- [11] Ding, C., He, X., and Simon, H.D., *Proc. SIAM Int'l Conf. Data Mining (SDM'05)*, 606-610, 2005.
- [12] Note that each element of H in Eq.(4) is an independent variable, so this problem can be decomposed into $N \times K$ one dimensional subproblem which can be expressed as minimization of $\lambda_1 \sum_{g=1}^2 |(H_g)_{ij} - (H)_{ij}| + \lambda_2 |(H)_{ij}|$. The optimal solution of this one-dimensional subsection function subproblem can be easily obtained by considering the value of each interval.
- [13] Zhang, S., Wang, R.S. and Zhang, X.S. (2007) *Phys. Rev. E* 76, 046103.
- [14] Brunet, J. P., Tamayo, P., Golub, T. R. and Mesirov, J. P. (2004) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 101, 4164-4169.
- [15] Kolar, M., L. Song, A. Ahmed, and E. P. Xing (2010) *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 4, 94-123.
- [16] Ho, Q., Song, L. and Xing, E.P. (2011) *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS'11)*.

A. Appendix

We have applied the reduced formulation onto simulated networks with multiple trials. The networks have been simulated based on the principle suggested in Lancichinetti *et al* (Phys Rev E 2004, 78, 046110). We found that our method can obtain reasonable results for many different simulation settings assessed with normalized mutual information (NMI) index (Figure 5). We also compared it with other typical community methods which have shown our method has competitive performance with them. These analyses partially show that our criterion for multiple networks is reasonable.

The computational efficiency of the proposed method can also be seen in the simulation study where we have applied the reduced formulation onto a single network with 10000 nodes. Both of the theoretic and experimental analyses have shown that our method can scale well (Figure 6).

- [A1] Clauset, A., Newman, M.E.J. and Moore, C. (2004) *Phys. Rev. E* 70, 066111.
- [A2] Reichardt, J. and Bornholdt, S. (2006) *Phys. Rev. E*, 74, 016110.




FIG. 5: Tests of our method on single network using the benchmark suggested in Lancichinetti *et al* (2008). We also compared it with two modularity optimization algorithms: the fast greedy modularity optimization method (Q_{FG}) (Phys. Rev. E 2004, 70, 066111) and the spin-glass model and simulated annealing method (SGSA) (Phys. Rev. E 2006, 74, 016110). Each point corresponds to an average over 25 network realizations. Detailed parameter settings of the simulated networks can be seen in Lancichinetti *et al* (2008).




FIG. 6: The computation time (in seconds) with network size of $n=1000$ to 10000. Each bar corresponds to an average over 25 network realizations.

(Dated: June 15, 2021)

Abstract

