

Representing higher-order dependencies in networks

Jian Xu^{1,3}, Thanuka L. Wickramaratne^{2,3,4}, Nitesh V. Chawla^{1,3,4,*}

¹Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Notre Dame, USA

²Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Notre Dame, USA

³Interdisciplinary Center for Network Science and Applications, University of Notre Dame, USA

⁴Environmental Change Initiative, University of Notre Dame, USA

*To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: nchawla@nd.edu

To ensure the correctness of network analysis methods, the network (as the input) has to be a sufficiently accurate representation of the underlying data. However, when representing sequential data from complex systems such as global shipping traffic or web clickstream traffic as networks, the conventional network representation implicitly assuming the Markov property (first-order dependency) can quickly become limiting. That is, when movements are simulated on the network, the next movement depends only on the current node, failing to capture the fact that the movement may depend on multiple previous steps. We show that data derived from some complex systems show up to fifth-order dependencies, such that the oversimplification in the first-order network representation can later result in inaccurate network analysis results. To that end, we propose the Higher-Order Network (HON) representation that can discover and embed variable orders of dependencies in a network representation. Through a comprehensive empirical evaluation and analysis, we establish several desirable characteristics of HON – accuracy, scalability, and direct compatibility with the existing suite of network analysis methods. We

illustrate the broad applicability of HON by using it as the input to a variety of tasks, such as random walking, clustering and ranking, where these methods yield more accurate results without modification. Our approach brings the representative power of networks for handling the increasingly complex systems.

Introduction

Today's systems are inherently complex, whether it is the billions of people on Facebook powering a global social network or the transportation networks powering the commute and economy or the interacting neurons powering the coherent activity in the brain. These complex systems are made up of a number of interacting components that influence each other. Network-based representation has quickly emerged as the norm in representing such rich interactions among the components of a complex system. These components are represented as nodes in the network, and the edges or links between these nodes represent the (ranges and strengths of) interactions. As this network representation is becoming the norm, a fundamental question arises – *given the data, how should one construct the most appropriate network representation that captures the interactions among components of the complex system?*

A common practice to construct the network from data (in a complex system) is to directly take the sum of pairwise connections in the sequential data as the edge weights in the network — e.g., taking the sum of traffic between locations in an interval (1–4), the sum of user traffic between two web pages, and so on (5, 6). This direct conversion however implicitly assumes the Markov property (7) (first-order dependency) and loses important information about dependencies in the raw data. For example, consider the shipping traffic network among ports, where the ports are the nodes in the network and the links or edges are a function of the pairwise shipping traffic between two pairs. When interactions are simulated on the network, such as

how ports introduce invasive species to each other, driven by the movements of ships via ballast water exchange, the next interaction (port-port species introduction) only depends on the current node (which port the ship is coming from), while in fact the interaction may be heavily influenced by the trajectory of interactions over the sequence of nodes (which ports the ship has visited before). Another example is user clickstream behavior – navigating from one web page to another. Imagine a user searches for some content, landing on a web page and following the links from that web page to the final destination (nodes are web pages and interactions are users going from one web page to another). The user’s final web page destination is a result of a sequence of prior clicks. Thus, there are higher-order dependencies in networks and not just the first-order (Markovian) dependency as captured in the common network representation.

To that end, in this paper, we focus on deriving the network based on the specific set of interactions, namely the interactions induced by movements among components of a complex system, wherein the sequence of movement patterns becomes pivotal in defining the interactions.

Let us again consider the process of constructing a network from the global shipping complex system by incorporating the movements from the ship trajectories (8, 9) (Fig. 1A). Conventionally (1–6, 8, 10), a network is built by taking the number of trips between port pairs as edge weights (Fig. 1B). When ship movements are simulated on this first-order network, according to the network structure where the edge *Singapore* \rightarrow *LosAngeles* and the edge *Singapore* \rightarrow *Seattle* have similar edge weights, a ship currently at Singapore has similar probabilities of going to Los Angeles or Seattle, no matter from where it came to Singapore. In reality, the global shipping data indicate that a ship’s previous stops before arriving at Singapore do influence the ship’s next movement: the ship is more likely to go to Los Angeles if it came from Shanghai, and more likely to go to Seattle if it came from Tokyo. A first-order network representation fails to capture important information like this because in every step, the

flow of traffic on the network is simply aggregated and mixed. As a consequence, trajectories simulated on the first-order network do not follow true ship movement patterns. On the contrary, by breaking down the node *Singapore* into *Singapore|Tokyo* and *Singapore|Shanghai* (Fig. 1C), the higher-order network can better guide the movements simulated on the network: when a ship follows different paths to Singapore, it has different probability distributions for choosing the next step. Distinguishing these differences is critical for the evaluation of species introduction probabilities among ports given that ships can translocate species via ballast water exchanges (11).

Such higher-order dependencies exist ubiquitously and are indispensable for modeling vehicle and human movements (12), email correspondence (13), article and web browsing (12, 14, 15), conversations (16), stock market (17), and so on. While higher-order dependencies have been thoroughly studied in the field of time series (17, 18), information theory (19), frequent pattern mining (20), next location prediction (21), variable order Markov (22, 23), hidden Markov model (24), Markov order estimation (25, 26), and so on, they all focus on the stochastic process, rather than how to represent higher-order dependencies in networks that are representations of intricate interactions in complex systems. In the field of network science, the frontier of research still remains at the stage of assuming a fixed second order of dependency when constructing the network (12, 27–30) or using multiplex networks (31), and there is neither a thorough discussion beyond second-order dependencies, nor a systematic way of representing dependencies of variable orders in networks.

If networks are deemed to represent complex systems, it becomes critical to ensure that the network is an accurate representation of the ebbs and flows in such a complex system. For whatever the analysis performed upon the network, such as clustering (32, 33), ranking (34), link prediction (35, 36), and anomaly detection (37), if the input network is not a sufficiently accurate representation of the underlying data, the results of all further analyses performed on

this network become questionable. For example, it is shown that web users are not Markovian (14), thus topological ranking measures such as PageRank fail to simulate user navigation on the conventional network representation (38); the choice of network representation also influences epidemic outbreaks and other diffusion processes (39).

However, constructing a higher-order network is a non-trivial task. For example, the approach of assuming a fixed order when constructing a network does not scale for higher orders, because it is not practical and not necessary to add auxiliary nodes and edges to represent every possible combination of previous paths. So the true orders of dependencies for every path need to be determined beforehand. A subsequent challenge is how to represent variable orders of dependencies in a single network. In addition, it is important to keep the new network representation consistent with the conventional representation and compatible with the existing network analysis tools.

To that end, this paper focuses on three fundamental questions: (a) How to effectively represent sequential data as networks without omitting crucial information about higher-order dependencies in data? (b) How to make the data structure of this new network representation consistent with the conventional network framework, such that the new network representation can work directly with methods such as PageRank, clustering, link prediction, etc.? (c) What are the effects of using this new representation for network analyses?

We present a new process for extracting higher-order dependencies in the sequential data and constructing the Higher-Order Network (HON) that can represent such dependencies of variable orders. We demonstrate that our novel network representation HON: (a) is more reflective of the underlying real-world phenomena; for example, when using HON instead of a first-order network to represent the global shipping data, the accuracy is more than doubled when simulating a ship's next movement on the network, and is higher by one magnitude when simulating three steps. (b) HON scales well for higher orders, since auxiliary higher-order

nodes and edges are added to a first-order network only where necessary; because HON is more compact than networks with a fixed high order, network analysis algorithms run faster on HON. (c) More importantly, because the data structure of HON is consistent with the conventional network representation, we show that a variety of existing algorithms including clustering and ranking can run on HON without modification; these algorithms produce considerably different results on HON than on a first-order network, thus demonstrating the broad applications and potential influences of this novel network representation.

We analyze a variety of real-world data including global shipping transportation, clickstream web browsing trajectories, and Weibo retweet information diffusions. We show that some of them have dependencies up to the fifth order, which the conventional first-order network representations just cannot capture, and the downstream network analyses tools such as clustering and ranking are rendered with limited and possibly erroneous information about the actual interactions in data. We also validate the accuracy of HON on a synthetically generated data set where we introduced dependencies of variable orders through a process completely independent of the construction of HON. We show that HON accurately identifies all the higher-order dependencies introduced, which both the first-order and second-order methods fail at.

Results

We start with an examination of the conventional network representation, showing its limitations and formally introducing the higher-order network. Then with multiple real-world and synthetic data sets, we compare our proposed network representation with the conventional ones in terms of accuracy, scalability, and observations drawn from network analysis tools.

Representing higher-order dependencies with conventional nodes and edges

Conventionally, a network (also referred to as a graph) $G = (V, E)$ is represented with vertices or nodes V as entities (e.g., places, web pages) and edges or links E as connections between pairs of nodes (e.g., traffic between cities, web traffic between pages). Edge weight $W(i \rightarrow j)$ is a number associated with an edge $i \rightarrow j$ representing the intensity of the connection, which is usually assigned as the (possibly weighted) sum of pairwise connections $i \rightarrow j$ (e.g. the daily traffic from i to j) in data (1–6, 8, 10).

A wide range of network analysis methods such as PageRank for ranking (34), MapEquation (32) and walktrap (33) for clustering, and link prediction methods (35, 36) use random walking to simulate movements on networks (e.g. ships traveling between ports, users clicking through web pages, etc.). If the location of a random walker at time t is denoted as a random variable X_t where X can take values from the node set V , then conventionally (35, 40), the transition probability from node i_t to the next step i_{t+1} is proportional to the edge weight $W(i \rightarrow i_{t+1})$:

$$P(X_{t+1} = i_{t+1} | X_t = i_t) = \frac{W(i_t \rightarrow i_{t+1})}{\sum_j W(i_t \rightarrow j)} \quad (1)$$

This Markovian nature of random walking determines that every movement simulated on the network is only dependent on the current node.

In the conventional network representation, every node maps to a unique entity or system component, so that every movement of a random walker is only dependent on a single entity (in Fig. 1B is Singapore). When the data has higher-order dependencies that involve more than two entities, such as “ships coming from Shanghai to Singapore are more likely to go to Los Angeles” in the global shipping data, they cannot be modeled into the conventional network representation, and thus the simulation of movement performed on the network will fail to follow these higher-order patterns.

To represent higher-order dependencies in a network, we need to rethink the building blocks of a network: nodes and edges. Instead of using a node to represent a single entity (such as a port in the global shipping network), we break down the node into different higher-order nodes that carry different dependency relationships, where each node can now represent a series of entities. For example in Fig. 1C, Singapore is broken down into two nodes, Singapore *given* Tokyo as the previous step (represented as $Singapore|Tokyo$), and Singapore *given* Shanghai as the previous step (represented as $Singapore|Shanghai$). Consequently, the edges $Singapore|Shanghai \rightarrow LosAngeles$ and $Singapore|Shanghai \rightarrow Seattle$ can now involve three different ports as entities and carry different weights, thus representing second-order dependencies. For a random walker currently at node $Singapore|Shanghai$, because the out-edges here are in the form of $i|h \rightarrow j$ instead of $i \rightarrow j$, a random walker’s transition probability from node $i|h$ to node j is:

$$P(X_{t+1} = j | X_t = (i|h)) = \frac{W(i|h \rightarrow j)}{\sum_k W(i|h \rightarrow k)} \quad (2)$$

so that although a random walker’s movement depends only on the current node, it now depends on multiple entities in the new network representation (as in Fig. 1C), thus being able to simulate higher-order dependency patterns in the data. More importantly, this new representation is consistent with conventional networks and compatible with existing network analysis methods, because the data structure of HON is the same as the conventional network (the only change is the labeling of nodes). This makes it easy to use HON instead of the conventional first-order network as the input for network analysis methods, with no need to change the existing algorithms.

Rosvall et al. (12) consider a higher-order dependency, albeit with a fixed second-order assumption. They propose a network representation comprised of “physical nodes” and “memory nodes”. As we will show with experiments, variable orders of dependencies can co-exist in the same data set, and can go beyond the second order. So if the dependency is assumed as fixed

second order, it could be redundant when first-order dependencies are sufficient, and could be insufficient when higher-order dependencies exist. In HON, every node can involve more than two entities and represent an arbitrarily high order of dependency, so variable orders of dependencies can co-exist in the same network representation, as shown in Fig. 1D. For example, the fourth-order dependency relationship following the path of $Tianjin \rightarrow Busan \rightarrow Tokyo \rightarrow Singapore$ can now be represented as a fourth-order node $Singapore|Tokyo, Busan, Tianjin$; the second-order path $Shanghai \rightarrow Singapore$ is now a node $Singapore|Shanghai$; first-order relationships are now in a node $Singapore|\cdot$: these nodes of variable orders all represent the same physical location Singapore, and can co-exist in one network representation. We will show that compared with fixed order networks, our representation is compact in size by using variable orders and embedding higher-order dependencies only where necessary, thus HON scales well and can represent arbitrarily high orders of dependencies for better accuracy.

While the hypergraph (41) looks similar to HON in that its edges can connect to multiple nodes at the same time, it cannot directly represent dependencies. The reason is that dependencies are ordered relationships, but in a hypergraph the nodes connected by hyperedges are unordered, e.g., in the shipping example, an edge in a hypergraph may have the form of $set\{Tokyo, Busan, Tianjin\} \rightarrow set\{Singapore\}$, where $Tokyo, Busan, Tianjin$ are interchangeable and cannot represent the *path* of the ship before arriving at Singapore. On the contrary, the edges in HON have the form of $\{Tokyo|Busan, Tianjin\} \rightarrow \{Singapore|Tokyo, Busan, Tianjin\}$ where the entities in nodes are not interchangeable, thus HON can represent dependencies of arbitrary order.

Extracting higher-order dependencies

The construction of HON consists of two steps: first, the *rule extraction* step finds higher-order dependencies that are necessary for building HON, then the *network wiring* step adds these

rules describing variable orders of dependencies into the conventional first-order network (see the Materials and Methods section for details). First we show that the rule extraction algorithm in the first step can correctly extract higher-order dependencies from both synthetic and real data. The synthetic data set has 10,000,000 generated movements; normally when synthesizing trajectories, the movement for the next step is completely random. In order to simulate scenarios like “ships coming from Shanghai to Singapore are more likely to go to Los Angeles”, when a synthesized trajectory goes through 30 predefined special paths, the movement for the next step is altered. Every special path of length k corresponds to a k^{th} order dependency. We predefine 10 paths of length two, 10 paths of length three, and 10 paths of length four, so that movements that have variable orders of dependencies are generated (see Supplementary Material Note 1 for details). We run the rule extraction algorithm on the synthetic data with known variable orders of dependencies, and the result shows that the rule extraction algorithm (a) correctly captures all 30 of the predefined higher-order dependencies; in particular, variable orders (from second-order to fourth-order) of dependencies mixed in the same data set are correctly identified; (b) does not extract false dependencies beyond the fourth order even if a maximum order of five is allowed; (c) determines that all other dependencies are first-order, which reflects the fact that there is no other higher-order dependency in the data.

We then run the rule extraction algorithm on real data: the global shipping data containing ship trajectories among ports, the clickstream data containing user browsing trajectories among web pages, and the retweet data containing information diffusion paths among users (see Supplementary Material Note 1 for details). The global shipping data reveals variable orders of dependencies up to the fifth order, indicating that a ship’s movement can depend on up to five previous ports it has visited. The clickstream data also shows variable orders of dependencies up to third order, indicating that the page a user will visit can depend on up to three pages the user has visited before, matching the observation in another study on web user browsing behav-

iors (14). The fact that dependencies of variable orders up to the fifth order exist in real data further justifies our approach of representing variable and higher-order dependencies instead of imposing a fixed first or second order.

On the contrary, the rule extraction process shows that the retweet data (recording information diffusion) have no higher-order dependency at all. The reason is that in diffusion processes such as the diffusion of information and the propagation of epidemics, according to the classic spreading models (42), once a person A is infected, A will start to broadcast the information (or spread the disease) to all of its neighbors $\mathcal{N}(A)$, irrespective of who infected A . Due to this Markovian nature of diffusion processes, all diffusion data only show first-order dependencies and there is no need to build a higher-order network. This also agrees with a previous finding that assuming second-order dependency has “marginal consequences for disease spreading” (12).

It is worth noting that although higher-order dependencies exist in many types of data, it is the type of data that determines whether there are higher-order dependencies and how high the orders can be. Our proposed algorithm is backwards compatible with data that have no higher-order dependencies (such as the diffusion data): all rules extracted are first-order, thus the output will be a first-order network.

Improved accuracy on random walking

Since random walking is a commonly used method to simulate movements on networks and is the foundation of many network analysis tools such as PageRank (34) for ranking, MapEquation (32) and walktrap (33) for clustering, various link prediction algorithms (35, 36) and so on, it is crucial that a naïve random walker (only aware of the current node and its out-edges) can simulate the movements in the network accurately. If different network representations are built for the same sequential data set (consisted of trajectories), how will the network structure affect

the movements of random walkers running upon? Do the random walkers produce trajectories more similar to the real ones when running on HON?

We take the global shipping data to explain the experimental procedures (the clickstream data have similar results). As in illustrated in Fig. 2A, for every trajectory of a ship, the last three locations are held for testing, and the others are used to construct the network. A first-order network (Fig. 2B), a fixed second-order network (*I2*), and a HON (Fig. 2C) are constructed from the same data set, respectively. Given one of the networks, for every ship, a random walker simulates the ship’s movements on the network: It starts from the last location in the corresponding training trajectory, and walks three steps. Then the generated trajectories are compared with the ground truth in the testing set: a higher fraction of correct predictions means the random walkers can simulate the ship’s movements better on the corresponding network. Random walking simulations in each network are repeated 1,000 times and the mean accuracies are reported. By comparing the accuracies of random walking, our intention here is not to solve a next location prediction problem (*2I*) or similar classification problems, but from a network perspective, we focus on improving the representative power of the network, such that a variety of network analysis methods based on random walking can benefit from the more accurate simulation of movements on the network.

The comparison of results among the conventional first-order network, the fixed second-order network, and HONs with maximum order of two to five are shown in Fig. 2D. It is shown that random walkers running on the conventional first-order network have significantly lower accuracies compared with other networks. The reason is that the first-order network representation only accounts for pairwise connections and cannot capture higher-order dependencies in ships’ movement patterns. For example, in Fig. 2A, ships going between Port *a* and Port *b* will not go to Port *c*, but that is not guaranteed when movements are simulated in a first-order network (Fig. 2B).

By assuming an order of two for the whole network, the accuracies on the fixed second-order network increase considerably, because the network structure can help the random walker remember its last two steps. Meanwhile, the accuracies on HON with a maximum order of two is similar but slightly lower than that on the fixed second-order network, because HON uses first-order connections for compactness and only adds second-order connections wherever necessary. By increasing the maximum order to five for HON, there is a noticeable improvement compared with the fixed first and second-order networks, because HON can now capture all dependencies below or equal to the fifth order. Here the accuracy of simulating one step on HON has *more than doubled* compared with the conventional first-order network.

Furthermore, when simulating multiple steps, the advantage of using HON is even bigger. The reason is that in a first-order network, a random walker “forgets” where it came from after each step, and has a higher chance of disobeying higher-order movement patterns. This error is amplified quickly in a few steps — the accuracy of simulating three steps on the first-order network is almost zero. On the contrary, in HON the higher-order nodes and edges can help the random walker remember where it came from, and provide the corresponding probability distributions for the next step. As a consequence, the simulation of three steps on HON is one magnitude more accurate than on first-order network. This indicates that when multiple steps are simulated (which is usually seen in methods such as PageRank and MapEquation that need multiple iterations), using HON (instead of the conventional first-order network) can help random walkers simulate movements more accurately, thus the results of all random walking based network analysis methods will be more reliable.

Higher-order guidance for random walkers

We show quantitatively how the random walkers’ behaviors have changed on HON. A typical property of a network is the two step return rate (*l2*) of random walkers, which measures the

probability that a random walker will return to the same physical location in two steps. As shown in Table 1, by considering higher-order dependencies, the two step return rate on HON (above 40%) is substantially higher than that of the conventional first-order network (10.7%). By increasing the maximum order, the two step return rate on HON is higher than that of the fixed second-order network and converges at around 50%. In the context of global shipping, the reason that random walkers on HON show higher two step return rate is that a big proportion of ships (e.g., ships that sail across the English Channel) are indeed going back and forth between ports. If a ship sails from London to Rotterdam then back to London, then it is likely to go back to Rotterdam again, rather than going to other ports that are connected to London (consider Port a as London and Port b as Rotterdam Fig. 2A). This is naturally a higher-order dependency pattern because the ship's next step is significantly affected by its previous steps, and such patterns are captured during the rule extraction step and represented in the structure of HON (Fig. 2C). In comparison, in a first-order network, when a ship comes from Rotterdam to London (coming from Port b to Port a in Fig. 2B), given the many other connections London has, it is much less likely that the ship will go back to Rotterdam again, so that the two step return rate is low.

Not only do ships go back and forth, but some ships also sail in bigger loops. The three step return rate (Table 1) increases from 1.5% to 20.4% from the first-order network to HON with a maximum order of five; particularly, when increasing the maximum order from two to three for HON, the three step return rate shows the largest increase. The reason the three step return rate is low in the second-order network is that remembering two previous steps is insufficient to build a tight loop of three ports, thus random walkers are unlikely to return in three steps. Further increasing the maximum order of HON can capture even bigger loops and other higher-order patterns, resulting in higher accuracies in random walking. These observations not only show the necessity of representing higher orders of dependencies in networks, but also show

that when loops of different sizes co-exist, HON is capable of incorporating variable orders of dependencies.

In a first-order network, a random walker is given many choices in every step, which is the reason that return rates are low. Splitting nodes into higher-order nodes gives the random walker fewer choices for every step; figuratively, every step is more “certain”. To quantify the certainty of random walking on different network representations, we compute the entropy rate (12, 19), defined as:

$$H(X_{t+1}|X_t) = \sum_{i,j} \pi(i)p(i \rightarrow j) \log p(i \rightarrow j) \quad (3)$$

where $\pi(i)$ is the stationary distribution at node i and $p(i \rightarrow j)$ is the transition probability from node i to node j , defined in Equation 1. This entropy rate measures the number of bits needed to describe every step of random walking — the more bits needed, the more uncertainty there is for every step. In Table 1, the first-order network has the highest entropy rate, indicating that every step of random walking is more uncertain due to the lack of knowledge of what the previous steps are, which leads to the low accuracy in the simulation of movements. On the second-order network, as the previous step is given, where the random walker can move is more constrained, thus the entropy rate is decreased considerably. HON with a max order of two has a comparable entropy rate with the fixed second-order network, while the network size is reduced by half. By increasing the maximum order, the entropy rate keeps decreasing until convergence, indicating that using higher orders can make the random walker more certain in choosing every step. Here with increasing certainty, the HON representation does not overfit the data by increasing the maximum order, because the accuracy of random walking on the hold-out testing set keeps improving. Note that the entropy rate measures the uncertainty of movements simulated on the network, rather than the quality of the network. An entropy rate of zero means that every step is certain and the network degenerates into the sequential data. With increasing

maximum order, the entropy rate of HON will converge before reaching zero, because the rule extraction algorithm is guaranteed to terminate following the maximum order or the minimum support requirements (see the Materials and Methods section for details). In brief, HON can selectively embed higher-order dependencies into the network representation, thus the random walkers on the network can have more certain choices for every step, and can more accurately simulate back-and-forth trips as well as trips in bigger loops.

Effects on clustering

One important family of network analysis methods is clustering, which identifies groups of nodes that are tightly connected. A variety of clustering algorithms such as MapEquation (32) and walktrap (33) are based on random walking, by following the intuition that random walkers are more likely to move within the same cluster rather than between different clusters. Since using HON instead of a first-order network alters the movement patterns of random walkers running upon, the compelling question becomes: how does HON affect the clustering results?

Consider an important real-world application of clustering: identifying regions wherein aquatic species invasions are likely to happen. Since the global shipping network is the dominant global vector for the unintentional translocation of non-native aquatic species (43) (species get translocated either during ballast water uptake/discharge, or by accumulating on the surfaces of ships (11)), identifying clusters of ports that are tightly coupled by frequent shipping can reveal ports that are likely to introduce non-native species to each other. The limitation of the existing approach (9) is that the clustering is based on a first-order network that only accounts for direct species flows, while in reality the species introduced to a port by a ship may also come from multiple previous ports at which the ship has stopped. These indirect species introduction pathways driven by ship movements are already captured by HON and can influence the clustering result. As represented by the HON example in Fig. 1C, following the most

likely shipping route, species are more likely to be introduced to Los Angeles from Shanghai (via Singapore) rather than from Tokyo, so the clustering (driven by random walking) on HON prefers grouping Los Angeles with Shanghai rather than with Tokyo. In comparison, indirect species introduction pathways are ignored when performing clustering on a first-order network (Fig. 1B), thus underestimating the risk of invasions via indirect shipping connections.

By clustering on HON, how different clusters overlap is naturally revealed, highlighting ports that may be invaded by species from multiple regions. Since there can be multiple nodes representing the same physical location in HON (e.g., *Singapore|Tokyo* and *Singapore|Shanghai* both represent Singapore), and the ship movements through these nodes can be different, these higher-order nodes can belong to different clusters, so that Singapore as an international port belongs to multiple clusters, as one would expect. The clustering results (using MapEquation) on a first-order network and HON are compared in Fig. 3.

For example, let us consider Malta, a European island country in the Mediterranean Sea. Malta has two ports: Valletta is a small port that mainly serves cruise ships in Mediterranean, and Malta Freeport on the contrary is one of the busiest ports in Europe (many international shipping routes have a stop there). The clustering on the first-order network cannot tell the difference between the two ports and assigns both to the same Southern Europe cluster. On the contrary, the clustering on HON effectively separates Valletta and Malta Freeport by showing that Malta Freeport belongs to two additional clusters besides the South Europe cluster, implying long-range shipping connections and species exchanges with ports in the Asia-Pacific region. In summary, on HON, 14% of ports belong to more than one cluster, and 31 ports (1% of all) belong to as many as five clusters, including international ports such as Singapore, New York, Hong Kong, Gibraltar, Hamburg, and so on, indicating challenges to the management of aquatic invasions, as well as opportunities for devising targeted management policies. These insights are gained by adopting HON as the network representation for the global shipping data,

while the MapEquation algorithm is unmodified.

Effects on ranking

Another important family of network analysis methods is ranking. PageRank (34) is commonly used in assessing the importance of web pages by using random walkers (with random resets) to simulate users clicking through different pages, and pages with higher PageRank scores have higher chances of being visited. It has been shown that web users are not Markovian (14), and PageRank on the conventional network representation fails to simulate real user traffic (38). Because HON can help random walkers achieve higher accuracies in reproducing movement patterns and PageRank is based on random walking, in the context of ranking web pages, how can HON affect the PageRank scores, and why?

With the clickstream data, we can construct both a first-order network and a HON as the input for PageRank. In HON, the PageRank scores of multiple higher-order nodes representing the same web page are summed up as the final score for the page. As shown in Fig. 4, by using HON instead of the first-order network, 20% of the web pages show more than 10% of relative changes in ranking; more than 90% of the web pages lose PageRank scores, while the other pages show remarkable gains in scores. To have an idea of the changes, we list the web pages that gain or lose the most scores by using HON as the input to PageRank, as shown in Table S1. Interestingly, of the 15 web pages that gain the most scores from HON, 6 are weather forecasts and 5 are obituaries, as one would expect considering this data set is from websites of local newspapers and TVs. Of the 15 web pages that lose the most scores, 3 are the lists of news personnel under the “about” page, which a normal reader will rarely visit, but over-valued by ranking on the first-order network.

To further understand how the structural differences of HON and the first-order network lead to changes in PageRank scores, we choose web pages that show significant changes in

ranking, and compare the corresponding subgraphs of the two network representations. A typical example is a pair of pages, *PHOTOS: January 17th snow - WDBJ7 / news* and *View/Upload your snow photos - WDBJ7 / news* — these two pages gain 135% and 236% flow respectively on HON. In the first-order network representation, as shown in Fig. 5A where edge widths indicate the transition probabilities between web pages, it appears that after viewing or uploading the snow photos, a user is very likely to go back to the WDBJ7 home page immediately. In reality, however, once a user views and uploads a photo, the user is likely to repeat this process to upload more photos while less likely to go back to the home page. This natural scenario is completely ignored in the first-order network.

In comparison, in the HON representation of the same data, as in Fig. 5B, each of the two pages “View snow photos” and “Upload snow photos” is represented with a first-order node and a second-order node. The first-order nodes and connections in HON are identical to the first-order network, so that all first-order information is preserved. The additional higher-order structure captures the scenario of users uploading multiple photos. In HON, if a user uploads a photo and then views the snow photos album, the implicit random walker of PageRank simulating the user is now at the higher-order node in HON; then as indicated by the strong loop between the higher-order nodes, the user is now much more likely to upload more photos rather than going back to the WDBJ7 home page immediately. The example also shows how the higher “two step return rate” on HON can affect the ranking results. Similarly, such higher-order return flows not only exist between pairs of nodes, but can also be seen in bigger loops, like “three step return rate” discussed before, and these more complex behaviors can only be captured with HON. Again, all these insights are gained by using HON instead of the conventional first-order network, without any change to the PageRank algorithm. Besides the ranking of web pages, HON may also influence many other applications of ranking such as citation ranking.

Scalability of HON

We further show the scalability of HON, derived from its compact representation. In previous research (where a fixed second order is assumed for the network), from Table 1 it is shown that the network is considerably larger than the conventional first-order network, and assuming a fixed order beyond the second order becomes impractical because “higher-order Markov models are more complex” (12) due to combinatorial explosion. A network that is too large is not useful in practice, because it will be computationally expensive to construct the network or perform further analysis on it. On the contrary, while HON with maximum order of two has comparable accuracies in terms of random walking movement simulation, it is about half the size of a fixed second-order network, because it uses the first order whenever possible and embeds second-order dependencies only when necessary. Even when increasing the maximum order to five, HON is still smaller than the fixed second-order network, while all the useful dependencies up to the fifth order are incorporated in the network, resulting in considerably higher accuracies on random walking simulations. More discussions on the parameter sensitivity of HON in terms of network size and random walking accuracy are provided in Supplementary Material Note 3.

Another important advantage of HON over a fixed order network is that network analysis algorithms can run faster on HON, due to HON’s compact representation. Table 1 shows the running time of two typical network analysis tasks: ranking (with PageRank (34)) and clustering (with MapEquation (32)). Compared with the fixed second-order network, these tasks run almost two times faster on HON with a maximum order of two, and about the same speed on HON with a maximum order of five (which embeds more higher-order dependencies and is more accurate). Essentially, using HON instead of fixed order networks can speed up network analyses performed upon.

It is worth noting that the number of additional nodes/edges needed for HON (on top of a first-order network) is determined by the number of higher-order dependencies in the data; that

additional size is neither affected by the size of the raw data, nor the density of the corresponding first-order network. For example, even if the first-order network representation of a data set is a complete graph with 1 million nodes, if 100 second-order dependencies exist in the data, HON needs only 100 additional auxiliary second-order nodes on top of the first-order network, rather than making the whole network the second order. Thus, the advantage of HON is being able to effectively represent higher-order dependencies, while being compact by trimming redundant higher-order connections.

Discussion

We have shown that for sequential data with higher-order dependencies, the conventional first-order network fails to represent such dependency patterns in the network structure, and the fixed second-order dependency can become limiting. If the network representation is not truly representative of the original data, then it will invariably lead to unreliable conclusions or insights from network analyses. We develop a new process for extracting rules and patterns governing higher-order dependencies in the raw data, and for building a network (the Higher-Order Network (HON)) that can represent such higher-order dependencies. We demonstrate that our novel network representation is more accurate in representing the true patterns in data in comparison with the conventional first-order network or the fixed second-order network: for example, when using HON instead of a first-order network to represent the global shipping data, the accuracy is more than doubled when simulating a ship's next movement on the network, and is higher by one magnitude when simulating three steps. We give examples to explain the improved accuracy, that the higher-order nodes and edges in HON can provide more detailed guidance to random walkers. Besides improved accuracy, our algorithm has good scalability, by embedding higher-order dependencies only when necessary. Compared with fixed order networks, HON can represent higher orders using fewer space because variable order of dependencies can co-

exist in HON. In addition, network analysis algorithms run faster on HON than on networks with a fixed high order.

Furthermore, we show that using HON instead of conventional network representations can influence the results of network analyses methods that are based on random walking. For example, on HON, the clustering of ports takes indirect ship-borne species introduction pathways into account, and naturally produces overlapping clusters that indicate multiple sources of species invasion for international ports; the ranking of web pages is corrected by incorporating the higher-order patterns of users' browsing behaviors such as uploading multiple photos. Our work has the potential to influence a wide range of applications, as the proposed network representation is consistent with the input expected by various network analysis methods. In the current method, the choice of parameters may influence the structure of the resulting network, so we provide parameter discussions in Supplementary Material Note 3.

In future work, we look forward to (a) extending the applications of HON beyond the simulation of movements to more dynamic processes such as dynamic network anomaly detection, and (b) improving the algorithm by reducing the parameters needed.

Materials and Methods

The construction of the Higher-Order Network (HON) consists of two steps: *rule extraction* identifies higher-order dependencies that have sufficient support and can significantly alter a random walker's probability distribution of choosing the next step; then *network wiring* adds these rules describing variable orders of dependencies into the conventional first-order network by adding higher-order nodes and rewiring edges. The data structure of the resulting network is consistent with the conventional network representation, so existing network analysis methods can be applied directly without being modified. We use global shipping traffic data as a working example to demonstrate the construction of HON, but it is generalizable to any sequential data.

Rule extraction

The challenge of rule extraction is to identify the appropriate orders of dependencies in data; this step is often ignored by simply counting pairwise connections in the data to build the first-order network. We define a *path* as the movement from source node A to target node B with sufficient support (e.g. frequency ≥ 10), though with nodes that differ from those in a conventional network: a node here can represent a sequence of entities, no longer necessarily a single entity. Then among those paths, given a source node A containing a sequence of entities $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k]$, if including an additional entity a_0 at the beginning of A can significantly alter the normalized counts of movements (as probability distribution) to target nodes set $\{B\}$, it means $\{B\}$ has a higher-order dependency on $A_{ext} = [a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k]$, and paths containing higher-order dependencies like $A_{ext} \rightarrow \{B\}$ are defined as rules. Then a rule like $Freq([a_0, a_1] \rightarrow a_2) = 50$ can map to an edge in the network in the form of $a_1|a_0 \rightarrow a_2$ with edge weight 50. What are the expectations for the rule extraction process?

First, rules should represent dependencies that are significant. As in Figure S1 ③, if the probability distribution of a ship's next step from Singapore is significantly affected by knowing the ship came from Shanghai to Singapore, there is at least second-order dependency here. On the contrary, if the probability distribution of going to the next port is the same no matter how the ship reached Singapore, there is no evidence for second-order dependency (but third or higher-order dependencies may still exist, and can be checked similarly).

Second, rules should have sufficient support. Only when some pattern happens sufficiently many times can it be considered as a "rule" or a "path" rather than some random event. Although this requirement of minimum support is not compulsory, not specifying a minimum support will result in a larger and more detailed network representation, and more infrequent routes are falsely considered as patterns, ultimately lowering the accuracy of the representation (see the discussions of parameters in Supplementary Material Note 3).

Third, rules should be able to represent variable orders of dependencies. In real-world data such as the global shipping data, different paths can have different orders of dependencies. For the path $Busan \rightarrow Tokyo \rightarrow Singapore$, including $Tianjin$ or $Dalian$ as the previous step can significantly change the probability distribution of choosing the next step from Singapore, showing fourth-order dependency; while for the path $Shanghai \rightarrow Singapore$, knowing how the ship reached $Shanghai$ does not influence the ship’s next movement, showing second-order dependency. When variable orders can co-exist in the same data set, the rule extraction algorithm should not assign a fixed order to the data, but should be able to yield rules representing variable orders of dependencies. Following the aforementioned three objectives of rule extraction, we developed our Algorithm 1, which is detailed in the Supplementary Material Note 2.

An optional minimum support $MinSup$ helps eliminate noise, keeps the network concise and speeds up rule extraction. Because the orders of dependencies in the data are unknown before running rule extraction, a sufficiently large maximum order $MaxOrder$ is needed so that the rule growing algorithm can stop trying to raise the order of dependency at the given order. The discussion of parameters is given in the Supplementary Material Note 3.

It is worth noting that although Variable-order Markov (VOM) models can be used on sequential data to learn a VOM tree (22) for predictions (44), our goal is to build a more accurate network representation that captures higher-order dependencies in the data. While these two objectives are related, there are several key differences: (a) a VOM tree contains probabilities that are unnecessary (e.g. nodes that are not leaves) for representing higher-order dependencies in a network; (b) additional conditional probabilities are needed to connect nodes with different orders in HON, which are not guaranteed to exist in a pruned VOM tree; (c) VOM usually contains lots of unnecessary edges due to the “smoothing” process for the unobserved data, which is not desired for a network representation. Therefore, our work is not simply contained in a VOM implementation. Another study (25) discusses model order determination in higher-order

Markov chains, and gives a hint on how to convert a fixed higher-order Markov model into a first-order one, but no discussion is made to the case when variable orders exist in the same data set, nor does the discussion relate to network representation. Other Markov-related works such as hidden Markov model (24), frequent pattern mining (20), and next location prediction (21) focus more on the stochastic process, rather than the network representation problem.

Network wiring

The remaining task is to convert the rules obtained from the last step into a graph representation. It is trivial for building conventional first-order networks because every rule is first-order and can directly map to an edge connecting two entities. However, when rules representing variable orders of dependencies need to be embedded into the same network, a direct conversion of rules will not work. The reason is that during rule extraction, only the last entity of every path is taken as the target node, so that every edge points to a first-order node, which means higher-order nodes will not have in-edges. Rewiring is needed to ensure that higher-order nodes will have incoming edges, while preserving the sum of edge weights in the network.

The key of network wiring is to finish processing lower orders rules before starting with higher-order ones: first, convert all first-order rules into edges in the same way of constructing a first-order network; then, for all rules of one order higher, convert the rules into edges (add new higher-order nodes when necessary), and rewire existing edges to point to higher-order nodes; repeat the process until the highest order rules are processed; last, rewire edges built from *Valid* rules (refer to Algorithm 1 in Supplementary Note 2) to point to existing nodes with the highest possible order. The detailed steps are illustrated as follows:

1. Converting all first-order rules into edges. This step is exactly the same as constructing a first-order network, where every first-order rule (a path from one entity to another) corresponds to a weighted edge. As illustrated in Fig. S2A, *Shanghai* \rightarrow *Singapore* is

added to the network.

2. Converting higher-order rules. In this step, higher-order rules are converted to higher-order edges pointing out from higher-order nodes (the nodes are created if they do not already exist in the network). Fig. S2B shows the conversion of rules $Singapore|Shanghai \rightarrow LosAngeles$ and $Singapore|Shanghai \rightarrow Seattle$, where the second-order node $Singapore|Shanghai$ is created and two edges pointing out from the node are added.
3. Rewiring in-edges for higher-order nodes. This step solves the problem that higher-order nodes have no incoming edges, by pointing existing edges to higher-order nodes. When adding the second-order node $Singapore|Shanghai$, a lower order rule and the corresponding edge $Shanghai \rightarrow Singapore$ are guaranteed to exist, because during rule extraction when a rule is added, all preceding steps of the path are also added, as in ADDTORULES in Algorithm 1. As shown in Fig. S2C, the edge from $Shanghai$ to $Singapore$ is redirected to $Singapore|Shanghai$. The rewiring step (instead of adding edges) also preserves the sum of edge weights. Converting higher-order rules (Step 2) and rewiring (Step 3) are repeated for all rules of first order, then second order, and likewise up to the maximum order.
4. Rewiring edges built from *Valid* rules. After representing all rules as edges in HON, additional rewirings are needed for edges built from *Valid* rules (refer to Algorithm 1 in Supplementary Note 2). The reason is that the rule extraction step takes only the last entity of paths as targets, such that edges built from *Valid* rules always point to first-order nodes. In Fig. S2D, the node $Singapore|Shanghai$ was pointing to a first-order node $Seattle$. However, if a node of higher order $Seattle|Singapore$ already exists in the network, the edge $Singapore|Shanghai \rightarrow Seattle$ should point to $Seattle|Singapore$, otherwise the information about previous steps is lost. To preserve as much information as

possible, the edges built from *Valid* rules should point to nodes with the highest possible orders.

Following the above process, the algorithm for network wiring is given in Algorithm 2 in Supplementary Material Note 2, along with more detailed explanations. We have made the entire source code available as well (at <https://github.com/xyjprc/hon>).

Supplementary Material

Text

Fig. S1. Rule extraction example for the global shipping data.

Fig. S2. Network wiring example for the global shipping data.

Fig. S3. Parameter sensitivity of HON in terms of accuracy and network size.

Table S1. Changes of PageRank scores by using HON instead of a first-order network.

Algorithm 1. The rule extraction algorithm.

Algorithm 2. The network wiring algorithm.

References

1. G. Chowell, J. M. Hyman, S. Eubank, C. Castillo-Chavez, Scaling laws for the movement of people between locations in a large city. *Physical Review E* **68**, 066102 (2003).
2. A. De Montis, M. Barthelemy, A. Chessa, A. Vespignani, The structure of interurban traffic: a weighted network analysis. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* **34**, 905–924 (2007).
3. G. Bagler, Analysis of the airport network of india as a complex weighted network. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **387**, 2972–2980 (2008).

4. M. E. Newman, Analysis of weighted networks. *Physical Review E* **70**, 056131 (2004).
5. A. Barrat, M. Barthelemy, R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Vespignani, The architecture of complex weighted networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **101**, 3747–3752 (2004).
6. C. Song, Z. Qu, N. Blumm, A.-L. Barabási, Limits of predictability in human mobility. *Science* **327**, 1018–1021 (2010).
7. A. Markov, *Theory of Algorithms [Translated by Jacques J. Schorr-Kon and PST staff]* (Imprint Moscow, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1954).
8. P. Kaluza, A. Kölzsch, M. T. Gastner, B. Blasius, The complex network of global cargo ship movements. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* **7**, 1093–1103 (2010).
9. J. Xu, T. L. Wickramaratne, N. V. Chawla, E. K. Grey, K. Steinhaeuser, R. P. Keller, J. M. Drake, D. M. Lodge, *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining* (ACM, 2014), pp. 1699–1708.
10. M. E. Newman, Scientific collaboration networks. ii. shortest paths, weighted networks, and centrality. *Physical review E* **64**, 016132 (2001).
11. J. M. Drake, D. M. Lodge, Global hot spots of biological invasions: Evaluating options for ballast–water management. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **271**, 575–580 (2004).
12. M. Rosvall, A. V. Esquivel, A. Lancichinetti, J. D. West, R. Lambiotte, Memory in network flows and its effects on spreading dynamics and community detection. *Nature communications* **5** (2014).

13. P. Singer, D. Helic, B. Taraghi, M. Strohmaier, Detecting memory and structure in human navigation patterns using markov chain models of varying order. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e102070 (2014).
14. F. Chierichetti, R. Kumar, P. Raghavan, T. Sarlos, *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web* (ACM, 2012), pp. 609–618.
15. M. Deshpande, G. Karypis, Selective markov models for predicting web page accesses. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology* **4**, 163–184 (2004).
16. T. Takaguchi, M. Nakamura, N. Sato, K. Yano, N. Masuda, Predictability of conversation partners. *Physical Review X* **1**, 011008 (2011).
17. G. Janacek, Time series analysis: forecasting and control. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **31**, 303–303 (2010).
18. J. D. Hamilton, *Time series analysis*, vol. 2 (Princeton university press, 1994).
19. C. E. Shannon, A mathematical theory of communication. *ACM SIGMOBILE Mobile Computing and Communications Review* **5**, 3–55 (2001).
20. J. Han, J. Pei, Y. Yin, *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, SIGMOD '00 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2000), pp. 1–12.
21. A. Monreale, F. Pinelli, R. Trasarti, F. Giannotti, *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining* (ACM, 2009), pp. 637–646.
22. A. Shmilovici, I. Ben-Gal, Using a vom model for reconstructing potential coding regions in est sequences. *Computational Statistics* **22**, 49–69 (2007).

23. P. Bühlmann, A. J. Wyner, *et al.*, Variable length markov chains. *The Annals of Statistics* **27**, 480–513 (1999).
24. L. Rabiner, A tutorial on hidden markov models and selected applications in speech recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **77**, 257–286 (1989).
25. K. P. Murphy, Learning markov processes. *The Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science* (2002).
26. M. J. Van der Heyden, C. G. Diks, B. P. Hoekstra, J. DeGoede, Testing the order of discrete markov chains using surrogate data. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **117**, 299–313 (1998).
27. M. F. Heath, M. C. Vernon, C. R. Webb, Construction of networks with intrinsic temporal structure from uk cattle movement data. *BMC Veterinary Research* **4**, 11 (2008).
28. I. Scholtes, N. Wider, R. Pfitzner, A. Garas, C. J. Tessone, F. Schweitzer, Causality-driven slow-down and speed-up of diffusion in non-markovian temporal networks. *Nature communications* **5** (2014).
29. I. Scholtes, N. Wider, A. Garas, Higher-order aggregate networks in the analysis of temporal networks: Path structures and centralities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.06467* (2015).
30. M. T. Schaub, J. Lehmann, S. N. Yaliraki, M. Barahona, Structure of complex networks: Quantifying edge-to-edge relations by failure-induced flow redistribution. *Network Science* **2**, 66–89 (2014).
31. M. De Domenico, A. Solé-Ribalta, S. Gómez, A. Arenas, Navigability of interconnected networks under random failures. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **111**, 8351–8356 (2014).

32. M. Rosvall, C. T. Bergstrom, Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **105**, 1118–1123 (2008).
33. P. Pons, M. Latapy, Computing communities in large networks using random walks. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications* **10**, 191–218 (2006).
34. L. Page, S. Brin, R. Motwani, T. Winograd, The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web., *Technical Report 1999-66*, Stanford InfoLab (1999).
35. F. Fouss, A. Pirotte, J.-M. Renders, M. Saerens, Random-walk computation of similarities between nodes of a graph with application to collaborative recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **19**, 355–369 (2007).
36. L. Backstrom, J. Leskovec, *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, WSDM '11 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2011), pp. 635–644.
37. L. Akoglu, H. Tong, D. Koutra, Graph based anomaly detection and description: a survey. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **29**, 626–688 (2014).
38. M. R. Meiss, F. Menczer, S. Fortunato, A. Flammini, A. Vespignani, *Proceedings of the 2008 International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (ACM, 2008), pp. 65–76.
39. P. Holme, Information content of contact-pattern representations and predictability of epidemic outbreaks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.06583* (2015).
40. J.-C. Delvenne, S. N. Yaliraki, M. Barahona, Stability of graph communities across time scales. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **107**, 12755–12760 (2010).

41. C. Berge, *Hypergraphs: combinatorics of finite sets*, vol. 45 (Elsevier, 1984).
42. A. Vespignani, Modelling dynamical processes in complex socio-technical systems. *Nature Physics* **8**, 32–39 (2012).
43. J. L. Molnar, R. L. Gamboa, C. Revenga, M. D. Spalding, Assessing the global threat of invasive species to marine biodiversity. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **6**, 485–492 (2008).
44. R. Begleiter, R. El-Yaniv, G. Yona, On prediction using variable order markov models. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* pp. 385–421 (2004).
45. J. Zhang, B. Liu, J. Tang, T. Chen, J. Li, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI '13* (AAAI Press, 2013), pp. 2761–2767.

Acknowledgements: We thank Yuxiao Dong and Reid Johnson for discussions.

Funding: This work is based on research supported by the ND Office of Research via Environmental Change Initiative (ECI), the National Science Foundation (NSF) Award #1427157 and #1229450, the Army Research Laboratory and was accomplished under Cooperative Agreement Number W911NF-09-2-0053, the U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR), and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) grant #FA9550-12-1-0405.

Author Contributions: JX, TLW and NVC collectively conceived the research. JX and TLW designed the analyses. JX conducted the experiments. JX, TLW and NVC conducted the analyses. JX, TLW and NVC wrote the manuscript.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

Data and materials availability: The entire source code and the synthetic data are available online at <https://github.com/xyjprc/hon>.




Fig. 1. Necessity of representing dependencies in networks. (A) A global shipping data set, containing ship movements as sequential data. (B) A first-order network built by taking the number of trips between port pairs as edge weights. A ship currently at Singapore has similar probabilities of going to Los Angeles and Seattle, no matter where the ship came to Singapore. (C) By breaking down the node Singapore, the ship's next step from Singapore can depend on where the ship came to Singapore, thus more accurately simulate movement patterns in the original data. (D) Variable orders of dependencies represented in HON. First-order to fourth-order dependencies are shown here, and can easily extend to higher orders. Coming from different paths to Singapore, a ship will choose the next step differently.




Fig. 2. Comparison of random walking accuracies. (A) For the global shipping data comprised of ships’ trajectories, hold the last three steps of each trajectory for testing and use the rest to build the network. (B and C) Given a generated shipping network, every ship is simulated by a random walker, which walks three steps from the last location in the corresponding training trajectory. The generated trajectories are compared with the ground truth, and the fraction of correct predictions is the random walking accuracy. (D) By using HON instead of the first-order network, the accuracy is more than doubled when simulating the next step, and improved by one magnitude when simulating the next three steps. Note that error bars are too small to be displayed (standard deviations on HONs are $0.11\% \pm 0.02\%$).




Fig. 3. Clustering of ports on different network representations of the global shipping data. Ports tightly coupled by frequent shipping in a cluster are also likely to introduce non-native species to each other. MapEquation (32) is used for clustering, and different colors represent different clusters. **(A)** Clustering on the first-order network. Although Valletta and Malta Freeport are local and international ports respectively, the clustering result does not distinguish the two. **(B)** Clustering on HON. The overlapping clusters indicate how international ports (such as Malta Freeport) may suffer from species invasion from multiple sources.




Fig. 4. Change of web page rankings by using HON instead of first-order network. PageRank (34) is used for ranking. 20% the pages show more than 10% of relative changes in ranking. More than 90% of the web pages lose PageRank scores, while the other pages show remarkable gain in scores. Note that log-log scale is used in the figure, so a deviation from the diagonal indicates a significant change of the PageRank score.




Fig. 5. Comparison of different network representations for the same clickstream data. Edge widths indicate the transition probabilities. (A) The first-order network representation, indicating a user is likely to go back to the homepage after viewing or uploading snow photos. (B) The HON representation, which not only preserves the information in the first-order network, but also uses higher-order nodes and edges to represent an additional scenario: once a user views and uploads a photo, the user is likely to repeat this process to upload more photos and is less likely to go back to the home page. Consequently, these photo viewing and uploading pages will receive higher PageRank scores because the implicit random walkers of PageRank are more likely to be trapped in the loop of the higher-order nodes.

Table 1. Comparing different network representations of the same global shipping data.

Network representation	Number of edges	Two step return	Three step return	Entropy rate (bits)	Clustering time (mins)	Ranking time (s)
Conventional first-order	31,028	10.7%	1.5%	3.44	4	1.3
Fixed second-order	116,611	42.8%	8.0%	1.45	73	7.7
HON, max order two	60,959	40.3%	6.8%	1.54	38	4.4
HON, max order three	76,634	44.2%	16.4%	0.95	61	6.3
HON, max order four	84,345	49.1%	19.2%	0.66	68	7.5
HON, max order five	87,230	50.2%	20.4%	0.58	76	7.9

Supplementary Material

For the paper “Representing higher-order dependencies in networks” by Jian Xu, Thanuka L. Wickramaratne, and Nitesh V. Chawla

1 Data sets

Global shipping data. This data made available by Lloyd’s Maritime Intelligence Unit (LMIU) contains ship movement information such as `vessel_id`, `port_id`, `sail_date` and `arrival_date`. Our experiments are based on a recent LMIU data set that spans one year from May 1st, 2012 to April 30th, 2013, totaling 3,415,577 individual voyages corresponding to 65,591 ships that move among 4,108 ports and regions globally. A minimum support of 10 is used to filter out noise in the data.

Clickstream data. This data made available by Schurz Communication Inc. contains logs of users clicking through web pages that belong to 50 news web sites owned by the company. Fields of interest include `user_ip`, `pagename` and `time`. Our experiments are based on the clickstream records that span two months from December 4th, 2012 to February 3rd, 2013, totaling 3,047,697 page views made by 179,178 distinct IP addresses on 45,257 web pages. A minimum support of 5 is used to filter out noise in the data. Clickstreams that are likely to be created by crawlers (abnormally long clickstreams / clickstreams that frequently hit the error page) are omitted.

Retweet data. This data (45) records retweet history on Weibo (a Chinese microblogging website), with information about who retweets whose messages at what time. The data was crawled in 2012 and there are 23,755,810 retweets recorded, involving 1,776,950 users.

Synthetic data. We synthesize a trajectory data set (data and code are available at <https://github.com/xyjprc/hon>) with known higher-order dependencies to verify the effectiveness of the rule extraction algorithm. In the context of shipping, we connect 100 ports as a 10×10 grid, then generate trajectories of 100,000 ships moving among these ports. Each ship moves 100 steps, yielding 10,000,000 movements in total. Normally each ship has equal probabilities of going up/down/left/right on the grid in each step (with wrapping, e.g., going down at the bottom row will end up in the top row); we use additional higher-order rules to control the generation of ship movements. For example, a second-order rule can be defined as whenever a ship comes from Shanghai to Singapore, instead of randomly picking a neighboring port of Singapore for the next step, the ship has 70% chance of going to Los Angeles and 30% chance of going to Seattle. We predefine 10 second-order rules like this, and similarly 10 third-order rules, 10 fourth-order rules, and no other higher-order rules, before the generation of ship trajectories. To test the rule extraction algorithm, we set the maximum order as five to see if the algorithm will incorrectly extract false rules beyond the fourth order which we did not define; we set tolerance as 0.1 for the proactiveness of trimming redundant higher-order rules, and set minimum support as five for patterns to be considered as rules.

2 Algorithms

Rule extraction. With the aforementioned three objectives in the Methods section, it is natural to grow rules incrementally: start with a first-order path, try to increase the order by including one more previous step, and check if the probability distribution for the next step changes significantly (Fig. S1 ③). If the change is significant, the higher order is assumed, otherwise keep the old assumption of order. This rule growing process is iterated recursively until (a) the minimum support requirement is not met, or (b) the maximum order is exceeded.

Algorithm 1 gives the pseudocode of rule extraction. The procedure consists of three major steps: `BUILD-OBSERVATIONS` counts the frequencies of all subsequences from the second order to *MaxOrder* for every trajectory in T (Fig. S1 ①); `BUILD-DISTRIBUTIONS` first builds all paths by removing subsequences that appear less than *MinSupport* times, then estimates probability distributions of movements at every source node by normalizing the observed frequencies (Fig. S1 ②). `GENERATE-ALL-RULES` starts from the first order and tries to increase the order recursively, by including an additional entity at the beginning of the entity sequence of the source node and testing if the probability distribution for the next step changes significantly (Fig. S1 ③).

The comparison between probability distributions is performed by the recursive function `EXTEND-RULE`. *Curr* is the current source node ($X_t = \textit{Singapore}$ in Fig. S1), which is to be extended into a higher-order source node *ExtSource* by including the previous step ($X_t = \textit{Singapore}, X_{t-1} = \textit{Shanghai}$ in Fig. S1) (line 41). *Valid* is the last known source node from which a random walker has significantly different probability distributions towards the next step, i.e., the last assumed order for the path starting from node *Valid* is $\textit{length}(\textit{Valid})$. If at the extended source node, a random walker has a significantly different probability distribution of the next movement compared with that at node *Valid*, the extended source node will be marked as the new *Valid* for the recursive growing of rule (line 48), otherwise the old *Valid* is kept (line 50). The paths with *Valid* as the source node have correct orders of dependencies, and will be added to the rules set R whenever `EXTEND-RULE` exceeds *MaxOrder* (line 36) or the source node cannot be extended (line 42, true when no higher-order source node with the same last steps exists). When a higher-order rule (a path from *Source*) is added, all paths of the preceding steps of *Source* are added (line 55–56) to ensure the network wiring step can connect nodes with variable orders. For example, when paths from the source node $\textit{Singapore}|\textit{Shanghai}$ are added to R , the preceding step $\textit{Shanghai} \rightarrow \textit{Singapore}$ should also be added to R .

In our implementation, to judge if the probability distribution for the next step (line 47), we measure the angle θ between the two vectors representing the respective probability distributions \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_2 in a multidimensional space: if the angle θ is sufficiently large such that the cosine similarity $\cos(\theta) = \frac{\mathbf{P}_1 \cdot \mathbf{P}_2}{\|\mathbf{P}_1\| \|\mathbf{P}_2\|}$ satisfies $\cos(\theta) \leq 1 - \Delta$ where Δ is a predefined *tolerance*, the two probability distributions are considered significantly different, and the next step of a random walker depends on the (extended) higher-order path.

It is worth noting that Algorithm 1 also applies to data types other than trajectories such as diffusion data, which needs only one change of the EXTRACTSUBSEQUENCES function such that it takes only the newest entity subsequence.

Network wiring. Algorithm 2 gives the pseudocode for converting rules extracted from data into a graph representation. In line 3, sorting rules by the length of key *Source* is equivalent to sorting rules by ascending orders. This ensures that the `for` loop in line 4–7 converts all lower order rules before processing higher-order rules. For every order, line 5 converts rules to edges, and line 7 `REWIRE(r)` attempts rewiring if it is not the first order. Fig. S2C illustrates the case $r = \textit{Singapore}|\textit{Shanghai} \rightarrow \textit{LosAngeles}$ in line 11, indicating *PrevSource* is *Shanghai* and *PrevTarget* is *Singapore|Shanghai*. The edge *Shanghai* \rightarrow *Singapore|Shanghai* is not found in the network, so in line 15 and 16 *Shanghai* \rightarrow *Singapore|Shanghai* replaces *Shanghai* \rightarrow *Singapore* using the same edge weight.

After converting all rules in `REWIRETAILS`, edges created from *Valid* rules are rewired to target nodes that have the highest possible orders. Fig. S2D illustrates the following case: in line 21 $r = \textit{Singapore}|\textit{Shanghai} \rightarrow \textit{Seattle}$, so in line 22 *NewTarget* is assigned as *Seattle|Singapore, Shanghai*; assume *Seattle|Singapore, Shanghai* is not found in all sources of *R*, so the lower order node *Seattle|Singapore* is searched next; assume *Seattle|Singapore* already exists in the graph, so *Singapore|Shanghai* \rightarrow *Seattle|Singapore* replaces *Singapore|Shanghai* \rightarrow

Seattle.

3 Parameter discussion

Minimum support. As mentioned in the methods section, only when a subsequence occurs sufficiently many times (not below minimum support) can it be distinguished from noise and construed as a (non-trivial) path. While a minimum support is not compulsory, setting an appropriate minimum support can significantly reduce the network size and improve the accuracy of representation. As shown in Fig. S3A, by increasing the minimum support from 1 to 10 (with a fixed maximum order of 5 and a tolerance of 0.1), the size of the network shrinks by two orders of magnitude while the accuracy of random walking simulation shows only $\pm 2\%$ in changes. By increasing the minimum support from 1 to 100, the accuracy first increases then decreases. The reason is that with low minimum support, some unusual subsequences that are noise are counted as paths; on the other hand, a high minimum support leaves out some true patterns that happen less frequently. The optimal minimum support (that can increase the accuracy of representation and greatly reduce the size of the network) may not be the same for different types of data, but can be found by parameter sweeping.

Maximum order. With a higher maximum order, the rule extraction algorithm can capture dependencies of higher orders, leading to higher accuracies of random walking simulations. As shown in Fig. S3B, when increasing the maximum order from 1 to 5 (with a fixed minimum support of 10 and a tolerance of 0.1), the accuracy of random walking simulation keeps increasing but converges at the maximum order of 5, and the same trend applies for the size of the network. The reason is that the majority of dependencies have lower orders while fewer dependencies have higher orders, which again justifies our approach of not assigning a fixed high order for the whole network. On the other hand, setting a high maximum order does not sig-

nificantly increase the running time of building HON, because in the rule extraction algorithm, most subsequences of longer lengths do not satisfy the minimum support requirement and are not considered in the following steps. In brief, when building HON using the aforementioned algorithm, an order that is sufficiently high can be assumed as the maximum order (a maximum order of five is sufficient for most applications).

Tolerance. In the rule extraction algorithm, the tolerance Δ is used to judge whether the probability distribution of random walking from an extended source node is sufficiently different from that of a *Valid* node. The higher the tolerance, the more proactive the algorithm is in pruning similar higher-order rules. As expected in Fig. S3C, with a fixed minimum support of 10 and a maximum order of 5, higher tolerance leads to smaller network size, but as some higher-order rules are pruned, the accuracy of random walking simulation is also affected. A tolerance of 0 means every rule is raised to the highest order possible (under the minimum support and the maximum order constraint), and a tolerance of 1 means every higher-order rule is pruned and the network degenerates to a first-order network. This parameter controls the trade-off between whether the accuracy or the network size is more important to the application.

Supplementary figures, tables, and algorithms:




Fig. S1. Rule extraction example for the global shipping data. Step 1: count the occurrences of subsequences from the first order to the maximum order; those that meet the minimum support requirement are paths. Step 2: given the source node representing a sequence of entities as the previous step(s), compute probability distributions for the next step. Step 3: given the original source node and an extended source node (extended by including an additional entity at the beginning of the entity sequence), compare the probability distributions of the next step. For example, when the current location is Singapore, knowing that a ship comes from Shanghai to Singapore (second order) significantly changes the probability distribution for the next step compared with not knowing where the ship came from (first order). So the second-order dependency is assumed here; then the probability distribution is compared with that of the third order, and so on, until the minimum support is not met or the maximum order is exceeded.




Fig. S2. Network wiring example for the global shipping data. Figure shows how the dependency rules are represented as HON. **(A)** convert all first-order rules into edges; **(B)** convert higher-order rules, and add higher-order nodes when necessary, **(C)** rewire edges so that they point to newly added higher-order nodes (the edge weights are preserved); **(D)** rewire edges built from *Valid* rules so that they point to nodes with the highest possible order.




Fig. S3. Parameter sensitivity of HON in terms of the accuracy and network size. The global shipping data illustrated, and the accuracy is the percentage of correct predictions when using a random walker to predict the next step. **(A)** An appropriate minimum support can significantly reduce the network size and improve the accuracy of representation; **(B)** when increasing the maximum order, the accuracy of random walking simulation keeps improving but converges near the maximum order of 5, and the same trend applies to the size of the network; **(C)** the higher the tolerance, the more proactive the algorithm prunes the similar higher-order rules, which leads to a smaller but less accurate network representation.

Table S1. Changes of PageRank scores by using HON instead of a first-order network. For the clickstream data. Top 15 gainers / losers of PageRank scores are listed.

Pages that gain PageRank scores	Δ PR
South Bend Tribune - Home.	+0.0131
South Bend Tribune - Obits - 3rd Party.	+0.0129
South Bend Tribune / sports / notredame - Front.	+0.0112
Hagerstown News / obituaries - Front.	+0.0059
WDBJ7 - Home.	+0.0056
WDBJ7 / weather / radar - Front.	+0.0047
Aberdeen News / news / obituaries - Front.	+0.0045
Hagerstown News - Home.	+0.0045
KY3 / weather - Front.	+0.0039
WDBJ7 / weather / closings - Front.	+0.0038
WSBT TV / weather - Front.	+0.0038
Daily American / lifestyle / obituaries - Front.	+0.0032
WDBJ7 / weather / 7-day-planner - Front.	+0.0029
WDBJ7 / weather - Front.	+0.0025
South Bend Tribune / obituaries / arrangements - Front.	+0.0024
Pages that lose PageRank scores	Δ PR
KTUU - Home.	-0.0062
KWCH - Home.	-0.0039
KY3 - Home.	-0.0016
Petoskey News - Home.	-0.0009
Imperial Valley Press / classifieds / topjobs - Front.	-0.0005
WDBJ7 / weather / web-cams - Front.	-0.0004
KTUU / about / meetnewsteam - Front.	-0.0003
KWCH / about / station / newsteam - Front.	-0.0003
Amnews / news / obituaries - Front.	-0.0003
South Bend Tribune / sports / highschoolsports - Front.	-0.0002
WDBJ7 / news / anchors-reporters - Front.	-0.0002
South Bend Tribune / sports / notredame / moreallsports - Front.	-0.0002
WDBJ7 / news - Front.	-0.0002
WKHY - Home.	-0.0002
Hagerstown News / search - .	-0.0002

Algorithm 1 Rule extraction. Given the sequential data T , outputs higher-order dependency rules R .

Parameters: \mathcal{O} : MaxOrder, S : MinSupport, Δ : Tolerance

```
1: global counter  $C \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: global nested dictionary  $D \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3: global nested dictionary  $R \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4:
5: function EXTRACTRULES( $T, \mathcal{O}, S, \Delta$ )
6:   BUILD OBSERVATIONS( $T, \mathcal{O}$ )
7:   BUILD DISTRIBUTIONS( $S$ )
8:   GENERATE ALL RULES( $\mathcal{O}, S, \Delta$ )
9:   return  $R$ 
10:
11: function BUILD OBSERVATIONS( $T, \mathcal{O}$ )
12:   for  $t$  in  $T$  do
13:     if  $\text{length}(t) > \mathcal{O}$  then
14:       for  $o$  from 2 to  $\mathcal{O}$  do
15:          $SS \leftarrow \text{ExtractSubSequences}(t, o)$ 
16:         for  $s$  in  $SS$  do
17:            $Target \leftarrow \text{LastElement}(s)$ 
18:            $Source \leftarrow \text{AllButLastElement}(s)$ 
19:            $\text{IncreaseCounter}(C[Source][Target])$ 
20:
21: function BUILD DISTRIBUTIONS( $S$ )
22:   for  $Source$  in  $C$  do
23:     for  $Target$  in  $C[Source]$  do
24:       if  $C[Source][Target] < S$  then
25:          $\text{Remove}(C[Source][Target])$ 
26:     for  $Target$  in  $C[Source]$  do
27:        $D[Source][Target] \leftarrow C[Source][Target] / \text{Sum}(C[Source][*])$ 
28:
29: function GENERATE ALL RULES( $\mathcal{O}, S, \Delta$ )
30:   for  $Source$  in  $D$  do
31:     if  $\text{length}(Source) = 1$  then
32:        $\text{ADD TO RULES}(Source)$ 
33:        $\text{EXTEND RULE}(Source, Source, 1, \Delta)$ 
34: (To be continued on the next page.)
```

Algorithm 1 (*continued*)

```
35: function EXTENDRULE(Valid, Curr, Order,  $\Delta$ )
36:   if  $Order \geq 0$  then
37:     ADDTORULES(Valid)
38:   else
39:      $Distr \leftarrow D[Valid]$ 
40:      $NewOrder \leftarrow Order + 1$ 
41:      $Extended \leftarrow$  all Source satisfying  $length(Source) = NewOrder$  and end with Curr
42:     if  $Extended = \emptyset$  then
43:       ADDTORULES(Valid)
44:     else
45:       for ExtSource in  $Extended$  do
46:          $ExtDistr \leftarrow D[Extended]$ 
47:         if  $Distance(Distr, ExtDistr) > \Delta$  then
48:           EXTENDRULE(ExtSource, ExtSource,  $NewOrder$ ,  $\Delta$ )
49:         else
50:           EXTENDRULE(Valid, ExtSource,  $NewOrder$ ,  $\Delta$ )
51:
52: function ADDTORULES(Source)
53:   if  $length(Source) > 0$  then
54:      $R[Source] \leftarrow C[Source]$ 
55:      $PrevSource \leftarrow AllButLastElement(Source)$ 
56:     ADDTORULES(PrevSource)
```

Algorithm 2 Network wiring. Given the higher-order dependency rules R , convert the rules of variable orders into edges, perform rewiring, and output the graph G as HON.

```
1: function BUILDNETWORK( $R, \mathcal{O}$ )
2:   global nested dictionary  $G \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:    $R \leftarrow \text{Sort}(R, \text{ascending, by length of key } Source)$ 
4:   for  $r$  in  $R$  do
5:      $G.add(r)$ 
6:     if  $\text{length}(r.Source) > 1$  then
7:       REWIRE( $r$ )
8:   REWIRETAILS()
9:   return  $G$ 
10:
11: function REWIRE( $r$ )
12:    $PrevSource \leftarrow \text{AllButLastElement}(r.Source)$ 
13:    $PrevTarget \leftarrow \text{LastElement}(r.Source)$ 
14:   if (edge: (Source:  $PrevSource$ , Target:  $r.Source$ )) not in  $G$  then
15:      $G.add(\text{edge: (Source: } PrevSource, \text{ Target: } r.Source, \text{ Weight: } r.Probability))$ 
16:      $G.remove(\text{edge: (Source: } PrevSource, \text{ Target: } PrevTarget))$ 
17:
18: function REWIRETAILS()
19:    $ToAdd \leftarrow \emptyset; ToRemove \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
20:   for  $r$  in  $R$  do
21:     if  $\text{length}(r.Target) = 1$  then
22:        $NewTarget \leftarrow \text{concatenate}(Source, Target)$ 
23:       while  $\text{length}(NewTarget) > 1$  do
24:         if  $NewTarget$  in all Sources of  $R$  then
25:            $ToAdd.add(\text{edge: (Source: } r.Source, \text{ Target: } NewTarget, \text{ Weight: } r.Probability))$ 
26:            $ToRemove.add(\text{edge: (Source: } r.Source, \text{ Target: } r.Target))$ 
27:           Break
28:         else
29:            $\text{PopFirstElement}(NewTarget)$ 
30:    $G \leftarrow (G \cup ToAdd) \setminus ToRemove$ 
```
