

A Comprehensive Survey on Community Detection with Deep Learning

Xing Su, Shan Xue, Fanzhen Liu, Jia Wu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Jian Yang, Chuan Zhou, Wenbin Hu, Cecile Paris, Surya Nepal, Di Jin, Quan Z. Sheng, and Philip S. Yu, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—A community reveals the features and connections of its members that are different from those in other communities in a network. Detecting communities is of great significance in network analysis. Despite the classical spectral clustering and statistical inference methods, we notice a significant development of deep learning techniques for community detection in recent years with their advantages in handling high dimensional network data. Hence, a comprehensive overview of community detection’s latest progress through deep learning is timely to both academics and practitioners. This survey devises and proposes a new taxonomy covering different categories of the state-of-the-art methods, including deep learning-based models upon deep neural networks, deep nonnegative matrix factorization and deep sparse filtering. The main category, *i.e.*, deep neural networks, is further divided into convolutional networks, graph attention networks, generative adversarial networks and autoencoders. The survey also summarizes the popular benchmark data sets, model evaluation metrics, and open-source implementations to address experimentation settings. We then discuss the practical applications of community detection in various domains and point to implementation scenarios. Finally, we outline future directions by suggesting challenging topics in this fast-growing deep learning field.

Index Terms—Community Detection, Deep Learning, Social Networks, Network Representation, Graph Neural Networks

I. INTRODUCTION

Communities have been investigated as early as 1920s in sociology and social anthropology [1]. However, it is only after the 21st century that researchers started to detect communities with powerful mathematical tools and large-scale data manipulation to address challenging problems [2]. Since 2002 [3], Girvan and Newman brought the graph partition problem to the broader attention. In the past 10 years, researchers from computer science have extensively studied the problem of community detection [4] by utilizing network topological structures [5]–[8] and entities’ semantic information [9]–[11], for both static and dynamic networks [12]–[14], and for small

X. Su, S. Xue, F. Liu, J. Wu, J. Yang, Q. Z. Sheng are with Department of Computing, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. E-mail: {xing.su2@students., emma.xue, fanzhen.liu@students., jia.wu, jian.yang, michael.sheng}@mq.edu.au.

C. Zhou is with Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. E-mail: zhouchuan@amss.ac.cn.

W. Hu is with School of Computer Science, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China. E-mail: hwb@whu.edu.cn.

S. Xue, C. Paris, S. Nepa are with CSIRO’s Data61, Sydney, Australia. E-mail: {emma.xue, surya.nepal, cecile.paris}@data61.csiro.au

D. Jin is with School of Computer Science and Technology Tianjin University, China. E-mail: jindi@tju.edu.cn.

P.S. Yu is with Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, USA. Email: psyu@uic.edu.




Fig. 1: (a) An illustration of graph structures with nodes denoting users in a social network and their edges. (b) An illustration of two communities (C_1 and C_2) based on the prediction of users’ occupations. The prediction utilizes users’ closeness in online activities (topological structures) and account profiles (node attributes).

and large networks [15]–[17]. Increasingly graph-based approaches are developed to detect communities in environments with complex data structures [18], [19]. With community detection, the dynamics and impacts of communities in a network can be analyzed in details, for example, for rumor spread, virus outbreak, and tumour evolution.

The existence of communities drives the development of community detection studies and a research area with increasing practical significance. As the saying goes, *Birds of a feather flock together* [20]. Based on the theory of *Six Degrees of Separation*, any person in the world can know anyone else through six acquaintances [21]. Indeed, our world is a huge network formed by a series of communities. For example, by detecting communities in social networks [22]–[24], as shown in Fig. 1, platform sponsors can promote their products to targeted users. Community detection in citation networks [25] determines the importance, interconnectedness, evolution of research topics and identifies research trends. In metabolic networks [26], [27] and Protein-Protein Interaction (PPI) networks [28], community detection reveals metabolisms and proteins with similar biological functions. Similarly, community detection in brain networks [19], [29] reflects the functional and anatomical segregation of brain regions.

Many traditional techniques, such as spectral clustering [30], [31] and statistical inference [32]–[35], are employed for small networks and simple scenarios. However, they do not scale up for large networks or networks with high dimensional features because of their significant computational and space costs. Rich nonlinear structure information in real-world networks makes traditional models less applicable to practical applications. Thus, more powerful techniques with good computation performance are required. For now, **deep learning** offers the most flexible solution because deep learning models:

(1) learn nonlinear network properties, such as relationship between nodes, (2) provide a low-dimensional network representation preserving the complicated network structures, and (3) achieve an improved performance in detecting communities from various pieces of information. Therefore, deep learning for community detection is a new trend that demands a timely comprehensive survey¹.

To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first comprehensive survey focusing on deep learning contributions in community detection. Previous surveys focused on traditional community detection, reviewing its significant impact in discovering the inherent network patterns and functions [36], [37]. The surveys on specific techniques are also summarized but not limited to: partial detection based on Stochastic Block Models (SBMs) [38], Label Propagation Algorithm (LPAs) [39], [40], and evolutionary computation for single- and multi-objective optimizations [13], [14]. In terms of network types, researchers have provided overviews of community detection methods in dynamic networks [12], directed networks [41] and multi-layer networks [5]. Moreover, a series of overviews to disjoint and overlapping community defections are reviewed [6], [7]. Focusing on application scenarios, previous surveys review community detection techniques in social networks [9], [42].

This paper aims to support researchers and practitioners to understand the past, current and future trends of the community detection field from:

- **Systematic Taxonomy and Comprehensive Review.** We propose a new systematic taxonomy for this survey (see Fig. 3). For each category, we review, summarize and compare the representative works. We also briefly introduce community detection applications in the real world. These scenarios provide horizons for future community detection research and practices.
- **Abundant Resources and High-impact References.** The survey is not only a literature review but also a collection of resources of benchmark data sets, evaluation metrics, open-source implementations and practical applications. We widely survey community detection publications in the latest high-impact international conferences and high-quality peer-reviewed journals, covering domains of artificial intelligence, machine learning, data mining and data discovery.
- **Future Directions.** As deep learning is a new research trend, we discuss current limitations, critical challenges and open issues for future directions.

The rest of this survey is organized as follows: Section II introduces notations used in this paper, gives definitions of basic concepts, and specifies the input and output of deep learning-based community detection. Section III provides an overview of traditional community detection approaches and explains why uncovering communities should rely on deep learning. Section IV introduces a taxonomy which is used in the rest of the paper. Sections V-X provide a comprehensive overview of community detection with various deep learning




Fig. 2: An illustrative comparison between (a) disjoint communities and (b) overlapping communities (overlapping nodes are in blue).

techniques. Section XI summarizes the popular experimental data sets, evaluation metrics and open-source implementing codes. We survey real-world applications in Section XII. Lastly, Section XIII discusses the current challenges, suggesting future research directions. Section XIV summarizes the paper.

II. DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

Preliminaries include primary definitions, notations (TABLE I), and general inputs and outputs of deep learning models.

Definition 1: Network. A basic network structure is represented as $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, where V is the set of nodes and E is the set of edges. Let $v_i \in V$ denote a node and $e_{ij} = (v_i, v_j) \in E$ an edge between v_i and v_j . The neighborhood of a node v_i is defined as $N(v_i) = \{u \in V | (v_i, u) \in E\}$. The adjacency matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ is an $n \times n$ dimensional matrix, where $a_{ij} = 1$ if $e_{ij} \in E$, and $a_{ij} = 0$ if $e_{ij} \notin E$. If $a_{ij} \neq a_{ji}$, \mathcal{G} is a *directed network*, otherwise it is an *undirected network*. If a_{ij} is weighted by $w_{ij} \in W$, $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, W)$ is a *weighted network*, otherwise it is an *unweighted network*. If a_{ij} 's value differs in $+1$ and -1 , \mathcal{G} is a *signed network* representing positive (1) and negative (-1) edges. If nodes V have attributes $X = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_1^n$, $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, X)$ is an *attributed network* where $\mathbf{x}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ represents an attribute vector of v_i , otherwise it is an *unattributed network*. When the network changes over time t , it is a *dynamic network* denoted $\mathcal{G}_{(t)} = (V_{(t)}, E_{(t)})$ or *temporal network* denoted $\mathcal{G}_{(t)} = (V, E, X_{(t)})$.

Definition 2: Community. Given a set of communities $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$, each community C_i is a partition of the network \mathcal{G} which keeps regional structures and clusters' common properties. A node v_i clustered into community C_i should satisfy the condition that the internal node degree (inside the community) exceeds its external degree. Suppose $C_i \cap C_j = \emptyset$, $(\forall i, j)$, then \mathcal{C} is a set of *disjoint communities*; otherwise it includes a set of *overlapping communities* in which nodes belong to more than one community.

Community Detection Input. Deep learning-based community detection models take as input the network structure and other attributed information, including node attributes and signed edges. *Network structure* represents topological relationships by nodes and edges. Weights may apply on edges indicating the connection strength. *Node attributes* denote semantic information on nodes, e.g., user's account profiles in online social networks. *Signed edges* indicate connection statuses, i.e., positive ($+$) and negative ($-$) connections.

¹This paper is an extended vision of our published survey [4] in IJCAI-20, which is the first published work on the review of community detection approaches with deep learning.

TABLE I: Notations and their descriptions in this paper.

Notations	Descriptions
\mathbb{R}	A data space
\mathcal{G}	A graph
V	A set of nodes
E	A set of edges
\mathcal{C}	A set of communities
v_i	The i -th node
e_{ij}	The edge between v_i and v_j
C_k	The k -th community
$N(v_i)$	A neighborhood of v_i
n	The number of nodes
m	The number of edges
A	An adjacency matrix
$A(+, -)$	The adjacency matrix of a signed network
\mathcal{A}_{ij}	The anchor links between graphs $(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_j)$
\mathcal{X}	A set of heterogeneous node attributes
X	A node attribute matrix
\mathbf{x}_i	The node attribute vector of v_i
y_i	The node label of v_i
y_i^k	The binary community label of v_i in C_k
c_k	The community label of C_k
d	The attribute dimension of \mathbf{x}_i
D	A degree matrix
L	A Laplacian matrix
l	The layer index of DNN
$W^{(l)}$	The weight matrix of the l -th layer
$\sigma(\cdot)$	The activation function
$H^{(l)}$	The matrix of activations in the l -th layer
$\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)}$	The representation vector of v_i in the l -th layer
Z	Processed features (e.g., autoencoded, noised)
\mathbf{z}_i	A vector of processed features of v_i
B	A modularity matrix
b_{ij}	The modularity value of (v_i, v_j)
Q	The modularity evaluation metric
M	A Markov matrix
S	A similarity matrix
s_{ij}	The pairwise node similarity value of (v_i, v_j)
O	A community membership matrix
o_{ij}	The community membership value of (v_i, v_j)
UIP	The nonnegative matrix
p_{ij}	Community membership probability of (v_i, C_j)
\mathcal{L}	A loss function
Ω	A sparsity penalty
$ \cdot $	The length of a set
$\ \cdot\ $	The norm operator
Θ	Trainable parameters
$Pr(\cdot)$	The probability distribution
ϕ_g	A generator
ϕ_d	A discriminator
ϕ_e	An encoder
ϕ_r	A decoder

Community Detection Output. In general, community models output a set of communities that group nodes and edges. The communities can be either disjoint or overlapping. As shown in Fig. 2, overlapping communities share nodes, while disjoint communities do not. We consider both of these communities.

III. A DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY DETECTION

Community detection has been significant in network analysis and data mining. Fig. 4 illustrates its development of traditional and deep learning methods. Traditional methods explore communities upon network structures. These methods in seven categories (left part in Fig. 3) only capture shallow connections in a straightforward way. The detection results of

traditional approaches are often sub-optimal. We briefly review their representative methods in this section. Deep learning methods (right part in Fig. 3) uncover deep network information, complex relationships and handle high-dimensional data.

Graph Partition. These methods, widely known as graph clustering [36], partition a network into k communities, where k is a predefined number. The number of edges in a cluster is denser than the number of edges between the clusters. Kernighan-Lin [43] is a representative heuristic algorithm for finding partitions of graphs. It initially divides a graph into two arbitrary sub-graphs and then optimizes nodes' participants until it reaches the maximization of the gain function. Another representative method is spectral bisection [44] which applies the spectrum Laplacian matrix for graph partitioning. These methods are still used in deep learning methods.

Statistical Inference. Stochastic Block Model (SBM) [32] is a widely applied generative model by assigning nodes into communities and controlling their probabilities of likelihood. The variants include Degree-Corrected SBM (DCSBM) [33], Mixed Membership SBM (MMB) [34] and Overlapping SBM (OSBM) [35].

Hierarchical Clustering. This group of methods discover multi-level community structures in three ways: divisive, agglomerative and hybrid. Girvan-Newman (GN) algorithm finds community structure in a divisive way by a successively removing edges such that a new community occurs [2], [45]. Its output is a dendrogram representing a nested hierarchy of community structures. Fast Modularity (FastQ) [3], [46], an agglomerative algorithm, gradually merges nodes, each of which is initially regarded as a community. Community Detection Algorithm based on Structural Similarity (CDASS) [47] jointly applies divisive and agglomerative strategies in a hybrid way, which divides the graph based on structural similarity and merges it into hierarchical communities.

Dynamical Methods. Random walks utilize the tendency of a walker being trapped within a community during a short walk, which is the most exploited procedure to dynamical detect communities. For example, WalkTrap [48] uses a random walk to calculate the probability and distance in measuring node's similarities within communities. Information Mapping (InfoMap) [49] detects communities by describing paths of random walks using the minimal-length encoding. Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA) [50] identifies communities through an information propagation mechanism to detect the diffusion community, denoting a set of nodes grouped by the same propagation. A combination with the modularity forms a variation – Modularity-specialized LPA (LPAm) [51].

Spectral Clustering. The property of spectrum in a network can be used to detect communities. Spectral clustering [30] partitions nodes based on the network's normalized Laplacian matrix from regularized adjacency matrix, and then fits partitions to a SBM using a pseudo-likelihood algorithm. By examining the spectra of normalized Laplacian matrices, Siemon *et al.* [31] identified an integrative community structure in neural brain networks to partition three kinds of animals.




Fig. 3: Traditional community detection methods and the taxonomy of deep learning-based methods.




Fig. 4: A timeline of community detection development.

Density-based Algorithms. This group includes the following significant clustering algorithms: Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (DBSCAN) [52], Structural Clustering Algorithm for Networks (SCAN) [53] and Locating Structural Centers for Community Detection (LCCD) [54]. They identify communities, hubs and outliers by measuring entities' density. LCCD particularly uses the density peak clustering algorithm [55] to locate the structural centres from networks and then expands communities from the identified centres to the borders through a local search procedure.

Optimizations. Community detection methods employ optimizations to reach an extremum value, which usually expects maximization indicating a likelihood over communities. The most classic optimization function is Modularity (Q) [45] and its variant Fast Q [3], [46]. They estimate the quality of a partition of the network in communities. The general expression of modularity [37] is:

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i,j} (a_{ij} - p_{ij}) \delta(C_i, C_j), \quad (1)$$

where C_i and C_j indicates the community of node v_i and v_j , δ is the Kronecker delta function which yields one if

$C_i = C_j$ and zero otherwise, the sum runs over all pairs of nodes (v_i and v_j) on adjacency matrix $a_{ij} \in A$, m denotes the number of edges, and $P = [p_{ij}]$ indicates the average adjacency matrix of an ensemble of randomizations of the original network. P preserves the network features, such as bipartiteness, correlations, signed edges and space embeddedness. The standard P [45] denotes $p_{ij} = k_i k_j / 2m$, where k_i and k_j are node degrees. Louvain [56] is another well-known optimization algorithm that employs the node-moving strategy to extract community structures with the network's optimized modularity. The extensions of greedy optimization methods include simulated annealing [57], extremal optimization [58] and spectral optimization [59]. Effective in local learning and global searching [60], the evolutionary community detection methods can be divided into two classes: single- and multi-objective optimizations. Single-objective optimizations, such as Multi-Agent Genetic Algorithm (MAGA-Net) [61], apply the modularity function. Multi-objective optimizations combine multiple objective functions. For example, Combo [62] mixes Normalized Mutual Information (NMI) [63] and Conductance (CON) [64]. Continuous Encoding Multi-Object




Fig. 5: A general framework for CNN-based community detection. Since Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) only takes images as the input, the input of a graph must be preprocessed on nodes or edges. The d -dimensional latent features are convolutionally mapped within multiple CNN hidden layers. A final full connected layer outputs representations of each node or each edge for classifications. Focusing on nodes, the flow ① predicts community labels in k classes that nodes with same labels are clustered into a community. Focusing on edges, the flow ② predicts edge labels in two classes, *i.e.*, inner and inter. The temporal communities are formed by removing inter-community edges and optimized by back-propagating into CNN embeddings for a best measurement result, *e.g.*, Modularity (Q). The details are in Section V-A.

Evolutionary Algorithm (CE-MOEA) [10] optimizes modularity and similarity objectives based on Nondominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II (NSGA-II) [65].

Why community detection needs deep learning? Especially in large complex networks, deep learning models [66] have the advantage of leveraging high-dimensional nonlinear features (*i.e.*, network topological information) and high-relational features (*i.e.*, network attributed information) from nodes, neighborhoods, edges, sub-graphs (*e.g.*, communities), and encode feature representations. Such models are more resilient to the high sparsity networks and superior for the unsupervised learning tasks in real-world scenarios. The details and their references are provided in the following sections.

IV. A TAXONOMY OF COMMUNITY DETECTION WITH DEEP LEARNING

This survey proposes a taxonomy of deep community detection. The taxonomy summarizes methods into six categories: convolutional networks, Graph Attention Network (GAT), Generative Adversarial Network (GAN), AutoEncoder (AE), Deep Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (DNMF) and Deep Sparse Filtering (DSF) – based deep community detection methods. Convolutional networks include Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and Graph Convolutional Network (GCN). AEs are further divided into subcategories of stacked AE, sparse AE, denoising AE, graph convolutional AE, graph attention AE and Variational AE (VAE). The taxonomy structure is as shown in Fig. 3. The timeline of representative publications is illustrated in Fig. 4 and reviewed below. Appendix A summarises techniques of deep learning-based community detection methods. Appendix D explains all the abbreviations used in this survey.

V. CONVOLUTIONAL NETWORK-BASED COMMUNITY DETECTION

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [67] are a particular class of feed-forward Deep Neural Network (DNN) proposed for grid-like topology data such as image data, where convolution layers reduce computational costs and pooling operators ensure CNN's robustness in feature representations.

Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) [68] are proposed for graph-structured data based on CNNs and the first-order approximation of localized spectral filters on graphs. The propagation rule used in CNNs and GCNs is designed as:

$$H^{(l+1)} = \sigma(\tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{A} \tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^{(l)} W^{(l)}), \quad (2)$$

where $H^{(l)}$ preserves a matrix of latent representations in the l -th layer ($H^{(0)} = X$), through the activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$ with the layer-specific trainable weight matrix $W^{(l)}$; $\tilde{A} = A + I_n$ is the adjacency matrix of the undirected graph \mathcal{G} with added self-connections, where I_n denotes the identity matrix; and $\tilde{D}_{ii} = \sum_j \tilde{a}_{ij}$ where $\tilde{a}_{ij} \in \tilde{A}$.

A. CNN-based Community Detection

The existing CNN-based community detection methods implement CNN models with strict data input limitations: image-formatted data and labelled data. Therefore, these methods need to pre-process their inputs: (1) map network samples into the image data format, and (2) manually label nodes or communities in advance since most real-world networks do not have labels. Fig. 5 demonstrates a general framework for CNN-based community detection methods. To solve particular problems in community detection, previous studies develop a series of techniques as follows.

The traditional community detection techniques assume networks are topologically complete. The detection relies on a graph analysis measuring node similarities within the neighborhood. However, networks in the real world obtain limited structural information. The incomplete network affects neighborhood analyses and further reduces the community detection accuracy. A CNN architecture can gradually recovery intact latent features from the rudimental input. A supervised model within the CNN framework is proposed for Topologically Incomplete Networks (TINs) [8]. The model has two CNN layers with max-pooling operators for network representation and a fully connected DNN layer for community detection. The convolutional layers represent each node's local features from different views. The last full connection layer f updates communities for each node v_i :

$$d_i^k = \sigma(b_k^f + W_k^f h_i^{(2)}), \quad (3)$$




Fig. 6: A general framework for GCN-based community detection. It inputs a graph structure (A) and possible node attributes (X). Within multiple Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) layers, graph latent features are smoothed based on community detection requirements. The graph representation learning is activated by $\sigma(\cdot)$. Four community detection frameworks are illustrated in ①–④ applying either final node representations (① and ②) or temporal representations in hidden layers (③ and ④). The details are in Section V-B. Given node labels, communities are detected based on node classification in ① while ② implements node clustering on embeddings (H) and can further optimized in ③ with evaluations, e.g., Mutual Information (MI), for best community affiliations. ④ optimizes clustering results and GCN representations that gradually detects each node into communities with convolutionally represented node embeddings.

where σ is the *sigmoid* function, W_k^f and b_k^f are weights and bias of the k -th neuron o_i^k , and $h_i^{(2)}$ is the node representation vector output by the previous two convolutional layers. The model performs back-propagation to optimize by minimizing:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \|\mathbf{o}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \sum_k (o_i^k - y_i^k)^2, \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{y}_i denotes a ground truth label vector and $y_i^k \in \{0, 1\}$ represents whether or not node v_i belongs to the k -th community. The experiments on this model achieve a community detection accuracy around 80% in TINs with 10% labelled nodes and the rest unlabelled, indicating that a high-order neighborhood representation in a range of multiple hops can improve the community detection accuracy. A sparse convolution matrix [69] is further designed for TINs, dealing explicitly with the high sparsity in large-scale social networks.

Community Network Local Modularity R (ComNet-R) [70] is an edge-2-image model for community detection, classifying edges within and across communities. ComNet-R removes inter-community edges to prepare the disconnected preliminary communities. The optimization process is designed to merge communities based on the local modularity.

B. GCN-based Community Detection

GCNs aggregate node neighborhood's information in deep graph convolutional layers, so that they can globally capture complex features for community detection. There are two classes of community detection methods based on GCNs: (1) supervised/semi-supervised community classification, and (2) community clustering with unsupervised network representation. Community classification methods are limited by a lack of labels in the real world. In comparison, network representations are more flexible to cluster communities through techniques such as matrix reconstructions and objective optimizations. Fig. 6 shows how GCNs are generally applied in community detection, and TABLE V compares the techniques.

GCNs employ a few traditional community detection methods as deep graph operators, such as Stochastic Block Models (SBMs) for statistical inference, Laplacian matrix for spectrum

analysis and probabilistic graphical models for belief propagation. For example, Line Graph Neural Network (LGNN) [71] is a supervised community detection model, which improves SBMs with better community detection performance and reduces the computational cost. Integrating the non-backtracking operator with belief propagation's message-passing rules [72], LGNN learns node represented features in directed networks. The softmax function identifies conditional probabilities that a node v_i belongs to the community C_k ($o_{i,k} = p(y_i = c_k | \Theta, \mathcal{G})$), and minimizes the cross entropy loss over all possible permutations (S_C) of community labels:

$$\mathcal{L}(\Theta) = \min_{\pi \in S_C} - \sum_i \log o_{i, \pi(y_i)}. \quad (5)$$

Since GCN is not originally designed for the community detection task, community structures are not the focus in learning node embeddings and there are no smoothness constraints for the structural consistency between communities and nodes. To this end, a semi-supervised GCN community detection model (MRFasGCN) [11] is proposed to characterize hidden communities. It extends the network-specific Markov Random Field as a new convolutional layer (eMRF) which makes MRFasGCN community oriented and performs a smooth refinement to the coarse results from GCN.

Community Deep Graph Infomax (CommDGI) [73] jointly optimizes graph representations and clustering through Mutual Information (MI) on nodes and communities, and measures graph modularity for maximization. It applies k -means for node clustering and targets cluster centers.

In terms of a probabilistic inference framework, the problem of detecting overlapping communities can be solved by a generative model inferring the community affiliations of nodes. For example, Neural Overlapping Community Detection (NOCD) [74] combines the Bernoulli–Poisson (BP) probabilistic model and a two-layer GCN to learn community affiliation vectors by minimizing BP's negative log-likelihood. By setting a threshold to keep recognizing and removing weak affiliations, final communities are obtained.

Spectral GCNs represent all latent features from node's neighborhood. The features of neighboring nodes will converge to the same values by repeatedly operating Laplacian

smoothing in deep GCN layers. However, these models lead to an over-smoothing problem in community detection. To reduce such negative impact, Graph Convolutional Ladder-shape Networks (GCLN) [75] is designed as a new GCN architecture for unsupervised community detection (k -means), which is based on the U-Net in the CNN field. A contracting path and an expanding path are symmetrically built in GCLN. The contextual features which captured from the contracting path fuse with the localized information that learned in the expanding path. The layer-wise propagation follows Eq. (2).

Since different types of connections are generally treated as plain edges, GCNs individually represent each type of connection and aggregate them, which leads to redundant representations. Independence Promoted Graph Disentangled Network (IPGDN) [76] distinguishes the neighborhood into different parts and automatically discovers the nuances of graph's independent latent features, so that reduces the difficulty in detecting communities. IPGDN is supported by Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion (HSIC) regularization [77] in neighborhood routings.

For attributed graphs, community detection by GCNs relies on both structural information and representational features, where neighboring nodes and nodes with similar features are likely clustered to the same community. Therefore, graph convolutions multiply the above two graph signals and need to smoothly filter out high-frequency noises. To this end, Adaptive Graph Convolution (AGC) [78] designs a low-pass graph filter with a frequency response function:

$$p(\lambda_q) = (1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_q)^k, \quad (6)$$

where the frequency response function of \mathcal{G} denotes $p(\Lambda) = \text{diag}(p(\lambda_1), \dots, p(\lambda_n))$ decreasing and nonnegative on all eigenvalues λ_q of the symmetrically normalized graph Laplacian L_s which fall into interval $[0, 2]$. $p(\lambda_q)$ becomes more low-pass as k increases, indicating that the filtered node features \bar{X} will be smoother. AGC convolutionally selects suitable neighborhood hop sizes in k and represents graph features by the k -order graph convolution as:

$$\bar{X} = (I - \frac{1}{2}L_s)^k X, \quad (7)$$

on which spectral clustering is performed.

Adaptive Graph Encoder (AGE) [79] is another smoothing filter-related GCN model scalable to community detection. To generate smoothed features, AGE adaptively performs pairwise node similarity measurement ($S = [s_{ij}]$) and t -stacked Laplacian smoothing filters ($\bar{X} = (I - \gamma L)^t X$):

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{(v_i, v_j) \in V'} -y_{ij} \log(s_{ij}) - (1 - y_{ij}) \log(1 - s_{ij}), \quad (8)$$

where V' denotes balanced training set over positive (similar) and negative (dissimilar) samples, y_{ij} is the ranked binary similarity label on node pairs (v_i, v_j) .

A few works make significant contributions on GCN's filters. For example, Graph Convolutional Neural Networks with Cayley Polynomials (CayleyNets) [80], in a spectral graph convolution architecture, proposes an effective Cayley filter for high-order approximation on community detection. It specializes in narrow-band filtering since low frequencies




Fig. 7: A general framework for GAT-based community detection. Graph Attention Network (GAT) assigns attention coefficients ($\alpha_{ij}^{(l)}$: {green, blue, purple}) between each node v_i and its connected nodes v_j in every hidden layer (l). The represented vector ($h_i^{(l)}$) aggregates all available information: ① various edges between the same pair of nodes in the multiplex network, or ② heterogeneous semantic metapaths in a network. By embedding analyses of community structures into GAT representation, the output embeddings (H) are applied to cluster communities. The details are in Section VI.

contain large volume of community information for community detection-aimed representations. Cooperating with the Cayley filter, CayleyNets involves a mean pooling in spectral convolutional layers and a semi-supervised softmax classifier on nodes for community membership prediction.

VI. GRAPH ATTENTION NETWORK-BASED COMMUNITY DETECTION

Graph Attention Network (GAT) –based community detection methods can detect communities in complicated network scenarios. A general framework is shown in Fig. 7. GATs [81] aggregate nodes' features in neighborhoods by trainable weights with attentions on various factors, especially for networks with multiple relational types:

$$h_i^{(l+1)} = \sigma \left(\sum_{j \in N(v_i)} \alpha_{ij}^{(l+1)} W^{(l+1)} h_j^{(l)} \right), \quad (9)$$

where $h_i^{(l)}$ denotes the output representation of node v_i in l -th layer ($h_i^{(0)} = x_i$) and $\alpha_{ij}^{(l)}$ is the attention coefficient between v_i and $v_j \in N(v_i)$.

The relations need special attention in deep community detection models. For example, co-authorship and citations both significant in clustering papers into research topics. Multiplex networks provide a DNN structure with multiplex network layers to enable comprehensive analysis over multiple graph's interactions. Deep Graph Infomax for attributed Multiplex network embedding (DMGI) [82] independently embeds each relation type and computes network embeddings in maximizing the globally shared features to detect communities. A consensus regularization is applied on the attention coefficient that less significant relations are weakened in embeddings.

Metapath Aggregated Graph Neural Network (MAGNN) [83] offers a superior community detection solution by multi-informative semantic metapaths which distinguish heterogeneous structures in graph attention layers. MAGNN generates node attributes from semantic information. Since heterogeneous nodes and edges exist in intra- and inter-metapaths, MAGNN utilizes the attention mechanism in both of their embeddings by aggregating semantic variances over nodes and metapaths. Therefore, MAGNN extract richer topological and semantic information to benefit community detection results.




Fig. 8: A general framework for GAN-based community detection. Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) produces fake samples (Z) by the generator (ϕ_g) to fool the discriminator (ϕ_d). The discriminator employs Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) for representations, e.g., Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) and Graph Convolutional Network (GCN). Thus, real and fake samples play a competitive game to finetune best optimized community features. Real samples used in GAN include inputted ① A or ② (A, X) if X is available, and embedded representations on nodes ③ H_v or community membership ④ H_c . Network topologies (in shapes of triplet, clique and community) are analyzed in representations or in GAN directly. Communities are detected in combining available samples from network topology, attributes and representations. The details of GAN-based methods are in Section VII.

VII. GENERATIVE ADVERSARIAL NETWORK-BASED COMMUNITY DETECTION

Adversarial training is effective in generative models and improves discriminative ability, however, needs to solve the overfitting problem when apply to community detection (Fig. 8). Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [84] play a competitive game between a generator ϕ_g and a discriminator ϕ_d in adversarial trainings. $\phi_d(\mathbf{x})$ represents the probability of input data, while $\phi_g(z)$ learn the generator's distribution p_g over data \mathbf{x} upon input noise variables $p_z(z)$. The generator fools the discriminator by generating fake samples. Its objective function is defined as:

$$\min_{\phi_g} \max_{\phi_d} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}(\mathbf{x})} [\log \phi_d(\mathbf{x})] + \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_z(z)} [\log(1 - \phi_d(\phi_g(z)))]. \quad (10)$$

Seed Expansion with generative Adversarial Learning (SEAL) [85] generate seed-aware communities from selected seed nodes by Graph Pointer Network with incremental updates (iGPN). It consists of four components in the community level, i.e., generator, discriminator, seed selector and locator. The discriminator adopts Graph Isomorphism Networks (GINs) to modify generated communities with ground truth community labels. The locator is designed to provide regularization signals to the generator, so that irrelevant nodes in community detection can be eliminated.

To imbalanced communities, Dual-Regularized Graph Convolutional Networks (DR-GCN) [86] utilizes a conditional GAN into the dual-regularized GCN model, i.e., a latent distribution alignment regularization and a class-conditioned adversarial regularization. The first regularization balances the communities by minimizing the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between majority and minority community classes (\mathcal{L}_{dist}) guided with a standard GCN training (\mathcal{L}_{gcn}): $\mathcal{L} = (1 - \alpha)\mathcal{L}_{gcn} + \alpha\mathcal{L}_{dist}$. The second regularization is designed

to distinguish communities on labeled node representations:

$$\min_{\phi_g, \mathcal{L}} \max_{\phi_d} \mathcal{L}(\phi_d, \phi_g) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{data}(\mathbf{x})} \log \phi_d(\mathbf{x} | y) + \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_z(z)} [\log(1 - \phi_d(\phi_g(z) | y))] + \mathcal{L}_{reg}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{reg} = \sum_{v_j \in N(\mathbf{x})} \|\mathbf{h}_{g_{\mathbf{x}}} - \mathbf{h}_j\|_2$ forces the generated fake node ($g_{\mathbf{x}}$) to reconstruct the respective neighborhood relations (as $v_j \sim \mathbf{x}$).

Instead of generating only one kind of fake samples by discriminators, Jointly Adversarial Network Embedding (JANE) [87] employs two network information of topology and node attributes to capture semantic variations from adversarial groups of real and fake samples. Specifically, JANE represents community features through a multi-head self-attention encoder (ϕ_e), where Gaussian noises are added for fake features (from Z) for competition over the generator (ϕ_g) and the discriminator (ϕ_d):

$$\min_{\phi_g, \phi_e} \max_{\phi_d} \mathcal{L}(\phi_d, \phi_e, \phi_g) := \mathbb{E}_{(a, \mathbf{x}) \sim p_{AX}} [\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_{\phi_e}(\cdot | a, \mathbf{x})} [\log \phi_d(z, a, \mathbf{x})]}_{\log \phi_d(\phi_e(a, \mathbf{x}), a, \mathbf{x})}] + \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_z} [\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{(a, \mathbf{x}) \sim p_{\phi_g}(\cdot | z)} [\log(1 - \phi_d(z, a, \mathbf{x}))]}_{\log(1 - \phi_d(z, \phi_g(z)))}], \quad (12)$$

where p_{AX} denotes the joint distribution of the topology A and sampled node attributes X ($a \in A$, $\mathbf{x} \in X$).

The proximity can capture underlying relationships within communities. However, sparsely connected networks in the real world do not provide enough edges. Attributes in networks cannot be measured by proximity. To address these limitations, Proximity Generative Adversarial Network (ProGAN) [88] encodes each node's proximity from a set of instantiated triplets, so that community relationships are discovered and preserved in a low-dimensional space.

Community Detection with Generative Adversarial Nets (CommunityGAN) [89] is proposed for overlapping communities, which obtains node representation by assigning each




Fig. 9: A general framework for stacked AE-based community detection. Stacked AEs are developed with a group of AEs stacked in multiple hidden layers, which are flexible to handle rich inputs. We illustrate 5 representative work flows (①-⑤) considering various community membership information (A: adjacency matrix, $A(+, -)$: signed adjacency matrix, X : node attributes, B : modularity matrix, O : prior information matrix of node pairwise community membership, S : node pairwise similarity matrix, and $\{A_{ij}\}$: anchor link matrices) in graphs of static, dynamic, cross-domain and heterogeneous. Pairwise constraint and reconstruction loss are two optimizations for all ①-⑤. The flow ① inputs topology structures (A or B), optimizes reconstruction loss and KL loss (over O and stacked AE embeddings Z), and outputs the final Z to the clustering procedure. The flow ② takes a snapshot (A_t) from the dynamic graph, which processes the same stacked AE embedding procedure as in ①. Communities are clustered based on temporal smoothness between the current ($Z_{(t)}$) and the previous ($Z_{(t-1)}$) embeddings so that similar community structures are inherited to C_t from C_{t-1} . The flow ③ unites both of topological structures (A or B) and node attributes (X), which are represented in two stacked AEs and jointly optimized over ($Z^{A/B}, Z^X$) with reconstruction losses. The two branches training can employ three strategies: mapping $Z^{A/B} = \mathbb{R}(Z^X)$ or $S(Z^{A/B}, Z^X)$ into the same feature space (\mathbb{R}); biased with similarity measurement (S) over ($Z^{A/B}, Z^X$); or concentrating individual $Z^{A/B}$ and Z^X . The flow ④ transfers source domain node pairwise similarity information into the target domain. The cross-domain relations are analyzed within the stacked AE training by minimizing loss on trainable variables (Θ) in both domains and aiming at a minimum KL loss over source domain (Z_s) and target domain (Z_t) embeddings. Thus, community detection task is made on Z_t encoding graphs in two domains. The flow ⑤ inputs aligned graphs (represented by $(A_1, X_1), (A_2, X_2), (A_3, X_3)$ in different methpaths, and $\{A_{ij}\}$ between each graph i and j . For each $\{A_{ij}\}$, ⑤ minimizes norm-2 loss ($\|Z_i, Z_j\|_2$) and all losses on stacked AE weights ($W_1, W_2, (W_1, W_2)$). ①-⑤ The output communities are clustered based on stacked AE embeddings. The details are in Section VIII-A.

node-community pair a nonnegative factor. Its objective function optimizes through a motif-level generator ($\phi_g(\cdot|v_i; \Theta_g)$) and discriminator ($\phi_d(\cdot, \Theta_d)$):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\Theta_g} \max_{\Theta_d} \mathcal{L}(\phi_g, \phi_d) = & \\ & \sum_i (\mathbb{E}_{C' \sim p_{true}(\cdot|v_i)} [\log \phi_d(C'; \Theta_d)] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{V' \sim \phi_g(V'|v_i; \Theta_g)} [\log (1 - \phi_d(V'; \Theta_d))], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where Θ_g and Θ_d unifies all nonnegative representation vector of node v_i in the generator and the discriminator, $V' \subseteq V$ denotes a node subset, C' represents motifs (*i.e.*, cliques), and conditional probability $p_{true}(C'|v_i)$ describes the preference distribution of C' covering v_i over all other motifs $C' \in \mathcal{C}$.

VIII. AUTOENCODER-BASED COMMUNITY DETECTION

Autoencoders (AEs) are most commonly used in unsupervised community detection, including stacked AE, sparse AE,

denoising AE, convolutional AE and variational AE (TABLE VII). AEs are able to depict nonlinear, noisy real-world networks and produce smooth representations. A general framework for AE [90] is formed by an encoder $Z = \phi_e(A, X)$ and decoder $X' = \phi_r(Z)$. The encoder (ϕ_e) maps a high-dimensional network structure (A) and possible attributes (X) into a low-dimensional latent feature space (Z). The decoder (ϕ_r) reconstructs a decoded network (Z) from encoder's representations (H) that X' inherits preferred information in A and X . A loss function $\mathcal{L}(x, \phi_r(\phi_e(x)))$ will be designed to maximize the likelihood between source data x and decoded data $\phi_r(\phi_e(x))$.

A. Stacked AE-based Community Detection

Since a single AE cannot meet requirements of community detection, stacked AEs are developed with a group of AEs stacked in multiple hidden layers. As shown in Fig. 9, each

encoder in the stack individually represents one type of input data. These stacked AE-based community detection methods are flexible to wide implementations, such as rapidly changing dynamic community detection [91].

Semi-supervised Nonlinear Reconstruction Algorithm with DNN (semi-DRN) [92] designs a stacked AE into a community detection model, where a modularity matrix learns the nonlinear node representations in AEs and k -means obtains final community structures. Given an edge between nodes v_i and v_j in the adjacency matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$, the modularity [93] $b_{ij} = a_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2m}$ in the modularity matrix B is optimized for maximization (details in Eq. (1)). Encoding the node pairwise similarities (community membership) based on node representations, a pairwise embedding matrix $O = [o_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}]$ is, meanwhile, defined to provide a prior knowledge that nodes v_i and v_j belong to the same community ($o_{i,j} = 1$) or not ($o_{i,j} = 0$). Thus, the learning process of semi-DRN is optimized by minimizing the loss function below:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(B, X') + \lambda \mathcal{L}(O, Z), \quad (14)$$

where X' represents the decoded network features over stacked representations ($\{H^{(l)}\}$) by a series of AEs, λ denotes an adjusting weight between the AE reconstruction loss $\mathcal{L}(B, X')$ and the pairwise constraints $\mathcal{L}(O, Z)$, and $\mathcal{L}(O, Z)$ measures each pair of community membership o_{ij} and latent representations (z_i, z_j) within stacked AEs.

Similarly, Deep Network Embedding with Structural Balance Preservation (DNE-SBP) [94] incorporates the adjusting weight on pairwise constraints for signed networks so that the stacked AE clusters the closest nodes distinguished by positive and negative connections. Unified Weight-free Multi-component Network Embedding (UWMNE) and its variant with Local Enhancement (WMCNE-LE) [95] preserve community properties from network topology and semantic information and integrate the diverse information in deep AE from local network structure perspective.

To discover time-varying dynamic community structure, Semi-supervised Evolutionary Autoencoder (sE-Autoencoder) [96] is developed within an evolutionary clustering framework, assuming community structures at previous time steps successively guide the detection at the current time step. To this end, sE-Autoencoder adds a temporal smoothness regularization $\mathcal{L}(Z_{(t)}, Z_{(t-1)})$ into the objective function in [92] for minimization:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(S_{(t)}, X'_{(t)}) + \lambda \mathcal{L}(O, Z_{(t)}) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{L}(Z_{(t)}, Z_{(t-1)}), \quad (15)$$

where reconstruction error $\mathcal{L}(S_{(t)}, X'_{(t)})$ minimizes the loss between the similarity matrix $S_{(t)}$ and decoded features $X'_{(t)}$ at the time step t , and the parameter λ controls the node pairwise constraint $\mathcal{L}(O, Z_{(t)})$ and the temporal smoothness regularization over time t -th graph representation $Z_{(t)}$.

To attributed networks, Deep Attributed Network Embedding (DANE) [97] develops a two-branch AE framework: one branch maps the highly nonlinear network structure to the low-dimensional feature space, and the other collaboratively learns node attributes. As similar nodes are more likely to be clustered in the same community, DANE measures these

similarities by a series of proximity regarding network topological and attribute information in the representation learning, where optimizations are applied on reconstruction losses at first-order proximity (\mathcal{L}_f), higher-order proximity (\mathcal{L}_h) and semantic proximity (\mathcal{L}_s), and a negative log likelihood control (\mathcal{L}_c) for a consistent and complementary representation.

Transfer Learning-inspired Community Detection with Deep Transitive Autoencoder (Transfer-CDDTA) [98] employs unsupervised transfer learning into the CDDTA algorithm which measures the KL divergence of AEs embedded instances to ensure that the differences (e.g., shifted distributions, imbalanced features and a lack of samples) between different domains can be approximately equal when learning low-dimensional representations. Aiming to map community information into one smooth feature space, CDDTA separates the input adjacency matrix (A) into a source domain (s) and a target domain (t) by similarity matrices (S_s and S_t) to keep node pairwise similarity values for each stacked AE. Transfer-CDDTA then incorporates domain independent features into the following minimization learning process:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_s(S_s, X'_s) + \mathcal{L}_t(S_t, X'_t) + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{KL}(Z_s, Z_t) + \beta \mathcal{L}(\Theta; \gamma), \quad (16)$$

where α, β, γ are trade-off parameters input into the algorithm, \mathcal{L}_s and \mathcal{L}_t denote reconstruction losses of source and target domains, \mathcal{L}_{KL} smooths the KL divergence on encoded features (Z_s, Z_t) across two domains, and $\mathcal{L}(\Theta)$ is a regularization term on trainable variables to reduce overfitting in the optimization.

Deep Aligned autoencoder-based eMbEdding (DIME) [99] stacks AEs for the multiple aligned structures in heterogeneous social networks. It employs metapaths to represent different relations (heterogeneous links denoting \mathcal{A}_{ij} which represents anchor links between multiple aligned network \mathcal{G}_i and \mathcal{G}_j) and various attribute information ($\mathcal{X} = \{X_i\}$). Correspondingly, a set of meta proximity measurements are developed for each meta path and embed the close nodes to a close area in the low-dimensional latent feature space. The relatively close region reflects communities which are going to be detected.

B. Sparse AE-based Community Detection

The sparsity commonly exists in real-world networks and causes computational difficulties in community detection algorithms. To solve these issues, sparse AEs [100] introduce a sparsity penalty $\Omega(\mathbf{h})$ in hidden layers \mathbf{h} . The reconstruction lost function is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \phi_r(\phi_e(\mathbf{x}))) + \Omega(\mathbf{h}). \quad (17)$$

Autoencoder-based Graph Clustering Model (GraphEncoder) [101] is the first work that uses AE for graph clustering. It processes the sparsity by a sparsity term as a part of the following loss function (minimization):

$$\mathcal{L}(\Theta) = \sum_i^n \|\mathbf{h}_i - \mathbf{x}_i\|_2 + \beta \Omega(\rho) \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n \mathbf{h}_i, \quad (18)$$

where the weight parameter β controls the sparsity penalty $\Omega(\|\cdot\|)$ over a configuration value ρ (a small constraint such as 0.01) and the average of hidden layers' activation values. GraphEncoder improves clustering efficiency of large-scale

networks and proves that sparse network can provide enough structural information for representations.

Deep Learning-based Fuzzy Clustering Model (Dfuzzy) [102] is proposed for overlapping community detection in sparse large-scale networks within a parallel processing framework. Dfuzzy introduces a stacked sparse AE targeting head nodes to evolve overlapping and disjoint communities based on modularity measurements. Dfuzzy performs 63% (modularity), 34% (conductance) and 21% (partition coefficient) higher than non-deep learning baselines.

Community Detection Method via Ensemble Clustering (CDMEC) [103] combines sparse AEs with a transfer learning model to discover more valuable information from local network structures. To this end, CDMEC constructs four similarity matrices and employs transfer learning to share local information via AEs' parameters. A consensus matrix is applied to aggregate community detection results which are individually produced by four similarity matrices and supported by k -means. The final communities are globally determined based on factorization of the consensus matrix.

C. Denoising AE-based Community Detection

The denoising process denotes subtracting noises within DNN layers. Denoising AEs [104] should be able to deal with corrupted input data (\tilde{x}) and minimize the reconstruction loss between denoised data (x) and decoded data:

$$\mathcal{L}(x, \phi_r(\phi_e(\tilde{x}))). \quad (19)$$

Deep Neural Networks for Graph Representation (DNGR) [105] is developed in a framework of stacked denoising autoencoders with 3 hidden layers. DNGR applies stacked denoising encoder to increase the robustness in capturing the local structural information when detect communities. Specifically, it generates a probabilistic co-occurrence matrix by randomly walking over communities and transforms it to a shifted positive pointwise MI matrix as the input.

To corrupted node attributes, Graph Clustering with dynamic Embedding (GRACE) [106] is a denoising AE in multiple nonlinear DNN layers guided by the influence propagation within neighborhoods which focuses on the dynamically changing inter-community activities. Thus, a self-training clustering reaches an efficient community detection performance.

Marginalized Graph AutoEncoder (MGAE) [104] denoises both graph attributes and structures to improve community detection through the marginalization process. It obtains the corrupted features \tilde{X} in m times. The objective function in MGAE training is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|X - \tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{A} \tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{X} W\|_2 + \lambda \mathcal{L}(W), \quad (20)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(W)$ denotes a regularization term on AE's parameters W with a coefficient λ .

D. Graph Convolutional AE-based Community Detection

It is a great success to introduce GCNs into AEs, since GCNs provide high-order graph regularizations and AEs alleviate the over-smoothing issue in GCNs. For example,

GCN-based approach for Unsupervised Community Detection (GUCD) [107] employs the semi-supervised MRF as a convolutional layer in GCN (MRFasGCN, details in Section V-B) [11] as its encoder and proposes a community-centric dual decoder to detect communities in attributed networks. Specifically, one decoder reconstructs the network topology and the other decodes node attributes. GUCD straightforward focuses on community identification.

Structural Deep Clustering Network (SDCN) [108] designs a delivery operator to connect AE and GCN over DNN layers, so that AE's representations are completely structure-aware supported by graph convolutions. When SDCN integrates the structural information into deep clustering, it updates communities by applying a dual self-supervised optimization for AE and GCN, respectively, that balances their contributions.

One2Multi Graph Autoencoder for Multi-view Graph Clustering (O2MAC) [109] is a One-view to Multi-view (One2Multi) graph clustering AE for multi-view attributed graphs. It consists of one encoder and multiple decoders. In the encoder, a GCN is applied to embed a set of view-separated graphs. Collaboratively, decoders are respectively assigned to these one-view graphs and select the most informative one-view graph jointly with the encoder. O2MAC significantly captures shared features among multi-view graphs and improves clustering results through a self-training optimization.

E. Graph Attention AE-based Community Detection

Instead of integrating GCNs, this community detection category applies GATs into AEs. Deep Attentional Embedded Graph Clustering (DAEGC) [110] is a representative method which employs a GAT as the encoder to rank the importance of attributed nodes within a neighborhood, where high-order neighbors are exploited to cluster communities.

There are two GAT and AE-based community detection methods for multi-view networks. Multi-View Attribute Graph Convolution Networks (MAGCN) [111] designs a two-pathway encoder: the first pathway encodes with a multi-view attribute GAT capable of denoising, and the second pathway develops a encoder to obtain consistent embeddings over multi-view attributes. Thus, noises and distribution variances are removed by MAGCN for the targeting task of community detection. Deep Multi-Graph Clustering (DMGC) [112] introduces AEs to represent each graph with an attention coefficient that node embeddings of multiple graphs cluster cross-graph centroids to obtain communities on Cauchy distribution.

F. Variational AE-based Community Detection

Variational AutoEncoder (VAE) is an extension of AEs based on variational inference (e.g., mean and covariance of features) [113]. It is first introduced into the graph learning field by Variational Graph AutoEncoder (VGAE) [114], which assumes Gaussian distribution and applies GCN as the encoder. Community detection based on VAEs is activated by models such as SBM, to fast inference community memberships in node representations [115]. The inference process considers the uncertainty of the network [116], [117], e.g., community contradiction between neighbors of boundary nodes

connecting multiple communities. VAEs are also required to handle sparsity in detecting communities. Meanwhile, VAEs easily incorporate with deeper nonlinear relationship information. For example, Triad (Variational) Graph Autoencoder (TGA/TVGA) [118] replace VAE/VGAE's decoder with a new triad decoder, which describes a real-world existing triadic closure property in communities.

Variational Graph Embedding and Clustering with Laplacian Eigenmaps (VGECL) [116] divides the graph representation into mean and covariance while generatively detecting communities, indicating each node's uncertainty of implicit relationships to its true geographic position. With a Mixture-of-Gaussian prior and a Teacher-Student (T-S) like regularization, VGECL aims to let the node v_i (student) learn a distribution close to its neighbors' (teacher).

Deep Generative Latent Feature Relational Model (DGLFRM) [115] and Ladder Gamma Variational Autoencoder for Graphs (LGVG) [119] further capture the community membership strength of each node. DGLFRM comprises a GCN-based nonlinear encoder to generate node embeddings and a nonlinear decoder for the link probability measurement over overlapping communities. DGLFRM models the sparse node embeddings by a Beta-Bernoulli process which can also infer the number of communities. LGVG is devised to learn the multi-layered and gamma-distributed embeddings, so that it can discover communities at multiple levels of granularity, *i.e.*, fine-grained communities in bottom layers and coarse-grained communities in top layers.

To capture the higher-order features from the community structure, Variational Graph Autoencoder for Community Detection (VGAECD) [117] employs a Gaussian Mixture Model and a community assignment parameter to generalize the network generation process. VGAECD is optimized by using a two-layer GCN to encode observed data into latent embedding for the evidence lower bound (ELBO) maximization. Since VGAECD leads to a sub-optimal community detection result, Optimizing Variational Graph Autoencoder for Community Detection (VGAECD-OPT) [116] proposes a dual optimization which minimizes the reconstruction loss with binary cross-entropy and the community loss with Expectation-Maximization algorithm.

Adversarial Regularized Graph AutoEncoder (ARGA) and Adversarially Regularized Variational Graph AutoEncoder (ARVGA) [120] inherit the significance of GAN and VGAE by introducing GAN's mechanism into GAE/VGAE training optimized in an additional regularization term.

IX. DEEP NONNEGATIVE MATRIX FACTORIZATION-BASED COMMUNITY DETECTION

Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF) [121] is proposed to factorize a large matrix into two small nonnegative matrices. It is not only highly interpretable but instinctively suitable for discovering the assignment of nodes to communities. The basic NMF model applied in community detection decomposes a adjacency matrix (A) into two nonnegative matrices ($U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$) with the nonnegative constraints that $P \geq 0$ and $U \geq 0$. The matrix U corresponds to the mapping

between the original network and the community membership space. Each column in the matrix $P = [p_{ij}]$ indicates the a community membership for every node that the node v_i belongs to the community C_j in the probability of p_{ij} . NMF is applicable for disjoint and overlapping community detections. While real-world networks contain complicated topology information, the traditional NMF cannot fully uncover them to detect communities. Inspired by the success of deep learning, extensive studies have been conducted on deep NMF [122], which stacks multiple layers of NMF ($\{U_1, \dots, U_p\}$) to capture node pairwise similarities in various levels/aspects, and deep layers such as GCN and AE.

In the community detection field, Deep Autoencoder-like Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (DANMF) [123] is the most influential model in an unsupervised learning setting. In contrast with the conventional NMF-based community detection mapping simple community membership, DANMF employs the AE framework to make network reconstruction on hierarchical mappings. The learning objective of community membership P_p and the hierarchical mappings $\{U_i\}_1^p$ are trained by combining reconstruction losses and a λ weighted graph regularization:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{P_p, U_i} \mathcal{L}(P_p, U_i) &= \|A - U_1 \dots U_p P_p\|_F^2 \\ &+ \|P_p - U_p^T \dots U_1^T A\|_F^2 + \lambda \text{tr}(P_p L P_p^T), \quad (21) \\ \text{s.t. } P_p &\geq 0, U_i \geq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, p \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm, L represents the graph Laplacian matrix, and graph regularization [124] focuses on the network topological similarity to cluster neighboring nodes. A further work [125] adds a sparsity constraint into the above deep NMF-based community detection.

Although deep NMF provide a solution to map multiple factors in forming communities, the computational cost is relatively high on matrix factorizations. To address this issue, Modularized Deep Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (MDNMF) [126] applies modularity (details in Eqs. (1) and (22)) directly into a basic multi-layer deep learning structure targeting community detection. The modularity matrix B is denoted as an objective in the following maximization training with the community membership matrix O :

$$Q = \text{tr}(O^T B O), \quad \text{s.t. } \text{tr}(O^T O) = n. \quad (22)$$

The nodes membership in communities P_p is finally reached by minimizing the objective function below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \|A - U_1 \dots U_p P_p\|_F^2 + \alpha \|O - P_p^T K^T\|_F^2 \\ &- \beta Q + \lambda \text{tr}(P_p L P_p^T), \quad (23) \\ \text{s.t. } P_p &\geq 0, U_i \geq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, p \end{aligned}$$

where K is an extra nonnegative matrix combining modularity information so that deep NMF can explore the hidden features of network topology.

X. DEEP SPARSE FILTERING-BASED COMMUNITY DETECTION

Sparse Filtering (SF) [127] is a simple two-layer learning model capable of handling high-dimensional graph data. The high sparse input (A with a lot of 0 elements) will be

TABLE II: Summary of open-source implementations.

Method	URL
CommunityGAN [89]	https://github.com/SamJia/CommunityGAN
ARGA [120]	https://github.com/Ruiqi-Hu/ARGA
MGAE [104]	https://github.com/FakeTibbers/MGAE
DIME [99]	http://www.ifmlab.org/files/code/Aligned-Autoencoder.zip
AGE [79]	https://github.com/thunlp/AGE
O2MAC [109]	https://github.com/songzuolong/WWW2020-O2MAC
DMGC [112]	https://github.com/flyingdoog/DMGC
semi-DRN	http://yangliang.github.io/code/DC.zip
AGC [78]	https://github.com/karenlatong/AGC-master
NOCD [74]	https://github.com/shchur/overlapping-community-detection
LGNN [71]	https://github.com/zhengdao-chen/GNN4CD
DMGI [82]	https://github.com/pcy1302/DMGI
MAGNN [83]	https://github.com/cynricfu/MAGNN
DNE-SBP [94]	https://github.com/shenxiaocam/Deep-network-embedding-for-graph-representation-learning-in-signed-networks
GraphEncoder [101]	https://github.com/zepx/graphencoder
DGLFRM [115]	https://github.com/nikhil-dce/SBM-meet-GNN
DANE [97]	https://github.com/gaoghc/DANE
SDCN [108]	https://github.com/bdy9527/SDCN
CayleyNet [80]	https://github.com/amoliu/CayleyNet
DNDR [105]	https://github.com/ShelsonCao/DNDR
SEAL [85]	https://github.com/yzhang1918/kdd2020seal

represented into lower-dimensional feature vectors (\mathbf{h}_i with non-zero values). To explore deeper information such as community membership, deep SF stacks multiple hidden layers to finetune more hyper-parameters (Θ) and extensively smooth data distributions ($Pr(\mathbf{h}_i)$).

As a representative method, Community Discovery based on Deep Sparse Filtering (DSFCD) [128] is developed on three phases: network representation, community feature mapping and community discovery. The network representation phase performs on the adjacency matrix (A), modularity matrix (B) and two similarity matrices (S and S'), respectively. The best representation are selected to input into the deep SF for community feature mapping represented on each node (\mathbf{h}_i). Meanwhile, \mathbf{h}_i preserves the node similarity in the original network (A) and latent community membership features. The node pairwise constraints are modeled in the loss function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_i \|\mathbf{h}_i\|_1 + \lambda \sum_i \text{distance}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j^*), \quad (24)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the L_1 norm penalty to optimize sparseness, \mathbf{h}_j^* denotes the most similar representation (\mathbf{h}^*) of node v_j by measuring distances through $\text{distance}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j)$ on Euclidean or KL. When the learning process is optimized on the minimized loss, similar nodes are clustered into communities. The deep SF architecture is investigated to be significant in experiments on real-world data sets. DSFCD discovers communities in higher accuracy than SF.

XI. PUBLISHED RESOURCES

We summarize the essential resources of the deep learning-based community detection research experiments and practices, including benchmark data sets, evaluation metrics, and open-source implementation codes (in TABLE II).

A. Data Sets

Both real-world data sets and synthetic data sets are popularly published. Real-world data sets in community detection

experiments are collected from real-world applications, which test performances of proposed methods from the real applicable aspect. Synthetic data sets are generated by specific models on manually designed rules that particular functions can be tested by these data sets.

Real-world Data Sets. The state-of-the-art popular real-world data sets below can be categorized into citation/co-authorship networks, social networks (online and offline), biological networks, webpage networks, product co-purchasing networks and others. The typical data sets covering various network shapes (*i.e.*, unattributed, attributed, multi-view and signed) are summarized in TABLE III. The related description is detailed in Appendix B.

Synthetic Benchmark Data Sets.

Girvan-Newman (GN) Networks [2]: The classic GN benchmark network consists of 128 nodes divided into 4 communities, where every community has 32 nodes, every node shares a fixed average degree (k_{in}), and connects a pre-defined number of nodes in another community (k_{out}). For example, $k_{in} + k_{out} = 16$. A parameter (μ) controls the ratio of neighbors in other communities for each node.

Lancichinetti-Fortunato-Radicchi (LFR) Networks [142]: The LFR benchmark data set simulates the degree of nodes in a real-world network and the scale-free nature of the network. The community validation is more challenging, and the results are more convincing. The LFR generation program provides a rich set of parameters through which the network topology can be controlled, including network size (n), the average (k) and maximum ($Maxk$) degree, the minimum ($MinC$) and maximum ($MaxC$) community size and the mixing parameter (μ). The node degrees are governed by power laws with exponents of τ_1 and τ_2 . LFR is more complicated than the GN benchmark in network structures. It can generate more flexible networks and is the most common simulation benchmark in

TABLE III: Summary of real-world benchmark data sets.

Category	Data set	Source	Nodes	Edges	Node Attributes	Number of Communities
Unattributed Networks	Karate	[129]	34	78	-	2
	Dolphins	[130]	62	159	-	2
	Friendship6	[6]	69	220	-	6
	Friendship7	[6]	69	220	-	7
	Polbooks	[93]	105	441	-	3
	Football	[2]	115	613	-	12
	Polblogs	[131]	1,490	16,718	-	2
	Amazon	[132]	334,863	925,872	-	75,149
	DBLP	[132]	371,080	1,049,866	-	13,477
	Youtube	[132]	1,134,890	2,987,624	-	8,385
LiveJournal	[133]	3,997,962	34,681,189	-	287,512	
Attributed Networks	Texas	[134]	187	328	1,703	5
	Cornell	[134]	195	304	1,703	5
	Washington	[134]	230	446	1,703	5
	Wisconsin	[134]	265	530	1,703	5
	Wiki	[133]	2,405	17,981	4,973	19
	Cora	[134]	2,708	5,429	1,433	7
	Citeseer	[134]	3,312	4,715	3,703	6
	UAI2010	[134]	3,363	45,006	4,972	19
	Facebook	[18]	4,039	88,234	1,283	193
	Flickr	[135]	7,564	239,365	12,047	9
PubMed	[136]	19,717	44,338	500	3	
Twitter	[18]	81,306	1,768,149	216,839	4,065	
GPlus	[18]	107,614	13,673,453	15,907	468	
Multi-view Networks	ACM	[137]	3,025	29,281 (view1) + 2,210,761 (view2)	1,830	3
	IMDB	[137]	4,780	98,010 (view1) + 21,018 (view2)	1,232	3
Signed Networks	Epinions	[138]	7,000	404,006 (positive) + 47,143 (negative)	-	-
	Slashdot	[139]	7,000	181,354 (positive) + 56,675 (negative)	-	-
	Wiki	[140]	7,118	81,318 (positive) + 22,357 (negative)	-	-

TABLE IV: Summary of commonly used evaluation metrics in community detection.

Metrics	Overlapping	Ground Truth	Publications
ACC	✓	Yes	[69] [11] [75] [73] [78] [79] [76] [86] [88] [87] [97] [95] [104] [107] [108] [109] [110] [111] [112] [116] [118] [117] [141] [120] [126] [123] [80]
NMI	×	Yes	[8] [70] [11] [74] [75] [73] [78] [79] [76] [82] [83] [86] [88] [87] [89] [92] [98] [95] [96] [101] [103] [105] [104] [107] [108] [109] [110] [111] [112] [118] [117] [141] [120] [126] [123]
Overlapping-NMI	✓		
Precision	✓	Yes	[8] [75] [76] [86] [87] [104] [118] [120]
Recall	✓	Yes	[104]
F1-Score	✓	Yes	[70] [75] [73] [78] [76] [82] [85] [86] [87] [89] [106] [104] [108] [109] [110] [118] [120]
ARI	✓	Yes	[75] [73] [79] [76] [83] [87] [104] [108] [109] [110] [111] [118] [120] [123]
Q	×	No	[98] [96] [102] [103] [117] [141]
Jaccard	✓	Yes	[8] [85] [106]
CON	✓	No	[117] [141]
TPR	✓	No	[117] [141]

traditional community detection research.

B. Evaluation Metrics

This section summarizes the mainstreaming evaluation metrics with a summary in TABLE IV. The detailed evaluation metric can be found in Appendix C.

XII. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Community detection has many applications across different tasks and domains, as summarized in Fig. 10. We now detail some typical applications in the following areas.

- **Recommendation Systems.** Community structure plays a vital role for graph-based recommendation systems [143], [144], as the community members may have similar interests and preferences. By detecting relations between nodes (*i.e.*, users–users, items–items, users–items), models such as CayleyNets [80] and UWMNE/WMCNE-LE [95] produce high-quality recommendations.
- **Biochemistry.** In this field, nodes represent proteins or atoms in compound and molecule graphs, while edges denote their interactions. Community detection can identify complexes of new proteins [8], [101] and chemical compounds which are functional in regional organs (*e.g.*, in brain [145]) or pathogenic factor of a disease (*e.g.*,




Fig. 10: Practical applications of community detection.

community-based lung cancer detection [146]). To various tumor types on genomic data sets, the previous study [147] shows relevances between communities' survival rates and distributions of tumor types over communities.

- **Online Social Networks.** Analyzing online social activities can identify online communities and correlate them in the real world. The practice on online social networks [2] such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn reveals similar interests among online users that individual preferences can be automatically provided. Meanwhile, community detection can be used for online privacy [148] and to identify **criminals** based on online social behaviors [149], who support and diffuse criminal ideas and even who may practice terrorism activities [150].
- **Community Deception.** To hide from the community detection, community deception [151] covers for a group of users in social networks such as Facebook. Deception is either harmful to virtual communities or harmless that provides justifiable benefits. From community-based structural entropy, Residual Entropy Minimization (REM) effectively nullify community detection algorithms [152]. A systematic evaluation [153] on community detection robustness to deception is carried out in large networks.
- **Community Search.** Community search aims to queue up a series of nodes dependent on communities [16]. For example, a user (node) search on interests (communities) after another user (node). To this end, communities are formed temporally based on the user's interest. There are several practices applied on this scenario. Local community search [15] assumes one query node at a time and expands the search space around it. The strategy will be attempted repeatedly until the community finds all belongings. Attributed Truss Communities (ATC) [154] interconnects communities on query nodes with similar query node attributes.

XIII. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Although deep learning has brought community detection into a prospering era, several open issues still need to be further investigated. Here, we suggest twelve future directions.

A. An Unknown Number of Communities

For community detection in real-world scenario, the majority of data are unlabeled due to the high-cost acquisition, there-

fore the number of communities is unknown. Unsupervised detection provides an effective way to handle such unknown scenario. However, they generally need to specify how many communities to detect. This brings us a catch-22: to achieve an appropriate detection performance, the existing approaches require prior knowledge about the number of communities, which can be impossible in reality. Accordingly, there is a demand for an efficient approach to deal with the situation caused by lacking of such knowledge.

Opportunities: Analysis of network topological structure offers a potential solution to tackle this challenge and some research efforts have been done [102]. Typically, these methods perform random walks to get preliminary communities and refine the detection results by modularity. But when they come to disconnected networks in practice, random walks cannot involve every node and would degrade the detection performance. This open issue therefore calls for a more complete solution and further research.

B. Community Embedding

Node embedding methods traditionally preserve nodes that are directly connected or share many common neighbors close to each other in the low-dimensional space, but they are rarely aware of community structure during the learning process [155]. To this end, better subsequent community detection introduces a community-aware learning process to characterize community information [156].

Opportunities: To date, few works integrate the community embedding into a deep learning model, so more efforts are desired for this promising area. In general, as community embedding that generates representations for communities might bring additional computational cost, future work needs to develop fast computation-aimed algorithms. Furthermore, since the embedding result relies on the hyper-parameter optimization, how to design a special optimization mechanism into deep community detection models is another key aspect.

C. Hierarchical Networks

Networks such as the Web often show a treelike hierarchical organization of communities on different scales, in which small communities in lower levels group together to form larger ones in higher levels. Hence, community detection is required to detect communities from low to high levels.

Opportunities: Traditional methods generally follow one of three work lines: (1) estimating the hierarchy directly and all at once, (2) recursively merging communities in a bottom-up fashion, and (3) recursively splitting communities in a top-down fashion. Their performance is limited by either a large number of parameters involved or strong requirements on network density [157]. Recent works have shown the efficiency of network embedding to this problem [158], [159]. While preserving hierarchies of communities, community detection methods are also required to sufficiently exploit the inclusion relationship between high-level and lower-level communities [159]. With the strong capacity to deal with the implicit

relationships when learning embeddings, we believe intensive research on deep learning can facilitate the development of hierarchical community detection.

D. Multi-layer Networks

As easily observed in our natural environment, two individuals who are family are always friends; places are connected by different modes of transportation. Entities always interact with each other in multiple ways [160]. Multi-layer networks provide a general multi-layered framework to represent multiple types of interactions between a set of entities as network layers [161].

Opportunities: In contrast with the prosperity of community detection works in single-layer networks, the development of research on multi-layer networks is still in its infancy [162]. A potential idea is to incorporate information of multi-layer networks into a single-layer, followed by monolayer community detection methods. In the context of deep learning, a similar solution can be framed for learning low dimensional representations of network information via deep architectures. Generally, deep learning methods for multi-layer community detection should properly take into account several issues including: (1) differences among the interaction types, (2) varying levels of sparsity in layers, (3) possible connections across layers, and (4) the scalability of the scheme with respect to the number of layers.

E. Heterogeneous Networks

For an accurate depiction of reality, networks are required to involve heterogeneous information [163] that characterizes relationships between different types of entities, such as the role-play relation between actors and movies. Since community detection methods designed for homogeneous networks cannot be directly employed, due to lack of capacity to model the complex structural and semantic information, there is a need for adaptable approaches for heterogeneous networks.

Opportunities: Meta-path is a promising research effort to deal with diverse semantic information, which describes a composite relation between the node types involved. This allows deep models to represent nodes by aggregating information from other nodes of the same type via different meta-paths, followed by community detection based on node similarity evaluation [83], [99], [137]. However, the selection of most meaningful meta-paths remains an open problem. The future efforts should focus on a flexible schema for meta-path selection and other novel models that can exploit various types of relationships.

F. Network Heterophily

Network heterophily [164] can be interpreted as a phenomenon that connected nodes belong to different communities or are characterized by dissimilar features. For example, fraudsters intentionally make a connection with user to hid themselves from being discovered. For community detection, boundary nodes connected across communities comply with

this property. It is significant to capture network heterophily providing valuable information on community division.

Opportunities: Since most methods heavily rely on homophily which assumes connected nodes share more similarities and are more likely to come from the same community, deep learning methods that exploit network heterophily are expected for better community detection performance.

G. Topologically Incomplete Networks

Relationships in real-world scenarios are not always available, which leads to incomplete network topology or even several independent connected network pieces [8]. As an example, protein-protein interaction (PPI) networks are usually incomplete since monitoring all protein-protein interactions are expensive [165]. Deriving meaningful knowledge of communities from limited topology information has been crucial to this case.

Opportunities: The requirement of complete network topology hugely harms applicability of community detection methods (especially those based on neighborhood aggregation) on such topologically incomplete networks (TINs). To this end, deep learning methods should be further developed with an information recovery mechanism so that accurate community detection could be achieved.

H. Cross-domain Networks

Different types of interactions among items can be described as various networks (domains). As commonly observed in real-world, users interact with each other via multiple online social platforms such as Facebook and Twitter. As network learning tasks benefits from leveraging rich information from related source domains [166], community detection is encouraged to develop its own deep learning models to achieve an improved detection result for a target domain [98].

Opportunities: Through domain adaptation that learns a common latent representation for source and target domains, many challenges in the following scenarios could be solved: (1) a lack of explicit community structures, (2) node label shortages, (3) missing a community's ground truth, (4) poor representation performance caused by the inferior network structure, and (5) a small-scale network unsuitable to deep learning models. In proposing deep learning-based community detection methods with cross-domain information, issues in applying the transfer learning architecture must be addressed, such as measurement on cross-domain efficiency, distribution shifts, and computational complexity.

I. Multi-attributed view Networks

Real-world networks are far more complex and contain distinctively featured data. [167]. Multi-attributed view networks provide a new look to describe relational information from multiple informative views each of which contains a kind of node attribute [168]. Communities are detected upon the same simple network structure, and supported by deeply but costly represented latent features. Hence, exploiting the

complementarity among multiple views potentially advances the community detection performance [169].

Opportunities: A straightforward workflow is to combine representations learned separately from each view, but it always introduces the noise/redundancy of multi-views data. Developing an integrated framework for this issue, deep learning has tried extracting the consistency information among multiple views by learning a common clustering embedding for community detection [111]. Since multi-view node attributes still require better integration scheme in the learning process, more works are encouraged to study the under-explored issue of global representation for community detection over multi-views to avoid sub-optimization.

J. Signed Networks

It has been increasingly noticed that not all occurring connection get items close. Generally, friendship indicates positive sentiment (*i.e.*, like and support), while foes express negative attitude (*i.e.*, dislike). These distinctions are reflected on network edges, called signed edges in networks [170]. As impacts of positive and negative ties on nodes are quite different, prior community detection methods working on unsigned networks are not applicable to signed ones.

Opportunities: To conduct community detection in signed network, the main challenges lie in adapting negative ties. Deep learning techniques should be exploited to properly represent positive and negative ties for community detection in signed networks. Unlike positively ties, a different node pairwise constraint based on negative ties offers a potential solution to learn signed network embedding for community detection [94]. Future works are expected to cope with signed edges, and to consider utilizing less prior knowledge of positive/negative attitude on edges owing to expensive acquisition.

K. Dynamic Networks

Networks are not static but evolve with dramatically changing network structures and temporal semantic features. The addition or removal of a node or edge can lead to changes in a local community, and so do changes in semantic features. Accordingly, deep learning models should rapidly capture the changes happening on networks to explore the evolution of communities.

Opportunities: Both deep learning and community detection need to handle the shifting distributions and evolving data scales. Re-training over static network snapshots is not an ideal solution. In our literature review, only one study touches the topic by designing an evolutionary AE aiming at discovering smoothly changing community structure over snapshots [96]. Technical challenges in detecting a dynamic network focus on controlling the dynamics (*i.e.*, spatial and temporal properties) in the model training process. Future directions of dynamic community detection include: (1) looking into the spatial changes influencing the community structure, (2) learning deep patterns with temporal semantic features such as node attributes and signed information on edges, and (3) developing

deep community detection methods tackling network dynamics and achieving robustness over snapshots.

L. Large-scale Networks

Large-scale networks can contain millions of nodes, edges, and structural patterns like community. Their inherent scale characteristics, like scale-free [21], [171] (*i.e.*, a power-law degree distribution) in social networks, can influence the performance of deep learning in community detection. Scalability is another crucial issue to enable deep learning to detect communities in large-scale networked environments [17]. One promising direction is to develop a robust and flexible deep learning approach that can achieve high-performance collaborative computing.

Opportunities: Regarding the high-dimensional network topological matrix, the key strategy of dimension reduction commonly used in deep learning, *i.e.*, matrix low-rank approximation, does not cope with large-scale networks. Even the current distributed computing solutions are still too expensive. Consequently, there is a crying need for novel deep frameworks, models, and algorithms that far exceed the current benchmarks in both precision and speed.

XIV. CONCLUSIONS

This survey provides a comprehensive overview of community detection methods. From the topic development, it depends heavily on deep learning models during the recent decade. Deep learning is a trend for community detection. Meanwhile, deep learning influences community detection procedures that large number of publications are immediately available in high-impact international conferences and peer-view journals discussed across multiple fields. Based on our survey, deep learning models significantly increase community detection effectiveness, efficiency, robustness and applicability. The new techniques are much more flexible in use and larger volume of data can be leveraged in a rough pre-process, compared to traditional community detection methods. Selectively included into six categories, we designed a taxonomy for the reviewed state-of-the-art literature. In each category, community detection is aimed by the deep learning model, *i.e.*, encoding representations and optimizing clustering results. We discussed the contributions of each deep learning model to community detection tasks. Furthermore, we summarized and provide handy resources, *i.e.*, data sets, evaluation metrics, open-source codes, based on the reviewed literature. We also offered an insight into a range of community detection applications. Finally, we identified open research directions to stimulate further research in this area.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. A. Rice, "The identification of blocs in small political bodies," *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 619–627, 1927.
- [2] M. Girvan and M. E. Newman, "Community structure in social and biological networks," *PNAS*, vol. 99, no. 12, pp. 7821–7826, 2002.
- [3] M. E. Newman, "Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 69, no. 6, p. 066133, 2004.
- [4] F. Liu, S. Xue, J. Wu, C. Zhou, W. Hu, C. Paris, S. Nepal, J. Yang, and P. S. Yu, "Deep learning for community detection: Progress, challenges and opportunities," in *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 4981–4987.

- [5] J. Kim and J.-G. Lee, "Community detection in multi-layer graphs: A survey," *ACM SIGMOD Record*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 37–48, 2015.
- [6] J. Xie, S. Kelley, and B. K. Szymanski, "Overlapping community detection in networks: The state-of-the-art and comparative study," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 1–35, 2013.
- [7] M. A. Javed, M. S. Younis, S. Latif, J. Qadir, and A. Baig, "Community detection in networks: A multidisciplinary review," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 108, pp. 87–111, 2018.
- [8] X. Xin, C. Wang, X. Ying, and B. Wang, "Deep community detection in topologically incomplete networks," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 469, pp. 342–352, 2017.
- [9] P. Chunaev, "Community detection in node-attributed social networks: A survey," *Computer Science Review*, vol. 37, p. 100286, 2020.
- [10] J. Sun, W. Zheng, Q. Zhang, and Z. Xu, "Graph neural network encoding for community detection in attribute networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03996*, 2020.
- [11] D. Jin, Z. Liu, W. Li, D. He, and W. Zhang, "Graph convolutional networks meet Markov random fields: Semi-supervised community detection in attribute networks," in *AAAI*, 2019, pp. 152–159.
- [12] G. Rossetti and R. Cazabet, "Community discovery in dynamic networks: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 51, no. 2, p. 37, 2018.
- [13] C. Pizzuti, "Evolutionary computation for community detection in networks: A review," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 464–483, 2018.
- [14] Q. Cai, L. Ma, M. Gong, and D. Tian, "A survey on network community detection based on evolutionary computation," *International Journal of Bio-Inspired Computation*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 84–98, 2016.
- [15] W. Cui, Y. Xiao, H. Wang, and W. Wang, "Local search of communities in large graphs," in *SIGMOD*, 2014, pp. 991–1002.
- [16] J. Li, X. Wang, K. Deng, X. Yang, T. Sellis, and J. X. Yu, "Most influential community search over large social networks," in *ICDE*, 2017, pp. 871–882.
- [17] H. Shiokawa, Y. Fujiwara, and M. Onizuka, "SCAN++ efficient algorithm for finding clusters, hubs and outliers on large-scale graphs," *PVLDB*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 1178–1189, 2015.
- [18] J. Leskovec and J. J. McAuley, "Learning to discover social circles in ego networks," in *NIPS*, 2012, pp. 539–547.
- [19] C. Nicolini, C. Bordier, and A. Bifone, "Community detection in weighted brain connectivity networks beyond the resolution limit," *Neuroimage*, vol. 146, pp. 28–39, 2017.
- [20] M. McPherson, L. Smith-Lovin, and J. M. Cook, "Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks," *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 415–444, 2001.
- [21] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, "Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks," *Nature*, vol. 393, no. 6684, pp. 440–442, 1998.
- [22] C. Pizzuti, "Ga-net: A genetic algorithm for community detection in social networks," in *PPSN*, 2008, pp. 1081–1090.
- [23] J. Xie and B. K. Szymanski, "Towards linear time overlapping community detection in social networks," in *PAKDD*, 2012, pp. 25–36.
- [24] J. Yang, J. McAuley, and J. Leskovec, "Community detection in networks with node attributes," in *ICDM*, 2013, pp. 1151–1156.
- [25] P. Chen and S. Redner, "Community structure of the physical review citation network," *Journal of Informetrics*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 278–290, 2010.
- [26] E. Ravasz, A. L. Somera, D. A. Mongru, Z. N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabási, "Hierarchical organization of modularity in metabolic networks," *Science*, vol. 297, no. 5586, pp. 1551–1555, 2002.
- [27] R. Guimera and L. A. N. Amaral, "Functional cartography of complex metabolic networks," *Nature*, vol. 433, no. 7028, pp. 895–900, 2005.
- [28] J. Chen and B. Yuan, "Detecting functional modules in the yeast protein–protein interaction network," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 22, no. 18, pp. 2283–2290, 2006.
- [29] O. Sporns and R. F. Betzel, "Modular brain networks," *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 67, pp. 613–640, 2016.
- [30] A. A. Amini, A. Chen, P. J. Bickel, E. Levina *et al.*, "Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 2097–2122, 2013.
- [31] S. de Lange, M. de Reus, and M. Van Den Heuvel, "The Laplacian spectrum of neural networks," *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, vol. 7, p. 189, 2014.
- [32] P. W. Holland, K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt, "Stochastic blockmodels: First steps," *Social Networks*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 109–137, 1983.
- [33] B. Karrer and M. E. Newman, "Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 83, no. 1, p. 016107, 2011.
- [34] E. M. Airoldi, D. M. Blei, S. E. Fienberg, and E. P. Xing, "Mixed membership stochastic blockmodels," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 9, no. Sep, pp. 1981–2014, 2008.
- [35] P. Latouche, E. Birmelé, C. Ambroise *et al.*, "Overlapping stochastic block models with application to the french political blogosphere," *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 309–336, 2011.
- [36] S. Fortunato, "Community detection in graphs," *Physics Reports*, vol. 486, no. 3–5, pp. 75–174, 2010.
- [37] S. Fortunato and D. Hric, "Community detection in networks: A user guide," *Physics Reports*, vol. 659, pp. 1–44, 2016.
- [38] E. Abbe, "Community detection and stochastic block models: Recent developments," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, no. 177, pp. 1–86, 2018.
- [39] S. E. Garza and S. E. Schaeffer, "Community detection with the label propagation algorithm: A survey," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 534, p. 122058, 2019.
- [40] J. H. Chin and K. Ratnavelu, "A semi-synchronous label propagation algorithm with constraints for community detection in complex networks," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2017.
- [41] F. D. Malliaros and M. Vazirgiannis, "Clustering and community detection in directed networks: A survey," *Physics Reports*, vol. 533, no. 4, pp. 95–142, 2013.
- [42] P. Bedi and C. Sharma, "Community detection in social networks," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 115–135, 2016.
- [43] B. W. Kernighan and S. Lin, "An efficient heuristic procedure for partitioning graphs," *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 291–307, 1970.
- [44] E. R. Barnes, "An algorithm for partitioning the nodes of a graph," *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 541–550, 1982.
- [45] M. E. Newman and M. Girvan, "Finding and evaluating community structure in networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 69, no. 2, p. 026113, 2004.
- [46] A. Clauset, M. E. Newman, and C. Moore, "Finding community structure in very large networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 70, no. 6, p. 066111, 2004.
- [47] F. D. Zarandi and M. K. Rafsanjani, "Community detection in complex networks using structural similarity," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 503, pp. 882–891, 2018.
- [48] P. Pons and M. Latapy, "Computing communities in large networks using random walks," in *Computer and Information Sciences*, 2005, pp. 284–293.
- [49] M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, "Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure," *PNAS*, vol. 105, no. 4, pp. 1118–1123, 2008.
- [50] U. N. Raghavan, R. Albert, and S. Kumara, "Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 76, no. 3, p. 036106, 2007.
- [51] M. J. Barber and J. W. Clark, "Detecting network communities by propagating labels under constraints," *Physical Review E*, vol. 80, no. 2, p. 026129, 2009.
- [52] M. Ester, H.-P. Kriegel, J. Sander, and X. Xu, "A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise," in *KDD*, 1996, p. 226–231.
- [53] X. Xu, N. Yuruk, Z. Feng, and T. A. Schweiger, "SCAN: A structural clustering algorithm for networks," in *KDD*, 2007, pp. 824–833.
- [54] X. Wang, G. Liu, J. Li, and J. P. Nees, "Locating structural centers: A density-based clustering method for community detection," *PloS One*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. e0169355, 2017.
- [55] A. Rodriguez and A. Laio, "Clustering by fast search and find of density peaks," *Science*, vol. 344, no. 6191, pp. 1492–1496, 2014.
- [56] V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre, "Fast unfolding of communities in large networks," *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, vol. 2008, no. 10, p. P10008, 2008.
- [57] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi, "Optimization by simulated annealing," *Science*, vol. 220, no. 4598, pp. 671–680, 1983.
- [58] S. Boettcher and A. G. Percus, "Optimization with extremal dynamics," *Complexity*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 57–62, 2002.
- [59] M. E. J. Newman, "Spectral methods for community detection and graph partitioning," *Physical Review E*, vol. 88, p. 042822, 2013.
- [60] F. Liu, J. Wu, C. Zhou, and J. Yang, "Evolutionary community detection in dynamic social networks," in *IJCNN*, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [61] Z. Li and J. Liu, "A multi-agent genetic algorithm for community detection in complex networks," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 449, pp. 336–347, 2016.

- [62] S. Sobolevsky, R. Campari, A. Belyi, and C. Ratti, "General optimization technique for high-quality community detection in complex networks," *Physical Review E*, vol. 90, no. 1, p. 012811, 2014.
- [63] L. Ana and A. K. Jain, "Robust data clustering," in *CVPR*, vol. 2, 2003.
- [64] R. Kannan, S. Vempala, and A. Vetta, "On clusterings: Good, bad and spectral," *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 497–515, 2004.
- [65] K. Deb, A. Pratap, S. Agarwal, and T. Meyarivan, "A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 182–197, 2002.
- [66] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, "Deep learning," *Nature*, vol. 521, pp. 436–444, 2015.
- [67] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio *et al.*, "Convolutional networks for images, speech, and time series," *The Handbook of Brain Theory and Neural Networks*, vol. 3361, no. 10, 1995.
- [68] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, "Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks," in *ICLR*, 2017.
- [69] G. Sperli, "A deep learning based community detection approach," in *SAC*, 2019, pp. 1107–1110.
- [70] B. Cai, Y. Wang, L. Zeng, Y. Hu, and H. Li, "Edge classification based on convolutional neural networks for community detection in complex network," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 556, p. 124826, 2020.
- [71] Z. Chen, L. Li, and J. Bruna, "Supervised community detection with line graph neural networks," in *ICLR*, 2019.
- [72] F. Krzakala, C. Moore, E. Mossel, J. Neeman, A. Sly, L. Zdeborová, and P. Zhang, "Spectral redemption in clustering sparse networks," *PNAS*, vol. 110, no. 52, pp. 20935–20940, 2013.
- [73] T. Zhang, Y. Xiong, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Y. Jiao, and Y. Zhu, "CommDGI: Community detection oriented deep graph infomax," in *CIKM*, 2020, pp. 1843–1852.
- [74] O. Shchur and S. Günnemann, "Overlapping community detection with graph neural networks," in *KDD Workshop on Deep Learning for Graphs*, 2019.
- [75] R. Hu, S. Pan, G. Long, Q. Lu, L. Zhu, and J. Jiang, "Going deep: Graph convolutional ladder-shape networks," in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 2838–2845.
- [76] Y. Liu, X. Wang, S. Wu, and Z. Xiao, "Independence promoted graph disentangled networks," in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 4916–4923.
- [77] A. Gretton, O. Bousquet, A. Smola, and B. Schölkopf, "Measuring statistical dependence with Hilbert-Schmidt norms," in *ALT*, 2005, pp. 63–77.
- [78] X. Zhang, H. Liu, Q. Li, and X.-M. Wu, "Attributed graph clustering via adaptive graph convolution," in *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 4327–4333.
- [79] G. Cui, J. Zhou, C. Yang, and Z. Liu, "Adaptive graph encoder for attributed graph embedding," in *KDD*, 2020, pp. 976–985.
- [80] R. Levie, F. Monti, X. Bresson, and M. M. Bronstein, "Cayleynets: Graph convolutional neural networks with complex rational spectral filters," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 97–109, 2018.
- [81] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Lio, and Y. Bengio, "Graph attention networks," in *ICLR*, 2018.
- [82] C. Park, D. Kim, J. Han, and H. Yu, "Unsupervised attributed multiplex network embedding," in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 5371–5378.
- [83] X. Fu, J. Zhang, Z. Meng, and I. King, "MAGNN: Metapath aggregated graph neural network for heterogeneous graph embedding," in *WWW*, 2020, pp. 2331–2341.
- [84] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," in *NIPS*, 2014, pp. 2672–2680.
- [85] Y. Zhang, Y. Xiong, Y. Ye, T. Liu, W. Wang, Y. Zhu, and P. S. Yu, "SEAL: Learning heuristics for community detection with generative adversarial networks," in *KDD*, 2020, pp. 1103–1113.
- [86] M. Shi, Y. Tang, X. Zhu, D. Wilson, and J. Liu, "Multi-class imbalanced graph convolutional network learning," in *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 2879–2885.
- [87] L. Yang, Y. Wang, J. Gu, C. Wang, X. Cao, and Y. Guo, "JANE: Jointly adversarial network embedding," in *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 1381–1387.
- [88] H. Gao, J. Pei, and H. Huang, "Progan: Network embedding via proximity generative adversarial network," in *KDD*, 2019, pp. 1308–1316.
- [89] Y. Jia, Q. Zhang, W. Zhang, and X. Wang, "CommunityGAN: Community detection with generative adversarial nets," in *WWW*, 2019, pp. 784–794.
- [90] G. E. Hinton and R. R. Salakhutdinov, "Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks," *Science*, vol. 313, no. 5786, pp. 504–507, 2006.
- [91] F. Liu, J. Wu, S. Xue, C. Zhou, J. Yang, and Q. Sheng, "Detecting the evolving community structure in dynamic social networks," *World Wide Web*, vol. 23, pp. 715–733, 2020.
- [92] L. Yang, X. Cao, D. He, C. Wang, X. Wang, and W. Zhang, "Modularity based community detection with deep learning," in *IJCAI*, 2016, p. 2252–2258.
- [93] M. E. Newman, "Modularity and community structure in networks," *PNAS*, vol. 103, no. 23, pp. 8577–8582, 2006.
- [94] X. Shen and F.-L. Chung, "Deep network embedding for graph representation learning in signed networks," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 1556–1568, 2018.
- [95] D. Jin, M. Ge, L. Yang, D. He, L. Wang, and W. Zhang, "Integrative network embedding via deep joint reconstruction," in *IJCAI*, 2018, pp. 3407–3413.
- [96] Z. Wang, C. Wang, C. Gao, X. Li, and X. Li, "An evolutionary autoencoder for dynamic community detection," *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 1–16, 2020.
- [97] H. Gao and H. Huang, "Deep attributed network embedding," in *IJCAI*, 2018, pp. 3364–3370.
- [98] Y. Xie, X. Wang, D. Jiang, and R. Xu, "High-performance community detection in social networks using a deep transitive autoencoder," *Information Sciences*, vol. 493, pp. 75–90, 2019.
- [99] J. Zhang, C. Xia, C. Zhang, L. Cui, Y. Fu, and S. Y. Philip, "BL-MNE: Emerging heterogeneous social network embedding through broad learning with aligned autoencoder," in *ICDM*, 2017, pp. 605–614.
- [100] A. Ng *et al.*, "Sparse autoencoder," *CS294A Lecture notes*, vol. 72, no. 2011, pp. 1–19, 2011.
- [101] F. Tian, B. Gao, Q. Cui, E. Chen, and T.-Y. Liu, "Learning deep representations for graph clustering," in *AAAI*, 2014, pp. 1293–1299.
- [102] V. Bhatia and R. Rani, "Dfuzzy: A deep learning-based fuzzy clustering model for large graphs," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 159–181, 2018.
- [103] R. Xu, Y. Che, X. Wang, J. Hu, and Y. Xie, "Stacked autoencoder-based community detection method via an ensemble clustering framework," *Information Sciences*, vol. 526, pp. 151–165, 2020.
- [104] C. Wang, S. Pan, G. Long, X. Zhu, and J. Jiang, "Mgae: Marginalized graph autoencoder for graph clustering," in *CIKM*, 2017, pp. 889–898.
- [105] S. Cao, W. Lu, and Q. Xu, "Deep neural networks for learning graph representations," in *AAAI*, 2016, p. 1145–1152.
- [106] C. Yang, M. Liu, Z. Wang, L. Liu, and J. Han, "Graph clustering with dynamic embedding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08249*, 2017.
- [107] D. He, Y. Song, D. Jin, Z. Feng, B. Zhang, Z. Yu, and W. Zhang, "Community-centric graph convolutional network for unsupervised community detection," in *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 3515–3521.
- [108] D. Bo, X. Wang, C. Shi, M. Zhu, E. Lu, and P. Cui, "Structural deep clustering network," in *WWW*, 2020, pp. 1400–1410.
- [109] S. Fan, X. Wang, C. Shi, E. Lu, K. Lin, and B. Wang, "One2multi graph autoencoder for multi-view graph clustering," in *WWW*, 2020, pp. 3070–3076.
- [110] C. Wang, S. Pan, R. Hu, G. Long, J. Jiang, and C. Zhang, "Attributed graph clustering: A deep attentional embedding approach," in *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 3670–3676.
- [111] J. Cheng, Q. Wang, Z. Tao, D. Xie, and Q. Gao, "Multi-view attribute graph convolution networks for clustering," in *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 2973–2979.
- [112] D. Luo, J. Ni, S. Wang, Y. Bian, X. Yu, and X. Zhang, "Deep multi-graph clustering via attentive cross-graph association," in *WSDM*, 2020, pp. 393–401.
- [113] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-encoding variational bayes," in *ICLR*, 2014.
- [114] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, "Variational graph auto-encoders," in *NIPS*, 2016.
- [115] N. Mehta, L. C. Duke, and P. Rai, "Stochastic blockmodels meet graph neural networks," in *ICML*, 2019, pp. 4466–4474.
- [116] Z. Chen, C. Chen, Z. Zhang, Z. Zheng, and Q. Zou, "Variational graph embedding and clustering with Laplacian eigenmaps," in *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 2144–2150.
- [117] J. J. Choong, X. Liu, and T. Murata, "Learning community structure with variational autoencoder," in *ICDM*, 2018, pp. 69–78.
- [118] H. Shi, H. Fan, and J. T. Kwok, "Effective decoding in graph auto-encoder using triadic closure," in *AAAI*, 2020, pp. 906–913.
- [119] A. Sarkar, N. Mehta, and P. Rai, "Graph representation learning via ladder gamma variational autoencoders," pp. 5604–5611, 2020.
- [120] S. Pan, R. Hu, G. Long, J. Jiang, L. Yao, and C. Zhang, "Adversarially regularized graph autoencoder for graph embedding," in *IJCAI*, 2018, pp. 2609–2615.

- [121] D. D. Lee and H. S. Seung, "Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization," *Nature*, vol. 401, no. 6755, pp. 788–791, 1999.
- [122] H. A. Song, B.-K. Kim, T. L. Xuan, and S.-Y. Lee, "Hierarchical feature extraction by multi-layer non-negative matrix factorization network for classification task," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 165, pp. 63–74, 2015.
- [123] F. Ye, C. Chen, and Z. Zheng, "Deep autoencoder-like nonnegative matrix factorization for community detection," in *CIKM*, 2018, pp. 1393–1402.
- [124] Y. Pei, C. Nilanjan, and S. Katia, "Nonnegative matrix tri-factorization with graph regularization for community detection in social networks," in *IJCAI*, 2015, pp. 2083–2089.
- [125] B.-J. Sun, H. Shen, J. Gao, W. Ouyang, and X. Cheng, "A non-negative symmetric encoder-decoder approach for community detection," in *CIKM*, 2017, pp. 597–606.
- [126] J. Huang, T. Zhang, W. Yu, J. Zhu, and E. Cai, "Community detection based on modularized deep nonnegative matrix factorization," *International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, p. 2159006, 2020.
- [127] J. Ngiam, Z. Chen, S. A. Bhaskar, P. W. Koh, and A. Y. Ng, "Sparse filtering," in *NIPS*, 2011, pp. 1125–1133.
- [128] Y. Xie, M. Gong, S. Wang, and B. Yu, "Community discovery in networks with deep sparse filtering," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 81, pp. 50–59, 2018.
- [129] W. W. Zachary, "An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups," *Journal of Anthropological Research*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 452–473, 1977.
- [130] D. Lusseau, "The emergent properties of a dolphin social network," *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 270, no. suppl_2, pp. S186–S188, 2003.
- [131] L. A. Adamic and N. Glance, "The political blogosphere and the 2004 us election: divided they blog," in *KDD Workshop*, 2005, pp. 36–43.
- [132] J. Yang and J. Leskovec, "Defining and evaluating network communities based on ground-truth," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 181–213, 2015.
- [133] C. Yang, Z. Liu, D. Zhao, M. Sun, and E. Y. Chang, "Network representation learning with rich text information," in *IJCAI*, 2015, pp. 2111–2117.
- [134] P. Sen, G. Namata, M. Bilgic, L. Getoor, B. Galligher, and T. Eliassirad, "Collective classification in network data," *AI magazine*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 93–93, 2008.
- [135] X. Huang, J. Li, and X. Hu, "Accelerated attributed network embedding," in *SDM*, 2017, pp. 633–641.
- [136] G. Namata, B. London, L. Getoor, B. Huang, and U. EDU, "Query-driven active surveying for collective classification," in *KDD Workshop on Mining and Learning with Graphs*, vol. 8, 2012.
- [137] X. Wang, H. Ji, C. Shi, B. Wang, Y. Ye, P. Cui, and P. S. Yu, "Heterogeneous graph attention network," in *WWW*, 2019, pp. 2022–2032.
- [138] P. Massa and P. Avesani, "Controversial users demand local trust metrics: An experimental study on Epinions. com community," in *AAAI*, vol. 5, 2005, pp. 121–126.
- [139] J. Kunegis, A. Lommatzsch, and C. Bauckhage, "The slashdot zoo: Mining a social network with negative edges," in *WWW*, 2009, pp. 741–750.
- [140] J. Leskovec, D. Huttenlocher, and J. Kleinberg, "Governance in social media: A case study of the wikipedia promotion process," in *ICWSM*, no. 1, 2010.
- [141] J. J. Choong, X. Liu, and T. Murata, "Optimizing variational graph autoencoder for community detection," in *BigData*, 2019, pp. 5353–5358.
- [142] A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato, and F. Radicchi, "Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms," *Physical Review E*, vol. 78, no. 4, p. 046110, 2008.
- [143] C.-Y. Liu, C. Zhou, J. Wu, Y. Hu, and L. Guo, "Social recommendation with an essential preference space," p. 346–353, 2018.
- [144] L. Gao, J. Wu, Z. Qiao, C. Zhou, H. Yang, and Y. Hu, "Collaborative social group influence for event recommendation," in *CIKM*, 2016, p. 1941–1944.
- [145] J. O. Garcia, A. Ashourvan, S. Muldoon, J. M. Vettel, and D. S. Bassett, "Applications of community detection techniques to brain graphs: Algorithmic considerations and implications for neural function," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, pp. 846–867, 2018.
- [146] J. J. Bechtel, W. A. Kelley, T. A. Coons, M. G. Klein, D. D. Slagel, and T. L. Petty, "Lung cancer detection in patients with airflow obstruction identified in a primary care outpatient practice," *Chest*, vol. 127, no. 4, pp. 1140–1145, 2005.
- [147] N. Haq and Z. J. Wang, "Community detection from genomic datasets across human cancers," in *GlobalSIP*, 2016, pp. 1147–1150.
- [148] C. Remy, B. Rym, and L. Matthieu, "Tracking bitcoin users activity using community detection on a network of weak signals," in *CNA*, 2017, pp. 166–177.
- [149] Z. Chen, W. Hendrix, and N. F. Samatova, "Community-based anomaly detection in evolutionary networks," *Journal of Intelligent Information Systems*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 59–85, 2012.
- [150] T. Waskiewicz, "Friend of a friend influence in terrorist social networks," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2012.
- [151] V. Fionda and G. Pirrò, "From community detection to community deception," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.00149*, 2016.
- [152] Y. Liu, J. Liu, Z. Zhang, L. Zhu, and A. Li, "REM: From structural entropy to community structure deception," in *NIPS*, 2019, pp. 12938–12948.
- [153] V. Fionda and G. Pirro, "Community deception or: How to stop fearing community detection algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 660–673, 2017.
- [154] X. Huang and L. V. Lakshmanan, "Attribute-driven community search," *VLDBJ*, vol. 10, no. 9, pp. 949–960, 2017.
- [155] B. Perozzi, R. Al-Rfou, and S. Skiena, "DeepWalk: Online learning of social representations," in *KDD*, 2014, pp. 701–710.
- [156] S. Cavallari, V. W. Zheng, H. Cai, K. C.-C. Chang, and E. Cambria, "Learning community embedding with community detection and node embedding on graphs," in *CIKM*, 2017, pp. 377–386.
- [157] T. Li, L. Lei, S. Bhattacharyya, K. V. den Berge, P. Sarkar, P. J. Bickel, and E. Levina, "Hierarchical community detection by recursive partitioning," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 1–18, 2020.
- [158] L. Du, Z. Lu, Y. Wang, G. Song, Y. Wang, and W. Chen, "Galaxy network embedding: A hierarchical community structure preserving approach," in *IJCAI*, 2018, pp. 2079–2085.
- [159] Q. Long, Y. Wang, L. Du, G. Song, Y. Jin, and W. Lin, "Hierarchical community structure preserving network embedding: A subspace approach," in *ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2019, pp. 409–418.
- [160] J. Wu, S. Pan, X. Zhu, C. Zhang, and P. S. Yu, "Multiple structure-view learning for graph classification," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 3236–3251, 2018.
- [161] M. Kiveliä, A. Arenas, M. Barthélemy, J. P. Gleeson, Y. Moreno, and M. A. Porter, "Multilayer networks," *Journal of Complex Networks*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 203–271, 2014.
- [162] X. Huang, D. Chen, T. Ren, and D. Wang, "A survey of community detection methods in multilayer networks," *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 35, pp. 1–45, 2021.
- [163] Y. Cao, H. Peng, J. Wu, Y. Dou, J. Li, and P. S. Yu, "Knowledge-preserving incremental social event detection via heterogeneous gnns," in *WWW*, 2021.
- [164] J. Zhu, Y. Yan, L. Zhao, M. Heimann, L. Akoglu, and D. Koutra, "Beyond homophily in graph neural networks: Current limitations and effective designs," in *NIPS*, 2020.
- [165] H. Jeong, S. P. Mason, A.-L. Barabási, and Z. N. Oltvai, "Lethality and centrality in protein networks," *Nature*, vol. 411, no. 6833, pp. 41–42, 2001.
- [166] S. Xue, J. Lu, and G. Zhang, "Cross-domain network representations," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 94, pp. 135–148, 2019.
- [167] J. Wu, X. Zhu, C. Zhang, and Z. Cai, "Multi-instance multi-graph dual embedding learning," in *ICDM*, 2013, pp. 827–836.
- [168] J. Wu, Z. Hong, S. Pan, X. Zhu, Z. Cai, and C. Zhang, "Multi-graph-view learning for graph classification," in *ICDM*, 2014, pp. 590–599.
- [169] R. Li, C. Zhang, Q. Hu, P. Zhu, and Z. Wang, "Flexible multi-view representation learning for subspace clustering," in *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 2916–2922.
- [170] P. Xu, W. Hu, J. Wu, and B. Du, "Link prediction with signed latent factors in signed social networks," in *KDD*, 2019, p. 1046–1054.
- [171] A.-L. Barabási and E. Bonabeau, "Scale-free networks," *Scientific American*, vol. 288, no. 5, pp. 60–69, 2003.
- [172] A. F. McDavid, D. Greene, and N. Hurley, "Normalized mutual information to evaluate overlapping community finding algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1110.2515*, 2011.
- [173] H. Shen, X. Cheng, K. Cai, and M.-B. Hu, "Detect overlapping and hierarchical community structure in networks," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 388, no. 8, pp. 1706–1712, 2009.
- [174] L. Hubert and P. Arabie, "Comparing partitions," *Journal of Classification*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 193–218, 1985.



Xing Su received her M.Eng. degree in computer technology from Lanzhou University, China in 2020. She is currently a Ph.D. candidate in Department of Computing at Macquarie University, Australia. Her current research interests include community detection, deep learning and social network analysis.



Shan Xue received her Ph.D. in Computer Science from the Center for Artificial Intelligence, University of Technology Sydney, Australia in 2019 and a Ph.D. in Information Management from the School of Management, Shanghai University, Shanghai, China in 2018. She is a postdoctoral research fellow of Department of Computing, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia as well as a researcher of CSIRO's Data61, Sydney, Australia. Her current research interests include artificial intelligence, machine learning and

knowledge mining.



Fanzhen Liu received the M.Res. (Master of Research) degree from Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in computer science with Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. His current research interests include graph mining and machine learning.



Jia Wu is an ARC DECRA Fellow at the Department of Computing, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. He received the PhD from the University of Technology Sydney, Australia. His current research interests include data mining and machine learning. He has published 100+ refereed research papers in the above areas such as TPAMI, TKDE, TNNLS, TMM, NIPS, KDD, ICDM, IJCAI, AAAI and WWW. Dr Wu was the recipient of SDM'18 Best Paper Award in Data Science Track and IJCNN'17 Best Student Paper Award. He currently

serves as an Associate Editor of *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data* (TKDD). He is a Senior Member of IEEE.



Jian Yang is a full professor at the Department of Computing, Macquarie University. She received her PhD in Data Integration from the Australian National University in 1995. Her main research interests are: business process management; data science; social networks. Prof. Yang has published more than 200 journal and conference papers in international journals and conferences such as IEEE Transactions, Information Systems, Data and Knowledge Engineering, VLDB, ICDE, ICDM, CIKM, etc. She is currently serving as an Executive Committee

for the Computing Research and Education Association of Australasia.



Chuan Zhou obtained Ph.D. degree from Chinese Academy of Sciences in 2013. He won the outstanding doctoral dissertation of Chinese Academy of Sciences in 2014, the best paper award of ICCS-14, and the best student paper award of IJCNN-17. Currently, he is an Associate Professor at the Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences. His research interests include social network analysis and graph mining. To date, he has published more than 80 papers, including TKDE, ICDM, AAAI, IJCAI, WWW, etc.



Wenbin Hu is currently a professor with the School of Computer Science, Wuhan University. His current research interests include intelligent and complex network, data mining and social network. He has more than 80 publications appeared in several top conferences such as SIGKDD, IJCAI, AAAI and ICDM, and journals such as IEEE TKDE, IEEE TMC, IEEE TITS, and ACM TKDD.



Cecile Paris is a pioneer in Natural Language Processing and User Modelling, and, more generally, in Artificial Intelligence and human-machine communication. With a Bachelor Degree from the University of Berkeley (California) and a PhD from Columbia University (New York), she has over to 25 years of experience in research and research management, and over 300 refereed publications. She is a Chief Research Scientist at CSIRO's Data61, a Fellow of the Academy for Technology, Science and Engineering (ATSE) and of the Royal Society

of NSW, and an Honorary Professor at Macquarie University.



Surya Nepal is a Senior Principal Research Scientist at CSIRO Data61 and the Deputy Research Director of Cybersecurity Cooperative Research Centre (CRC). He has been with CSIRO since 2000 and currently leads the distributed systems security group comprising 30 staff and 50 PhD students. His main research focus is on distributed systems, with a specific focus on security, privacy and trust. He has more than 250 peer-reviewed publications to his credit. He is a member of the editorial boards of IEEE TSC, ACM TOIT, and IEEE DSC. Dr Nepal also holds an honorary professor position at Macquarie University and a conjoint faculty position at UNSW.



Di Jin received the Ph.D. degree in computer science from Jilin University, Changchun, China, in 2012. He was a Postdoctoral Research Fellow with the School of Design, Engineering, and Computing, Bournemouth University, Poole, U.K., from 2013 to 2014. He is currently an Associate Professor with the College of Intelligence and Computing, Tianjin University, Tianjin, China. He has published more than 50 papers in international journals and conferences in the areas of community detection, social network analysis, and machine learning.



Quan Z. Sheng is a full Professor and Head of Department of Computing at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. His research interests include big data analytics, service oriented computing, and Internet of Things. Michael holds a PhD degree in computer science from the University of New South Wales. He has more than 400 publications. Prof Michael Sheng is the recipient of AMiner Most Influential Scholar Award in IoT in 2019, ARC Future Fellowship in 2014, Chris Wallace Award for Outstanding Research Contribution in 2012, and Microsoft Fellowship in 2003. He is ranked by Microsoft Academic as one of the Most Impactful Authors in Services Computing (ranked the 4th all time).

Microsoft Fellowship in 2003. He is ranked by Microsoft Academic as one of the Most Impactful Authors in Services Computing (ranked the 4th all time).



Philip S. Yu (F'93) is a distinguished professor of computer science with the University of Illinois at Chicago and also holds the Wexler chair in information technology. His research interest is on big data, including data mining, data stream, database, and privacy. He has published more than 990 papers in refereed journals and conferences. He holds or has applied for more than 300 US patents. He was the editor-in-chief of the IEEE TKDE (2001-2004). He has received several IBM honors including two IBM Outstanding Innovation Awards. Prof. Yu is a

fellow of the ACM and the IEEE.

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY TECHNIQUES OF DEEP LEARNING-BASED COMMUNITY DETECTION METHODS

TABLE V: A summary of GCN-based community detection methods.

Method	Input	Learning	Convolution	Clustering	Other characters	Complexity	Overlap
LGNN [71]	A, X	Supervise	First-order + Line graph	–	Edge features	$\mathcal{O}(m)$	✓
MRFasGCN [11]	A, X	Semi-supervise	First-order + Mean Field Approximate	–	GCN + eMRF	$\mathcal{O}(m)$	×
CommDGI [73]	A, X	Unsupervise	First-order + Sampling	–	Joint optimization	–	×
NOCD [74]	A, X	Unsupervise	First-order	–	GCN + BP	–	✓
GCLN [75]	A, X	Unsupervise	First-order	k -means	U-Net architecture	–	×
IPGDN [76]	A, X	Unsupervise	First-order + Disentangled representation	k -means	HSIC as regularizer	$\mathcal{O}(m)$	×
AGC [78]	A, X	Unsupervise	k -order + Laplacian smoothing filter	Spectral Clustering	–	$\mathcal{O}(n^2 dt + m dt^2)$	×
AGE [79]	A, X	Unsupervise	Laplacian smoothing filter	Spectral Clustering	Adaptive learning	–	×
CayleyNet [80]	A, X	Semi-supervise	Laplacian smoothing filter	–	Cayley polynomial	$\mathcal{O}(m)$	×

TABLE VI: A summary of GAN-based community detection methods.

Method	Input	Learning	Generator	Discriminator	Generated Samples	Clustering	Overlap
SEAL [85]	A, X	Semi-supervise	iGPN	GINs	Communities	–	✓
DR-GCN [86]	A, X	Semi-supervise	MLP	MLP	Embeddings	k -means	×
JANE [87]	A, X	Unsupervise	Various	MLP	Topology, attributes, embeddings	–	×
ProGAN [88]	A, X	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	Triples	k -means	×
CommunityGAN [89]	A	Unsupervise	Softmax	Inner Product	Motifs	–	✓

TABLE VII: A summary of AE-based community detection methods.

Category	Method	Input	Learning	Encoder	Decoder	Loss	Overlap	
Stacked AE	semi-DNR [92]	A	Semi-supervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+pairwise	×	
	DNE-SBP [94]	$A(+, -)$	Semi-supervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+regularization+pairwise	×	
	UWMNE/WMCNE-LE [95]	B, X	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+pairwise	×	
	sE-Autoencoder [96]	$\{A_t\}$	Semi-supervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+regularization+pairwise	×	
	DANE [97]	A, X	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+proximity	×	
	Transfer-CDDTA [98]	S_s, S_t	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+regularization	×	
Sparse AE	DIME [99]	$\{A_{ij}\}, \mathcal{X}$	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+regularization+proximity	×	
	GraphEncoder [101]	A, S, D	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+regularization+sparsity	×	
	Dfuzzy [102]	A	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+sparsity	✓	
	CDMEC [103]	A	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+sparsity	×	
	Denoising AE	DNGR [105]	A	Unsupervise	DNN	DNN	reconstruction	×
		GRACE [106]	A, X	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+regularization	×
Graph Convolutional AE	MGAE [104]	A, X	Unsupervise	GCN	GCN	reconstruction+regularization	×	
	GUCD [107]	A, X	Unsupervise	MRFasGCN	MLP	reconstruction+pairwise	×	
	SDCN [108]	A	Unsupervise	GCN	MLP	reconstruction+clustering	×	
	O2MAC [109]	A, X	Unsupervise	GCN	Link prediction	reconstruction+clustering	×	
Graph Attention AE	DAEGC [110]	A, X	Unsupervise	GAT	Inner Product	reconstruction+regularization+clustering	×	
	MAGCN [111]	A, X	Unsupervise	GAT+MLP	Inner Product	reconstruction+regularization	×	
	DMGC [112]	A	Unsupervise	MLP	MLP	reconstruction+regularization+proximity+clustering	×	
Variational AE	TGA/TVGA [118]	A	Unsupervise	GCN	Triad	reconstruction+regularization+clustering	×	
	VGECLC [116]	A	Unsupervise	DNN	DNN	reconstruction+regularization	×	
	DGLFRM [115]	A	Unsupervise	GCN	MLP	reconstruction+regularization	✓	
	LGVG [119]	A	Unsupervise	GCN	MLP	reconstruction+regularization	✓	
	VGAECD [117]	A, X	Unsupervise	GCN	Inner Product	reconstruction+regularization	×	
	VGAECD-OPT [141]	A, X	Unsupervise	GCN	Inner Product	reconstruction+regularization	×	
ARGA/ARVGA [120]	A, X	Unsupervise	GAN	Inner Product	reconstruction+regularization	×		

APPENDIX B DETAILED DESCRIPTION: DATA SETS

Citation/Co-authorship Networks. Citeseer, Cora and Pubmed² are most popular group of paper citation networks used in community detection experiments, where nodes correspond to publications and are connected if one cites the other. The nodes are associated with binary word vectors. Topics are class labels. The ACM data set is a paper network. There is an edge between two papers if they are written by same author. ACM can form a two-view network by co-paper (two papers are written by same author) relationship and co-subject (two papers contain same subjects) relationship. Paper features are the bag-of-words of the keywords. The communities are labeled by research areas of papers. The task is to classify the papers into classes of research topics. DBLP³ is a computer science bibliography website. The DBLP dataset extracted authors, papers, terms, and publication venues. The authors are divided into four research areas. Each author is described by a bag-of-words representation of their paper keywords. Data sets of Chemistry, Computer Science, Medicine and Engineering are co-authorship networks, constructed from the Microsoft Academic Graph⁴.

Online Social Networks. Facebook⁵ and Twitter are two collections of small ego-networks. They can be an attributed network. Facebook and Twitter allow users to write, read and share posts with their friends online. Users are linked by edges. The Slashdot data set is a signed social network extracted from the technology news site Slashdot, where users can form the relationships as friends (positive) or foes (negative). The Epinions data set is a *who trust whom* online social network generated from the Epinions site⁶, where one user can trust (positive) or distrust (negative) another. Youtube⁷ includes a social network which is extracted from the video-sharing web site. Last.fm is a music website⁸ keeping track of users' listening information from various sources. It consists users, artists and artist tags after data preprocessing. This dataset is used for the link prediction task, and no label or feature is included in this dataset. Flickr is a social network where users share their photos. Users follow each other to form a network. Tags on their images are used as the attribute. Groups that users joined are considered as class labels. LiveJournal⁹ is a free on-line blogging community where users declare friendship each other. Blogcatalog is a blogger community and an online social network where nodes are users and edges are the friendship between different users. The attribute of nodes is the extracted keywords from their blogs. The labels represent the topic categories provided by the authors. PolBlogs is a social blog network of political blogs where nodes are blogs and web links between them are represented by its edges.

These blogs have known political learnings and are labeled. Gplus¹⁰ is collected from users who had manually shared their circles using the *share circle* feature in Google+. The dataset includes node features (profiles), circles, and ego networks. Foursquare is another famous location based social network (LBSN), which provides users with various kinds of location-related services. In Foursquare, users with friendship links write posts which all attach location checkins.

Traditional Social Networks. Zachary's Karate Club is one of the most widely-used social networks in community detection. The 34 members of the club constitute the 34 nodes of the network. The relationships between members constitute the 78 edges of the network. The Football data set is a widely-used small-scale network. The nodes represent different football teams, and the edges represent the matches between them. The other traditional human social network data sets include: The Friendship6 and Friendship7 data sets construct high school friendship networks. Cellphone Calls¹¹ is an interaction network. Rados and Emails¹² are popular email data sets. Rados¹³ is an internal email communication network between employees of a mid-sized manufacturing company. The network is directed and nodes represent employees. The left node represents the sender and the right node represents the recipient of the email. Edges represent individual emails between two users. In the Dolphin social network, the connection of any two dolphins represents a tighter connection between them. The network can be detected as two communities.

Biological Networks. Protein-protein interaction (PPI) networks and brain networks are two major parts in the biological field. PPI networks are generally preprocessed and named from databases, such as BioGrid, DIP and Yeast. Most PPI networks are unweighted and unlabeled. BrainNet consists of five individual brain networks. In each network, a node represents a region in human brain and an edge depicts the functional association between two nodes. Nodes in different graphs are linked if they represent the same region. Each network aims to detect high-level functional systems (*i.e.*, clusters), including auditory, memory retrieval and visual.

Webpage Networks. The webpage networks connect between one type of world wide web resources. IMDb¹⁴ is an online database about movies and television programs, including information such as cast, production crew, and plot summaries. Each movie is also described by a bag-of-words representation of its plot keywords. For IMDB dataset, the task is to classify the movies into three classes (Action, Comedy, Drama). 20-Newsgroup data set is a collection of about 20,000 newsgroup documents. The documents are partitioned into 20 different groups according to their topics. Each node is a document and an edge encodes the semantic similarity between two nodes. Wiki¹⁵ is a webpage network where nodes are

²<https://linqs.soe.ucsc.edu/data>

³<http://dl.acm.org/>

⁴<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/com-DBLP.html>

⁵<https://kddcup2016.azurewebsites.net/>

⁶<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/ego-Facebook.html>

⁷<http://www.epinions.com/>

⁸<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/com-Youtube.html>

⁹<https://www.last.fm/>

¹⁰<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/soc-LiveJournal1.html>

¹⁰<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/ego-Gplus.html>

¹¹<http://www.cs.umd.edu/hcil/VASTchallenge08/download/Download.htm>

¹²<http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~7Eenron/>, <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/email-Eu-core.html>

¹³<http://networkrepository.com/ia-radoslaw-email.php>

¹⁴<https://www.imdb.com/>

¹⁵<https://linqs.soe.ucsc.edu/data>

webpages and are connected if one links the other. Nodes are associated with tf-idf weighted word vectors. The link among different nodes is the hyperlink in the web page. Another wiki data set, named UAI2010, contains article information from English Wikipedia pages. Articles are linked as network edges. WebKB, containing 4 sub-datasets, is a web page dataset gathered in four different universities, *i.e.*, Cornell, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin.

Product Co-purchasing Networks. The network of Amazon¹⁶ data set characterizes the co-purchased products on the Amazon website, with each node representing a product, and each link indicating that those two products are frequently co-purchased. The product category provided by Amazon website is also included in the data set, which is treated as the ground-truth label for each product. For some scenarios, Amazon data set contains a multiplex network of products, *i.e.*, also-viewed, also-bought, and bought-together relations between products. The task is to classify products into the four categories, such as Beauty, Automotive, Garden and Baby.

Other Networks. The other networks are popularly employed in community detection experiments, including Internet¹⁷ data set, dynamic source code structures of a Java¹⁸ program data set, High School, Hospital and Hypertext¹⁹ networks, and data set below. Reuters is a text data set containing around 810000 English news stories labeled with a category tree. The root categories, such as corporate/industrial, government/social, markets and economics are ground truth labels for clustering. Wine is a data set from UCI Machine Learning Repository. It is the results of a chemical analysis of wines grown in the same region in Italy but derived from three different cultivars. The network built on Wine data set applied cosine similarity of two different instances as edge weights, and labels as ground truth. The Heterogeneity Human Activity Recognition (HHAR) dataset contains 10299 sensor records from smart phones and smart watches. All samples are partitioned into 6 categories of human activities, including biking, sitting, standing, walking, stair up and stair down.

APPENDIX C DETAILED EVALUATION METRICS

Normalized Mutual Information (NMI): NMI is a normalization of the mutual information score that measures the correct proportion of the detected community structure \mathcal{C}^* compared with the ground truth \mathcal{C} :

$$\text{NMI}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}^*) = \frac{-2 \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\mathcal{C}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\mathcal{C}^*}} N_{ij} \log \frac{N_{ij} n}{N_i \cdot N_j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\mathcal{C}}} N_i \log \frac{N_i}{n} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\mathcal{C}^*}} N_j \log \frac{N_j}{n}}, \quad (25)$$

where $N_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $N_{\mathcal{C}^*}$ are the number of communities in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}^* , respectively, N_{ij} denotes the number of nodes that appear in both group i of \mathcal{C} and in group j of \mathcal{C}^* , $N_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\mathcal{C}^*}} N_{ij}$

and $N_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\mathcal{C}}} N_{ij}$. NMI can evaluate overlapping communities by its variants: Normalized Mutual Information for Overlapping Community (Overlapping-NMI) [172].

Accuracy (ACC): ACC measures the correctly divided communities according to the ground truth as follows:

$$\text{ACC}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}^*) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{C}|} \delta(C_i, C_i^*)}{|\mathcal{C}|}, \quad (26)$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ denotes the Kronecker delta which equals 1 when both labels of ground truth and the detected community match.

Precision: Community precision calculates the percentage of nodes in a detected community belonging to the ground truth community as follows:

$$\text{Precision}(C_i, C_i^*) = \frac{C_i \cap C_i^*}{|C_i^*|}, \quad (27)$$

where C_i^* is a detected community while C_i is a ground truth community.

Recall: Community recall measures the percentage of nodes of the ground truth community C_i which is covered by the detected community C_i^* .

$$\text{Recall}(C_i, C_i^*) = \frac{C_i \cap C_i^*}{|C_i|}. \quad (28)$$

F1-scores: F1-scores of community detection is the harmonic mean of Precision and Recall, it is formulated as:

$$\text{F1-scores}(C_i, C_i^*) = 2 \cdot \frac{\text{precision}(C_i, C_i^*) \cdot \text{recall}(C_i, C_i^*)}{\text{precision}(C_i, C_i^*) + \text{recall}(C_i, C_i^*)}, \quad (29)$$

where C_i^* is a detected community while C_i is a ground truth community. For a set of detected communities \mathcal{C}^* and a set of ground truth communities \mathcal{C} , the scores are computed as:

$$\text{F1-scores}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}^*) = \sum_{C_i^* \in \mathcal{C}^*} \frac{|C_i^*|}{\sum_{C_i^* \in \mathcal{C}^*} |C_i^*|} \max_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} \text{F1-scores}(C_i, C_i^*). \quad (30)$$

Adjusted Rand Index (ARI): ARI consists of an index and an expected index. The first part in the denominator is called the maximum index, and the second part in the denominator is the second part in the numerator.

$$\text{ARI}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}^*) = \frac{\sum_{ij} \binom{n_{ij}}{2} - [\sum_i \binom{C_i}{2}] \sum_j \binom{C_j^*}{2}] / \binom{N}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} [\sum_i \binom{C_i}{2} + \sum_j \binom{C_j^*}{2}] / \binom{N}{2} + [\sum_i \binom{C_i}{2}] \sum_j \binom{C_j^*}{2} / \binom{N}{2}}. \quad (31)$$

Modularity (Q): Q measures the quality of detected community structure compared with a null model which is a random graph with an equivalent degree distribution as of the given graph. Its calculation has been introduced in Eq. (1) in Section III. The extended modularity from [173] can evaluate overlapping community detection performances. Modularity evaluates the community quality without ground truth.

Jaccard: Jaccard measures the similarity between a detected community C_i^* and the ground truth community C_i as follows:

$$\text{JC}(C_i, C_i^*) = \frac{|C_i \cap C_i^*|}{|C_i \cup C_i^*|}. \quad (32)$$

¹⁶<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/#amazon>

¹⁷<http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/netdata/>

¹⁸<https://github.com/gephi/gephi/wiki/Datasets>

¹⁹<http://www.sociopatterns.org/datasets>

For a set of detected communities \mathcal{C}^* and a set of ground truth communities \mathcal{C} , Jaccard is computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{JC}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}^*) &= \sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{\max_{C_i^* \in \mathcal{C}^*} \text{JC}(C_i, C_i^*)}{2|\mathcal{C}|} \\ &+ \sum_{C_i^* \in \mathcal{C}^*} \frac{\max_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} \text{JC}(C_i, C_i^*)}{2|\mathcal{C}^*|}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Conductance (CON): CON measures the separability of the detected community structure through the fraction of total edge volume that links outside a detected community C^* , which can be defined as:

$$\text{CON}(C^*) = \frac{b_{C^*}}{2m_{C^*} + b_{C^*}}, \quad (34)$$

where m_{C^*} is the number of edges in C^* , $m_{C^*} = |(v_i, v_j) \in E : v_i, v_j \in C^*|$; and b_{C^*} is the number of edges on the boundary of C^* , $b_{C^*} = |(v_i, v_j) \in E : v_i \in C^*, v_j \notin C^*|$.

Triangle Participation Ratio (TPR): TPR indicates the density of the community structure through measuring the fraction of triads within the detected communities \mathcal{C}^* . It is defined as follows:

$$\text{TPR}(C^*) = \frac{|\{v_i \in C^*, \{(v_j, v_k) : v_j, v_k \in C^* \\ (v_i, v_j), (v_j, v_k), (v_i, v_k) \in E\} \neq \emptyset\}|}{|\mathcal{C}^*|}. \quad (35)$$

APPENDIX D
ABBREVIATIONS

TABLE VIII: Abbreviations in this survey.

Abbr.	Full Name	Ref.	Paper Title
AGC	Adaptive Graph Convolution	[78]	Attributed graph clustering via adaptive graph convolution
AGE	Adaptive Graph Encoder	[79]	Adaptive graph encoder for attributed graph embedding
AE	AutoEncoder	[90]	Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks
ARGA	Adversarial Regularized Graph AutoEncoder	[120]	Adversarially regularized graph autoencoder for graph embedding
ARVGA	Adversarially Regularized Variational Graph AutoEncoder		
ACC	Accuracy		
ARI	Adjusted Rand index	[174]	Comparing partitions
ATC	Attributed Truss Communities	[154]	Attribute-driven community search
BP	Bernoulli–Poisson		
CDASS	Community Detection Algorithm based on Structural Similarity	[47]	Community detection in complex networks using structural similarity
Combo	<i>It is a given name.</i>	[62]	General optimization technique for high-quality community detection in complex networks
CE-MOEA	Continuous Encoding Multi-Object Evolutionary Algorithm	[10]	Graph neural network encoding for community detection in attribute networks
CNN	Convolutional Neural Network	[67]	Convolutional networks for images, speech, and time series
ComNet-R	Community Network Local Modularity R	[70]	Edge classification based on Convolutional Neural Networks for community detection in complex network
CommDGI	Community Deep Graph Infomax	[73]	CommDGI: Community detection oriented deep graph infomax
CommunityGAN	Community Detection with Generative Adversarial Nets	[89]	CommunityGAN: Community detection with generative adversarial nets
CDMEC	(Stacked Autoencoder-Based) Community Detection Method via Ensemble Clustering	[103]	Stacked autoencoder-based community detection method via an ensemble clustering framework
CayleyNets	Graph Convolutional Neural Networks with Cayley Polynomials	[80]	Caylennets: Graph convolutional neural networks with complex rational spectral filters
CON	Conductance	[64]	On clusterings: Good, bad and spectral
DCSBM	Degree-Corrected Stochastic Block Model	[33]	Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks
DBSCAN	Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise	[52]	A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise
DMGI	Deep Graph Infomax for attributed Multiplex network embedding	[82]	Unsupervised attributed multiplex network embedding
DNN	Deep Neural Network		
DR-GCN	Dual-Regularized Graph Convolutional Networks	[86]	Multi-class imbalanced graph convolutional network learning
DANE	Deep Attributed Network Embedding	[97]	Deep attributed network embedding
DIME	Deep Aligned Autoencoder-based Embedding	[99]	BL-MNE: Emerging heterogeneous social network embedding through broad learning with aligned autoencoder
Dfuzzy	Deep Learning-based Fuzzy Clustering Model	[102]	Dfuzzy: A deep learning-based fuzzy clustering model for large graphs
DNGR	Deep Neural Networks for Graph Representation	[105]	Deep neural networks for learning graph representations
DAEGC	Deep Attentional Embedded Graph Clustering	[110]	Attributed graph clustering: A deep attentional embedding approach
DMGC	Deep Multi-Graph Clustering	[112]	Deep multi-graph clustering via attentive cross-graph association
DGLFRM	Deep Generative Latent Feature Relational Model	[115]	Stochastic blockmodels meet graph neural networks
DANMF	Deep Autoencoder-like Nonnegative Matrix Factorization	[123]	Deep autoencoder-like nonnegative matrix factorization for community detection
DSFCD	Community Discovery based on Deep Sparse Filtering	[128]	Community discovery in networks with deep sparse filtering
DNE-SBP	Deep Network Embedding with Structural Balance Preservation	[94]	Deep network embedding for graph representation learning in signed networks

TABLE IX: Abbreviations in this survey (continue-1).

Abbr.	Full Name	Ref.	Paper Title
eMRF	extended Network Markov Random Fields	[11]	Graph convolutional networks meet Markov random fields: Semi-supervised community detection in attribute networks
ELBO	Evidence Lower Bound	[116]	Variational graph embedding and clustering with Laplacian eigenmaps
FastQ	Fast Modularity	[3]	Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks
		[46]	Finding community structure in very large networks
F1-Score			
GN	Girvan-Newman	[2]	Community structure in social and biological networks
		[45]	Finding and evaluating community structure in networks
GCN	Graph Convolutional Network	[68]	Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks
GCLN	Graph Convolutional Ladder-shape Networks	[75]	Going deep: Graph convolutional ladder-shape networks
GAT	Graph Attention Network	[81]	Graph attention networks
GAN	Generative Adversarial Network	[84]	Generative adversarial nets
GIN	Graph Isomorphism Network		
GraphEncoder	Autoencoder-based Graph Clustering Model	[101]	Learning deep representations for graph clustering
GRACE	Graph Clustering with Dynamic Embedding	[106]	Graph clustering with dynamic embedding
GUCD	GCN-based approach for Unsupervised Community Detection	[107]	Community-centric graph convolutional network for unsupervised community detection
HSIC	Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion	[77]	Measuring statistical dependence with Hilbert-Schmidt norms
InfoMap	Information Mapping	[49]	Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure
IPGDN	Independence Promoted Graph Disentangled Network	[76]	Independence promoted graph disentangled networks
iGPN	Graph Pointer Network with incremental updates	[85]	SEAL: Learning heuristics for community detection with generative adversarial networks
JANE	Jointly Adversarial Network Embedding	[87]	JANE: Jointly adversarial network embedding
KL	Kullback-Leibler divergence		
LPA	Label Propagation Algorithm	[39]	Community detection with the label propagation algorithm: A survey
		[40]	A semi-synchronous label propagation algorithm with constraints for community detection in complex networks
LPAm	Modularity-specialized Label Propagation Algorithm	[51]	Detecting network communities by propagating labels under constraints
LCCD	Locating Structural Centers for Community Detection	[54]	Locating structural centers: A density-based clustering method for community detection
LINE			
LFR	Lancichinetti–Fortunato–Radicchi	[142]	Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms
LGNN	Line Graph Neural Network	[71]	Supervised community detection with line graph neural networks
LGVG	Ladder Gamma Variational Autoencoder for Graphs	[119]	Graph representation learning via ladder gamma variational autoencoders
MMB	Mixed Membership Stochastic Blockmodel	[34]	Mixed membership stochastic blockmodels
MAGA-Net	Multi-Agent Genetic Algorithm	[61]	A multi-agent genetic algorithm for community detection in complex networks
MI	Mutual Information		
MAGNN	Metapath Aggregated Graph Neural Network	[83]	MAGNN: Metapath aggregated graph neural network for heterogeneous graph embedding
MLP	Multi-Layer Perceptron		
MRFasGCN	Markov Random Fields as a convolutional layer in Graph Convolutional Networks	[11]	Graph convolutional networks meet Markov random fields: Semi-supervised community detection in attribute networks
MGAE	Marginalized Graph AutoEncoder	[104]	Mgae: Marginalized graph autoencoder for graph clustering
MAGCN	Multi-View Attribute Graph Convolution Networks	[111]	Multi-view attribute graph convolution networks for clustering
MDNMF	Modularized Deep NonNegative Matrix Factorization	[126]	Community detection based on modularized deep nonnegative matrix factorization

TABLE X: Abbreviations in this survey (continue-2).

Abbr.	Full Name	Ref.	Paper Title
NMI	Normalized Mutual Information	[63]	Robust data clustering
NSGA-II	Nondominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II	[65]	A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II
NOCD	Neural Overlapping Community Detection	[74]	Overlapping community detection with graph neural networks
NMF	Nonnegative Matrix Factorization	[121]	Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization
OSBM	Overlapping Stochastic Block Model	[35]	Overlapping stochastic block models with application to the french political blogosphere
O2MAC	One2Multi Graph Autoencoder for Multi-view Graph Clustering	[109]	One2multi graph autoencoder for multi-view graph clustering
One2Multi	One-view to Multi-view		
Overlapping-NMI	Normalized Mutual Information for Overlapping Community	[172]	Normalized mutual information to evaluate overlapping community finding algorithms
ProGAN	Proximity Generative Adversarial Network	[88]	Progan: Network embedding via proximity generative adversarial network
PPI	Protein-Protein Interaction	[165]	Lethality and centrality in protein networks
Q	Modularity		
REM	Residual Entropy Minimization		
SBM	Stochastic Block Models	[32]	Stochastic blockmodels: First steps
SCAN	Structural Clustering Algorithm for Networks	[53]	SCAN: A structural clustering algorithm for networks
SEAL	Seed Expansion with generative Adversarial Learning	[85]	SEAL: Learning heuristics for community detection with generative adversarial networks
semi-DRN	Semi-supervised Nonlinear Reconstruction Algorithm with Deep Nerual Network	[92]	Modularity based community detection with deep learning
sE-Autoencoder	Semi-supervised Evolutionary Autoencoder	[96]	An evolutionary autoencoder for dynamic community detection
SDCN	Structural Deep Clustering Network	[108]	Structural deep clustering network
SF	Sparse Filtering	[127]	Sparse filtering
TIN	Topologically Incomplete Networks	[8]	Deep community detection in topologically incomplete networks
Transfer-CDDTA	Transfer Learning-inspired Community Detection with Deep Transitive Autoencoder	[98]	High-performance community detection in social networks using a deep transitive autoencoder
TVGA	Triad Variational Graph Autoencoder	[118]	Effective decoding in graph auto-encoder using triadic closure
TGA	Triad Graph Autoencoder		
TPR			
UWMNE	Unified Weight-free Multi-component Network Embedding	[95]	Integrative network embedding via deep joint reconstruction
VAE	Variational AutoEncoder	[113]	Auto-encoding variational bayes
VGAE	Variational Graph AutoEncoder	[114]	Variational graph auto-encoders
VGECLE	Variational Graph Embedding and Clustering with Laplacian Eigenmaps	[116]	Variational graph embedding and clustering with Laplacian eigenmaps
VGAECD	Variational Graph Autoencoder for Community Detection	[117]	Learning community structure with variational autoencoder
VGAECD-OPT	Optimizing Variational Graph Autoencoder for Community Detection	[141]	Optimizing variational graph autoencoder for community detection
WalkTrap	<i>It is a given name.</i>	[48]	Computing communities in large networks using random walks
WMCNE-LE	Weight-free Multi-Component Network Embedding with Local Enhancement	[95]	Integrative network embedding via deep joint reconstruction