

# Bayesian Learning of Graph Substructures

Willem van den Boom\*

Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore  
and

Maria De Iorio

Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore  
Singapore Institute for Clinical Sciences, A\*STAR

Department of Statistical Science, University College London  
and

Alexandros Beskos

Department of Statistical Science, University College London  
Alan Turing Institute, UK

## Abstract

Graphical models provide a powerful methodology for learning the conditional independence structure in multivariate data. Inference is often focused on estimating individual edges in the latent graph. Nonetheless, there is increasing interest in inferring more complex structures, such as communities, for multiple reasons, including more effective information retrieval and better interpretability. Stochastic blockmodels offer a powerful tool to detect such structure in a network. We thus propose to exploit advances in random graph theory and embed them within the graphical models framework. A consequence of this approach is the propagation of the uncertainty in graph estimation to large-scale structure learning. We consider Bayesian nonparametric stochastic blockmodels as priors on the graph. We extend such models to consider clique-based blocks and to multiple graph settings introducing a novel prior process based on a dependent Dirichlet process. Moreover, we devise a tailored computation strategy of Bayes factors for block structure based on the Savage-Dickey ratio to test for presence of larger structure in a graph. We demonstrate our approach in simulations as well as on real data applications in finance and transcriptomics.

*Keywords:* Bayesian nonparametrics; Dependent Dirichlet process; Gaussian graphical models; Multiple graphical models; Multivariate data analysis; Degree-corrected stochastic blockmodels

---

\*Email: vandenboom@nus.edu.sg. This work was supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 2 under Grant MOE2019-T2-2-100.

# 1 Introduction

Graphical models provide a flexible tool to describe the conditional independence structure in multivariate data: the nodes of the graph represent variables and the edges amongst them define conditional dependence (Lauritzen, 1996). Most inferential approaches focus on estimation of individual edges rather than on identification of informative structure in a graph on a larger scale. This is despite the fact that such large-scale structure is often present and of interest in multivariate data (Ravasz et al., 2002; Yook et al., 2004). Moreover, estimation of a single edge is (often extremely) sensitive to the number of observations as well as to the presence of specific nodes in the graph. We therefore propose graphical models that also enable learning of large-scale structure. These models build on extensive work in random graphs and networks (Newman, 2011; Fortunato and Hric, 2016; Lee and Wilkinson, 2019) such as the stochastic blockmodel (Holland et al., 1983).

It is important to stress the distinction between random graph theory and graphical models as two parallel, large research areas with only limited interplay such as the work by Bornn and Caron (2011). Within the first field, models for random graphs have evolved substantially from initial approaches such as the Erdős–Rényi model (Erdős and Rényi, 1959) to methods for large-scale structure. They usually involve the description of network formation/evolution. See Fienberg (2012) for an overview. Such developments contrast with the literature on graphical models (Friedman et al., 2007; Zhou et al., 2011) that aims to infer a graph from multivariate data. In this context, focus of inference is usually to determine the presence of an edge between two nodes whereas modelling of large-scale graph structures is often neglected (Bornn and Caron, 2011).

The rationale underpinning our work derives from the following consideration. In the random graph literature, there is major interest on large-scale structures as they often arise

in applications. A common example is provided by scale-free networks which imply a hub structure (Yook et al., 2004). More recently, Newman (2011) advocates for more complex structures such as modularity. This consideration motivates the need to investigate such components also when inferring graphs from multivariate data. On the other hand, the Bayesian graphical model literature commonly focuses on single edges, and specification of a prior on graph space is achieved assuming the same probability of inclusion for each edge with all edges being independent. This prior corresponds to the Erdős–Rényi model.

Focusing on single edges can be restrictive in many applications, often preventing detection of important data features. For instance, assume we are interested in estimating a graph from gene expression data. It could be of biological interest (e.g., disease aetiology) to group genes in co-expression modules (i.e., block, larger structure) (Yook et al., 2004). Similarly in metabolomics, it is of interest to identify metabolites that are involved in the same biochemical reaction/pathway (Ravasz et al., 2002). Social networks provide another area where such graph substructures are relevant. For instance, we might estimate a graph from voting records of members of parliament with the goal of identifying political factions.

The increasing interest in estimating large structures in multivariate data is reflected in recent work. For example, Zhang (2018) first estimates a graph from the data and, then, identifies large-scale structure using random graph methods. Such an approach is suboptimal, for instance because it does not propagate the uncertainty from network estimation to the estimation of large-scale structure. In the machine learning literature, methods for identification of graph substructure can be found in Marlin et al. (2009).

Our work is positioned in this new line of research. Exploiting advances from random graph theory, we propose graphical models able to accommodate single-edge as well as block structure. The benefits of joint graph and structure recovery compared to a two stage

approach are multiple: (i) if present, large-scale structure can guide graph estimation; (ii) ad hoc specification of a graph estimator (e.g., through an edge inclusion probability threshold) is not required; (iii) data-driven detection of structure or lack thereof; (iv) uncertainty in graph estimation propagates to large-scale structure learning; (v) extension to complex set-ups (e.g., different biological conditions) is in principle straightforward which leads to; (vi) effective use of information as the developed framework allows combining data from multiple sources in a principled way. We consider both single and multiple graph scenarios as well as different blockmodels, namely the usual stochastic blockmodel and also one where blocks are cliques. Here we focus on blockmodels because of their popularity, but the setting is general and other priors could be employed.

One of our contributions is an algorithm (derived as by-product of the MCMC) to compute Bayes factors to test for the presence of block structure, which is equivalent to the presence of clusters in a nonparametric partition model. Our approach, based on the Savage-Dickey ratio (Dickey, 1971), offers computational advantages over existing methods (Basu and Chib, 2003; Legramanti et al., 2020). To define blocks in multiple graphs, we introduce a novel Bayesian nonparametric prior. Specifically, we propose a dependent Dirichlet process that does not enforce exchangeability within groups as in previous approaches (e.g., MacEachern, 1999; De Iorio et al., 2004; Müller et al., 2004; Camerlenghi et al., 2019).

The paper is structured as follows. Sections 1.1 and 1.2 review related work on blockmodels and graphical models, respectively. Section 2 introduces Gaussian graphical models (GGMs, Dempster, 1972). In Section 3, we propose various priors on graphs that allow recovery of large-scale structure. Section 4 introduces Bayes factors for testing for block structure. We demonstrate the proposed approach in simulation studies in Section 5 and on real data applications in Section 6. We conclude the paper in Section 7.

## 1.1 Stochastic Blockmodels

Arguably, the most widely used model for large-scale structure in graphs is the blockmodel (Fienberg, 2012) which is therefore our starting point. A stochastic blockmodel (Holland et al., 1983) consists of a partition of the set of nodes into blocks or communities, where we use both terms interchangeably. Then, nodes in the same block are more likely to be connected than nodes from different blocks. Thus, the structure of interest is the clustering of nodes and the connectivity within and between these clusters. Introducing block structure in graph estimation allows highlighting macro-organisation (instead of focusing on single edges) and important hubs/connectivity clusters, which ultimately will aid interpretation of the results and hypothesis generation.

To this end, the key modelling strategy that we adopt is to employ tools from the Bayesian nonparametric literature for estimation of block structure in a graph, as such a strategy provides uncertainty propagation across the full graphical model and data-driven determination of blocks' number and membership. See Schmidt and Mørup (2013) for an introduction to Bayesian nonparametric modelling of graphs including blockmodels. Kemp et al. (2006) introduce a blockmodel where the prior on the partition of nodes is a Chinese restaurant process (CRP, Pitman, 2006) which closely relates to the Dirichlet process (DP, Ferguson, 1973). Geng et al. (2018) place a mixture of finite mixtures prior on the partition and obtain posterior consistency results for the number of blocks. Legramanti et al. (2022) employ Gibbs-type partition priors which generalise both the CRP and the mixture of finite mixtures. In general, these approaches require also specification of prior edge inclusion probabilities jointly with the block structure prior. For instance, Kemp et al. (2006); Geng et al. (2018); Legramanti et al. (2022) place Beta distributions on the edge probabilities, while Tan and De Iorio (2019) use a DP to build a joint prior on the partition of nodes and

edge probabilities. Additionally, they extend the model to a degree-corrected blockmodel, i.e., they introduce a popularity parameter for each node. Passino and Heard (2020) consider a Bayesian blockmodel where edge probabilities derive from a latent space embedding.

## 1.2 Learning Block Structure in Graphical Models

Proposals for the estimation of large-scale structures in graphical models can be categorised in two main strategies: (i) regularisation methods; (ii) imposing structure on the precision matrix. Within the first framework, Ambroise et al. (2009); Marlin et al. (2009) do not model graphs explicitly, but learn a block structure as part of a shrinkage estimator for the precision matrix as in the graphical lasso (Friedman et al., 2007), where every block is characterised by its own regularisation parameter.

Within the second framework, Sun et al. (2014) consider a GGM with a CRP as prior on the partition of nodes. Then, the partition informs the sparsity pattern of the scale matrix of the Wishart prior on the precision matrix rather than of the precision matrix itself as is commonly done in GGMs. See Section S2 of Supplementary Material for details. Marlin and Murphy (2009) impose sparsity in the precision matrix of a GGM by first approximating the joint distribution of the nodes via the specification of the conditional distribution of each node given the others. Then, they impose a continuous spike-and-slab prior on “edge weights” that capture the association of a node with the others. Finally, the prior on edge weights incorporates a block structure. Sun et al. (2015) fix the number of blocks, place a Dirichlet prior on the partition of the nodes in an exponential graphical model and compute a point estimate of the partition using an expectation-maximisation algorithm. Bornn and Caron (2011) consider decomposable graphs, which allow modelling of cliques and separators separately, and use a product partition model as prior on the graph. Their prior can induce

large cliques and, as such, allows the identification of larger structures than edges.

## 2 Gaussian Graphical Models

Let the graph  $G = (V, E)$  be defined by a set of edges  $E \subset \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq p\}$  that represent links among the nodes in  $V = \{1, \dots, p\}$ . The data are represented by an  $n \times p$  matrix  $Y$  with independent and identically distributed rows corresponding to  $p$ -dimensional random vectors whose elements are represented by nodes on the graph. A graphical model (Lauritzen, 1996) is a family of distributions on the rows which is Markov over  $G$ . That is, the distribution  $p(Y \mid G)$  is such that the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th columns of  $Y$  are independent conditionally on the other columns if and only if  $(i, j) \notin E$ .

While our development for learning large-scale structure applies to graphical models in general, here we focus on GGMs (Dempster, 1972), which consider a Gaussian law for  $p(Y \mid G)$ . Then, each row of  $Y$  is distributed according to a Multivariate Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0_{p \times 1}, \Omega^{-1})$  with precision matrix  $\Omega$ . The conditional independence structure implied by  $G$  implies that  $\Omega_{ij} = 0$  if and only if nodes  $i$  and  $j$  are not connected. For the complete matrix  $Y$ ,  $\Omega_{ij} = 0$  implies that the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th columns of  $Y$  are independent conditionally on the others. In this context, a blockmodel on  $G$  enables learning of sparse block-structured precision matrices where the block structure is unknown.

A popular choice as prior  $p(\Omega \mid G)$  for the precision matrix  $\Omega$  conditional on the graph  $G$  is the  $G$ -Wishart distribution  $\mathcal{W}_G(\delta, D)$  as it induces conjugacy and allows working with non-decomposable graphs (Roverato, 2002). It is parameterised by degrees of freedom  $\delta > 2$  and a positive-definite rate matrix  $D$ . Then (e.g., Atay-Kayis and Massam, 2005),

$$p(Y \mid G) \propto \int p(\Omega \mid G) p(Y \mid \Omega) d\Omega = \frac{I_G(\delta^*, D^*)}{(2\pi)^{np/2} I_G(\delta, D)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\delta^* = \delta + n$ ,  $D^* = D + Y^\top Y$  and  $I_G(\delta, D)$  is the normalising constant of the density of

$\mathcal{W}_G(\delta, D)$ . The constant  $I_G(\delta, D)$  is not analytically available for general, non-decomposable  $G$ . Thus, we make use of the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methodology from van den Boom et al. (2022) and of a Laplace approximation of  $I_G(\delta, D)$  from Moghaddam et al. (2009) to perform posterior inference on  $G$ .

### 3 Graph Priors for Large-Scale Structure Recovery

Key to learning large structure in graphs is specification of a prior  $p(G)$  on graphs. To this end, we borrow ideas from random graph theory, adapting them effectively in our context.

#### 3.1 Degree-Corrected Stochastic Blockmodel

Our starting point is the Bayesian nonparametric degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel by Tan and De Iorio (2019) who propose a probit model for the edge inclusion probabilities. More specifically,  $\Pr\{(i, j) \in E\} = \Phi(\mu_{ij})$ , independently over distinct pairs  $(i, j)$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$ , where  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the CDF of the standard Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Then,

$$\mu_{ij} = \theta_i + \theta_j + \beta_{ij} \mathbb{1}[z_i = z_j] \tag{2}$$

The allocation variable  $z_i$  denotes the community node  $i$  belongs to. The parameter  $\beta_{ij}$  measures the strength of interaction among members of the same community with nodes in the same block expected to share more edges among themselves than with nodes outside. The popularity parameter  $\theta_i$  allows for degree correction in the blockmodel. That is, nodes have varying popularity as captured by the number of their neighbours, i.e., the number of nodes they are connected to via an edge. The popularity parameter can be thought of as the node-specific propensity to form connections with other nodes.

Key to our modelling strategy is the specification of a suitable model for the  $\beta_{ij}$ . Our



approach is based on the Dirichlet process (Ferguson, 1973), a probability model for random probability distributions. If a random measure  $H \sim \text{DP}(\nu, H_0)$ , then  $H$  is almost surely discrete.  $H_0$  is the base measure, a distribution around which the DP is centred, while  $\nu > 0$  denotes the precision parameter. Due to its discreteness,  $H$  admits the well-known “stick-breaking” construction (Sethuraman, 1994) and can be represented as a countable mixture of point masses:  $H = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k \delta_{\beta'_k}$ . Here  $\delta_{\beta'_k}$  is a point mass at  $\beta'_k$ , the weights  $w_k$  are generated by rescaled Beta distributions,  $w_k = \xi_k \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} (1 - \xi_l)$  with  $\xi_k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Beta}(1, \nu)$ , and the locations  $\{\beta'_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  are i.i.d. samples from the base measure  $H_0$ . Finally, the sequences  $\{\beta'_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  and  $\{\xi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  are independent.

We introduce auxiliary variable  $\beta_i$  for each node  $i$  and assume  $\beta_i | H \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} H$  for  $i \in V$  where  $H \sim \text{DP}(\nu, H_0)$  with  $H_0 = \mathcal{N}(0, s_\beta^2)$ ,  $s_\beta^2 > 0$ . The discreteness of the DP implies a positive probability of ties in a sample from  $H$  and this, in turn, induces a clustering structure so that the nodes will be grouped together in  $K$  clusters, where the number  $K$  of clusters is unknown and learned from the data through the posterior distribution. In our context, each cluster corresponds to a block, the parameters  $w_k$  denote the prior probabilities of belonging to each mixture component, and  $\beta'_k$  denotes the block-specific interaction parameter. Nodes are clustered based on their edge inclusion probability, so that nodes in the same block  $k$  share a common value  $\beta'_k$  such that in (2)  $\beta_{ij} = \beta_i = \beta_j = \beta'_k$ . Thus, the set of node-level parameters  $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^p$  reduces a posteriori to the set of unique values  $\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_K^*$  assigned to within-block edges. We denote block membership with the variable  $z_i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ ,  $i \in V$ .

To avoid identifiability issues due to a large number of parameters, we also cluster the elements of  $\theta$  via a DP. That is,  $\theta_i | F \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} F$  for  $i \in V$ , where  $F \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, F_0)$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , with  $F_0 = \mathcal{N}(0, s_\theta^2)$ ,  $s_\theta^2 > 0$ . Lastly,  $\nu \sim \Gamma(a_\nu, b_\nu)$  and  $\alpha \sim \Gamma(a_\alpha, b_\alpha)$ ,  $a_\nu, b_\nu, a_\alpha, b_\alpha > 0$ .

This model has wide applicability as blocks can represent communities. Algorithm S1 in Supplementary Material details an MCMC algorithm for posterior inference. We remark that the block-specific parameter  $\beta_k^*$  does not appear in the likelihood for a block  $k$  of size one, i.e., when  $|\{i \mid z_i = k\}| = 1$ , differently from conventional applications of the DP. Therefore, the Metropolis-Hastings proposal to add a block of size one does not require a proposal for the parameter specific to the new block. This property causes Algorithms 2 and 8 in Neal (2000), which we use to update the DP parameters, to coincide.

## 3.2 Southern Italian Community Structure

In the stochastic blockmodel, nodes in the same block are not necessarily connected. This level of flexibility is particularly desirable when the network is observed directly, and focus is on understanding network formation and evolution. On the other hand, in graphical models, the graph is a latent variable and, in applications, it might be appropriate to impose a more restrictive definition of block/community. More restrictions can also provide the benefit of improving computations as the space to explore gets smaller.

Here we assume that nodes in a block form a clique. In a clique, all pairs of nodes are connected by an edge. Indeed, the earliest approaches for community structure in graphs consider cliques (Luce and Perry, 1949; Festinger, 1949), the rationale being that a community is strongest if each pair of its members is connected. Cliques have for instance biological significance in protein-protein interaction networks (Yu et al., 2006). We thus introduce a Bayesian nonparametric graph prior where each block is a clique.

In this context, main object of inference are the cluster allocation variables  $z_i$ ,  $i \in V$ , as in Section 3.1, as then the block structure is given:  $\Pr\{(i, j) \in E\} = 1$  if  $z_i = z_j$ . We name such construction the Southern Italian community structure (SICS) with reference to

traditional Southern Italian communities where everybody knows each other. Still, there can be connections between nodes from different blocks and, for these edges, we assume a prior inclusion probability  $\rho$ :  $\Pr\{(i, j) \in E\} = \rho$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$  and  $z_i \neq z_j$ . This construction defines a prior  $p(G | z)$ .

A prior on  $z$  completes the graph prior  $p(G) = \int p(G | z)p(z)dz$ . We assume that  $z$  follows the Chinese restaurant process (Pitman, 2006) with concentration parameter  $\nu$  a priori for concreteness and consistency with the DP in Section 3.1. We note that our approach is flexible and other priors on the partition of nodes  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_p)$  can be straightforwardly adopted borrowing from the rich Bayesian nonparametric literature. The CRP assumption implies:

$$\Pr(z_i = k | z_{-i}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n_{-i,k}^\beta}{p-1+\nu}, & k = 1, \dots, K^{-i} \\ \frac{\nu}{p-1+\nu}, & k = K^{-i} + 1 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $z_{-i} = \{z_j | j \neq i\}$ ,  $n_{-i,k}^\beta = |\{j \in V | z_j = k, j \neq i\}|$  and  $K^{-i}$  is the number of unique elements in  $z_{-i}$ . Finally,  $\rho \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$  and  $\nu \sim \Gamma(a_\nu, b_\nu)$ ,  $a_\nu, b_\nu > 0$ , complete prior specification.

We now highlight some of the implications of the SICS prior on the overall graph structure and on the corresponding MCMC algorithm. In the standard GGM framework, moves on the posterior space of graphs usually involve a single edge and consequently, when updating the graph, we only need to integrate out one element of the Cholesky decomposition of the precision matrix (assumed to have a  $G$ -Wishart prior) leading to efficient computation (van den Boom et al., 2022). In such a context, updating more than an edge at a time is extremely challenging. On the other hand, under the SICS framework, change of block membership for a single node can affect a number of edges in the graph:

- The node joins a new block, and forms connections with every node already present

in that block, thus a number of edges are introduced in the graph.

- The node is removed from the current block (which is represented by a clique). Thus, as many edges as the number of nodes left in that block are removed. Some of these edges might be readded as there is a positive probability  $\rho$  of connection between nodes in different communities.

From a computational point of view, the structure in SICS poses a challenge to posterior inference using MCMC, due to the multiple edge change. Updates of  $z$  conditional on  $G$  are not possible. Instead, we devise MCMC steps to update  $z$  and  $G$  jointly, in addition to updating  $G$  conditional on  $z$ . Section S1.2 of Supplementary Material details the MCMC.

The SICS prior is a limiting case of the stochastic blockmodel, obtained taking the limit for  $\beta_k^* \rightarrow \infty$  in the model described in Section 3.1. In the limit, blocks become cliques with probability one. Palla et al. (2012) consider a latent factor model that is, conditionally on the factor loadings, equivalent to a GGM with the SICS prior where  $\rho = 0$ . That is, there is an edge between two nodes if and only if they belong to the same block.

### 3.3 Multiple Graphs

In applications, it is common that data (i.e., the rows of the observation matrix  $Y$ ) are naturally clustered due to experimental conditions. For instance,  $Y$  could represent gene expression measurements with different groups of rows corresponding to different cancer types. One way to deal with such heterogeneity is a multiple graphical model (e.g., Ma and Michailidis, 2016; Mitra et al., 2016; Tan et al., 2017), where each graph corresponds to an experimental condition (e.g., case/control status).

Consider multiple graphs  $G_x = (V, E_x)$  and associated data  $(n_x, Y_x)$  for  $x = 1, \dots, q$ . Here,  $x$  indexes the groups such that we have  $n_x$  observations in  $Y_x$ , with each group

characterised by its own graph and data-generating process  $p(Y_x | G_x)$ . We model the graphs  $G_1, \dots, G_q$  jointly through the specification of a prior  $p(G_1, \dots, G_q)$ . The goal is to identify common patterns, as well idiosyncratic edge/block structures. We now introduce the multiple graph extension of the degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel, described in Section 3.1. For each graph  $G_x$ , we have  $\Pr\{(i, j) \in E_x\} = \Phi(\mu_{xij})$  and (2) becomes

$$\mu_{xij} = \theta_i + \theta_j + \beta_{xij} \mathbb{1}[z_{xi} = z_{xj} = k]$$

where  $z_{xi}$  is the allocation variable for group  $x$ ,  $x = 1, \dots, q$ , and node  $i \in V$ . Similarly to Section 3.1, we introduce auxiliary variable  $\beta_{xi} | H \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} H$  for  $i \in V$ , marginally for each  $x$ . Then,  $\beta_{xij} = \beta_{xi} = \beta_{xj}$  when  $i, j$  belong to the same community under condition  $x$ . The other parameters of the blockmodel are shared across graphs and have priors as specified in Section 3.1. Thus, marginally for each  $x$ , we recover the blockmodel of Section 3.1.

We treat one group (and so graph) as baseline and the other graphs as offset from the baseline group. For ease of notation, we set  $x = 1$  as baseline group and, for clarity, corresponding parameters by a subscript ‘ $b$ ’.

There is a vast literature on dependent Dirichlet processes (DDPs, see, e.g., MacEachern, 1999; De Iorio et al., 2004; Müller et al., 2004; Camerlenghi et al., 2019), where the goal is to cluster subjects based also on group information. These tools are not directly applicable to our context as we are actually clustering variables (i.e., nodes on the graph) observed on  $n_x$  subjects under each of  $q$  experimental conditions (groups). Since we are assuming that  $\beta_{xi} | H \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} H$  marginally for each group  $x$ , the same node  $i$  under different groups can either belong to a different cluster (block) or to the same. In the multiple graph context, it is then desirable to have  $\Pr(z_{bi} = z_{xi}) > \Pr(z_{bi} = z_{xj})$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $x \geq 2$  to reflect that node  $i$  in  $G_b$  and in  $G_x$  correspond to the same variable and to encourage sharing of large-scale structures across graphs. See also the discussion on identifiability for multiple

blockmodels in Section 2.2 of Matias and Miele (2016). On the other hand, DDP models typically assume exchangeability within each group  $x$  across subjects which implies that  $\Pr(z_{xi} = k) = \Pr(z_{xj} = k)$  a priori. We thus consider the following set-up, where the block structures  $\{z_{xi}\}_{i=1}^p$ ,  $x \geq 2$ , are estimated as offsets from the baseline  $\{z_{bi}\}_{i=1}^p$ .

Let  $\beta_{bi} \mid H \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} H$  for  $i \in V$  and  $H \sim \text{DP}(\nu, H_0)$  where  $H_0 = \mathcal{N}(0, s_\beta^2)$ . Then, set  $\beta_{xi} = \beta_{bi}$  with probability  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_{xi} \mid H \sim H$  with probability  $1 - \gamma$ , independently for  $i \in V$  and  $x = 2, \dots, q$ . Posterior computations are greatly simplified by the introduction of binary “genealogical indicators”  $g_{xi} \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $\beta_{xi} = \beta_{bi}$  if  $g_{xi} = 1$  and  $\beta_{xi} \mid H \sim H$  if  $g_{xi} = 0$ . Note that even in the case  $g_{xi} = 0$ , there is a positive probability that  $\beta_{xi} = \beta_{bi}$  due to the discrete nature of  $H$ . This implies that the probability of  $\beta_{xi} = \beta_{bi}$ ,  $x \geq 2$ , is greater than  $\Pr(g_{xi} = 1) = \gamma$  a priori conditionally on  $H$ . Section S1.3 of Supplementary Material details an MCMC algorithm for inference which involves a joint update for  $(g_{xi}, \beta_{xi})$ . The prior dependence among the  $z_{1i}, \dots, z_{qi}$  enables learning of block structure both within and across graphs. The indicators  $g_{xi}$  capture the extent to which structure in  $G_x$  is shared with  $G_b$ . At the same time, the cluster indicators  $\{z_{xi}\}_{i=1}^p$  capture the within-graph block structure. Thus, the proposed prior construction allows for borrowing of large-scale information across graphs, as well as the detection of graph-specific blocks.

We want to highlight that our construction differs from the hierarchical Dirichlet process (HDP, Teh et al., 2006), as assuming an HDP-type prior would imply that  $\beta_{xi} \mid H_x \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} H_x$ ,  $H_x \mid H \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{DP}(\cdot, H)$ ,  $H \sim \text{DP}(\nu, H_0)$ . This means that the  $\beta_{xi}$  have a positive probability to be equal across group  $x$  (and obviously node  $i$ ), but the same node would not have higher probability to belong to the same block across groups.

There are proposals in the graphical model literature where a graph is considered baseline (e.g., Telesca et al., 2012; Mitra et al., 2016; Tan et al., 2017), but their focus

is on differences in individual edges instead of blocks. Moreover, Paul and Chen (2020) consider blockmodels with multiple graphs in a frequentist framework where the number of blocks is known and assume a hierarchical structure for the block memberships under each experimental condition, linking block membership to an unknown baseline membership. Reyes and Rodríguez (2016); Stanley et al. (2016) induce dependence among graphs by assuming that they either share the same block structure or have unrelated block structures, which leads to a less flexible modelling tool than our approach. Ma and Michailidis (2016) assume that multiple graphs share the same known block structure and only edges between and across blocks might differ across experimental conditions. Edges are estimated using regularised nodewise regression (Zhou et al., 2011), instead of working directly on graph space. In a different context, previous work on hidden Markov models (Fox et al., 2008), including time-varying blockmodels (Ishiguro et al., 2010; Fan et al., 2015), involves a similar dependence for cluster indicators across time, but this dependence is induced through a more involved construction with a “spiked” base measure for the DP on the transition probability vector of the Markov chain.

In our construction, the distribution of  $\{z_{xi}\}_{i=1}^p$ ,  $x \geq 2$ , is defined conditionally on  $\{z_{bi}\}_{i=1}^p$  such that  $\{g_{xi}\}_{i=1}^p$  captures differences from  $\{z_{bi}\}_{i=1}^p$ . Alternative dependence structures could be easily considered within our framework. For instance, instead of setting a group as baseline, we could specify a latent block structure  $\{z_{0i}\}_{i=1}^p$  and then define  $\{z_{xi}\}_{i=1}^p$ ,  $x \geq 1$ , as deviations from  $\{z_{0i}\}_{i=1}^p$ , for which a prior process needs to be specified (e.g., simply assume  $H$  as prior). Finally, the multiple graph set-up can be straightforwardly extended to the SICS prior from Section 3.2.

## 4 Testing for Large-Scale Structure

In this section, we describe a strategy to test if there is any block structure in an individual graph. Although the description below will only involve one graph for ease of explanation, the same techniques can be employed to test for the presence of structure in multiple graphs.

In model (2), block structure is represented through indicator vector  $z$ . Thus, testing for presence of block structure is equivalent to testing whether  $K \geq 2$ . In the Bayesian paradigm, we can use Bayes factors and here we describe a computational method for their evaluation based on the Savage-Dickey ratio (Dickey, 1971), as they are not available analytically. Consider a prespecified block structure  $z^*$ . For instance,  $z^*$  can consist of a single ( $K^* = 1$ ) block, i.e., no large-scale structure, such that the test assesses the evidence for any block structure. Our method will often be computationally infeasible for other choices of  $z^*$  as discussed later but the idea applies to any  $z^*$  in principle.

The computation of Bayes factors for DP-based models has received attention in the literature though with some drawbacks: the method from Basu and Chib (2003) requires an extra MCMC run with  $z$  fixed to  $z^*$  and the use of sequential importance sampling, resulting in an involved strategy, not easily integrated into an existing MCMC implementation. Legramanti et al. (2020) evaluate the marginal likelihood of each model using the harmonic mean approach from Raftery et al. (2007), which can be unstable or slow to converge. Application of their method in our (and other's) context would benefit from the direct evaluation of  $p(Y | z)$  which is not available in closed form. Without an analytical form for  $p(Y | z)$ , the harmonic mean approach requires an extra MCMC run with  $z$  fixed to  $z^*$  to approximate  $p(Y | z^*)$ . Indeed, one of the main advantages of our method is that Bayes factors can be evaluated directly from the MCMC output for the model of interest.

More in details, the Bayes factor of the relative evidence of  $z = z^*$  (model  $\mathcal{M}^*$ ) over



$z \sim p(z)$  (model  $\mathcal{M}$ ) is

$$B = \frac{p(Y | \mathcal{M}^*)}{p(Y | \mathcal{M})} = \frac{p(Y | z^*)}{p(Y)} = \frac{p(Y, z^*)}{p(Y)p(z^*)} = \frac{p(z^* | Y)}{p(z^*)} \quad (4)$$

where the last ratio is the Savage-Dickey ratio. Note that the second equality uses the property that the prior on all remaining parameters in the model such as  $\beta_i$  are the same under  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}^*$  in such a way that we recover the same model specification as  $\mathcal{M}^*$  when  $z = z^*$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Now, an estimate  $\widehat{B}$  for  $B$  is obtained by plugging in the usual (in terms of sample frequency) estimate of  $p(z^* | Y)$  derived from the MCMC chain while  $p(z^*)$  is readily computed by numerical quadrature:  $p(z) = \int p(z | \nu) p(\nu) d\nu$  where  $p(\nu) = \Gamma(\nu | a_\nu, b_\nu)$  and (e.g., Legramanti et al., 2022)

$$p(z | \nu) = \frac{\nu^K \prod_{k=1}^K |\{i | z_i = k\}|!}{\prod_{i=0}^{p-1} (\nu + i)}.$$

This scheme can be employed to compute  $\widehat{B}$  from an MCMC chain as long as  $p(z^*)$  is not too small. In that case, reliably estimating  $p(z^* | Y)$  might be hard as the MCMC chain could visit  $z^*$  only rarely after convergence. Furthermore,  $p(z^*)$  will often be too small if  $z^*$  corresponds to multiple blocks due to the combinatorially many ways to assign  $p$  nodes to  $K^* \geq 2$  blocks, but it usually assumes reasonable values for  $z^*$  corresponding to absence of block structure ( $K^* = 1$ ), which refers to the conventional null hypothesis of no structure (i.e., “no effect”). For instance, we test for  $K^* = 1$  in the examples considered in this work. We remark that the methods from Basu and Chib (2003); Legramanti et al. (2020) do not have such limitation for small  $p(z^*)$ , but in general require additional MCMC runs. Note that  $p(z^* | Y)$  being estimated as (close to) zero is not problematic, but leads to an accurate estimate of  $B \approx 0$  (as long as  $p(z^*)$  is sufficiently far from zero). In Section S3 of Supplementary Material, we show empirically that the proposed Bayes factor estimation converges faster than the harmonic mean approach.

## 5 Simulation Studies

We demonstrate the performance of our approach in two simulation scenarios. For all empirical results, we set the hyperparameters as  $\gamma = 0.5$ ,  $s_\beta^2 = s_\theta^2 = 1$ ,  $a_\nu = b_\nu = a_\alpha = b_\alpha = 2$ ,  $\delta = 3$  and  $D = I_p$  unless otherwise stated.

### 5.1 Karate Club Network

We investigate the importance of uncertainty propagation when learning community structure in a graphical model. As true underlying graph  $G$ , we consider the karate club network (Zachary, 1977) which Tan and De Iorio (2019) analyse using the degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel of Section 3.1. The network’s  $p = 34$  nodes correspond to members of a karate club while its 78 edges signify friendships between members. Conditionally on  $G$ , we sample a precision matrix  $\Omega \mid G \sim \mathcal{W}_G(\delta, D)$ . The  $n$  rows of  $Y$  are sampled according to the GGM in Section 2 independently from  $\mathcal{N}(0_{p \times 1}, \Omega^{-1})$ . Finally, we fit the model from Section 3.1 using 6000 MCMC iterations, discarding the first 1000 as burn-in. In this case, we set  $a_\nu = b_\nu = a_\alpha = b_\alpha = 5$  as in Tan and De Iorio (2019) for a fair comparison.

We repeat the simulation for  $n = 10^4, 10^3, 10^2, 10$  while keeping  $\Omega$  the same and present the estimated community structure in Figure 1. For  $n = 10^4$ , the results are very close to those in Tan and De Iorio (2019) where the underlying network is known, with the two main blocks corresponding to the karate instructor Mr Hi and the club’s president John A. The increased uncertainty in the estimation of  $G$  for smaller values of  $n$  obviously affects inference on the block structure, with too little information present in the data with only  $n = 10$  observations to recover the two main blocks. This is also reflected in the estimate of the Bayes factor comparing the model with no block structure vs the model with  $z \sim p(z)$ :  $\widehat{B} = 0$  for  $n = 10^4, 10^3$ ,  $\widehat{B} = 0.28$  for  $n = 10^2$  and  $\widehat{B} = 0.40$  for  $n = 10$ . These results show




Figure 1: Karate club network: posterior similarity matrices for the simulation studies. The nodes are ordered as in Tan and De Iorio (2019).

that uncertainty in graph estimation can have a major impact on community estimation and this uncertainty should not be ignored as is often done in applications where a two-step approach is adopted (first graph estimation and then blocks).

## 5.2 Block Structure Recovery

We now investigate how accurately the proposed methodology can recover block structure. We assign  $p = 20$  nodes to  $K$  clusters by sampling  $z_i$  with replacement from  $\{1, \dots, K\}$  for  $i \in V$ . Then, we generate a graph  $G$  according to the SICS prior from Section 3.2 with between-block edge inclusion probability  $\rho = 0.2$ . Data  $Y$  corresponding to  $G$  are sampled as in Section 5.1. We consider the following scenarios:  $K = 4$  for  $n = 20, 100, 500, 1000$  and  $n = 500$  for  $K = 2, 3, 4, 5$ . The performance of the algorithms is assessed over 50 replicates for each scenario.

We fit both models from Sections 3.1 and 3.2, as well as the model by Sun et al. (2014) (see Section S2 of Supplementary Material for a description) for comparison. We run the MCMC for 1000 iterations after a burn-in of 500 for the for the stochastic blockmodel and the model by Sun et al. (2014) while we record 5000 iterations after a burn-in of 1000 for the SICS model to account for the slower convergence and mixing of its MCMC.

The cluster allocation vector  $z$  informs the block structure. As point estimate for  $z$ , we report the configuration that minimises the posterior expectation of Binder’s loss function (Binder, 1978) under equal misclassification costs, which is a common choice in the applied Bayesian nonparametrics literature (Lau and Green, 2007). See Appendix B of Argiento et al. (2014) for computational details. Briefly, this expectation of the loss measures the difference for all possible pairs of nodes between the posterior probability of co-clustering and the estimated cluster allocation. Following Sun et al. (2014), we use the Rand index




Figure 2: Block structure recovery: Rand index versus the number of observations (left) and the number of clusters (right). The lines represent means over the 50 replicates for the stochastic blockmodel, SICS and the model by Sun et al. (2014). The shaded areas are 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals.

(Rand, 1971) to quantify the difference between the true allocation and its Binder point estimate. A Rand index of one corresponds to a perfect match while a lower value indicates worse block structure recovery.

Figure 2 shows that the proposed methodology recovers the block structure comparably to or substantially more accurately than the model by Sun et al. (2014). The superior performance of the stochastic blockmodel over SICS, when occurring, is most likely due to the fact that the SICS model imposes more stringent assumptions on the correlation structure of the data, which might not be captured with small sample sizes (left panel of Figure 2). This is in line with power considerations for detecting correlation in a frequentist framework, with large sample size usually required, especially for partial correlations (see, e.g., Castelo and Roverato, 2006; Knudson and Lindsey, 2014). Secondly, the SICS structure is more easily recovered when fewer nodes belong to a block (right panel of Figure 2) as this relaxes the assumption on the overall dependence structure among the random variables.

Finally, posterior inference for the stochastic blockmodel is performed through an exact MCMC (van den Boom et al., 2022) while, for the SICS, we employ a Laplace approximation for the graph likelihood to update  $z$  and  $G$  jointly. See Section S1 of Supplementary Material.

## 6 Applications

We apply the proposed models to two real data sets. We discuss MCMC mixing and convergence in Section S4 of Supplementary Material.

### 6.1 Mutual Fund Data

We consider data on monthly returns of  $p = 59$  mutual funds described in Scott and Carvalho (2008). The funds are divided into four types by the sectors they invest in with 13 funds investing in U.S. bonds, 30 in U.S. stocks, 7 in both U.S. stocks and bonds, and 9 in international stocks. The data contain observations on  $n = 86$  months. Here, we ignore the dependence of the returns across time and focus on the dependence between funds as in Scott and Carvalho (2008); Marlin et al. (2009). Note that time dependence could be easily incorporated through a mean term. The returns are quantile-normalised so that they marginally follow a standard Gaussian distribution. We fit both the degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel from Section 3.1 and SICS from Section 3.2. We run the MCMC chain for 15000 iterations discarding the first 5000 as burn-in for the stochastic blockmodel, and for 110000 iterations discarding the first 10000 for SICS.

The stochastic blockmodel identifies clear blocks of funds per Figures 3 (left panel) and 4. Specifically, the U.S. bonds, U.S. stocks and bonds, and international stocks funds are each blocked together without overlap between these fund types except for two international stocks funds that are grouped with the U.S. stocks and bonds. The other funds, which




Figure 3: Mutual fund data: posterior similarity matrices. The red dotted lines demarcate the fund types.

invest in U.S. stocks, are mostly blocked with the U.S. stocks and bonds, or with the international stocks but not with the U.S. bonds. These results are intuitive as funds with a mixture of U.S. stocks and bonds make investments which overlap with funds with only U.S. stocks, and correlation between the returns of U.S. and international stocks is likely. This identified block structure is notably more in line with the fund types than the blocking results presented in Marlin et al. (2009) obtained by shrinkage estimation and optimisation, where only a clear separation of the U.S. bonds funds from the others is detected.

The SICS prior leads to a large number of blocks with a posterior mode at  $K = 24$  blocks. A larger number of blocks with SICS than with the stochastic blockmodel is expected as SICS' definition of a block as a clique is more stringent such that larger blocks are less likely to appear. The large-scale pattern of the similarity matrix for SICS is still similar to that




Figure 4: Mutual fund data: median probability graph (Barbieri and Berger, 2004), which consists of edges with posterior inclusion probability greater than 0.5, from the stochastic blockmodel. Colour of nodes refers to fund type. Boxes group nodes belonging to blocks estimated by minimising Binder’s loss function.



of the stochastic blockmodel in Figure 3, though with much lower values for  $\Pr(z_i = z_j | Y)$ . Still, the posterior fit indicates strong evidence for the presence of a block structure as the Bayes factor in favour of absence of block structure is  $\hat{B} = 0$ .

Generally, the posterior inference contains information on whether the stochastic blockmodel or SICS is the most appropriate model for the data at hand. We assess this by computing the Bayes factor of the stochastic blockmodel versus SICS using the harmonic mean approach. This results in a log Bayes factor of 235 indicating strong evidence that the stochastic blockmodel fits the data better than SICS.

## 6.2 Gene Expression Data

As a second application, we consider gene expression levels, the interactions between which are often represented as networks. An important concept in the gene network literature is that of module, which is a densely connected subgraph. Thus, learning the block structure of a graph allows module detection. Typically, a two-step approach is adopted: first the graph is estimated from the gene expressions, and then the modules are derived from the graph estimate (see, e.g., Zhang, 2018), which underestimates uncertainty and often leads to false positives.

We analyse data on gene expressions from  $n_1 = 590$  breast cancer tissue samples and  $n_2 = 561$  ovarian cancer samples from The Cancer Genome Atlas. We focus on  $p = 44$  genes identified by Zhang (2018) as spread across four estimated modules (Modules 6, 14, 36 and 39 in Table 2 of the cited paper) which are highly enriched in terms of Gene Ontology (GO, Ashburner et al., 2000) annotations. For each cancer, the gene expressions are quantile-normalised to marginally follow a standard Gaussian distribution. We apply the proposed multiple graph methodology from Section 3.3 with  $q = 2$  separate groups, corresponding to




Figure 5: Gene expression data: posterior similarity matrices. The three matrices visualise the posterior probabilities of  $z_{1i} = z_{1j}$ ,  $z_{1i} = z_{2j}$  and  $z_{2i} = z_{2j}$ , respectively, where  $x = 1$  corresponds to breast cancer and  $x = 2$  to ovarian cancer. The red dotted lines demarcate the modules identified by Zhang (2018).

the two different cancers. We run the MCMC algorithm for 55000 iterations, discarding the first 5000 as burn-in.

Posterior inference on block structure, shown in Figure 5, carries strong similarities with the modules identified by Zhang (2018). For ease of discussion, we refer to the modules from Zhang (2018) as Module 1 (comprising Nodes 1 through 7), 2 (Nodes 8 through 32), 3 (Nodes 33 through 38) and 4 (Nodes 39 through 44), and highlight them in Figure 5. The proposed methodology finds differences in block structure between breast and ovarian cancer (see middle panel of Figure 5) as well as differences from Zhang’s modules, which are forced to be the same across both cancers by construction. Across both breast and ovarian cancer, we find that Nodes 39 and 40 (GSTM3 and BCAR3 genes, respectively) are grouped with genes from Module 2, which has GO annotations relating to inflammatory response. For Breast cancer, we cluster Nodes 42 through 44 (GSTM1, GSTM2 and GSTM5) with

Module 2 while we put them together with Module 1, which has GO annotations relating to pattern specification, for ovarian cancer. Note that these three genes are paralogs of each other which suggests that they have similar function. Finally, Nodes 35 and 41 (HOXB13 and GSTM4) are together with nodes in Module 1 for both cancers. These results show the flexibility of the proposed model to capture differences as well as commonalities in large-scale dependence structure across multiple biological conditions.

## 7 Discussion

In this work, we combine advances from random graph theory with graphical models to obtain joint estimation of the graph and its large-scale structure. The resulting graphical models are able to go beyond estimation of individual edges to provide inference on the community structure of the graph, while appropriately propagating uncertainty in the estimation. We introduce a novel DDP prior process tailored to the multiple graph setting and propose a convenient computation of Bayes factors in partition models. Advantages of the proposed approach include interpretability, flexibility (due to the nonparametric component) and wide applicability. We focus on two different block structures: stochastic blockmodels and SICS. We note that the SICS prior is more suitable in applications where strong partial correlation between a small number of nodes is expected.

Alternative priors on the block structure could be considered by changing (3) and the corresponding steps in the MCMC algorithms. For instance, Gibbs-type priors (Gnedin and Pitman, 2005) and microclustering priors (Betancourt et al., 2020) are drop-in replacements for the respective DP terms used here, and cover a wide range of partition priors. Such changes might be motivated by the application or by available prior information on the graph structure.

We focus on GGMs for convenience and because of their popularity. Our methodological contribution is however not constrained to this specific set-up and can be extended to work with other graphical models, e.g., to graphs with discrete or mixed type nodes. Moreover, our computational strategy to estimate Bayes factors finds general applicability in the context of Bayesian nonparametric models to test the presence/absence of a partition structure.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

**Supplement:** Details of the MCMC algorithms, description of the model by Sun et al. (2014), empirical results for the Bayes factor approach and MCMC trace plots. (.pdf file)

**Code:** Code for the empirical results is available at <https://github.com/willemvandenboom/graph-substructures>. (GitHub repository)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data used in Section 6.2 are generated by The Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network: <https://www.cancer.gov/tcga>.

## References

- Ambroise, C., J. Chiquet, and C. Matias (2009). Inferring sparse Gaussian graphical models with latent structure. *Electron. J. Stat.* 3, 205–238.
- Argiento, R., A. Cremaschi, and A. Guglielmi (2014). A “density-based” algorithm for cluster analysis using species sampling Gaussian mixture models. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* 23(4), 1126–1142.

- Ashburner, M., C. A. Ball, J. A. Blake, D. Botstein, H. Butler, J. M. Cherry, A. P. Davis, K. Dolinski, S. S. Dwight, J. T. Eppig, M. A. Harris, D. P. Hill, L. Issel-Tarver, A. Kasarskis, S. Lewis, J. C. Matese, J. E. Richardson, M. Ringwald, G. M. Rubin, and G. Sherlock (2000). Gene Ontology: tool for the unification of biology. *Nat. Genet.* *25*(1), 25–29.
- Atay-Kayis, A. and H. Massam (2005). A Monte Carlo method for computing the marginal likelihood in nondecomposable Gaussian graphical models. *Biometrika* *92*(2), 317–335.
- Barbieri, M. M. and J. O. Berger (2004). Optimal predictive model selection. *Ann. Stat.* *32*(3), 870–897.
- Basu, S. and S. Chib (2003). Marginal likelihood and Bayes factors for Dirichlet process mixture models. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* *98*(461), 224–235.
- Betancourt, B., G. Zanella, and R. C. Steorts (2020). Random partition models for microclustering tasks. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*. Advance online publication.
- Binder, D. A. (1978). Bayesian cluster analysis. *Biometrika* *65*(1), 31–38.
- Bornn, L. and F. Caron (2011). Bayesian clustering in decomposable graphs. *Bayesian Anal.* *6*(4), 829–846.
- Camerlenghi, F., D. B. Dunson, A. Lijoi, I. Prünster, and A. Rodríguez (2019). Latent nested nonparametric priors (with discussion). *Bayesian Anal.* *14*(4), 1303–1356.
- Castelo, R. and A. Roverato (2006). A robust procedure for Gaussian graphical model search from microarray data with  $p$  larger than  $n$ . *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* *7*(94), 2621–2650.
- De Iorio, M., P. Müller, G. L. Rosner, and S. N. MacEachern (2004). An ANOVA model for dependent random measures. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* *99*(465), 205–215.

- Dempster, A. P. (1972). Covariance selection. *Biometrics* 28(1), 157–175.
- Dickey, J. M. (1971). The weighted likelihood ratio, linear hypotheses on normal location parameters. *Ann. Math. Stat.* 42(1), 204–223.
- Erdős, P. and A. Rényi (1959). On random graphs I. *Publ. Math. Debr.* 6, 290–297.
- Fan, X., L. Cao, and R. Y. D. Xu (2015). Dynamic infinite mixed-membership stochastic blockmodel. *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.* 26(9), 2072–2085.
- Ferguson, T. S. (1973). A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *Ann. Stat.* 1(2), 209–230.
- Festinger, L. (1949). The analysis of sociograms using matrix algebra. *Hum. Relat.* 2(2), 153–158.
- Fienberg, S. E. (2012). A brief history of statistical models for network analysis and open challenges. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* 21(4), 825–839.
- Fortunato, S. and D. Hric (2016). Community detection in networks: A user guide. *Phys. Rep.* 659, 1–44.
- Fox, E. B., E. B. Sudderth, M. I. Jordan, and A. S. Willsky (2008). An HDP-HMM for systems with state persistence. In *Proc. of the 25th Int. Conf. on Machine Learning*, pp. 312–319. ACM Press.
- Friedman, J., T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani (2007). Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics* 9(3), 432–441.
- Geng, J., A. Bhattacharya, and D. Pati (2018). Probabilistic community detection with unknown number of communities. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 114(526), 893–905.

- Gnedin, A. V. and J. Pitman (2005). Exchangeable Gibbs partitions and Stirling triangles. *Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov* 325, 83–102.
- Holland, P. W., K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt (1983). Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Soc. Netw.* 5(2), 109–137.
- Ishiguro, K., T. Iwata, N. Ueda, and J. Tenenbaum (2010). Dynamic infinite relational model for time-varying relational data analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 23. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Kemp, C., J. B. Tenenbaum, T. L. Griffiths, T. Yamada, and N. Ueda (2006). Learning systems of concepts with an infinite relational model. In *Proc. of the 21st National Conf. on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 1*, pp. 381–388. AAAI Press.
- Knudson, D. V. and C. Lindsey (2014). Type I and type II errors in correlations of various sample sizes. *Comprehensive Psychology* 3, 1.
- Lau, J. W. and P. J. Green (2007). Bayesian model-based clustering procedures. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* 16(3), 526–558.
- Lauritzen, S. L. (1996). *Graphical Models*. Oxford Statistical Science Series. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lee, C. and D. J. Wilkinson (2019). A review of stochastic block models and extensions for graph clustering. *Appl. Netw. Sci.* 4(122), 1–50.
- Legramanti, S., T. Rigon, and D. Durante (2020). Bayesian testing for exogenous partition structures in stochastic block models. *Sankhya A*. Advance online publication.
- Legramanti, S., T. Rigon, D. Durante, and D. B. Dunson (2022). Extended stochastic

- block models with application to criminal networks. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* (forthcoming).  
arXiv:2007.08569v3.
- Luce, R. D. and A. D. Perry (1949). A method of matrix analysis of group structure. *Psychometrika* 14(2), 95–116.
- Ma, J. and G. Michailidis (2016). Joint structural estimation of multiple graphical models. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 17(166), 1–48.
- MacEachern, S. N. (1999). Dependent nonparametric processes. In *ASA 1999 Proc. of the Section on Bayesian Statistical Science*. American Statistical Association.
- Marlin, B. M. and K. P. Murphy (2009). Sparse Gaussian graphical models with unknown block structure. In *Proc. of the 26th Annual Int. Conf. on Machine Learning*, pp. 705–712. ACM Press.
- Marlin, B. M., M. Schmidt, and K. P. Murphy (2009). Group sparse priors for covariance estimation. In *Proc. of the Twenty-Fifth Conf. on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 383–392. AUAI Press.
- Matias, C. and V. Miele (2016). Statistical clustering of temporal networks through a dynamic stochastic block model. *J. R. Stat. Soc: B (Stat. Methodol.)* 79(4), 1119–1141.
- Mitra, R., P. Müller, and Y. Ji (2016). Bayesian graphical models for differential pathways. *Bayesian Anal.* 11(1), 99–124.
- Moghaddam, B., E. Khan, K. P. Murphy, and B. M. Marlin (2009). Accelerating Bayesian structural inference for non-decomposable Gaussian graphical models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 22. Curran Associates, Inc.



- Müller, P., F. Quintana, and G. Rosner (2004). A method for combining inference across related nonparametric Bayesian models. *J. R. Stat. Soc: B (Stat. Methodol.)* 66(3), 735–749.
- Neal, R. M. (2000). Markov chain sampling methods for Dirichlet process mixture models. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* 9(2), 249–265.
- Newman, M. E. J. (2011). Communities, modules and large-scale structure in networks. *Nat. Phys.* 8(1), 25–31.
- Palla, K., Z. Ghahramani, and D. Knowles (2012). A nonparametric variable clustering model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 25. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Passino, F. S. and N. A. Heard (2020). Bayesian estimation of the latent dimension and communities in stochastic blockmodels. *Stat. Comput.* 30(5), 1291–1307.
- Paul, S. and Y. Chen (2020). A random effects stochastic block model for joint community detection in multiple networks with applications to neuroimaging. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* 14(2), 993–1029.
- Pitman, J. (2006). *Combinatorial Stochastic Processes: Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXII – 2002*. Springer, Berlin. Edited by Jean Picard.
- Raftery, A. E., M. A. Newton, J. M. Satagopan, and P. N. Krivitsky (2007). Estimating the integrated likelihood via posterior simulation using the harmonic mean identity. In *Bayesian Statistics 8*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Rand, W. M. (1971). Objective criteria for the evaluation of clustering methods. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 66(336), 846–850.

- Ravasz, E., A. L. Somera, D. A. Mongru, Z. N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabási (2002). Hierarchical organization of modularity in metabolic networks. *Science* 297, 1551–1555.
- Reyes, P. E. and A. Rodríguez (2016). Stochastic blockmodels for exchangeable collections of networks. arXiv:1606.05277v1.
- Roverato, A. (2002). Hyper inverse Wishart distribution for non-decomposable graphs and its application to Bayesian inference for Gaussian graphical models. *Scand. J. Stat.* 29(3), 391–411.
- Schmidt, M. N. and M. Mørup (2013). Nonparametric Bayesian modeling of complex networks: an introduction. *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* 30(3), 110–128.
- Scott, J. G. and C. M. Carvalho (2008). Feature-inclusion stochastic search for Gaussian graphical models. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* 17(4), 790–808.
- Sethuraman, J. (1994). A constructive definition of Dirichlet priors. *Stat. Sin.* 4, 639–650.
- Stanley, N., S. Shai, D. Taylor, and P. J. Mucha (2016). Clustering network layers with the strata multilayer stochastic block model. *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.* 3(2), 95–105.
- Sun, S., H. Wang, and J. Xu (2015). Inferring block structure of graphical models in exponential families. In *Proc. of the 18th Int. Conf. on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Volume 38 of *Proc. of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 939–947. PMLR.
- Sun, S., Y. Zhu, and J. Xu (2014). Adaptive variable clustering in Gaussian graphical models. In *Proc. of the 17th Int. Conf. on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Volume 33 of *Proc. of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 931–939. PMLR.
- Tan, L. S. and M. De Iorio (2019). Dynamic degree-corrected blockmodels for social networks: A nonparametric approach. *Stat. Model.* 19(4), 386–411.

- Tan, L. S. L., A. Jasra, M. De Iorio, and T. M. D. Ebbels (2017). Bayesian inference for multiple Gaussian graphical models with application to metabolic association networks. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* 11(4), 2222–2251.
- Teh, Y. W., M. I. Jordan, M. J. Beal, and D. M. Blei (2006). Hierarchical Dirichlet processes. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 101(476), 1566–1581.
- Telesca, D., P. Müller, S. M. Kornblau, M. A. Suchard, and Y. Ji (2012). Modeling protein expression and protein signaling pathways. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 107(500), 1372–1384.
- van den Boom, W., A. Beskos, and M. De Iorio (2022). The  $G$ -Wishart weighted proposal algorithm: Efficient posterior computation for Gaussian graphical models. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.*. Advance online publication.
- Yook, S.-H., Z. N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabási (2004). Functional and topological characterization of protein interaction networks. *Proteomics* 4(4), 928–942.
- Yu, H., A. Paccanaro, V. Trifonov, and M. Gerstein (2006). Predicting interactions in protein networks by completing defective cliques. *Bioinformatics* 22(7), 823–829.
- Zachary, W. W. (1977). An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups. *J. Anthropol. Res.* 33(4), 452–473.
- Zhang, S. (2018). Comparisons of gene coexpression network modules in breast cancer and ovarian cancer. *BMC Syst. Biol.* 12(S1), 57–87.
- Zhou, S., P. Rütimann, M. Xu, and P. Bühlmann (2011). High-dimensional covariance estimation based on Gaussian graphical models. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 12, 2975–3026.

# Supplement to “Bayesian Learning of Graph Substructures”

Willem van den Boom, Maria De Iorio and Alexandros Beskos

## S1 Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms

This section discusses the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms used in the main text.

### S1.1 Degree-Corrected Stochastic Blockmodel

Algorithm S1 details an MCMC step to compute the joint posterior on  $(G, \theta, \beta, z)$  with the degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel as prior on the graph space. It uses the  $G$ -Wishart weighted proposal algorithm (WWA) of van den Boom et al. (2022) to update the graph  $G$ . We use the latent variable update from Albert and Chib (1993) for  $\beta^*$  and  $\theta$ . The update of the block labels  $z$  uses that (3) also applies to the Dirichlet process. Define the cluster label  $c_i$  for the popularity parameter  $\theta$  analogously to  $z_i$  for  $\beta$ , and let  $M$  denote the number of unique elements in  $\theta$  such that  $1 \leq c_i \leq M$ . Then, analogously to (3),

$$\Pr(c_i = m \mid c_{-i}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n_{-i,k}^\theta}{p-1+\alpha}, & k = 1, \dots, M^{-i} \\ \frac{\alpha}{p-1+\alpha}, & m = M^{-i} + 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{S1})$$

where  $n_{-i,k}^\theta = |\{1 \leq j \leq p \mid c_j = k, j \neq i\}|$  and  $M^{-i}$  is the number of unique elements in  $c_{-i} = \{c_j \mid j \neq i\}$ . Also, denote the  $M$ -dimensional vector with the unique values of  $\theta$  by  $\theta^*$ . The updates for the Dirichlet precision parameters  $\nu$  and  $\alpha$  follow Escobar and West (1995).

---

**Algorithm S1** MCMC step for the degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel.

---

1. Update  $G \mid \mu, Y$  using WWA from van den Boom et al. (2022).
2. For all  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$ :
  - (a) If  $(i, j) \in E$ , sample  $\zeta_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}_{(0,\infty)}(\mu_{ij}, 1)$ .
  - (b) If  $(i, j) \notin E$ , sample  $\zeta_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}_{(-\infty,0)}(\mu_{ij}, 1)$ .
3. For  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , let  $S_k^\beta = \{(i, j) \mid i < j, z_i = z_j = k\}$  and sample  $\beta_k^* \sim \mathcal{N}\{\sigma_k^2 \sum_{(i,j) \in S_k^\beta} (\zeta_{ij} - \theta_i - \theta_j), \sigma_k^2\}$  where  $\sigma_k^2 = (s_\beta^{-2} + |S_k^\beta|)^{-1}$ .

4. Let  $\zeta_{ij}^{-\beta} = \zeta_{ij} - \mathbf{1}[z_i = z_j]\beta_i$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$  and set  $\zeta_{ji}^{-\beta} = \zeta_{ij}^{-\beta}$  for notational convenience. For  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , let  $S_m^\theta = \{(i, j) \mid i < j, c_i = c_j = m\}$  and sample  $\theta_m^* \sim \mathcal{N}[\sigma_m^2 \{2 \sum_{S_m^\theta} \zeta_{ij}^{-\beta} + \sum_{\{(i,j) \mid c_i = m \neq c_j\}} (\zeta_{ij}^{-\beta} - \theta_j)\}, \sigma_m^2]$  where  $\sigma_m^2 = \{s_\theta^{-2} + 4|S_m^\theta| + n_m^\theta(p - n_m^\theta)\}^{-1}$  with  $n_m^\theta = |\{1 \leq j \leq p \mid c_j = m\}|$ .

5. Update the block labels  $z$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, p$ :

- (a) Set  $K^{-i}$  equal to the number of unique values in  $z_{-i}$  and relabel  $z_{-i}$  such that  $1 \leq z_j \leq K^{-i}$  for  $j \neq i$ .
- (b) Denote the  $\mu$  resulting from  $z_i = k$  by  $\mu^k$ . Here,  $\mu^{K^{-i}+1}$  does not involve the not yet specified  $\beta_{K^{-i}+1}^*$ . The neighbourhood of node  $i$  is  $N_i = \{j \mid (i, j) \in E\}$ . Sample  $z_i$  according to

$$p(z_i = k \mid \text{---}) \propto \Pr(z_i = k \mid z_{-i}) \prod_{j \in N_i} \Phi(\mu_{ij}^k) \prod_{j \notin N_i} \{1 - \Phi(\mu_{ij}^k)\}$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, K^{-i} + 1$  where  $\Pr(z_i = k \mid z_{-i})$  is given by (3).

- (c) If  $z_i \leq K^{-i}$ , set  $\beta_i = \beta_{z_i}^*$  and  $K = K^{-i}$ .
- (d) If  $z_i = K^{-i} + 1$ , sample  $\beta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, s_\beta^2)$  and set  $K = K^{-i} + 1$ .

6. Update the block labels  $c$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, p$ :

- (a) Set  $M^{-i}$  equal to the number of unique values in  $c_{-i}$  and relabel  $c_{-i}$  such that  $1 \leq c_j \leq M^{-i}$  for  $j \neq i$ .
- (b) Sample  $c_i$  according to

$$p(c_i = m \mid \text{---}) \propto \Pr(c_i = m \mid c_{-i}) \times \begin{cases} \exp \left\{ \theta_m^* \sum_{j \neq i} (\zeta_{ij}^{-\beta} - \theta_j) - \frac{p-1}{2} (\theta_m^*)^2 \right\}, & m = 1, \dots, M^{-i} \\ \frac{\sigma_c}{s_\theta} \exp \left( \frac{\mu_c^2}{2\sigma_c^2} \right), & m = M^{-i} + 1 \end{cases}$$

where  $\Pr(c_i = m \mid c_{-i})$  is given by (S1),  $\sigma_c^2 = (p - 1 + s_\theta^{-2})^{-1}$  and  $\mu_c = \sigma_c^2 \sum_{j \neq i} (\zeta_{ij}^{-\beta} - \theta_j)$ .

- (c) If  $c_i \leq M^{-i}$ , set  $\theta_i = \theta_{c_i}^*$  and  $M = M^{-i}$ .
- (d) If  $c_i = M^{-i} + 1$ , sample  $\theta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_c, \sigma_c^2)$  and set  $M = M^{-i} + 1$ .

7. Sample  $t_\nu \sim \text{Beta}(\nu + 1, p)$ . Then, sample  $\nu$  from the mixture  $\pi_\nu \Gamma(a_\nu + K, b_\nu - \log t_\nu) + (1 - \pi_\nu) \Gamma(a_\nu + K - 1, b_\nu - \log t_\nu)$  where  $\pi_\nu$  is defined by

$$\frac{\pi_\nu}{1 - \pi_\nu} = \frac{a_\nu + K - 1}{p(b_\nu - \log t_\nu)}$$

8. Sample  $t_\alpha \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha + 1, p)$ . Then, sample  $\alpha$  from the mixture  $\pi_\alpha \Gamma(a_\alpha + M, b_\alpha - \log t_\alpha) + (1 - \pi_\alpha) \Gamma(a_\alpha + M - 1, b_\alpha - \log t_\alpha)$  where  $\pi_\alpha$  is defined by

$$\frac{\pi_\alpha}{1 - \pi_\alpha} = \frac{a_\alpha + M - 1}{p(b_\alpha - \log t_\alpha)}$$

---

Algorithm S1 is similar to Algorithm 1 of Tan and De Iorio (2019). A difference is that we marginalize over the latent variables  $\zeta_{ij}$  when updating the block labels  $z_i$ .

## S1.2 Southern Italian Community Structure

As mentioned in Section 3.2, MCMC with the Southern Italian community structure as graph prior requires a joint update of  $z$  and  $G$ . A change in  $z$  can force the addition of more than one edge in  $G$ . Therefore, we cannot use WWA (van den Boom et al., 2022) used in Algorithm S1 as it is restricted to single edge updates. Instead, we evaluate  $p(Y | G)$  in (1) directly by using the Laplace approximation, with a diagonal Hessian matrix, of the normalising constant  $I_G(\delta, D)$  from Moghaddam et al. (2009). Then, we can readily evaluate Metropolis-Hastings updates that involve changing multiple edges in  $G$ . Algorithm S2 details the MCMC step. Here, we only discuss the joint update of  $z$  and  $G$  in more detail (Step 3) as the other steps are more standard.

---

**Algorithm S2** MCMC step for the Southern Italian community structure.

---

1. Compute  $n^\beta = \sum_k n_k^\beta (p - n_k^\beta) / 2$  where  $n_k^\beta = |S_k^\beta| = |\{(i, j) \mid i < j, z_i = z_j = k\}|$ . Sample  $\rho$  from its full conditional  $\text{Beta}\{1 + |E| - n^\beta, 1 + p(p - 1) / 2 - |E|\}$
2. If  $n_k^\beta < p(p - 1) / 2$ , perform a single edge update in  $G$  with as proposal to add or remove a uniformly sampled edge with equal probability, if possible:
  - (a) If  $|E| = n_k^\beta$ , pick an edge uniformly at random to add to  $G$  to obtain the proposed  $\tilde{G}$ . Set  $G = \tilde{G}$  with probability  $1 \wedge \{p(p - 1) - 2|E|\}R / 4$  with  $R$  as in (S2).
  - (b) If  $|E| = p(p - 1) / 2$ , pick an edge uniformly at random from the  $|E| - n^\beta$  free edges in  $G$  to remove to obtain the proposed  $\tilde{G}$ . Set  $G = \tilde{G}$  with probability  $1 \wedge 4R / \{|E| - n^\beta\}$ .
  - (c) Otherwise, with probability 0.5, pick an edge uniformly at random from the  $p(p - 1) / 2 - |E|$  potential edges to add to  $G$  to obtain the proposed  $\tilde{G}$ . Set  $G = \tilde{G}$  with probability  $1 \wedge rR$  where

$$r = \begin{cases} \frac{p(p-1)-2|E|}{|\tilde{E}|-n^\beta}, & |\tilde{E}| = \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \\ \frac{p(p-1)-2|E|}{2(|\tilde{E}|-n^\beta)}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

With probability 0.5, pick an edge uniformly at random from the  $|E| - n^\beta$  free edges to remove from  $G$  to obtain the proposed  $\tilde{G}$ . Set  $G = \tilde{G}$  with probability  $1 \wedge rR$  where

$$r = \begin{cases} \frac{|E|-n^\beta}{p(p-1)-2|\tilde{E}|}, & |\tilde{E}| = n^\beta \\ \frac{2(|E|-n^\beta)}{p(p-1)-2|\tilde{E}|}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

3. For  $i = 1, \dots, p$ :
  - (a) Sample a proposal  $(\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G})$  from  $q(\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G} \mid z_i, G)$  defined in the text.
  - (b) Set  $(z_i, G) = (\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G})$  with probability  $1 \wedge R$  where  $R$  is given by (S2).
4. Update  $\nu$  as in Step 7 of Algorithm S1.

---

The joint update for  $z$  and  $G$  is a Metropolis-within-Gibbs step where we update

$(z_i, G)$  conditional on  $z_{-i}$  for  $i \in V$  sequentially. The remainder of this write-up considers this conditional update where we do not always make the conditioning on  $z_{-i}$  explicit. The target distribution is proportional to  $\pi(z_i, G) = p(z_i | z_{-i}) p(G | z) p(Y | G) = p(z_i) p(G | z_i) p(Y | G)$  where  $p(z_i | z_{-i}) = p(z_i)$  is given by (3).

We choose a Metropolis-Hastings proposal that factorizes as  $q(\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G} | z_i, G) = q(\tilde{z}_i | z_i) q(\tilde{G} | \tilde{z}_i, G)$  where  $(\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G})$  denotes the proposed value. We set  $q(\tilde{z}_i | z_i) = p(\tilde{z}_i | z_{-i})$ . We define  $q(\tilde{G} | \tilde{z}_i, G)$  by

1. adding all edges  $\{(i, j) | z_j = \tilde{z}_i\}$ , if any, following from  $\tilde{z}_i = z_j = \tilde{k}$  implying  $(i, j) \in \tilde{G}$ , and,
2. if  $\tilde{z}_i \neq z_i$ , resampling all edges  $\{(i, j) | z_j = z_i\}$  with probability  $\rho$ ,
3. if  $\tilde{z}_i = z_i$ , resampling all edges  $\{(i, j) | z_j \neq z_i\}$  with probability  $\rho$ .

Since this construction follows the prior  $p(G | z) = p(G | z_i)$ , we have  $q(\tilde{G} | \tilde{z}_i, G)/q(G | z_i, \tilde{G}) = p(\tilde{G} | \tilde{z}_i)/p(G | z_i)$  which simplifies the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance probability. The acceptance probability equals  $1 \wedge R$  where

$$R = \frac{q(z_i, G | \tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G}) \pi(\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G})}{q(\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{G} | z_i, G) \pi(z_i, G)} = \frac{p(Y | \tilde{G})}{p(Y | G)}. \quad (\text{S2})$$

### S1.3 Multiple Graphs

Algorithm S3 details the MCMC for the proposed model. For notational convenience, we define  $g_{xi}$  also for  $x = 1$  by  $g_{1i} = 1$ . Conditionally on  $g_{xi}$ , it largely mimics Algorithm S1. It uses a modified version of (3):

$$\Pr(z_{1i} = k | z \setminus \{z_{xi} | g_{xi} = 1\}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n_{0k}^{-i}}{\alpha + \sum_{k=1}^{K^{-i0}} n_{0k}^{-i}}, & k = 1, \dots, K^{-i0} \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \sum_{k=1}^{K^{-i0}} n_{0k}^{-i}}, & k = K^{-i0} + 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{S3})$$

where  $n_{0k}^{-i} = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{1}[z_{1j} = k] + \sum_{x \geq 2} \sum_{\{j | g_{xj} = 0\}} \mathbb{1}[z_{xj} = k]$  and  $K^{-i0}$  is the number of unique elements in  $z \setminus \{z_{xi} | g_{xi} = 1\}$ . Similarly, we have for  $(i, x)$  such that  $g_{xi} = 0$ ,

$$\Pr(z_{xi} = k | z \setminus z_{xi}) = \begin{cases} \frac{n_k^{-ix}}{\alpha + \sum_{k=1}^{K^{-ix}} n_k^{-ix}}, & k = 1, \dots, K^{-ix} \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \sum_{k=1}^{K^{-ix}} n_{0k}^{-i}}, & k = K^{-ix} + 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{S4})$$

where  $n_k^{-ix} = \sum_j \mathbb{1}[z_{1j} = k] + \sum_{\xi \geq 2} \sum_{\{j | g_{\xi j} = 0\}} \mathbb{1}[z_{j\xi} = k] - \mathbb{1}[z_{xi} = k]$  and  $K^{-ix}$  is the number of unique elements in  $z \setminus z_{xi} = \{z_{1j} | 1 \leq j \leq p\} \cup \{z_{\xi j} | 1 \leq j \leq p, 2 \leq \xi \leq q\} \setminus z_{xi}$ .

---

**Algorithm S3** MCMC step for the multiple graph stochastic blockmodel.

---

1. For  $x = 1, \dots, q$ , update  $G_x | \mu, Y$  using WWA from van den Boom et al. (2022).
2. For  $x = 1, \dots, q$ , for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$ :
  - (a) If  $(i, j) \in E_x$ , sample  $\zeta_{xij} \sim \mathcal{N}_{(0, \infty)}(\mu_{xij}, 1)$ .

- (b) If  $(i, j) \notin E_x$ , sample  $\zeta_{xij} \sim \mathcal{N}_{(-\infty, 0)}(\mu_{xij}, 1)$ .
3. For  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , let  $S_{kx} = \{(i, j) \mid i < j, z_{xi} = z_{xj} = k\}$  ( $x = 1, \dots, q$ ) and sample  $\beta_k^* \sim \mathcal{N}\{\sigma_k^2 \sum_x \sum_{(i,j) \in S_{kx}} (\zeta_{xij} - \theta_i - \theta_j), \sigma_k^2\}$  where  $\sigma_k^2 = (s_\beta^{-2} + \sum_x |S_{kx}|)^{-1}$ .
4. Let  $\zeta_{xij}^{-\beta} = \zeta_{xij} - \mathbb{1}[z_{xi} = z_{xj}] \beta_{xi}$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$  and  $x = 1, \dots, q$ , and set  $\zeta_{xji}^{-\beta} = \zeta_{xij}^{-\beta}$  for notational convenience. For  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , let  $S_m^\theta = \{(i, j) \mid i < j, c_i = c_j = m\}$  and sample  $\theta_m^* \sim \mathcal{N}[\sigma_m^2 \{2 \sum_{x, S_m^\theta} \zeta_{xij}^{-\beta} + \sum_{x, \{(i,j) \mid c_i = m \neq c_j\}} (\zeta_{xij}^{-\beta} - \theta_j)\}, \sigma_m^2]$  where  $\sigma_m^2 = \{s_\theta^{-2} + 4q|S_m^\theta| + qn_m^\theta(p - n_m^\theta)\}^{-1}$  with  $n_m^\theta = |\{1 \leq j \leq p \mid c_j = m\}|$ .
5. Update the block labels  $z_1$  conditional on the  $g_{xi}$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, p$ :

- (a) Set  $K^{-i0}$  equal to the number of unique values in  $z \setminus \{z_{xi} \mid g_{xi} = 1\}$  and relabel these values such that they are less than or equal to  $K^{-i0}$ .
- (b) Denote the  $\mu$  resulting from  $z_{1i} = k$  by  $\mu^k$ . Here,  $\mu^{K^{-i0}+1}$  does not involve the not yet specified  $\beta_{K^{-i0}+1}^*$ . The neighbourhood of node  $i$  in  $G_x$  is  $N_{xi} = \{j \mid (i, j) \in E_x\}$ . Sample  $z_{1i}$  according to

$$p(z_{1i} = k \mid \text{---}) \propto \Pr(z_{1i} = k \mid \{z_{xi} \mid g_{xi} = 1\}) \prod_{\{x \mid g_{xi} = 1\}} \left[ \prod_{j \in N_{xi}} \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k) \prod_{j \notin N_{xi}} \{1 - \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k)\} \right]$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, K^{-i0} + 1$  where  $\Pr(z_{1i} = k \mid \{z_{xi} \mid g_{xi} = 1\})$  is given by (S3).

- (c) If  $z_{1i} \leq K^{-i0}$ , set  $\beta_{1i} = \beta_{z_{1i}}^*$  and  $K = K^{-i0}$ .
- (d) If  $z_{1i} = K^{-i0} + 1$ , sample  $\beta_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, s_\beta^2)$  and set  $K = K^{-i0} + 1$ .
- (e) Update  $z_{xi}$  and  $\beta_{xi}$  for  $x \geq 2$  such that  $g_{xi} = 1$  accordingly.
6. Update the block labels  $c$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, p$ :

- (a) Set  $M^{-i}$  equal to the number of unique values in  $c_{-i}$  and relabel  $c_{-i}$  such that  $1 \leq c_j \leq M^{-i}$  for  $j \neq i$ .
- (b) Sample  $c_i$  according to

$$p(c_i = m \mid \text{---}) \propto \Pr(c_i = k \mid c_{-i}) \times \begin{cases} \exp \left\{ \theta_m^* \sum_{x, j \neq i} (\zeta_{xij}^{-\beta} - \theta_j) - \frac{q(p-1)}{2} (\theta_m^*)^2 \right\}, & k = 1, \dots, K^{-i} \\ \frac{\sigma_c}{s_\theta} \exp \left( \frac{\mu_c^2}{2\sigma_c^2} \right), & k = K^{-i} + 1 \end{cases}$$

where  $\Pr(z_i = k \mid z_{-i})$  is given by (S1),  $\sigma_c^2 = \{q(p-1) + s_\theta^{-2}\}^{-1}$  and  $\mu_c = \sigma_c^2 \sum_{x, j \neq i} (\zeta_{xij}^{-\beta} - \theta_j)$ .

- (c) If  $c_i \leq M^{-i}$ , set  $\theta_i = \theta_{c_i}^*$  and  $M = M^{-i}$ .
- (d) If  $c_i = M^{-i} + 1$ , sample  $\theta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_c, \sigma_c^2)$  and set  $M = M^{-i} + 1$ .
7. Sample  $(g_{xi}, z_{xi})$  from its full conditional: for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , for  $x = 2, \dots, q$ , run Algorithm S4.



8. Let  $p' = p + \sum_{x=2}^q \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{1}[g_{xi} = 0]$ . Sample  $t_\nu \sim \text{Beta}(\nu + 1, p')$ . Then, sample  $\nu$  from the mixture  $\pi_\nu \Gamma(a_\nu + K, b_\nu - \log t_\nu) + (1 - \pi_\nu) \Gamma(a_\nu + K - 1, b_\nu - \log t_\nu)$  where  $\pi_\nu$  is defined by

$$\frac{\pi_\nu}{1 - \pi_\nu} = \frac{a_\nu + K - 1}{p' (b_\nu - \log t_\nu)}$$

9. Update  $\alpha$  as in Step 8 of Algorithm S1.

To update  $(g_{xi}, z_{xi})$ ,  $x \geq 2$ , according to its full conditional, we first sample  $g_{xi}$  and then  $z_{xi} | g_{xi}$ . We sample  $g_{xi}$  from its conditional distribution where we condition on everything but  $(g_{xi}, z_{xi})$ . To derive this distribution, consider

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p(g_{xi} = 1 | \text{---})}{p(g_{xi} = 0 | \text{---})} &= \frac{p(g_{xi} = 1 | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g \setminus g_{xi}, G_x)}{p(g_{xi} = 0 | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g \setminus g_{xi}, G_x)} \\ &= \frac{p(g_{xi} = 1 | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g \setminus g_{xi}) p(G_x | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g, g_{xi} = 1)}{p(g_{xi} = 0 | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g \setminus g_{xi}) p(G_x | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g, g_{xi} = 0)} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Bayes' rule. Here,  $p(g_{xi} = 1 | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g \setminus g_{xi}) = \gamma$  and  $p(g_{xi} = 0 | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g \setminus g_{xi}) = 1 - \gamma$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} p(G_x | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g, g_{xi}) &= p(G_x | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g) \\ &= \sum_{z_{xi}} p(z_{xi}, G_x | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g) \\ &= \sum_{z_{xi}} p(z_{xi} | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g) p(G_x | z_{xi}, \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g). \end{aligned}$$

If  $g_{xi} = 0$ ,  $p(z_{xi} | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g)$  is equal to (S4). If  $g_{xi} = 1$ , then  $p(z_{xi} | \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g) = \mathbb{1}[z_{xi} = z_{1i}]$ . Finally, denote the  $\mu$  resulting from  $z_{xi} = k$  by  $\mu^k$ . Here,  $\mu^{K-i_x+1}$  does not involve the not yet specified  $\beta_{K-i_x+1}^*$ . The neighbourhood of node  $i$  in  $G_x$  is  $N_{xi} = \{j | (i, j) \in E_x\}$ . Then,

$$p(G_x | z_{xi} = k, \beta \setminus \beta_{xi}, g) \propto \prod_{j \in N_{xi}} \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k) \prod_{j \notin N_{xi}} \{1 - \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k)\}$$

where the normalisation constant does not depend on  $g_{xi}$  or  $z_{xi}$ . Algorithm S4 details the resulting update for  $(g_{xi}, z_{xi})$ .

## S2 Model from Sun et al. (2014)

This section describes the model from Sun et al. (2014) and an MCMC algorithm for it as used in Section 5.2. The prior on the block structure  $z$  is the same Chinese restaurant process as in Section 3.2. Then, let  $U = Y^\top Y$  and define the  $p \times p$  matrix  $D(z)$  with a block diagonal structure given by  $z$  by  $D_{ij}(z) = \mathbb{1}[z_i = z_j] W_{ij} / \delta'$  where the last equality follows from  $W$  being the empirical precision matrix  $nU^{-1}$  and  $\delta' = \max(p, n) = n$  since  $n \geq p$  in Section 5.2. Now,  $\Omega | z \sim \text{Wishart}\{D(z), \delta'\}$ , a Wishart distribution with scale matrix  $D(z)$  and degrees of freedom  $\delta'$ . Finally, conditionally on  $\Omega$ , the rows of  $Y$  are independently distributed according to  $\mathcal{N}(0_{p \times 1}, \Omega^{-1})$ .

---

**Algorithm S4** Full conditional update for  $(g_{xi}, z_{xi})$  in Algorithm S3.

---

1. Flip the value of  $g_{xi}$ . Sample  $g_{xi}$  according to the distribution with as odds of  $g_{xi} = 1$  versus  $g_{xi} = 0$  the ratio

$$\frac{\gamma \prod_{j \in N_{xi}} \Phi(\mu_{xij}^{z_{0i}}) \prod_{j \notin N_{xi}} \{1 - \Phi(\mu_{xij}^{z_{0i}})\}}{(1 - \gamma) \sum_{k=1}^{K^{-ix}+1} \Pr(z_{xi} = k \mid z \setminus z_{xi}) \prod_{j \in N_{xi}} \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k) \prod_{j \notin N_{xi}} \{1 - \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k)\}}$$

where  $\Pr(z_{xi} = k \mid z \setminus z_{xi})$  is given by (S4).

2. (a) If  $g_{xi} = 0$ , update  $z_{xi}$ :
  - i. Set  $K^{-ix}$  equal to the number of unique values in  $z \setminus z_{xi}$  and relabel these values such that they are less than or equal to  $K^{-ix}$ .
  - ii. Denote the  $\mu$  resulting from  $z_{xi} = k$  by  $\mu^k$ . Here,  $\mu^{K^{-ix}+1}$  does not involve the not yet specified  $\beta_{K^{-ix}+1}^*$ . The neighbourhood of node  $i$  in  $G_x$  is  $N_{xi} = \{j \mid (i, j) \in E_x\}$ . Sample  $z_{xi}$  according to

$$p(z_{xi} = k \mid \text{---}) \propto \Pr(z_{xi} = k \mid z \setminus z_{xi}) \prod_{j \in N_{xi}} \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k) \prod_{j \notin N_{xi}} \{1 - \Phi(\mu_{xij}^k)\}$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, K^{-ix} + 1$  where  $\Pr(z_{xi} = k \mid z \setminus z_{xi})$  is given by (S4).

- iii. If  $z_{xi} \leq K^{-ix}$ , set  $\beta_{xi} = \beta_{z_{xi}}^*$  and  $K = K^{-ix}$ .
    - iv. If  $z_{xi} = K^{-ix} + 1$ , sample  $\beta_{xi} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, s_\beta^2)$  and set  $K = K^{-ix} + 1$ .
  - (b) If  $g_{xi} = 1$ , set  $z_{xi} = z_{0x}$ .
- 

---

**Algorithm S5** MCMC step for the model from Sun et al. (2014).

---

1. Update the block labels  $z$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, p$ :
  - (a) Set  $K^{-i}$  equal to the number of unique values in  $z_{-i}$  and relabel  $z_{-i}$  such that  $1 \leq z_j \leq K^{-i}$  for  $j \neq i$ .
  - (b) Sample  $z_i$  according to

$$p(z_i = k \mid \text{---}) \propto \Pr(z_i = k \mid z_{-i}) \frac{|D(z)|^{n/2}}{|I_p + D(z)U|^{(n+\delta')/2}}$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, K^{-i} + 1$  where  $\Pr(z_i = k \mid z_{-i})$  is given by (3).

2. Update  $\nu$  as in Step 7 of Algorithm S1.
-

Sun et al. (2014) use  $a_\nu = b_\nu = 1$  for the  $\Gamma(a_\nu, b_\nu)$  prior on the precision parameter  $\nu$  of the Chinese restaurant process. We set  $a_\nu = b_\nu = 2$  for consistency with the other methods considered.

Algorithm S5 describes an MCMC algorithm targeting the resulting posterior on  $z$  based on Algorithm 1 of Sun et al. (2014). It does not contain split-merge Metropolis-Hastings updates of  $z$  (Jain and Neal, 2004), unlike Algorithm 1 of Sun et al. (2014), in line with the other MCMC algorithms presented. Such split-merge updates can improve the traversal of the MCMC chain between cluster allocations that are separated by configurations with low posterior probability when viewed in terms of updating each  $z_i$  in isolation. These split-merge steps can be added to the MCMC algorithms presented in this supplement though with some added complexity (Dahl, 2005) as  $p(Y | z)$  is not available in closed form in the proposed models. We do not consider this extra complication here as the scenarios of interest to us have sufficient posterior uncertainty in  $z$  such that the presented simpler MCMC algorithms are able to effectively explore the posterior on  $z$ .

### S3 Proposed Bayes Factor Computation vs Harmonic Mean Approach

A motivation for the Bayes factor computation based on the Savage-Dickey ratio from Section 4 is that it converges faster and is more stable than the harmonic mean approach from Raftery et al. (2007). Here, we empirically consider that benefit for the simulation study in Section 5.1.

To assess the differences in convergence and stability, we inspect how the estimates from both approaches vary as we increase the number of recorded MCMC iterations these estimates are based on. The variable part for the proposed approach is the MCMC estimate of  $p(z^* | Y)$ . Here,  $z^*$  corresponds to  $K^* = 1$  block as in Section 5.1. The harmonic mean approach requires the estimation of both  $p(Y | \mathcal{M}^*)$  and  $p(Y | \mathcal{M})$  to compute the Bayes factor as defined in (4). The harmonic mean estimate for  $p(Y | \mathcal{M}^*) = p(Y | z^*)$  would involve running a separate MCMC chain with  $z$  fixed to  $z^*$  since  $p(Y | z^*)$  is not available in closed form in our model. Since the latter is not the case if  $p(Y | z^*)$  were directly available, we constrain ourselves to the variability arising from the estimate for  $p(Y | \mathcal{M})$  in this comparison. Since  $p(Y | z)$  is not directly available, we take the harmonic mean with the MCMC samples of the Gaussian density  $p(Y | \Omega)$  as the estimate of  $p(Y | \mathcal{M}) = p(Y)$ . Note that the precision matrix  $\Omega$  is sampled as part of Step 1 in Algorithm S1.

We only consider the scenarios  $n = 10^2, 10$  as  $n = 10^4, 10^3$  invariably yield  $B = 0$  with the proposed Bayes factor computation for any number of MCMC iterations used. The Bayes factor  $B$  is proportional to  $p(Y | z^*)$  and inversely proportional to  $p(Y | \mathcal{M})$ . This fact gives rise to the comparison in Figure S1 which shows that the proposed approach converges to  $B$  faster, with respect to the number of MCMC iterations, than the harmonic mean approach.




Figure S1: Log of the MCMC estimates constituting the proposed Bayes factor computation (solid lines) and the harmonic mean approach (dashed lines) versus the number of MCMC iterations used for the simulation study in Section 5.1.

## S4 MCMC trace plots

To assess the MCMC convergence and mixing for the applications in Section 6, we inspect trace plots. Specifically, we consider trace plots of the Gaussian likelihood  $p(Y | \Omega)$  in the application with the mutual fund data set. Recall that the precision matrix  $\Omega$  is sampled as part of Step 1 in Algorithm S1. For Algorithm S2, we add a step that samples  $\Omega | G, Y \sim \mathcal{W}_G(\delta^*, D^*)$  at each iteration. For the multiple graph application with the gene expression data, we define the precision matrix  $\Omega_x$  for each group  $x$  analogously to  $\Omega$  in the single graph case. Then, the likelihood follows as  $\prod_{x=1}^q p(Y_x | \Omega_x)$  where each  $p(Y_x | \Omega_x)$  is the density resulting from the rows of  $Y_x$  being independently distributed according to  $\mathcal{N}(0_{p \times 1}, \Omega_x^{-1})$ . Analogously to Algorithm S1,  $\Omega_x$  is sampled as part of Step 1 of Algorithm S3.

Figure S2 contains the resulting trace plots. They do not suggest deficient MCMC convergence or mixing.

## References

- Albert, J. H. and S. Chib (1993). Bayesian analysis of binary and polychotomous response data. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 88(422), 669–679.
- Dahl, D. B. (2005). Sequentially-allocated merge-split sampler for conjugate and nonconjugate Dirichlet process mixture models. Technical report, Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University.
- Escobar, M. D. and M. West (1995). Bayesian density estimation and inference using mixtures. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 90(430), 577–588.
- Jain, S. and R. M. Neal (2004). A split-merge Markov chain Monte Carlo procedure for the Dirichlet process mixture model. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.* 13(1), 158–182.
- Moghaddam, B., E. Khan, K. P. Murphy, and B. M. Marlin (2009). Accelerating Bayesian




Figure S2: Trace plots of the log-likelihood for the recorded MCMC iterations of the applications in Section 6.

- structural inference for non-decomposable Gaussian graphical models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 22. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Raftery, A. E., M. A. Newton, J. M. Satagopan, and P. N. Krivitsky (2007). Estimating the integrated likelihood via posterior simulation using the harmonic mean identity. In J. M. Bernardo, M. J. Bayarri, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid, D. Heckerman, A. F. M. Smith, and M. West (Eds.), *Bayesian Statistics 8*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Sun, S., Y. Zhu, and J. Xu (2014). Adaptive variable clustering in Gaussian graphical models. In S. Kaski and J. Corander (Eds.), *Proc. of the 17th Int. Conf. on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Volume 33 of *Proc. of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 931–939. PMLR.
- Tan, L. S. and M. De Iorio (2019). Dynamic degree-corrected blockmodels for social networks: A nonparametric approach. *Stat. Model.* 19(4), 386–411.
- van den Boom, W., A. Beskos, and M. De Iorio (2022). The  $G$ -Wishart weighted proposal algorithm: Efficient posterior computation for Gaussian graphical models. *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.*. Advance online publication.