

GSL-LPA: Fast Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA) for Community Detection with no Internally-Disconnected Communities

Subhajit Sahu

subhajit.sahu@research.iiit.ac.in

IIIT Hyderabad

Hyderabad, Telangana, India

ABSTRACT

Community detection is the problem of identifying tightly connected clusters of nodes within a network. Efficient parallel algorithms for this play a crucial role in various applications, especially as datasets expand to significant sizes. The Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA) is commonly employed for this purpose due to its ease of parallelization, rapid execution, and scalability. However, it may yield internally disconnected communities. This technical report introduces GSL-LPA, derived from our parallelization of LPA, namely GVE-LPA. Our experiments on a system with two 16-core Intel Xeon Gold 6226R processors show that GSL-LPA not only mitigates this issue but also surpasses FLPA, igraph LPA, and NetworKit LPA by 55×, 10,300×, and 5.8×, respectively, achieving a processing rate of 844M edges/s on a 3.8B edge graph. Additionally, GSL-LPA scales at a rate of 1.6× for every doubling of threads.

KEYWORDS

Community detection, Internally-disconnected communities, Parallel Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA)

1 INTRODUCTION

Community detection refers to the task of identifying groups of vertices characterized by dense internal connections and sparse connections between groups [12]. These groups, often referred to as communities or clusters [1], offer valuable insights into the structure and function of networks [12]. The problem of community detection is NP-hard and finds applications in various domains, including topic discovery, protein annotation, recommendation systems, and targeted advertising [15]. An additional challenge arises from the lack of prior knowledge about the number and size distribution of communities [4]. Heuristic-based approaches are commonly employed for community detection [4, 7, 11, 20, 30–32, 43–45, 48, 51]. The modularity metric [28] is used to measure the quality of communities identified. The communities identified are considered intrinsic when based solely on network topology and disjoint when each vertex belongs to only one community [9, 15].

The Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA), also known as RAK [30], is a widely adopted diffusion-based heuristic for community detection, capable of identifying communities of moderate quality. It offers simplicity, speed, and scalability advantages over the Louvain method [4], another effective community detection algorithm renowned for its high-quality results. Specifically, we observe LPA to outpace Louvain by 2.3–14× in terms of speed, while identifying communities of 3–30% lower quality. LPA’s efficiency is attributed to its avoidance of repeated optimization steps and its ease of parallelization. Thus, LPA is well-suited for applications prioritizing high performance at the expense of slightly lower result quality.

In our experimentation with alternative methods such as COPRA [15], SLPA [48], and LabelRank [47], we found LPA to be the most efficient, while identifying communities of equivalent quality [36].

However, LPA is susceptible to identifying internally disconnected communities. Through our experimental analysis, we observe that up to 3.1%, 0.3%, and 14.5% of communities identified using FLPA [43], igraph LPA [10], and NetworKit LPA [41] exhibit this issue. Rectifying such disconnected communities is crucial to ensuring the accuracy and robustness of community detection algorithms. Several studies have addressed internally-disconnected communities as a post-processing step [15, 17, 27, 30, 46]. This is also the methodology we adopt here.

1.1 Our Contributions

This report introduces GSL-LPA¹, a parallel implementation of the Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA) designed to identify communities without internal disconnections. GSL-LPA is derived from our parallelization of LPA, referred to as GVE-LPA [35]. Experimental evaluations conducted on a system equipped with two 16-core Intel Xeon Gold 6226R processors demonstrate that GSL-LPA not only resolves the issue of disconnected communities but also surpasses FLPA [43], igraph LPA [10], and NetworKit LPA [41] by 55×, 10,300×, and 5.8×, respectively. On a graph with 3.8B edges, GSL-LPA achieves a processing rate of 844M edges/s. Additionally, GSL-LPA scales at a rate of 1.6× for every doubling of threads.

2 RELATED WORK

Communities within networks serve as functional units or meta-nodes [6]. Identifying these divisions in an unsupervised manner is crucial in various domains, including drug discovery, disease prediction, protein annotation, topic discovery, link prediction, recommendation systems, customer segmentation, inferring land use, and criminal identification [19]. Numerous schemes have been devised for community detection [4, 7, 11, 20, 30–32, 43–45, 48, 51]. These can be categorized into three basic approaches: bottom-up, top-down, and data-structure based [40]. Additionally, they can be classified as divisive, agglomerative, or multi-level methods [52]. To evaluate these methods, fitness scores like modularity [29] are used. Modularity measures the relative density of links within communities compared to those outside and ranges from -0.5 to 1 .

The Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA) is a diffusion-based method for identifying communities. Techniques for parallelizing LPA include vertex assignment with guided scheduling [42], parallel bitonic sort [39], and pre-partitioning of the graph [23].

In terms of quality, LPA may yield communities with low modularity score, resulting in the emergence of a dominant community

¹<https://github.com/puzzlef/rak-communities-openmp>

that envelops the majority of the nodes, obscuring finer community structures [15]. To address instability of result, community structure quality, and performance due to vertex processing order, a few ordering strategies have been attempted. These include updating only the active nodes [49] or prioritizing specific subsets based on properties, like core or boundary nodes [16]. In some cases, oscillations in label assignments may arise instead of convergence. To address this, asynchronous mode [25], alternating updates of independent node subsets [8], and parallel graph coloring techniques [8] have been attempted. Raghavan et al. [30] note that after just five iterations, labels of 95% of nodes converge to their final values.

Additional enhancements to LPA encompass employing a stable (non-random) mechanism for selecting labels when encountering multiple best labels [50], mitigating the challenge posed by monster communities [3, 38], discerning central nodes and combining communities to enhance modularity [51], as well as leveraging frontiers with alternating push-pull to minimize the number of edges traversed and enhance solution quality [26]. While a number of variations of LPA have been introduced, the original formulation remains the simplest and most efficient [13].

A few open-source implementations and software packages have been developed for community detection utilizing the LPA. Fast Label Propagation Algorithm (FLPA) [43] is a variant of the LPA that employs a queue-based method, processing only vertices with recently updated neighborhoods. NetworKit [41] is a software package built to analyze the structural attributes of graph datasets containing billions of connections. It integrates C++ kernels with a Python frontend, and features a parallel implementation of LPA. igraph [10] is a similar package that is written in C, and offers Python, R, and Mathematica frontends. It enjoys widespread adoption in academic research and includes an LPA implementation.

Raghavan et al. [30] note that their Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA) for community detection can uncover internally-disconnected communities [15]. Genetic algorithms [18] and expectation minimization/maximization algorithms [2, 17] can also detect such disconnected communities. To address this, they propose applying Breadth-First Search (BFS) to subnetworks in each individual group to separate the disconnected communities. This can be achieved with a time complexity of $O(M + N)$. Gregory [15] extends LPA with the Community Overlap Propagation Algorithm (COPRA), which removes nested communities and splits disconnected communities using a method similar to Raghavan et al. [30]. Hafez et al. [17] introduce a community detection algorithm using Bayesian Network and Expectation Minimization (BNEM), which includes a step to detect disconnected components within communities. If detected, disconnected components are assigned new community labels. This scenario arises when the network has more communities than the specified number k in the algorithm. Hesamipour et al. [18] propose a genetic algorithm for community detection, integrating similarity-based and modularity-based approaches. They use an MST-based representation to address issues like disconnected communities and ineffective mutations. Goel et al. [14] present a tangential work, where they identify a set of nodes in a network, known as a Structural Hole Spanner (SHS), that act as a bridge among different otherwise disconnected communities.

3 PRELIMINARIES

Consider an undirected graph $G(V, E, w)$, where V denotes the set of vertices, E denotes the set of edges, and $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$ denotes the weight associated with each edge (i and j represent the vertices at the endpoints of each edge). In the case of unweighted graphs, we assume a unit weight for each edge, i.e., $w_{ij} = 1$. The neighbors of a vertex i are represented as $J_i = \{j \mid (i, j) \in E\}$, the weighted degree of each vertex is represented as $K_i = \sum_{j \in J_i} w_{ij}$, the total number of vertices is $N = |V|$, the total number of edges is $M = |E|$, and the sum of edge weights in the undirected graph is $m = \sum_{i, j \in V} w_{ij}/2$.

3.1 Community detection

Disjoint community detection involves assigning a community ID c from set Γ to each vertex $i \in V$, denoted by the mapping $C : V \rightarrow \Gamma$. Vertices belonging to community $c \in \Gamma$ are denoted as V_c , and the community of a vertex i is represented by C_i . Further, we represent the neighbors of vertex i within community c as $J_{i \rightarrow c} = \{j \mid j \in J_i \text{ and } C_j = c\}$, their corresponding edge weights summed as $K_{i \rightarrow c} = \sum_{j \in J_{i \rightarrow c}} w_{ij}$, the edge weight within community c as $\sigma_c = \sum_{(i, j) \in E \text{ and } C_i = C_j = c} w_{ij}$, and the total edge weight of community c as $\Sigma_c = \sum_{(i, j) \in E \text{ and } C_i = c} w_{ij}$ [24].

3.2 Modularity


Modularity is a metric that is used for assessing the quality of communities detected by heuristic-based algorithms. It quantifies the difference between the observed fraction of edges within communities and the expected fraction under random edge distribution. Modularity values range from -0.5 to 1 , where higher values indicate better community structure [5]. The modularity Q is calculated using Equation 1, where δ represents the Kronecker delta function ($\delta(x, y) = 1$ if $x = y$, 0 otherwise).

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{(i, j) \in E} \left[w_{ij} - \frac{K_i K_j}{2m} \right] \delta(C_i, C_j) = \sum_{c \in \Gamma} \left[\frac{\sigma_c}{2m} - \left(\frac{\Sigma_c}{2m} \right)^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

3.3 Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA)

LPA [30] is a widely used diffusion-based technique for identifying medium-quality communities in large networks. It is known for its simplicity, speed, and scalability. In LPA, each vertex i initially possesses a unique label (community ID) C_i . During each iteration, vertices adopt the label with the highest interconnecting weight, as illustrated in Equation 2. This iterative process leads to a consensus among densely connected groups of vertices. The algorithm converges when at least $1 - \tau$ fraction of vertices (where τ is the iteration tolerance parameter) maintain their community membership. LPA exhibits a time complexity of $O(L|E|)$ and a space complexity of $O(|V| + |E|)$, with L representing the number of iterations performed [30]. LPA has also been utilized in influence maximization, where the goal is to identify a small set of influential nodes in a network that can maximize the spread of information [22].

$$C_i = \arg \max_{c \in \Gamma} \sum_{j \in J_i \mid C_j = c} w_{ij} \quad (2)$$



(a) The initial community structure with 4 communities (b) After a few iterations, C2, C3, and C4 combine (c) Following this, vertex 4 transitions to C3

Figure 1: An example illustrating the potential of internally-disconnected communities with LPA [37]. Here, C1, C2, C3, and C4 represent four communities derived after one iteration of LPA, with vertices 1 to 7 belonging to community C1. Thicker lines are used here to indicate higher edge weights.

3.4 Possibility of Internally-disconnected communities with LPA

LPA has been noted to potentially identify internally disconnected communities [30]. This is illustrated with an example in Figure 1. Initially, Figure 1(a) show the community structure after one iteration of LPA, with four communities labeled C1, C2, C3, C4, and vertices 1 to 7 grouped in C1 (i.e., vertices 1 to 7 have identified C1 as the most weighted label among their neighbors). Subsequent iterations, illustrated in Figure 1(b), result in relabeling of vertices in C2 and C4 into C3, due to strong internal connections, resulting in the combining of communities C2, C3, and C4 into C3. This results in C3 becoming the most weighted label for vertex 4. Thus, 4 changes its label to C3, resulting in internal disconnection of C1 as vertices 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 retain their locally popular labels. This phenomenon is common across various LPA implementations, including FLPA [43], igraph LPA [10], and NetworKit LPA [41], which identify up to 3.1%, 0.3%, and 14.5% of communities that are internally-disconnected, respectively.

4 APPROACH

In the preceding section, we discussed the occurrence of internally-disconnected communities with LPA. However, this phenomenon is not exclusive to LPA and has been observed in various other community detection algorithms [2, 4, 17, 18]. To address this issue, a commonly used approach involves splitting disconnected communities as a post-processing step (i.e., after the completion of all iterations of the community detection algorithm, when the community memberships of vertices have converged), known as Split Last (SL) using Breadth First Search (BFS) [15, 17, 27, 30, 46].

To split the internally-disconnected communities using the SL method, we investigate three different techniques: minimum-label-based Label Propagation (LP), minimum-label-based Label Propagation with Pruning (LPP), and Breadth First Search (BFS). We choose to explore LP and LPP techniques for splitting disconnected communities due to their inherent parallelizability.

Using the LP technique, each vertex in the graph is initially assigned a unique label corresponding to its vertex ID. Subsequently, in every iteration, each vertex within its assigned community selects the minimum label among its neighbors. This iterative process continues until convergence is achieved for all vertex labels. Consequently, each vertex acquires a unique label within its connected component and its respective community, thereby partitioning communities consisting of multiple connected components. On the other hand, the LPP technique integrates a pruning optimization step where only unprocessed vertices are processed. Once a vertex is processed, it is flagged as such and is only reactivated (or marked as unprocessed) if one of its neighbors alter their labels. The pseudocode for both the LP and LPP techniques is provided in Algorithm 1, with its explanation given in Section 4.1.

In contrast, the BFS technique for splitting internally disconnected communities involves selecting a random vertex within each community and identifying all reachable vertices from it as part of one subcommunity. If any vertices remain unvisited in the original community, another random vertex is selected from the remaining set, and the process repeats until all vertices within each community are visited. Consequently, the BFS technique facilitates the partitioning of connected components within each community. The pseudocode for this technique is presented in Algorithm 2, with detailed explanations provided in Section 4.2.

4.1 Explanation of LP/LPP technique

We now present the pseudocode for the parallel minimum-label-based Label Propagation (LP) and Label Propagation with Pruning (LPP) techniques, outlined in Algorithm 1, which are utilized for partitioning internally-disconnected communities. These techniques serve as a post-processing step (SL) at the end of the community detection algorithm. The function `splitDisconnectedLp()` accepts as input the graph $G(V, E)$ and the community memberships C of vertices, and outputs the updated community memberships C' where all disconnected communities have been separated.

The algorithm commences in lines 2-5 by initializing the minimum labels C' of each vertex to their respective vertex IDs and marking all vertices as unprocessed. Lines 6-23 denote the iteration loop of the algorithm. Initially, the number of changed labels ΔN is set (line 7). Subsequently, an iteration of label propagation is performed (lines 8-21), followed by a convergence check (line 23). During each iteration, unprocessed vertices are handled concurrently. For each unprocessed vertex i , if the Label Propagation with Pruning (LPP) technique is used, it is marked as processed. The algorithm then identifies the minimum label c'_{min} within the community of vertex i (lines 12-15) by considering only the labels of its neighbors belonging to the same community, and its own label. If c'_{min} differs from the current minimum label $C'[i]$ (line 16), $C'[i]$ is updated, ΔN is incremented to mark the change in label, and neighboring vertices of i in the same community are marked as unprocessed (to be updated in the subsequent iteration). The label propagation loop (lines 6-23) continues until no further changes occur (line 23). Finally, the updated labels C' , reflecting the community membership of each vertex with no internally-disconnected communities, are returned (line 24).

Algorithm 1 Split disconnected communities using (min) LP [37].

```

▷  $G(V, E)$ : Input graph
▷  $C$ : Initial community membership/label of each vertex
□  $C'$ : Updated community membership/label of each vertex
□  $c'_{min}$ : Minimum connected label within the community
□  $\Delta N$ : Number of changes in labels

1: function SPLITDISCONNECTEDLP( $G, C$ )
2:    $C' \leftarrow \{\}$ 
3:   for all  $i \in V$  in parallel do
4:     Mark  $i$  as unprocessed
5:      $C'[i] = i$ 
6:   loop
7:      $\Delta N \leftarrow 0$ 
8:     for all unprocessed  $i \in V$  in parallel do
9:       if is SL-LPP or SP-LPP then
10:        Mark  $i$  as processed
11:        ▷ Find minimum community label
12:         $c'_{min} \leftarrow C'[i]$ 
13:        for all  $j \in G.out(i)$  do
14:          if  $C[j] = C[i]$  then
15:             $c'_{min} \leftarrow \min(C'[j], c'_{min})$ 
16:          if  $c'_{min} = C'[i]$  then continue
17:          ▷ Update community label
18:           $C'[i] \leftarrow c'_{min}$ ;  $\Delta N \leftarrow \Delta N + 1$ 
19:          if is SL-LPP or SP-LPP then
20:            for all  $j \in G.out(i)$  do
21:              Mark  $j$  as unprocessed if  $C[j] = C[i]$ 
22:            ▷ Converged?
23:            if  $\Delta N = 0$  then break
24:   return  $C'$ 

```

4.2 Explanation of BFS technique

Following that, we move on to describe the pseudocode of the parallel Breadth First Search (BFS) technique, as outlined in Algorithm 2, designed for the partitioning of disconnected communities. Similar to the LP/LPP techniques, this approach can be utilized as a post-processing step (SL) at the conclusion of the process. The function `splitDisconnectedBfs()` receives the input graph $G(V, E)$ and the community membership C of each vertex, and yields the updated community membership C' of each vertex where all the disconnected communities have been separated.

Initially, between lines 2 and 4, the flag vector vis , indicating visited vertices, is initialized, and the labels C' for each vertex are set to their respective vertex IDs. Subsequently, multiple thread concurrently process each vertex i in the graph G (lines 6 to 11). If the community c of vertex i is not present in the work-list $work_t$ of the current thread t , or if vertex i has already been visited, the thread proceeds to the next iteration (line 8). Conversely, if community c is in the work-list $work_t$ of the current thread t and vertex i has not been visited, a Breadth-First Search (BFS) is executed from vertex i to explore vertices within the same community. This BFS employs lambda functions f_{if} to selectively perform BFS on vertex j if it belongs to the same community, and f_{do} to update the label of visited vertices after each vertex is explored during BFS (line 11). After processing all vertices, the threads synchronize, and the updated labels C' , denoting the community membership of each vertex with no disconnected communities, are returned (line 12). It is worth noting that the work-list $work_t$ for each thread identified by t is defined as a set containing communities $[t\chi, t(\chi + 1)) \cup [T\chi + t\chi, T\chi + t(\chi + 1)) \cup \dots$, where χ represents the chunk size and T denotes the total number of threads used. In our implementation, a chunk size of $\chi = 1024$ is utilized for efficient parallel processing. This choice optimizes workload distribution among threads and enhances overall performance during community detection tasks.

Algorithm 2 Split disconnected communities using BFS [37].

```

▷  $G(V, E)$ : Input graph
▷  $C$ : Initial community membership/label of each vertex
□  $C'$ : Updated community membership/label of each vertex
□  $f_{if}$ : Perform BFS to vertex  $j$  if condition satisfied
□  $f_{do}$ : Perform operation after each vertex is visited
□  $vis$ : Visited flag for each vertex
□  $work_t$ : Work-list of current thread

1: function SPLITDISCONNECTEDBFS( $G, C$ )
2:    $C' \leftarrow \{\}$ ;  $vis \leftarrow \{\}$ 
3:   for all  $i \in V$  in parallel do
4:      $C'[i] = i$ 
5:   for all threads do
6:     for all  $i \in V$  do
7:        $c' \leftarrow C'[i]$ 
8:       if  $c \notin work_t$  or  $vis[i]$  then continue
9:        $f_{if} \leftarrow (j) \implies C[j] = C[j]$ 
10:       $f_{do} \leftarrow (j) \implies C'[j] \leftarrow c'$ 
11:       $bfsVisitForEach(vis, G, i, f_{if}, f_{do})$ 
12:   return  $C'$ 

```

Figure 2 depicts an example of the Breadth-First Search (BFS) technique. Initially, as shown in Figure 2(a), two communities, $C1$ and $C2$, are formed after running a few iterations of LPA. Here, $C1$ experiences internal disconnection due to the vertex 4 selecting $C2$ as its best community, mirroring the scenario illustrated in Figure 1(c). Subsequently, employing the BFS technique, a thread selects a random vertex within community $C1$, such as 2, and assigns the label 2 to all vertices reachable within $C1$ from vertex 2, marking them as visited (Figure 2(b)). Following this, as illustrated in Figure 2(c), the same thread randomly selects an unvisited vertex within community $C1$, for instance, 7, and assigns the label 7 to all vertices reachable within $C1$ from vertex 7, marking them as visited. A similar procedure is carried out within community $C2$. As a result, all vertices are visited, and the labels assigned to them signify the updated community membership of each vertex without disconnected communities. It's essential to note that each thread possesses a distinct work-list, ensuring that concurrent BFS operations within the same community are avoided.

4.3 Our GSL-LPA algorithm

To evaluate the effectiveness of the Split Last (SL) approach in conjunction with the minimum-label-based Label Propagation (LP), minimum-label-based Label Propagation with Pruning (LPP), and Breadth-First Search (BFS) techniques for splitting disconnected communities within the framework of LPA, we employ GVE-LPA [34], our parallel implementation of LPA.

4.3.1 Determining suitable technique for splitting disconnected communities. To evaluate the optimal technique for partitioning disconnected communities, we investigate the SL approach with LP, LPP, and BFS techniques. Figures 3(a), 3(b), and 3(c) display the mean relative runtime, modularity, and fractions of disconnected communities for SL-LP, SL-LPP, SL-BFS, and the default approaches. The SL approach yields non-disconnected communities, as depicted in Figure 3(c). Additionally, Figure 3(b) shows that the modularity of communities obtained through the SL approach exceeds that of the default approach. Figure 3(a) illustrates that SL-BFS, i.e., the SL approach with BFS technique, exhibits superior performance. Thus, employing BFS for splitting disconnected communities as a post-processing step (SL) of LPA is preferable.

4.3.2 Explanation of the algorithm. We denote GVE-LPA utilizing the Split Last (SL) approach with Breadth-First Search (SL-BFS) technique to deal with the internally-disconnected communities as *GSL-LPA*. The core procedure of *GSL-LPA*, encapsulated in the `lpa()` function, is presented in lines 1-8 of Algorithm 3. This function takes a graph $G(V, E)$ as input and produces the community membership (or label) C for each vertex in the graph, ensuring that none of the returned communities are internally disconnected.

In lines 2-3, we start by initializing the labels C for each vertex in G , and marking all vertices in the graph as unprocessed. We then iterate to propagate labels based on the weighted influence of neighboring vertices. We limit the number of iterations to `MAX_ITERATIONS` (lines 4-6). Within each iteration, we utilize the `lpaMove()` function for label propagation and track the count of nodes with updated labels ΔN (line 5). If the ratio of ΔN to the

total number of nodes N falls within the specified iteration tolerance τ , convergence is achieved, and the loop terminates (line 6). After completing all iterations, the algorithm enters the splitting phase to separate internally-disconnected communities in C . This is accomplished using the parallel BFS technique in line 7, employing the `splitCommunitiesBfs()` function (Algorithm 2). Finally, we return the updated labels C (line 8).

Algorithm 3 *GSL-LPA: Our Parallel LPA which identifies communities that are not internally disconnected.*

```

▷  $G(V, E)$ : Input graph
□  $C$ : Community membership of each vertex
□  $H_t$ : Collision-free per-thread hashtable
□  $l_i$ : Number of iterations performed
□  $\tau$ : Per iteration tolerance

1: function LPA( $G$ )
2:   Vertex membership:  $C \leftarrow [0..|V|)$ 
3:   Mark all vertices in  $G$  as unprocessed
4:   for all  $l_i \in [0..MAX\_ITERATIONS)$  do
5:      $\Delta N \leftarrow lpaMove(G, C)$ 
6:     if  $\Delta N/N \leq \tau$  then break           ▷ Converged?
7:    $C \leftarrow splitDisconnectedBfs(G, C)$    ▷ Algorithm 2
8:   return  $C$ 

9: function LPA MOVE( $G, C$ )
10:  Changed vertices:  $\Delta N \leftarrow 0$ 
11:  for all unprocessed  $i \in V$  in parallel do
12:    Mark  $i$  as processed (prune)
13:     $H_t \leftarrow scanCommunities(\{i\}, G, C, i)$ 
14:    ▷ Use  $H_t$  to choose the most weighted label
15:     $c^* \leftarrow$  Most weighted label to  $i$  in  $G$ 
16:    if  $c^* = C[i]$  then continue
17:     $C[i] \leftarrow c^*$ ;  $\Delta N \leftarrow \Delta N + 1$ 
18:    Mark neighbors of  $i$  as unprocessed
19:  return  $\Delta N$ 

20: function SCAN COMMUNITIES( $H_t, G, C, i$ )
21:  for all  $(j, w) \in G.edges(i)$  do
22:    if  $i \neq j$  then  $H_t[C[j]] \leftarrow H_t[C[j]] + w$ 
23:  return  $H_t$ 

```

In lines 9-19, the function `lpaMove()` operates by concurrently iterating over unprocessed vertices. For each unprocessed vertex i in the graph G , it marks i as processed (vertex pruning optimization, line 12), computes the total edge weight of connected labels in a per-thread hashtable H_t using the `scanCommunities()` function (line 13), and selects the most weighted label c^* (line 15). If c^* differs from the current label of i , the label of i is updated, the count of changed vertices ΔN is incremented, and the neighbors of i are marked as unprocessed for the next iteration (lines 17-18). Upon having processed all the vertices, the function returns the total number of vertices with updated labels ΔN (line 19). The `scanCommunities()` function, given in lines 20-23, iterates over the neighbors of the current vertex i , excluding itself, and computes the total edge weight linked to each label in the hashtable H_t .




Figure 2: An example demonstrating the BFS technique for splitting disconnected communities [37]. Initially, two communities, C1 and C2, are depicted, where C1 is internally disconnected because vertex 4 has joined C2. The BFS technique randomly selects vertices within each community and assigns the same label to reachable vertices (indicated with a new community ID).

5 EVALUATION

5.1 Experimental Setup

5.1.1 System used. We employ a server consisting of two Intel Xeon Gold 6226R processors, each featuring 16 cores running at 2.90 GHz. Each core includes a 1 MB L1 cache, a 16 MB L2 cache, and shares a 22 MB L3 cache. The system is equipped with 376 GB of RAM and runs CentOS Stream 8.

5.1.2 Configuration. We utilize 32-bit integers for representing vertex IDs and 32-bit floats for edge weights, while computations and hashtable values are based on 64-bit floats. We use 64 threads by default, which to correspond to the available cores on the system. Compilation is conducted using GCC 8.5 and OpenMP 4.5.

5.1.3 Dataset. The graphs employed in our experiments are detailed in Table 1, obtained from the SuiteSparse Matrix Collection [21]. These graphs encompass a range of 3.07 to 214 million vertices and 25.4 million to 3.80 billion edges. We make sure that the edges are both undirected and weighted, with a default weight set to 1.

5.2 Comparing Performance of GSL-LPA


We now compare the performance of GSL-LPA with igraph LPA [10], FLPA [43], and NetworKit LPA [41]. Both igraph LPA and FLPA are implemented sequentially, while NetworKit LPA is parallelized. For FLPA, we checkout the branch featuring the modified version of `igraph_community_label_propagation()` function, and update the label propagation example in C to use the `IGRAPH_LPA_FAST` variant, and enable loading the input graph from a file. The runtime of `igraph_community_label_propagation()` is measured using `gettimeofday()`. For igraph LPA, we adopt a similar methodology as FLPA, but utilize the code from the master branch of igraph. For NetworKit, we use a Python script to run PLP (Parallel Label Propagation) algorithm, and record the runtime with `getTiming()`. The runtime of NetworKit LPA is measured five times for each graph to obtain an average. Due to extensive duration of igraph LPA runs, we perform only a single run per graph. Additionally, we record the modularity of communities identified by each implementation.

Table 1: List of 13 graphs sourced from the SuiteSparse Matrix Collection [21] (directed graphs are marked with *). Here, $|V|$ is the number of vertices, $|E|$ is the number of edges (after adding reverse edges), D_{avg} is the average degree, and $|\Gamma|$ is the number of communities identified with GSL-LPA.


Graph	$ V $	$ E $	D_{avg}	$ \Gamma $
Web Graphs (LAW)				
indochina-2004*	7.41M	341M	41.0	160K
uk-2002*	18.5M	567M	16.1	414K
arabic-2005*	22.7M	1.21B	28.2	268K
uk-2005*	39.5M	1.73B	23.7	744K
webbase-2001*	118M	1.89B	8.6	6.70M
it-2004*	41.3M	2.19B	27.9	694K
sk-2005*	50.6M	3.80B	38.5	433K
Social Networks (SNAP)				
com-LiveJournal	4.00M	69.4M	17.4	6.91K
com-Orkut	3.07M	234M	76.2	192
Road Networks (DIMACS10)				
asia_osm	12.0M	25.4M	2.1	278K
europa_osm	50.9M	108M	2.1	1.52M
Protein k-mer Graphs (GenBank)				
kmer_A2a	171M	361M	2.1	40.1M
kmer_V1r	214M	465M	2.2	48.7M

Figure 4(a) depicts the runtimes of FLPA, igraph LPA, NetworKit LPA, and GVE-LPA for each graph in the dataset. Meanwhile, Figure 4(b) illustrates the speedup of GSL-LPA compared to each of the aforementioned implementations of LPA. igraph LPA encounters runtime issues on protein k-mer graphs (*kmer_A2a* and *kmer_V1r*), hence its results for these graphs are omitted.


GSL-LPA demonstrates average speedups of 55 \times , 10, 300 \times , and 5.8 \times over FLPA, igraph LPA, and NetworKit LPA respectively. Specifically, on the *sk-2005* graph, GSL-LPA identifies communities within 4.5 seconds, achieving a processing rate of 844 million edges/s.



(a) Relative runtime using *Split Last (SL)* approach, based on three different techniques, for splitting disconnected communities with Parallel LPA



(b) Modularity of communities obtained using *Split Last (SL)* approach for splitting disconnected communities with Parallel LPA



(c) Fraction of disconnected communities (logarithmic scale) using *Split Last (SL)* approach for splitting disconnected communities with Parallel LPA

Figure 3: Mean relative runtime, modularity, and fraction of disconnected communities (log-scale) using the *Split Last (SL)* approach for addressing disconnected communities with Parallel LPA [35] across all graphs in the dataset. The *SL* approach utilizes minimum label-based *Label Propagation (LP)*, *Label Propagation with Pruning (LPP)*, or *Breadth First Search (BFS)* techniques for splitting disconnected communities.

Furthermore, Figure 4(c) presents the modularity of communities obtained by each implementation. On average, GSL-LPA achieves modularity that is 7.1% and 0.7% higher than FLPA (particularly on road networks and protein k-mer graphs) and igraph LPA respectively. Additionally, it records a 3.6% lower modularity compared to NetworKit LPA (especially on protein k-mer graphs).

5.3 Performance Analysis of GSL-LPA

Next, we proceed with an analysis of GSL-LPA’s performance. The phase-wise breakdown of GSL-Leiden is depicted in Figure 5. This illustration shows that GSL-LPA allocates a significant portion of its runtime to the splitting phase, particularly noticeable on social networks, whereas it predominantly emphasizes the label propagation phase on web graphs. On average, GSL-LPA dedicates 47% of its runtime to the label propagation phase and 53% to the splitting phase. We plan to address the optimization of the splitting phase, i.e., Algorithm 2, in future work.

5.4 Strong Scaling of GSL-LPA


Finally, we evaluate the strong scaling performance of GSL-LPA. This involves varying the number of threads from 1 to 64 in powers of 2, for each input graph, and measuring the time taken for GSL-LPA to identify communities. Figure 6 illustrates the average strong scaling of GSL-LPA, including the scaling of its individual phases: the label propagation phase and the splitting phase. At 32 threads, GSL-LPA achieves a speedup of 10.7 \times compared to single-threaded execution, indicating a performance increase of 1.6 \times for each doubling of threads. The scalability is constrained by the splitting phase, which only provides a speedup of 6.2 \times with 32 threads, while the label propagation phase offers a speedup of 14.5 \times with the same number of threads. At 64 threads, GSL-LPA is affected by NUMA effects and offers a speedup of 11.5 \times .

6 CONCLUSION


In this report, we explored the issue of internally-disconnected communities arising from the Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA). Our experimental findings showed that FLPA [43], igraph LPA [10], and NetworKit LPA [41] identified communities with this issue in up to 3.1%, 0.3%, and 14.5% of cases respectively. To address this, we introduced GSL-LPA, derived from our parallelization of LPA (GVE-LPA) [35], which mitigates this problem by splitting disconnected communities as a post-processing step, akin to previous approaches. Our experiments conducted on a system equipped with two 16-core Intel Xeon Gold 6226R processors demonstrated that GSL-LPA not only resolves this issue but also outperforms FLPA, igraph LPA, and NetworKit LPA by 55 \times , 10, 300 \times , and 5.8 \times respectively. Moreover, GSL-LPA achieves a processing rate of 844M edges/s on a 3.8B edge graph. Additionally, GSL-LPA exhibits performance improvement at a rate of 1.6 \times for every doubling of threads.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS


I would like to thank Prof. Kishore Kothapalli and Prof. Dip Sankar Banerjee for their support.




(a) Runtime in seconds (logarithmic scale) with FLPA, igraph LPA, NetworkKit LPA, and GSL-LPA



(b) Speedup (logarithmic scale) of GSL-LPA with respect to FLPA, igraph LPA, NetworkKit LPA.



(c) Modularity of communities obtained with FLPA, igraph LPA, NetworkKit LPA, and GSL-LPA.



(d) Fraction of disconnected communities (logarithmic scale) with FLPA, igraph LPA, NetworkKit LPA, and GSL-LPA.

Figure 4: Runtime in seconds (log-scale), speedup (log-scale), modularity, and fraction of disconnected communities (log-scale) compared across FLPA, igraph LPA, NetworkKit LPA, and GSL-LPA for each graph in the dataset. igraph LPA fails to execute on kmer_A2a and kmer_V1r graphs, and thus its results are excluded.




Figure 5: Phase split of *GSL-LPA* for each graph in the dataset.




Figure 6: Overall speedup of *GSL-LPA*, including its label propagation and splitting phases, with increasing number of threads (in powers of 2).

REFERENCES

- [1] Emmanuel Abbe. 2018. Community detection and stochastic block models: recent developments. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18, 177 (2018), 1–86.
- [2] B. Ball, B. Karrer, and M. EJ. Newman. 2011. Efficient and principled method for detecting communities in networks. *Physical Review E* 84, 3 (2011), 036103.
- [3] K. Berahmand and A. Bouyer. 2018. LP-LPA: A link influence-based label propagation algorithm for discovering community structures in networks. *International Journal of Modern Physics B* 32, 06 (10 mar 2018), 1850062.
- [4] V. Blondel, J. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre. 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2008, 10 (Oct 2008), P10008.
- [5] U. Brandes, D. Delling, M. Gaertler, R. Gorke, M. Hoefer, Z. Nikoloski, and D. Wagner. 2007. On modularity clustering. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering* 20, 2 (2007), 172–188.
- [6] B. Chatterjee and H. Saha. 2019. Detection of communities in large scale networks. In *IEEE 10th Annual Information Technology, Electronics and Mobile Communication Conference (IEMCON)*. IEEE, 1051–1060.
- [7] Aaron Clauset, Mark EJ Newman, and Cristopher Moore. 2004. Finding community structure in very large networks. *Physical review E* 70, 6 (2004), 066111.
- [8] Gennaro Cordasco and Luisa Gargano. 2012. Label propagation algorithm: a semi-synchronous approach. *International Journal of Social Network Mining* 1, 1 (2012), 3–26.
- [9] Michele Coscia, Fosca Giannotti, and Dino Pedreschi. 2011. A classification for community discovery methods in complex networks. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal* 4, 5 (2011), 512–546.
- [10] G. Csardi, T. Nepusz, et al. 2006. The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal, complex systems* 1695, 5 (2006), 1–9.
- [11] Jordi Duch and Alex Arenas. 2005. Community detection in complex networks using extremal optimization. *Physical review E* 72, 2 (2005), 027104.

- [12] S. Fortunato. 2010. Community detection in graphs. *Physics reports* 486, 3-5 (2010), 75–174.
- [13] Sara E Garza and Satu Elisa Schaeffer. 2019. Community detection with the label propagation algorithm: a survey. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 534 (2019), 122058.
- [14] Diksha Goel, Hong Shen, Hui Tian, and Mingyu Guo. 2023. Effective Graph-Neural-Network based Models for Discovering Structural Hole Spanners in Large-Scale and Diverse Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12442* (2023).
- [15] S. Gregory. 2010. Finding overlapping communities in networks by label propagation. *New Journal of Physics* 12 (10 2010), 103018. Issue 10.
- [16] Qiong Gui, Rui Deng, Pengfei Xue, and Xiaohui Cheng. 2018. A community discovery algorithm based on boundary nodes and label propagation. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 109 (2018), 103–109.
- [17] Ahmed Ibrahim Hafez, Aboul Ella Hassanien, and Aly A Fahmy. 2014. BNEM: a fast community detection algorithm using generative models. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 4 (2014), 1–20.
- [18] Sajjad Hesamipour, Mohammad Ali Balafar, Saeed Mousazadeh, et al. 2022. Detecting communities in complex networks using an adaptive genetic algorithm and node similarity-based encoding. *Complexity* 2023 (2022).
- [19] A. Karataş and S. Şahin. 2018. *Application Areas of Community Detection: A Review*. 65–70 pages.
- [20] K. Kloster and D. Gleich. 2014. Heat kernel based community detection. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. ACM, New York, USA, 1386–1395.
- [21] S. Kolodziej, M. Aznaveh, M. Bullock, J. David, T. Davis, M. Henderson, Y. Hu, and R. Sandstrom. 2019. The SuiteSparse matrix collection website interface. *The Journal of Open Source Software* 4, 35 (Mar 2019), 1244.
- [22] Sanjay Kumar, Lakshay Singhla, Kshitij Jindal, Khyati Grover, and BS Panda. 2021. IM-ELPR: Influence maximization in social networks using label propagation based community structure. *Applied Intelligence* (2021), 1–19.
- [23] Konstantin Kuzmin, Mingming Chen, and Boleslaw K Szymanski. 2015. Parallelizing SLPA for scalable overlapping community detection. *Scientific Programming* 2015 (2015), 4–4.
- [24] J. Leskovec. 2021. CS224W: Machine Learning with Graphs | 2021 | Lecture 13.3 - Louvain Algorithm. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0zuiLBOicsw>
- [25] Ian XY Leung, Pan Hui, Pietro Lio, and Jon Crowcroft. 2009. Towards real-time community detection in large networks. *Physical Review E* 79, 6 (2009), 066107.
- [26] X. Liu, M. Halappanavar, K. Barker, A. Lumsdaine, and A. Gebremedhin. 2020. Direction-optimizing label propagation and its application to community detection. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 192–201.
- [27] Malte Luecken. 2016. *Application of multi-resolution partitioning of interaction networks to the study of complex disease*. Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Oxford.
- [28] M. Newman. 2006. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Physical review E* 74, 3 (2006), 036104.
- [29] Mark EJ Newman. 2006. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 103, 23 (2006), 8577–8582.
- [30] U. Raghavan, R. Albert, and S. Kumara. 2007. Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks. *Physical Review E* 76, 3 (Sep 2007), 036106–1–036106–11.
- [31] Jörg Reichardt and Stefan Bornholdt. 2006. Statistical mechanics of community detection. *Physical review E* 74, 1 (2006), 016110.
- [32] M. Rosvall and C. Bergstrom. 2008. Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 105, 4 (2008), 1118–1123.
- [33] Subhajit Sahu. 2023. GVE-Leiden: Fast Leiden Algorithm for Community Detection in Shared Memory Setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13936* (2023).
- [34] S. Sahu. 2023. GVE-Louvain: Fast Louvain Algorithm for Community Detection in Shared Memory Setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04876* (2023).
- [35] Subhajit Sahu. 2023. GVE-LPA: Fast Label Propagation Algorithm (LPA) for Community Detection in Shared Memory Setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08140* (2023).
- [36] S. Sahu. 2023. Selecting a suitable Parallel Label-propagation based algorithm for Disjoint Community Detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09125* (2023).
- [37] Subhajit Sahu. 2024. An Approach for Addressing Internally-Disconnected Communities in Louvain Algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11454* (2024).
- [38] M. Sattari and K. Zamanifar. 2018. A spreading activation-based label propagation algorithm for overlapping community detection in dynamic social networks. *Data & knowledge engineering* 113 (Jan 2018), 155–170.
- [39] Jyothish Soman and Ankur Narang. 2011. Fast community detection algorithm with gpu and multicore architectures. In *2011 IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium*. IEEE, 568–579.
- [40] S. Souravlas, A. Sifaleras, M. Tsintogianni, and S. Katsavounis. 2021. A classification of community detection methods in social networks: a survey. *International journal of general systems* 50, 1 (Jan 2021), 63–91.
- [41] C.L. Staudt, A. Sazonovs, and H. Meyerhenke. 2016. NetworKit: A tool suite for large-scale complex network analysis. *Network Science* 4, 4 (2016), 508–530.

- [42] Christian L. Staudt and Henning Meyerhenke. 2015. Engineering parallel algorithms for community detection in massive networks. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 27, 1 (2015), 171–184.
- [43] V.A. Traag and L. Šubelj. 2023. Large network community detection by fast label propagation. *Scientific Reports* 13, 1 (2023), 2701.
- [44] V. Traag, L. Waltman, and N. Eck. 2019. From Louvain to Leiden: guaranteeing well-connected communities. *Scientific Reports* 9, 1 (Mar 2019), 5233.
- [45] J. Whang, D. Gleich, and I. Dhillon. 2013. Overlapping community detection using seed set expansion. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 2099–2108.
- [46] F Alexander Wolf, Fiona K Hamey, Mireya Plass, Jordi Solana, Joakim S Dahlin, Berthold Göttgens, Nikolaus Rajewsky, Lukas Simon, and Fabian J Theis. 2019. PAGA: graph abstraction reconciles clustering with trajectory inference through a topology preserving map of single cells. *Genome biology* 20 (2019), 1–9.
- [47] J. Xie, M. Chen, and B. Szymanski. 2013. LabelrankT: Incremental community detection in dynamic networks via label propagation. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Dynamic Networks Management and Mining*. ACM, New York, USA, 25–32.
- [48] J. Xie, B. Szymanski, and X. Liu. 2011. SLPA: Uncovering overlapping communities in social networks via a speaker-listener interaction dynamic process. In *IEEE 11th International Conference on Data Mining Workshops*. IEEE, IEEE, Vancouver, Canada, 344–349.
- [49] Jierui Xie and Boleslaw K Szymanski. 2011. Community detection using a neighborhood strength driven label propagation algorithm. In *2011 IEEE Network Science Workshop*. IEEE, 188–195.
- [50] Y. Xing, F. Meng, Y. Zhou, M. Zhu, M. Shi, and G. Sun. 2014. A node influence based label propagation algorithm for community detection in networks. *The Scientific World Journal* 2014 (2014), 1–14.
- [51] X. You, Y. Ma, and Z. Liu. 2020. A three-stage algorithm on community detection in social networks. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 187 (2020), 104822.
- [52] N. Zarayeneh and A. Kalyanaraman. 2021. Delta-Screening: A Fast and Efficient Technique to Update Communities in Dynamic Graphs. *IEEE transactions on network science and engineering* 8, 2 (Apr 2021), 1614–1629.

A APPENDIX

A.1 Finding disconnected communities

We present a parallel algorithm aimed at identifying disconnected communities using the original graph and vertex community memberships as input. The fundamental principle involves evaluating each community’s size, selecting a representative vertex, traversing within the community while avoiding neighboring communities, and flagging a community as disconnected if all its vertices are unreachable. We explore four distinct approaches, characterized by their utilization of parallel Depth-First Search (DFS) or Breadth-First Search (BFS), and whether per-thread or shared *visited* flags are employed. In the case of shared visited flags, each thread scans all vertices but exclusively processes its assigned community based on the community ID. Our results demonstrate that employing parallel BFS traversal with a shared flag vector yields the most efficient outcomes. Due to the deterministic nature of this algorithm, all approaches produce identical results. Algorithm 4 presents the pseudocode for this approach, where the `disconnectedCommunities()` function takes the input graph G and community membership C , returning the disconnected flag D for each community.

Algorithm 4 Finding disconnected communities in parallel [33].

- ▷ $G(V, E)$: Input graph
- ▷ C : Community membership of each vertex
- D : Disconnected flag for each community
- S : Size of each community
- f_{if} : Perform BFS to vertex j if condition satisfied
- f_{do} : Perform operation after each vertex is visited
- $reached$: Number of vertices reachable from i to i ’s community
- vis : Visited flag for each vertex
- $work_t$: Work-list of current thread

```

1: function DISCONNECTEDCOMMUNITIES( $G, C$ )
2:    $D \leftarrow \{\}$ ;  $vis \leftarrow \{\}$ 
3:    $S \leftarrow communitySizes(G, C)$ 
4:   for all threads in parallel do
5:     for all  $i \in V$  do
6:        $c \leftarrow C[i]$ ;  $reached \leftarrow 0$ 
7:       ▷ Skip if community  $c$  is empty, or
8:       ▷ does not belong to work-list of current thread.
9:       if  $S[c] = 0$  or  $c \notin work_t$  then continue
10:       $f_{if} \leftarrow (j) \implies C[j] = c$ 
11:       $f_{do} \leftarrow (j) \implies reached \leftarrow reached + 1$ 
12:       $bfsVisitForEach(vis, G, i, f_{if}, f_{do})$ 
13:      if  $reached < S[c]$  then  $D[c] \leftarrow 1$ 
14:       $S[c] \leftarrow 0$ 
15:   return  $D$ 

```

Let us now explain Algorithm 4. Initially, in line 2, we set up the disconnected community flag D and the visited vertices flags vis . Line 3 calculates the size of each community S concurrently using the `communitySizes()` function. Subsequently, each thread processes every vertex i in the graph G concurrently (lines 5-14). In line 6, we ascertain the community membership of i (c) and initialize the count of reached vertices from i to 0. If community c


is either empty or not in the work-list of the current thread $work_t$, the thread proceeds to the next iteration (line 9). However, if community c is non-empty and in the work-list of the current thread $work_t$, we execute BFS from vertex i to explore vertices within the same community. This involves utilizing lambda functions f_{if} to conditionally execute BFS to vertex j if it belongs to the same community and f_{do} to update the count of reached vertices after each vertex is visited during BFS (line 12). If the number of vertices *reached* during BFS is less than the community size $S[c]$, we flag community c as disconnected (line 13). Finally, we update the size of the community $S[c]$ to 0, indicating that the community has been processed (line 14). It’s worth noting that the work-list $work_t$ for each thread with ID t is defined as a set containing communities $[t\chi, t(\chi + 1)) \cup [T\chi + t\chi, T\chi + t(\chi + 1)) \cup \dots$, where χ is the chunk size and T is the number of threads. In our implementation, we use a chunk size of $\chi = 1024$.

A.2 Additional Performance comparison


Next, we proceed with the comparison of performance between GSL-LPA and GVE-LPA [35]. Following a similar methodology as earlier, we run both implementations five times for every graph in the dataset to reduce measurement noise, and present the averages in Figures 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), and 7(d).

Figure 7(a) illustrates the runtimes of GVE-LPA and GSL-LPA on each graph in the dataset. On average, GSL-LPA demonstrates a runtime approximately 125% longer than GVE-LPA. This additional computational time represents a trade-off made to ensure the absence of internally disconnected communities. To minimize the runtime for GSL-LPA, it is necessary to optimize Algorithm 2. We plan to address this in the future.


Figure 7(c) showcases the modularity of communities obtained by each implementation. On average, GSL-LPA achieves a 0.4% higher modularity compared to GVE-LPA. Finally, Figure 7(d) presents the fraction of internally disconnected communities identified by each implementation. Communities obtained with GSL-LPA exhibit no disconnected communities, while those identified with GVE-LPA feature an average of 6.6% disconnected communities.




(a) Runtime in seconds (logarithmic scale) with *GVE-LPA* and *GSL-LPA*



(b) Speedup of *GVE-LPA* with respect to *GSL-LPA*.



(c) Modularity of communities obtained with *GVE-LPA* and *GSL-LPA*.



(d) Fraction of disconnected communities (logarithmic scale) with *GVE-LPA* and *GSL-LPA*.

Figure 7: Runtime in seconds (log-scale), speedup, modularity, and fraction of disconnected communities (log-scale) with *GVE-LPA* [35] and *GSL-LPA* for each graph in the dataset.