Multi-Scale Node Embeddings for Graph Modeling and Generation

Riccardo Milocco,^{1, 2, *} Fabian Jansen,² and Diego Garlaschelli^{1, 3}

¹IMT School for Advanced Studies, Piazza San Francesco 19, 55100 Lucca (Italy)

²ING Bank N.V., Bijlmerdreef 106, 1102 CT Amsterdam (The Netherlands)

³Lorentz Institute for Theoretical Physics, Leiden University,

Niels Bohrweg 2, 2333 CA Leiden (The Netherlands)

(Dated: December 6, 2024)

Lying at the interface between Network Science and Machine Learning, node embedding algorithms take a graph as input and encode its structure onto output vectors that represent nodes in an abstract geometric space, enabling various vector-based downstream tasks such as network modelling, visualization, data compression, node classification, link prediction, and community detection. Two apparently unrelated limitations affect these algorithms. On one hand, it is not clear what the basic operation defining vector spaces, i.e. the vector sum, corresponds to in terms of the original nodes in the network. On the other hand, while the same input network can be represented at multiple levels of resolution by coarse-graining the constituent nodes into arbitrary block-nodes, the relationship between node embeddings obtained at different hierarchical levels is not understood. Here, building on recent results in network renormalization theory, we address these two limitations at once and define a multiscale node embedding method that, upon arbitrary coarse-grainings, ensures statistical consistency of the embedding vector of a block-node with the sum of the embedding vectors of its constituent nodes. We illustrate the power of this approach on two economic networks that can be naturally represented at multiple resolution levels: namely, the network of international trade between (sets of) countries and the network of input-output flows among (sets of) industries in the Netherlands. We confirm the statistical consistency between networks retrieved from coarse-grained node vectors and networks retrieved from sums of fine-grained node vectors, a result that cannot be achieved by alternative methods. Several key network properties, including a large number of triangles, are successfully replicated already from embeddings of very low dimensionality, allowing for the generation of faithful replicas of the original networks at arbitrary resolution levels.

I. INTRODUCTION

Complex networks capture a variety of socially relevant processes, from economic activities to interactions among brain regions [1-3]. Indeed, every dyadic interaction can be described by properly defining which are the actors (nodes) and the type of connections among them (edges). By defining the nodes as the sectors and the edges as the transactions among them, the Input-Output network (ION) [4] is recovered. Again, by defining the nodes as the states and the edges as the trade among them, the World Trade Web (WTW) [5] is obtained. On the other hand, if nodes were seen as the brain regions connected by electrical stimuli, the brain network is represented. In particular, this flexibility allows for arbitrary definitions of the nodes even when looking at the same phenomenon that is generating the data (generative process). For example, one could have access to the network involving the most detailed sector classification (National Industry), whereas another one only at the community level (Industry) - see the upper part of Figure 1. The same reasoning applies naturally in other contexts (neuroscience, social sciences, \cdots), as community structures help in simplifying the heterogeneity of the graph [6, 7]. Therefore, seen at a coarser resolution, the graph represents the interactions among block-nodes, and it would

be uniquely recovered after the specification of the partitions. This scheme could be iterated at wish to produce a multi-scale unfolding of the original graph with nested partitions: pictorially, the base of a pyramid is the observed network, whereas the coarser levels are the cross-sections of the pyramid. Lastly, it is worth noticing that the properties of each lower-resolution graph change with levels. For instance, the firm graph is less dense than the sector one since there will be fewer nodes to redistribute links to.

Here, assuming to know the nodes, we aim at modeling their interactions by assigning a probability for every pair of nodes (or edge or link) [8]: the higher the probability, the more likely is that edge to exist in a sampled graph. Ultimately, the measurements over the observed graph should coincide with the average over the sampled networks. This exercise is called, in general, network modeling but also network reconstruction [9] or (binary) edge classification [10] in the machine-learning literature.

To tackle this problem, many machine-learning models use node embeddings [2, 11, 12]. As highlighted by the arrows in Figure 1, one may assign a set of coordinates for every node and, then, extract the probability for the network's edges. The optimal node embeddings are the vector of parameters that optimize a functional involving the observed graph and the model, for e.g. the likelihood. Therefore, these vectors are interpreted as informative features about the nodes that can be deployed to different tasks, such as community detection or node classification [13].

^{*} Corresponding author:riccardo.milocco@imtlucca.it

Two hallmarks of real-world graphs are 1) low density (sparsity) and 2) high triangle density, where there are many triangles incident to low-degree vertices [14]. It was recently proven that linear node embedding methods, such as node2vec [11], are not capable of reproducing the triangle density [14]. To overcome this drawback, LogisticPCA [15] optimized the vectors for a non-linear logistic function. Furthermore, Chanpuriya et colleagues proposed the "symmetric" LogisticPCA (LPCA) [16] to deal with undirected networks (see section III A).

As mentioned, a phenomenon can be studied at different scales. By combining nodes into communities we go from a microscopic to a coarse grained scale. Nevertheless, most of the models, e.g. LPCA, regard a network only at one scale, providing the optimal *embeddings* for that level. If nodes were merged into communities, the block-vectors have to be recomputed. In other words, the two sets of vectors are completely unrelated, as if the models see the two networks as realizations of two distinct processes - even though it is not the case. there is no prescription to use the node embeddings from a lower level to create an embedding for a community. For this reason, we would refer to this class of models as "single-scale" models (SSM).

To tackle the renormalization problem on networks, several methods have been proposed in the literature, but they all rely on strong assumptions that limit their use cases [17]. More concretely, the most promising one [3] assumes that the nodes are embedded in a hyperbolic plane, all the coarser networks are scale-free and the block-nodes contain r=2 micro-nodes. The latter restriction doesn't allow to aggregate the nodes with the "most natural" way induced by the studied phenomenon, e.g. geographical distances for the WTW or the sector (industry) for the ION. To overcome this limitation, the multi-scale model [17] was proposed, which is generalizable at higher levels and allows for any arbitrary partition of the microscopic nodes. Indeed, the block parameters are uniquely obtained by summing the vectors of the nodes belonging to a community (renormalization rule) - this mimics the *unique* identification of the coarser network starting from the microscopic one.

In this work, we enhance the scalar multi-scale model with node embeddings (MSM). The renormalization rule for vectors is shown in Figure 1: each community embedding is the summation of its lower-level ones. Therefore, the MSM provides an interpretation of the sum of node embeddings, which is rarely addressed in the literature¹ [19]. Due to the renormalization rule, the MSM has the additional benefit of having to be fitted only at the ground level, further implying a lower computational complexity with respect to a single-scale model to be tai-




FIG. 1. Visualization of the research question: how node embeddings relate across scales? Here, it is shown the embedding extraction scheme for two levels: on the left the microscopic level that uniquely generates the coarser one on the right after aggregation. However, for SSM, the vectors fitted at the microscopic level can't be used to obtain the ones computed at level 1 (red question marks), whereas its the case for our MSM. The latter succes is possible thanks to the vector sum which is highlighted by using the parallelogram law on the right, e.g. pale red vectors are aligned in order to get the solid red vector at an higher scale.

lored at every level.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section III, we introduce the LogisticPCA and the Multi-Scale Model (MSM) alongside its renormalization rule. In section IV A, we describe the ING Input-Output Network and the World Trade Web datasets. Furthermore, we present the coarse-graining procedure to obtain the higher-scale network. In section VI, we show the multi-scale results of the two models and discuss the implications of the theoretical results over either network- and machine-learning scores. Finally, in the Appendices, we store all the technical details supporting the results in the main text.

II. GRAPH RENORMALIZATION

In this section, we will introduce the mathematical description of a graph and its coarse-graining procedure. We use the subscript $\ell=0$ to identify the base graph whereas $\ell>0$ for its aggregated versions. In addition, we refer to a generic quantity at level ℓ as ℓ -quantity, e.g. the 2-vectors and 2-nodes are, respectively, the node embeddings and block-nodes at level 2.

Consider a binary undirected graph with N_0 "microscopic" nodes \mathcal{V}_0 (labelled as $i_0 \in [1, N_0]$) and their connections (called edges or links), i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}_0 := \left\{ (i_0, j_0) : i_0 \in \mathcal{V}_0, j_0 \in [i_0, N_0], a_{i_0 j_0}^{(0)} = 1 \right\}$$

where $a_{i_0j_0}^{(0)}=1$ if there was an edge among i_0,j_0 and $a_{i_0j_0}^{(0)}=1$ otherwise. This system could be represented by an $N_0\times N_0$ adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$ which has to be symmetric, i.e. $a_{i_0j_0}^{(0)}=a_{j_0i_0}^{(0)}$, since the graph is *undirected*. We don't account for multiple edges, whereas we

¹ The successes of Natural Language Processing are also due to the effective representation of a phrase obtained by summing the embedding for each word of it [18]. This is hardly replicated in a graph setting as it is intrinsically more complex than a language.

do for self-loops in the diagonal of $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$, i.e. $a_{i_0i_0}^{(0)}=0,1$. Unless explicitely specified, we would use the notation $\xi_{ij} := \xi_{i_\ell j_\ell}^{(\ell)}$ with ξ as a chosen quantity when the results are valid for any level $\ell \geq 0$, e.g. if $\xi := \mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}$ then $a_{ij} :=$ $a_{i_\ell j_\ell}^{(\ell)}$

Coarse-Graining

In order find the coarse-grained version of the graph, we define non-overlapping arbitrary partitions Ω_0 of the microscopic nodes into block-nodes

$$\mathcal{V}_1 := \{i_1 := \Omega_0(i_0) \quad \forall i_0 \in \mathcal{V}_0\}.$$

Secondly, we assume that two communities are connected if there was at least one edge between their internal nodes, i.e.

$$a_{i_1j_1}^{(1)} = 1 - \prod_{i_0 \in \Omega_0^{-1}(i_1), j_0 \in \Omega_0^{-1}(j_1)} (1 - a_{i_0j_0}^{(0)})$$
 (1)

where the operation used is the *logical OR* over the edges connecting two communities. That is, only the zeros are preserved whereas the possible multiple-edges among the lumped nodes are projected to one. Moreover, note that Ω_0 is only surjective but not injective, since multiple nodes i_0 are merged into i_1 , and that we allow for selfloops as we didn't require $i_1 \neq j_1$. At a higher level, the self-loop proxies there is at least one connection inside the community either because links among nodes or selfloops edges. In this way, we built the $N_1 \times N_1$ adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(1)}$ which is binary and symmetric as $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$. To ease the recalling, we will refer to $A^{(0)}$ as θ -graph, $A^{(1)}$ as 1-graph, the N_0 microscopic nodes as 0 - nodes and the block-nodes as 1 - nodes.

The lumping procedure could be iterated $\ell + 1 (\geq 1)$ times by specifying the partition Ω_{ℓ} of $\ell - nodes$ into $N_{\ell+1}$ block-nodes

$$\mathcal{V}_{\ell+1} := \left\{ i_{\ell+1} := \Omega_{\ell}(i_{\ell}) \, \forall i_{\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_{\ell} \right\}.$$

However, since the partitions $\{\Omega_{\ell}\}_{\ell>0}$ are not overlapping, one can define their composition $\Omega_{0\to\ell}$ as

$$\Omega_{0\to\ell} := \Omega_{\ell} \circ \cdots \circ \Omega_{0}. \tag{2}$$

This provides a direct mapping of 0 - nodes into blocknodes $i_{\ell+1} = \Omega_{0\to\ell}(i_0)$. Therefore, the $(\ell+1)-graph$, $\mathbf{A}^{(\ell+1)}$ is recovered both applying iteratively the Equation 1 or directly via Equation 2

$$a_{i_{\ell+1}j_{\ell+1}}^{(\ell+1)} = 1 - \prod_{\substack{i_{\ell} \in \Omega_{\ell}^{-1}(i_{\ell+1}), j_{\ell} \in \Omega_{\ell}^{-1}(j_{\ell+1})}} (1 - a_{i_{\ell}j_{\ell}}^{(\ell)})$$

$$= 1 - \prod_{\substack{i_{0} \in \Omega_{\ell}^{-1}(i_{\ell+1}), j_{\ell} \in \Omega_{\ell}^{-1}(j_{\ell+1})}} (1 - a_{i_{0}j_{0}}^{(0)})$$
 (4)

$$=1-\prod_{\substack{i_0\in\Omega^{-1}_{\ell\to 0}(i_{\ell+1}),j_{\ell}\in\Omega^{-1}_{\ell\to 0}(j_{\ell+1})}} (1-a_{i_0j_0}^{(0)}) \quad (4)$$

where $\Omega_{\ell\to 0}^{-1}:=\Omega_0^{-1}\circ\cdots\circ\Omega_\ell^{-1}$ is the inverse of Equation 2.

The nested $\{\Omega_{\ell}\}_{\ell>0}$ can be uniquely parametrized in terms of a dendrogram as shown in [17]. By following an "horizontal" cut of the dendrogram, one obtains the community partitions at the same scale, e.g. for the WTW by merging states nearer than a fixed geographical distance. In contrast, by cutting the dendrogram at different heights, one recovers the "multiscale" clusters, e.g. a state interacting with a continent.

In many cases, the problem setting suggests a partitioning of the nodes into communities without an explicit distance matrix, e.g. the classification of the Industries based on the NAICS-codes digits. They characterize each Industry by a number at 6 digits, e.g. Full-Service Restaurants (722511), but also their clusters by progressively removing the last number up to 2 digits, e.g. Accommodation and Food Services (72). More concretely, the industries sharing the first $n \in [2,5]$ digits are merged into a block-node at the $\ell := 6 - n \in [1, 4]$ level (cfr. Hamming Distance). The dendrogram can be built by setting the height where the blocks split into sub-cluster as ℓ .

Lastly, if the problem doesn't come with any "natural" partition, it would be possible to merge the θ -nodes randomly by creating a dendrogram from a random distance matrix.

III. MODELS

In the previous sections, we highlighted that one phenomenon could be studied at different resolutions. In particular, since every adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}$ is binary and undirected, every edge (i_{ℓ}, j_{ℓ}) could be seen as a Bernoulli random variable. Since the theory is valid for every scale, we will remove the dependence on the level ℓ on each quantity, e.g. $a_{ij} := a_{i\ell j\ell}^{(\ell)}$ (see section II). Hence, for every resolution the adjacency entries are

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & p_{ij} \\ 0 & 1 - p_{ij} \end{cases} \quad \forall i \le j. \tag{5}$$

To model this hierarchical structure, we will use the LogisticPCA [16] and the new MSM. We selected LPCA as the representative for the SSM whereas, at the best of our knowledge, only the MSM accounts for a renormalization rule over arbitrary partitions of the nodes.

Logistic PCA

LPCA² [16] is a probabilistic model which aims to classify each edge as existing (class 1) or non-existing (class

² The authors have historically called LPCA the directed LPCA, but there was no straightforward acronym for its undirected counterpart [16]. Since in this work, we will use only the symmetric one, we will call it LPCA for easiness.

0). This is a common "spam / non-spam" problem [13], but applied to objects (the links) that are not carrying explicit features - that is why node embeddings come into play.

The connection probability reads

$$p_{ij} := \sigma(\vec{b}_i, \vec{b}_j, \vec{c}_i, \vec{c}_j) \tag{6}$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\left(\langle \vec{b}_i, \vec{b}_j \rangle - \langle \vec{c}_i, \vec{c}_j \rangle\right)}} \tag{7}$$

where the node embeddings

$$\vec{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{D_B \ge 1}, \vec{c}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{D_C \ge 1}$$

were introduced by the Chanpuriya et colleagues to grasp the "homophily" and "heterophily" natures of a node respectively (see Supp.Mat. I). By defining the

non-negative matrices as
$$\mathbf{B}:=\begin{bmatrix} -\vec{b}_1^T-\\ \vdots\\ -\vec{b}_{N_0}^T- \end{bmatrix}$$
 and simi-

larly for \mathbf{C} , the scalar product among them becomes $\mathbf{X} := \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}^T$ implying $x_{ij} := \langle \vec{b}_i, \vec{b}_j \rangle - \langle \vec{c}_i, \vec{c}_j \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, the node embeddings are obtained by maximizing the likelihood [20]

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{A}) := \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}|\mathbf{A}) = \tag{8}$$

$$= \sum_{i \le j} \min(x_{ij}, 0) - \ln(1 + e^{-|x_{ij}|}) - (1 - a_{ij})x_{ij} \quad (9)$$

subject to $\vec{b}_{ik} \geq 0, \vec{c}_{ik} \geq 0.$

B. Multi-Scale Model

The natural way of modelling $\{\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}: \ell \geq 0\}$ is deploying renormalization models that have to be self-consistent across scales and allowing for arbitrary partitions $\{\Omega_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 0}$. The multi-scale model [17] is the only one that takes into account all these properties (cfr. [3] for homogeneous partitions). In addition, by equipping the (global) multi-scale model with node embedding $\{\vec{x}_i\}_{i \in [1,N]}$, the connection probability for the new multi-scale model (MSM) reads

$$p_{ij} := p(\vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j, w_i) = \begin{cases} 1 - e^{-\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle} & i \neq j \\ 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2} \|\vec{x}_i\|^2 - w_i} & i = j \end{cases}$$
(10)

subject to $\vec{x}_{ik} \geq 0$, $w_i \geq -\frac{1}{2} ||\vec{x}_i||^2$ since the probability has to be bounded $(p_{ij} \in [0,1])$. In principle, one should impose $\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle \geq 0$, but this is equivalent to restricting every component to be non-negative, i.e. $\vec{x}_{ik} \geq 0$ (see Supp.Mat. IIF). The norm $||\vec{x}_i|| := \langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_i \rangle$ is the one induced by the scalar product. In general, \vec{x}_i could be interpret as the propensity of i to create a link with another node j. Theoretically, this role in encoded by its

modulus (significance) and its relative angle (similarity) with the other embeddings. On the other hand, w_i rules the self-loop of node i. A more detailed interpretantion of the node embeddings is lacking in the literature, but it is out of the scope for this work.

As for LPCA, $\{\vec{x}_i\}_{[0,N-1]}$ are obtained by maximizing the likelihood

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{A}\right) := \sum_{i \leq j} a_{ij} \ln\left(p_{ij}\right) + (1 - a_{ij}) \ln\left(1 - p_{ij}\right) \quad (11)$$

$$= \sum_{i \leq j} a_{ij} \ln\left(1 - e^{-\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle}\right) - (1 - a_{ij}) \left\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \right\rangle \quad (12)$$

where
$$\mathbf{X}:=\begin{bmatrix} -\vec{x}_1^T-\\ \vdots\\ -\vec{x}_N^T- \end{bmatrix}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times D}$$
 is the vertical stacking

of the embedding vectors, i.e. $\mathbf{X}_{i*} = \vec{x}_i$. We optimized only the vectors of the *structural inequivalent* nodes (see Supp.Mat. IID). The *loop* parameters $\{w_i\}_{i \in [1,N]}$ are fixed to

$$w_{i} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} \|\vec{x}_{i}\|^{2} & \text{if } p_{ii} = 1\\ \to \infty & \text{if } p_{ii} = 0 \end{cases}$$
 (13)

after the training of the node embeddings. Indeed, for each node i, the likelihood of the self-loops i displays only one term related to the presence $(a_{ii} = 1)$ or absence of the self-loop $(a_{ii} = 0)$. Therefore, by maximizing the likelihood the reached values for the loop parameters will be exactly the ones set above.

1. Self-Consistency and Renormalization

The MSM enforces the equality among the renormalized $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ and the coarse-grained $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ probabilities³ with the same functional form ([17], Supp.Mat. II), namely

$$\begin{cases}
\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)} \stackrel{!}{=} \widecheck{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)} \\
\mathbf{P}^{(\ell)} \stackrel{!}{=} \mathbf{P}^{(m)} & \forall \ell \ge 0, m \ge 0
\end{cases}$$
(14)

These two conditions are called self-consistency and scale-invariance. Here, we will use again the subscript $\ell=0$ to highlight that $\{\vec{x}_{i_0},w_{i_0}\}_{i\in[1,N_0]}$ are the fitted vectors at finest level 0, whereas $\{\vec{x}_I,w_I\}_{I\in[1,N_\ell]}$ are the parameters at the level $\ell\geq 0$ where we set the blocknodes as $I:=\Omega_{0\to\ell}(i_0)$. Therefore, by assuming that

³ The notation for the different probabilities uses the ^ (hat) to refer to the **P** with fitted parameters. On the contrary, the (check) reuses the 0-level parameters (the opposite of ^), and the _ (tilde) resembles the "S" of "summed" for the renormalized probabilities.

the block-node parameters are the sum of the lower level ones, i.e.

$$\vec{x}_I = \sum_{i_0 \in I} \vec{x}_{i_0} \text{ and } w_I = \sum_{i_0 \in I} w_{i_0},$$
 (15)

Equation 14 are satisfied by means of Equation 10 (see section II). In this way, the MSM at level ℓ is recovered by inserting them in the Equation 10, namely

$$p_{IJ} := p(\vec{x}_I, \vec{x}_J, w_I) = \begin{cases} 1 - e^{-\langle \vec{x}_I, \vec{x}_J \rangle} & I \neq J \\ 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2} ||\vec{x}_I||^2 - w_I} & I = J \end{cases}$$
(16)

Thanks to the *summation rule*, the MSM has a lower computational complexity with respect to the single-scale models (see section IIG) as they need to be refitted at every scale.

In this essay, we took advantage of this property by fitting the *embeddings* vector from the observed network to recover all the coarser $\ell - parameters$ for every $\ell \geq 0$ by means of Equation 15. Finally, the probability p_{IJ} among $\ell - communities$ was obtained by inserting the $\{\vec{x}_I, w_I\}_{I \in [1, N_\ell]}$ in Equation 10.

IV. APPLICATIONS

A. ING Input-Output Network

ING Bank N.V. regularly reports the economic transactions of all ING clients for different years. We focused on the payments for the year 2022 between ING firms by removing the *individual* or non-Dutch clients, the flows of money sent/received by a non-ING account and the payments circulating inside a firm, i.e. self-payments. Since ING is the biggest bank in The Netherlands [21], this gave us the possibility of analyzing a major portion of the market.

More precisely, we chose the year 2022 both to ease the numerical calculations and to avoid skewed distributions by the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the procedure may be easily replicated for other time intervals, e.g. 3 years span, quarterly, ...

At the firm-to-firm (f2f) resolution, the dataset is composed by $N_{f2f} \approx 3.4 \cdot 10^5$ nodes, $L_{f2f} \approx 4 \cdot 10^4$ links which imply a density $\rho_{f2f} \approx 3.5 \cdot 10^{-5}$. Therefore, the network is big and sparse. From this network, we aggregated the firms by NAICS (North American Industry Classification System) codes and set an edge among two sectors if there was at least one link among the firms of each community (see Equation 3). Then, we filtered out the "Public Administration" (92), "Finance and Insurance" (52), "Management of Companies and Enterprises" / "Holdings" (55) sectors to retain a production ION. Roughly, the reasons underneath the payments from/to the sectors 52-55-92 are not directly connected with a product/service. In particular, the "Public Administration" fluxes includes taxes and fees; the "Finance and Insurance", money management, e.g. loans, that are not part of the production

chain of any good; and the "Management of Companies and Enterprises"/"Holdings" are a collection of business entities, controlling stocks in other companies. Lastly, we mapped, for simplicity, the 6-digits NAICS codes to integers, i.e. $111110 \rightarrow 0, 111120 \rightarrow 1, \cdots$.

This is a first application of the MSM on the multiscale structure built from the ION. Therefore, we studied only the economic relationships among the sectors discarding the directionality and the amount of money of the link. In other words, each edge is reciprocated and binary. For example⁴, if w_{ij} was the total amount of money sent from i to j at level 0, we reciprocated the weight by setting $w_{ij} \rightarrow w'_{ij} := \frac{w_{ij} + w_{ji}}{2}$ [5] and $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 1$ if $w'_{ij} > 0$ and imposed $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 0$ if $w'_{ij} = 0$ to create a binary edge. In this way, a bidirectional link is created, i.e. $a_{ij} = 1$ every time there was at least one directed flow among two sectors. The empirical ION is composed by $N_0 = 972$ sectors and $L_0 = 1.4 \cdot 10^5$ links, which imply a density $\rho_0 \approx 0.29 \gg \rho_{f2f}$ by 4 order of magnitudes.

1. Coarse-Graining The ION

In the previous section, we obtained the binary undirected adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(\ell=0)}$ representing the interactions among the 6-digits sectors (θ -nodes). Here, we describe the coarse-graining procedure producing the multiscale unfolding of $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$.

At first, the θ -nodes with the first $6-\ell$ digits, with $\ell \in [0,4]$, are lumped together in the ℓ -nodes, e.g. the sectors 111191, 111199 would be merged in the same 11119 community starting from $\ell = 1^5$.

Secondly, we set an edge among two $\ell-nodes$ if there was $at\ least\ one$ link among their higher resolution members. More formally, the $coarse-grained\ \mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}$ is calculated by applying the Equation 4. We chose this one-step procedure to easily generate every level without passing into the intermediate scales. However, the MSM accept every arbitrary-steps scheme, e.g. if $\ell=3$ then $0\to 1\to 3$ is also possible. Note that the coarse-grained graphs become fully-connected from $\ell=4$. Therefore, the statistical modelling would be possible up to $\ell=3$.

B. World Trade Web

As a second application, we considered the World Trade Web (WTW) from the Gleditsch dataset [23], which reports the international trade flows (imports and exports) among all the world countries. We selected the year 2000 (the most recent one) and removed the states

 $^{^4}$ To be precise, the notation for the nodes i,j refers to the observed microscopic nodes, namely $i:=i_0,j:=j_0$

⁵ In general, the model accepts every other non-overlapping partition of the 0-nodes [17], e.g. Louvain [7, 22].

that were not reported in the BACI-CEPII GeoDist [24] as we would use the geographical distances to coarse-grain the WTW. This results in $N_0 = 185$ 0-nodes. Although we analyzed the year 2000 the methodology can be applied also to other years.

The dataset provides two columns which display, for every pair of nodes (i,j): the export w_{ij} and import w_{ji} among i,j in USA dollars. However, by flipping $i \leftrightarrow j$, the export ω_{ji} and import ω_{ij} don't coincide with the previous value. Therefore, we used only the redefined $w_{ij} \leftarrow \frac{w_{ij} + \omega_{ji}}{2}$ [25] as the amount of trade from i to j.

As done for the ION, we symmetrized the connections by mapping $w_{ij} \to w'_{ij} := \frac{1}{2} (w_{ij} + w_{ji})$, i.e. the average flow between the two directions. By renaming w'_{ij} as w_{ij} , it follows that the weights are symmetric, i.e. $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$. Note that the WTW has a high reciprocity of links, i.e. the connections in the WTW are almost always corresponded [26]. Therefore, its undirected approximation is a legitimate starting point to study the system. Moreover, we binarized the import-export matrix to get an adjacency matrix among the states. Formally, we projected all the positive values of the weighted matrix $\mathbf{W} := \{w_{ij}\}_{i \in [1,N_0]}$ to one, i.e. $\mathbf{A} := \Theta(\mathbf{W})$ where the $\Theta(\cdot)$ is the Heaviside function.

1. Coarse-Graining of WTW

To coarse-grain the empirical WTW, assumed at level 0, we used the geographical distances [24] to iteratively merge "close" nodes into block-nodes as in [17]. Technically, this is done by means of a single-linkage agglomerative clustering model which returns a dendrogram where the leaves are the 0-nodes, the branching points are the block-countries, and the height of each branching point represents the distance, obtained via the single-linkage, between two leaves following the corresponding branches. Therefore, to calculate the partitions $\{\Omega_{\ell}\}_{\ell>0}$ we cut the dendrogram at 18 hierarchical heights $\ell \in [0, 17]$, such that the number of block-countries, namely $i_{\ell+1} := \Omega_{\ell}(i_{\ell})$, are $N_{\ell} := N_0 - 10 \cdot \ell$. Note that the coarse-grained graphs become fully-connected from $\ell = 7$. Therefore, the statistical modelling would be possible up to $\ell = 6$.

V. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we will define the scores used to evaluate the models over the ION and the WTW.

A. Embedding Dimension

The choice of the best embedding dimension is still an active Research topic [27–29]. Here, we relied on the "Minimum Description Length" principle approximated

by the Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC) [28]. In the Supp.Mat. section II H, we reported the BIC scores over the dimensions D=1,2,8,16 and also, for completeness, the AIC ones [27]. The best dimension, according to BIC, depends on the resolution levels: for the ION, $D_{\ell\geq 1}^{best}=1$ whereas $D_{\ell=0}^{best}=2$. Since the WTW is a less complex network, the BIC selects everytime the lowest dimension, i.e. $D_{\ell\geq 0}^{best}=1$ (see Supp. Mat.). This result could be expected since having more nodes, as for the lower levels, it implies more heterogeneity and, therefore, a bigger embedding dimension to grasp the ION. However, since this is the first time the MSM has been proposed, we will show the scores for all the D=1,2,8,16 dimensions.

B. Renormalization of LPCA

Having fitted the \vec{b}_{i_0} , \vec{c}_{i_0} (at level 0), in order to model $A^{(\ell)}$, one may either proceed with the Equation 8 or by refitting LPCA at that level. However, both solutions have similar drawbacks as there is no renormalization rule enforcing the *scale-invariance* (cfr. Equation 15). In the following, we will analyze them in detail.

Firstly, one may calculate $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ from the RHS of the Equation 13. Nevertheless, as shown in Supp.Mat. IB, it wouldn't be possible to rearrange the $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ to recover a logistic function with renormalized parameters. Hence, the resulting method would no longer belong to the logistic parametric family. In other words, LPCA is not self-consistent under coarse-graining.

In addition, note that the calculation of $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ requires a greater complexity than the MSM Supp.Mat. section II G.

Secondly, by refitting LPCA at level ℓ , one would find another set of vectors that, in general, are unrelated with the $(\ell-1)$ -vectors. To the point of view of LPCA, the different levels ℓ are realizations of different generative process.

To enforce relatedness of the ℓ -vectors, we forced the lower-resolution parameters \vec{x}_I, w_I to be a function of the higher-resolution ones. Since there is no natural way of combining them, we used the Equation 15, namely

$$\vec{b}_I := \sum_{i_0 \in I} \vec{b}_{i_0}, \quad \vec{c}_I := \sum_{i_0 \in I} \vec{c}_{i_0}$$
 (17)

where $I := \Omega_{0 \to \ell}(i_0) = (\Omega_{\ell} \circ \cdots \circ \Omega_0)(i_0)$ are the blocknodes at level ℓ . Then, to imposed self-consistency, the parameters are inserted in LPCA activation function, i.e.

$$\sigma(\vec{b}_I, \vec{b}_J, \vec{c}_I, \vec{c}_J) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\left(\langle \vec{b}_I, \vec{b}_J \rangle - \langle \vec{c}_I, \vec{c}_J \rangle\right)}}$$
(18)

At this point, the machinery provides self-consistency and relatedness of LPCA across scales as the MSM does naturally. Hence, we can fairly compare their expected values with respect to $\mathbf{A}^{(\ell \geq 1)}$.

C. Comparison Among Probabilities

For every level ℓ , both LPCA and MSM give rise to 3 probability functions⁶: the *fitted* $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$, summed $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ and the coarse-grained $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$. Hence, we produced a cross comparison among them to understand their hallmarks.

Firstly, we will compare for each model how the $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ relates with $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$, i.e. Equation 18 against Equation 8 and Equation 16 against Equation 14.

Secondly, $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$, namely Equation 18 against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{LPCA}^{(\ell)}$ and Equation 16 against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{MSM}^{(\ell)}$.

The insets, displayed in some figure, are reporting the 2D histogram of the density of points inside each bin⁷, i.e.

$$r_{xy} = 2 \frac{n_{\text{bin}_{xy}}}{N_2(N_2 - 1)} \in [0, 1].$$
 (19)

where $n_{\text{bin}_{xy}}$ ("xy" refers to its center of mass) is the total number of points and $N_2(N_2-1)$ the number of pairs. Finally, we colored the bins according to r_{xy} (creating a heatmap) - the bigger the value, the lighter the color.

The missing evaluation of $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ against $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ is due to the fact the *coarse-grained* probability spoils the LPCA functional form (see section VB) whereas $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)} = \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ for the MSM. Therefore, we used it only to check numerically the Equation 13 in the first comparison.

D. Scores

E. Network Measurements

The fundamental topological properties of a network are the degree, the average nearest neighbor degree (ANND) and the binary clustering coefficient (CC) [8]. Formally, each of such measurements is a function $Y(\mathbf{A})$ of an $N \times N$ adjacency matrix representing a graph \mathbf{G} .

Here, we compute them both in the observed network \mathbf{A} and as expected by the model $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{X})$. More precisely, the *degree* counts the number of edges that are incident to a node i, i.e.

$$k_i(\mathbf{A}) := \sum_{j(\neq i)} a_{ij} \tag{20}$$

and its expected value is given by

$$\langle k_i \rangle = \sum_{j(\neq i)} p_{ij} \tag{21}$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the expected value over the ensemble of graphs sampled from $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{X})$. Moving *two-hops* away from i, the *ANND* reports the average degree of the neighbors of the node i, i.e.

$$k_i^{nn}(\mathbf{A}) := \sum_{j(\neq i)} \frac{a_{ij}k_j}{k_i} \tag{22}$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{j(\neq i), k(\neq j)} a_{ij} a_{jk}}{\sum_{j(\neq i)} a_{ij}}$$
 (23)

whereas its expected value reads

$$\langle k_i^{nn} \rangle := \langle \frac{\sum_{j(\neq i), k(\neq j)} a_{ij} a_{jk}}{\sum_{j(\neq i)} a_{ij}} \rangle \tag{24}$$

$$\approx 1 + \frac{\sum_{j(\neq i), k(\neq j, i)} p_{ij} p_{jk}}{\sum_{j(\neq i)} p_{ij}}$$
 (25)

where in the second passage we took advantage on the first order approximation $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{X}{Y}\right] \approx \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{\mathbb{E}[Y]}$ (delta approximation) [30]. Lastly, the CC is defined as the ratio among the number of triangles of node i and its number of wedges, namely

$$c_i(\mathbf{A}) := \frac{\triangle_i}{\triangle_i} \tag{26}$$

$$=\frac{\sum_{i\neq j\neq k} a_{ij} a_{jk} a_{ki}}{\sum_{j\neq k} a_{ij} a_{ik}}$$
 (27)

whereas the expected one is

$$\langle c_i \rangle := \langle \frac{\triangle_i}{\wedge_i} \rangle \tag{28}$$

$$\approx \frac{\langle \triangle_i \rangle}{\langle \wedge_i \rangle} \tag{29}$$

$$\approx \frac{\sum_{i \neq j \neq k} p_{ij} p_{jk} p_{ki}}{\sum_{j \neq k} p_{ij} p_{ik}} \tag{30}$$

For more complicated measurements, e.g. the variance of the ANND, the delta approximation won't be valid and one has to estimate them as the average over a sufficiently large ensemble $\mathcal{A} := \{\mathbf{A}_s\}_{s \in [0, \mathcal{S}-1]}$ where \mathcal{S} is the number of graphs. In particular, having optimized the parameters of the model, we can generate unbiased realizations \mathcal{A} by sampling each a_{ij} independently with probability p_{ij} [17, 30].

In the limit of $S \to \infty$, the sampled average of any measure Y_i meets its analytical estimations $\langle Y_i \rangle$ [17], i.e.

$$\bar{Y}_i := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_N|} \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{A}} \in A} Y_i(\hat{\mathbf{A}})$$
 (31)

$$\rightarrow \langle Y_i \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{A}_N} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{B}|\mathbf{X}) Y_i(\mathbf{B})$$
 (32)

where $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{A}_N$ is a matrix drawn from the set of the undirected binary graphs \mathcal{A}_N of N nodes.

⁶ For the MSM, the symbols on top of **P** refers to different values of the *inner* parameters since its functional form does not vary by construction.

We set the number of bins equal to 30 both along the x- and y-axis.

Lastly, to estimate the uncertainty of the model over the sampled realizations, we calculated the 97.5-th (2.5-th) percentile of $Y_i(\mathcal{A})$ calculated with linear approximation (see [31]). These values are seen as upper and lower bounds of the dispersion intervals $\Delta_c(\langle Y_i \rangle)$ [26] which contains c = 95% of the measurements $Y_i(\mathcal{A}) := \{Y_i(\mathbf{A}_s)\}_{s \in [0,S-1]}$ over the sampled graphs. Note that in the whole procedure we arbitrarily fix the percentage of "dispersion" to c = 95% [26], but other values are also allowed.

F. Reconstruction Accuracy

In order to have a cross-comparison among all the levels and models, we exploited the reconstruction accuracy [26]. This measure is defined as the fraction of times an observed statistics Y_i falls within the dispersion interval $\Delta_c(\langle Y_i \rangle)$ (see section VE). More formally, the reconstruction accuracy at level ℓ for the statistics Y is defined as

$$RA_s^{\ell} := \frac{1}{N_{\ell}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\ell}-1} \mathbb{I}\left\{Y_i \in \Delta(\langle Y_i \rangle)\right\}$$
 (33)

where \mathbb{I} is the indicator function⁸. Roughly, it counts the frequency at which the sampled ensemble includes the observed statistics. If all the observed statistics, e.g. degrees, were included in the interval, the accuracy would be 1, whereas the accuracy would be 0 if none of them were included.

G. Rescaled ROC and PR Curves

The LPCA and MSM could be seen as binary classifiers that predict the presence of a link between two nodes. For this reason, we evaluated them also for the common metrics used in the Machine Learning field: the expected confusion matrix, the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) and the Precision-Recall (PR) curves [32, 33]. Firstly, the expected confusion matrix is a 2×2 matrix that reports the expected value of True Positives (TP), i.e. $\langle TP \rangle := \sum_{i \leq j} a_{ij} p_{ij}$, False Positives (FP), i.e. $\langle TP \rangle := \sum_{i \leq j} (1 - a_{ij}) p_{ij}$, True Negatives (TN), i.e. $\langle TN \rangle := \sum_{i \leq j} (1 - a_{ij}) ((1 - p_{ij}))$, and False Negatives (FN), i.e. $\langle FN \rangle := \sum_{i \leq j} a_{ij} (1 - p_{ij})$ [34]. By combining these scores, one recovers the True Positive Rate (TPR), the False Positive Rate (FPR) and the Positive Predic-

tive Value (PPV) [33], namely

$$TPR := \frac{TP}{Pos} = \frac{\sum_{i < j} a_{ij} p_{ij}}{L} \tag{34}$$

$$FPR := \frac{FP}{Neg} = \tag{35}$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{i < j} (1 - a_{ij}) p_{ij}}{\binom{N}{2} - L}$$
 (36)

$$PPV := \frac{TP}{PP} \approx \frac{TP}{PP} = \frac{\sum_{i < j} a_{ij} p_{ij}}{\sum_{i < j} p_{ij}}$$
(37)

$$=\frac{\sum_{i< j} a_{ij} p_{ij}}{L} \tag{38}$$

where $Pos := \sum_{i < j} a_{ij} = L$, $Neg := \sum_{i < j} (1 - a_{ij}) = \binom{N}{2} - L$. It's possible to "activate" these scores by mapping the entries $p_{ij} \ge \epsilon$ to 1 and otherwise to 0. For convenience, we will call them $TPR(\epsilon), FPR(\epsilon), PPV(\epsilon)$. The ROC and PR curves are obtained by spanning $\epsilon \in [0,1]$ [32] and plotting, respectively, the TPR against the FPR, and the TPR against the PPV (see Figure 4). Interestingly, if $\epsilon = 1$, then $TPR(\epsilon = 1) = FPR(\epsilon = 1) = 0$, $PPV(\epsilon = 1) := 1$, whereas if $\epsilon = 0$, $TPR(\epsilon = 0) = FPR(\epsilon = 0) = 1$, $PPV(\epsilon = 0) = p := \frac{Pos}{Pos + Neg} = \frac{L}{\binom{N}{2}}$.

As a reference model, it is commonly employed a random classifier predicting the majority class, i.e. $argmax_{ij}[p_{ij}, 1-p_{ij}]$. In the ROC plane, this naive model spans the identity line, and an "L" shape in the PR plane which depends on the link density. Nonetheless, since we are interested in ranking the *summed* models, we rescaled the Area Under the Curve (AUC) to highlight the advantage with respect to the *naive* classifier. Specifically, we defined

$$AUC - ROC_{norm} = \frac{AUC_{ROC} - 0.5}{0.5}$$
 (39)

$$AUC - PR_{norm} = \frac{AUC_{PR} - p}{1 - p}.$$
 (40)

Therefore, the perfect classifier would still have AUC-ROC = AUC-PR = 1 but the random one AUC-ROC = AUC-PR = 0. The new AUCs can be negative, as a signal of a worse performance than the random classifier.

H. Triangle Density

Inspired by [15], we computed the *expected* number of triangles for every model at disposal¹⁰. Specifically, the

⁸ Further refinements are possible, but we stick with this definition for the sake of simplicity.

 $^{^9}$ As the density increases the corner will be right-shifted and vertical line bent forming a "_" shape

In this essay, our objective was to model probabilistically the observed network rather than describing it exactly, namely the limit where $p_{ij} \equiv a_{ij} \forall i > j$.

expected density of triangles at a certain level ℓ is defined as

$$\rho^{(\ell)}(c) := \frac{\triangle(\mathbf{G}_{k_{i_{\ell}} \ge c}^{(\ell)})}{2N_{\ell}} = \frac{\sum_{i \ne j \ne k} g_{ij} g_{jk} g_{ki}}{2N_{\ell}}$$
(41)

where $\triangle(\mathbf{G}_{k_{i_{\ell}} \geq c}^{(\ell)})$ is the number of observed triangles (see Equation 26) calculated on the subgraph $\mathbf{G}_{k_{i_{\ell}} \geq c}^{(\ell)}$ composed by the nodes $I_c := \{i_{\ell} : k_{i_{\ell}} \geq c\}$ with degree lower (or equal) than a threshold c [14, 15]. Its expected value reads

$$\langle \rho^{(\ell)}(c) \rangle = \frac{\langle \triangle(\mathbf{G}_{k_{i_{\ell}} \ge c}^{(\ell)}) \rangle}{2N_{\ell}} \approx \frac{\sum_{i < j < k} \tilde{p}_{ij} \tilde{p}_{jk} \tilde{p}_{ki}}{N_{\ell}}$$
 (42)

where $i \in I_c, j \in I_c, k \in I_c$ and the probabilities \tilde{p}_{ij} refers to the summed model $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Here, we present the results of the LPCA and MSM models applied to the ION and WTW datasets.

A. Scale-Invariance Evidence and Multi-Scale Clustering Coefficient

In Figure 2a, it is represented the behavior of the summed probability against the coarse-grained (see Equation 13) as described in section VC. We chose the lowest embedding dimensions $D_B = D_C = 1$ and D = 1 to highlight the differences among the models even in the simplest case. Specifically, the identity line depicts the scale-invariant nature (Equation 13) which is met only by MSM. On the other hand, LPCA systematically underestimates the coarse-grained version, since the θ -vectors, maximizing the likelihood at $\ell = 0$, get lower values than the ones needed to enforce scale-invariance.

By taking a sufficiently large embedding dimensions $D_B = D_C = 8$ and D = 16, we reported in Figure 2b a cross-comparison between the LPCA-(8,8) and MSM-16 focusing on the multi-scale CC. At a plain eye inspection, LPCA-(8,8) is outperforming MSM-16 at level 0 (where we fitted the models); whereas it is the other way around at level 2. More quantitatively at level 0, the $AUC - ROC_{LPCA} \approx 0.92$, $AUC - PR_{LPCA} \approx 0.89$ while $AUC - ROC_{MSM} \approx 0.91$, $AUC - PR_{MSM} \approx 0.88$. Additionally, we exploited the relative Froebenius error among the fitted probability $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ and the adjacency matrix defined as [15]

$$\epsilon := \frac{\left\|\hat{\mathbf{P}} - \mathbf{A}\right\|_2}{L} \tag{43}$$

to obtain that $\epsilon_{LPCA} \approx 48\% < \epsilon_{MSM} \approx 51\%$. The comparison is further enriched by the insets displaying

the summed $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ against the fitted $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ at $\ell=0,2$ either for LPCA and MSM - the identity line represents the perfect match. Technically, we created a 2D histogram as described in section \mathbf{VC} .

Here, we verify numerically that LPCA is not scale-invariant and the agreement of the expected CCs with respect to the observed ones. Comparable results were also obtained for the other levels and measures, namely the DEG and ANND - for ION at $\ell=2$ (see Figure 3), but refer to the Supplementary Material for the WTW and the other levels. Hence, as expected from the theory, the MSM provides the best modelling of the multi-scale ION.

B. Expected Values of the Network Measurements

In Figure 3, we display the key network properties at level 2 (see section V E) calculated for the empirical network $\mathbf{A}^{(2)}$, as expected by the summed model $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ and by the refitted one $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ (see section III and V B). The dimension D we used are $D_B=8$, $D_C=8$ for the LPCA (LPCA-(8,8)) and D=16 for the MSM (MSM-16).

We computed the observed properties as in section VE. Then, focusing on the fitted model $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell=2)}$, we sampled $N_{\mathcal{A}} = 1000$ realizations in order to

calculate $\{\overline{k_{i_2}}, \overline{annd_{i_2}}, \overline{c_{i_2}}\}_{i_2 \in [1,N_2]}$ as reported in Equation 31. In addition, we obtained the dispersion interval for each measurement with c=95% - the bars attached to every sampled average in the plot. Lastly, we reapplied the same procedure to the summed model $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$.

In the upper panel, we report the observed measurements (x-axis) and the expected ones (y-axis) both for the summed model (orange points) and the fitted one (blue points). Needless to say, the identity line represents the perfect match of the predicted quantities with the observed properties. The single inset depicts the scattered plots of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ as described in section VI A.

As expected from Figure 2a, LPCA does not recover the measurements on average whereas the MSM can approximate them including most of the observed points in the dispersion intervals. In addition, by looking at the inset in the upper-left plot, $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ approximates $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ only for the MSM. This result, differently from Equation 13, was not enforced theoretically, and it explains the good agreement of the MSM measurements through the coarse-grained levels.

In the lower panel, it is displayed the behavior of the network measurements as the degrees increase. From the left-most plot, one finds the complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF) of the degrees, the ANND and the CC. Since the real CCDF is decreasing, the observed network has a higher presence of lower-degree nodes than the hubs whereas it is not scale-free as its shape is not a straight line in log-log scale. Similarly, the ION (WTW) is disassortative and hierarchical since, respectively, the high-degree nodes are connected to low-




FIG. 2. Left: Visualization of the Equation 13 where the LHS lies on the y-axis and the RHS on the x-axis. Right: Cross comparison among LPCA-(8,8) and MSM-16 focusing on the CC. The upper panel reports the expected $\{\langle CC_i \rangle\}_{j \in [1,N]}$ at level 0 whereas the lower at level 2. In addition, the first row refers to the LPCA-(8,8) and the second to MSM-16. The inset highlights the $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ at that resolution level, namely 0 or 2.





FIG. 3. Fundamental Network Measurements at level 2 for the ION dataset. In the upper panel, the x-axis hosts the observed measurements whereas the y-axis the expected ones. In particular, from the left one finds the DEG, the ANND and the CC. The single inset depicts the scattered plots of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$. In the lower panel, it is displayed the behavior of the network measurements as the degrees increase either for the observed quantities and the expected ones. One finds every expected value calculated with the fitted $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ (blue) and the summed $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ (orange) while the observed measures are depicted in azure. The left half of the figure refers to the LPCA-(8,8) model, whereas the right half of the figure to the MSM-16.


degree ones, and they trade with loosely-interacting partners [35].

These plots underscore that the MSM-16, not only capture the CC (see Figure 2b), but also the lower-hops measurements and behaviors. As expected, the LPCA-(8,8) provides a good fit only at the fitted scale as depicted by the blue points for $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$.

Reconstruction Accuracy and ROC-PR Curves


In Figure 5a, one can find the reconstruction accuracy (see Equation 33) for the DEG, ANND, CC across the available levels for the ING network, i.e. $\ell = 0, \dots, 3$ [26]. In particular, we reported the summed LPCA with dimensions $D_B = D_C = 1$ and $D_B = D_C = 8$, and the summed MSM with D = 1, 2, 8, 16. Since we have fitted every model at $\ell = 0$, only most of the trends are peaked at the resolution scale, for e.g. the MSM-1 has a higher CC at level 1 than at 0. In addition, out of the fitted level, the LPCA fails in generating an ensemble of networks that are consistent with the observed one. Contrarily, the MSM ensemble includes the measures at every level apart from resolution 2 where the topology change could not be grasped only by the *0-parameters* and the renormalization rule. Especially for D=1, the MSM overesti-






- (a) Level 2 LPCA-(8,8) Summed, Fitted ROC and PR curves
- (b) Level 2 MSM-16 Summed, Fitted ROC and PR curves

FIG. 4. Confusion matrices, ROC and PR curves at level 2 for the ION dataset. The left most side is occupied by the two confusion matrices for the fitted $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$ (upper) and the summed $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(2)}$. The middle plot (ROC curves) reports the behavior of the TPR VS FPR as the threshold goes from 1 to 0 (reading the graphic left-to-right). As before, the two curves are associated with the fitted (blue) model and the summed (orange) one. The left half of the figure refers to the LPCA-(8,8) model, while the right half of the figure to the MSM-16.





(a) All level Reconstruction Accuracy

(b) AUC-ROC and AUC-PR curves through levels

FIG. 5. Left: Reconstruction Accuracy (y-axis) by model, level and network statistics. Right: Area Under the ROC and PR curves for the summed models by diminishing the number of nodes or, equivalently, increasing the scale. More concretely, the third point reports the AUC-ROC and PR from Figure 4 as y-coordinates while the x-coordinates are the number of nodes N₂.

mates the DEG, ANND, CC since the summation of the 0-parameters lead to bigger values than the 2-parameters fitted at level 2. As said, this is not per se a problem of the MSM since the scale-invariance enforces the inner consistency of the MSM (see Equation 13) rather than recovering the fitted parameters at every level. Also, the choice of the pathological partition leads to worse results than expected as discussed in section VIC1. In addition, by increasing the number of parameters, i.e. D, the reconstruction accuracy improves, but it leads to overfitting as highlighted by the higher BIC scores reported in Supp.Mat. section IIH. Another way to tackle this deviation, could be to introduce a dyadic relationship d_{ij} among the nodes as done in [17]. However, this is out of the scope of this work.

In Figure 5b, one may arrive to similar conclusions but looking at different scores: the Area-Under the Curve (AUC) for the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) and the Precision-Recall (PR) curves [33]. The illustrations underline the phase separation due to their functional forms. In particular, even if LPCA-(8,8) outperforms all the other candidates at $\ell = 0$, its performances

decreases with the scales; so, does LPCA-(1,1). On the contrary, the MSM displays growing scores since, due to the density increase, the TP are likely to grow in number. Hence, the ROC and PR curves are pushed towards the TPR $\equiv 1$ and PR $\equiv 1$ upper boundaries.

In conclusion, the MSM can consistently model all the coarse-grained levels, whereas the LPCA outperforms the MSM only at the fitting scale $\ell = 0$. This implies that, by fine tuning the functional form, one can prioritize either the single-scale "overfitting" with LPCA or the generalization capability with the MSM.

1. Dependence on an arbitrary partition

The agreement of the summed model and the observed (coarser) graph depends on the chosen partitions. other words, by recalling the notation used in as in Equation 1 and Equation 13, the relationship

$$a_{IJ} \approx p_{IJ}$$
 (44)

iff
$$(45)$$

$$1 - \prod_{i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J} (1 - a_{i_0 j_0}) \approx 1 - \prod_{i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J} (1 - p(x_{i_0}, x_{j_0}, w_{i_0}))$$
(46)

depends on the partition since I, J are functions of Ω . Therefore, one can engineer a partition Ω^{diff} that spoils the latter approximation by requiring that p_{IJ} addresses the zeros of a_{IJ} (cfr. Equation 44) through

$$\Omega^{diff} := \min_{\Omega} \sum_{I \le J} \left(\prod_{i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J} (1 - p_{i_0 j_0}) - a_{IJ} \right)^2 \tag{47}$$

As said, Ω^{diff} would provide a partition leading to worse results than the ones observed for ION and WTW.

D. Expected Number of Triangles

The authors of [15] show that it is possible, by introducing LPCA, to reproduce the triangle density (Tri-Dens) for an embedding dimension *lower* that the number of nodes (cfr. [14]). Here, we show the *expected* TriDens as described by Equation 41, Equation 42.

In Figure 6, the filled azure dots depict the observed TriDens whereas the other markers identify each model: azure circles (LPCA-(1,1)), orange triangles (LPCA-(8.8)), green circles (MSM-1), red circles (MSM-2), violet crosses (MSM-8), brown triangles (MSM-16). In Figure 6a, it is reported the level $\ell = 0$ where it is clear that even the lowest embedding dimension (D=1) well approximates the TriDens. By construction, as c increases, the difference among the TriDens vanishes until it coincides at c = N - 1 since the subgraph of hubs is likely not to contain triangles in a disassortative network (see Figure 3). This result is not in contrast with the previous works [14, 15] since we are computing the expected TriDens rather than the exact one. By coarse-graining the network Figure 6b at $\ell = 2$, the MSM models are in a good agreement with the coarser TriDens. In particular, as seen in Figure 3, as D increases, also the estimates improve. On the contrary, LPCA are underestimating the considered score being biased because, as said previously, it is not generalizable to lower resolutions.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The power of graphs relies on their ability to accommodate different kind of interactions by a suitable definition of nodes and edges. By arbitrarily identifying a node as the aggregation of microscopic entities the resulting network is a *coarse-grained* version of the original one.

By repeating this procedure several times, one obtains a *multi-scale* unfolding of the observed graph. We have applied this procedure on the ION and the WTW (see section IV A) showing how one *generative process* could be represented at several resolutions.

A relevant part of the node-embedding literature [36] aims at find the optimal representation of the nodes at a single scale, neglecting these numerous ways of tracking down the generative process. To stress the point, we applied either a single-scale method from the machinelearning field, i.e. LPCA [16], and the new multiscale models enriched with node embeddings (MSM) section III. The key assumption is that, similarly to the generative process, the models must be scale-invariant through the scales. Since the MSM is built with this premise, it would naturally be self-consistent whereas we forced LPCA to be self-consistent by applying the same renormalization rule of the MSM (Equation 17). In particular, the renormalization rule (Equation 15) states that the community vectors are the sum of their innernode vectors. This allows for a principled interpretation of the sum of the node embeddings which is not possible with LPCA and, in general, with the single-scale models.

At fitting scale $\ell = 0$, LPCA outperforms MSM in every metric we have considered in section V. At higher scales, the ranking is reversed (see Figure 5) as the predictions of LPCA highly deviates from the observed structure - this defined this change as single-scale overfitting. More specifically, in Figure 2a, we visualized at which extent imposing the self-consistency makes LPCA diverge from its coarse-graining probability - the MSM satisfies this identically. Secondly, we showed the agreement (disagreement) of the expected network measurement by using the summed MSM (LPCA). This implies that LPCA has to be fitted at every level as if every scale would be generated by a different generative process. Therefore, also the node embeddings would not be related to each other. On the contrary, the MSM can be fitted at the highest resolution, providing the fundamental vectors that can be summed to obtain the higher-level embeddings. This is a clear advantage of the MSM over the LPCA - even computationally as reported in the Supp.Mat. section II G.

As cross-comparison between the models, we visualized the Reconstruction Accuracy (Figure 5a), the AUCs (Figure 5b) and the expected number of triangles (Figure 6). Specifically, the Reconstruction Accuracy highlights that the ensembles, generated by the two models, includes the observed quantities at level $\ell=0$. However, by changing scale, LPCA generates graphs that are not related to the empirical one. Interestingly, also the MSM struggles to recover the observed properties at level $\ell=2$ because the graph topology changes more than what expected by the model. In particular, without the *dyadic* parameters, the MSM overestimates the 0-parameters which lead to a higher density of edges at level 2 (see the z-score in the legend of Figure 3b). As a consequence, all the measurements are overestimated




FIG. 6. Left: Rich-Club-Triangle Density at level 0. The plot shows the evolution of the $\rho^{(\ell)}(c)$ with respect to the degree k in azure solid dots. The other markers identify the expected $\langle \rho^{(\ell)}(c) \rangle$ by the models: LPCA-(1,1) (azure circles), LPCA-(8,8) (orange triangles), MSM-1 (green circles), MSM-2 (red circles), MSM-8 (violet crosses), MSM-16 (brown triangles). Right: Rich-Club-Triangle Density at level 2.

and the dispersion interval can't include the observed values. In Figure 5b, it has been depicted the clear sign of single-scale overfitting: the predictability of LPCA is restricted to $\ell=0$ since the AUCs constantly decrease when it is applied to higher levels. Lastly, the analysis of the expected triangular density (Figure 6) shows that it is possible to generate networks with comparable values as the observed triangular density. As said before, this possibility is spoiled under aggregation for the LPCA, but it is preserved for the MSM.

In conclusion, LPCA, developed using the maximum Shannon entropy principle, is the best model at its fitted level but struggles to accurately represent the network's structure at other scales. In contrast, the multiscale model (MSM), based on the scale-invariance principle, consistently captures coarser resolutions, such as the ION and WTW. The decline in LPCA's predictive performance at higher scales suggests that MSM provides a better balance for modeling the multi-scale structures. In addition, the MSM offers a meaningful interpretation of node embedding sums, as they naturally generate lower-resolution levels, making it a more versatile and comprehensive approach for analyzing networks.

A. Future Perspectives

Although this work used undirected and binary models, it was a good starting point to extend the analysis to directed methods [37] and, hence, the interpretation of the resulting *directed* node embeddings within the economic theory. For the weighted part, there is still theoretical work to do to understand how the weights could be included in the MSM framework.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank ING Bank N.V. for their support and active collaboration. A special thanks to the whole DataScience team at ING Bank for their advice that helped shape this research.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

accompanying the paper "Multi-Scale Node Embeddings for Graph Modeling and Generation" by R. Milocco, F. Jansen and D. Garlaschelli

I. NON-NEGATIVE LOGISTIC PCA

The non-negative LPCA (LPCA) [15] aims to classify every edge (i, j) as existing (0) or non-existing (1). By treating every entry a_{ij} of the adjacency matrix **A** as a Bernoulli random variable (Equation 5), this comes down to the factorization

$$\mathbf{A} \sim \sigma(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}^T) \qquad \text{or} \qquad a_{ij} \sim \sigma(\langle \vec{b}_i, \vec{b}_j \rangle - \langle \vec{c}_i, \vec{c}_j \rangle) := \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\left(\langle \vec{b}_i, \vec{b}_j \rangle - \langle \vec{c}_i, \vec{c}_j \rangle\right)}} \quad \forall i, j$$
 (1)

where σ is the logistic function depending on the scalar product of two embedding per nodes assumed to encode the role of each node in the network, namely $\vec{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{D_B}, \vec{c}_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{D_C}$ where $D_B \geq 0, D_C \geq 0$. The compact formulation on the LHS was written in terms of the matrices $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times D_B}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times D_C}$ that are created by stacking horizontally the vectors \vec{b}_i and \vec{c}_i respectively.

Similarly, for the MSM (section III), the LPCA vectors are fitted by means by maximizing the log-likelihood estimation" [38]. In particular, the log-likelihood and its gradient read

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}|\mathbf{A}) := \sum_{i \le j} a_{ij} \ln(\sigma_{ij}) + (1 - a_{ij}) \ln(1 - \sigma_{ij})$$
(2)

$$= \sum_{i < j} \min(x_{ij}, 0) - \ln(1 + e^{-|x_{ij}|}) - (1 - a_{ij})x_{ij}$$
(3)

$$\partial_{b_{ik}} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{j} (a_{ij} - \sigma_{ij}) b_{jk} \tag{4}$$

$$\partial_{c_{ik}} \mathcal{L} = -\sum_{j} \left(a_{ij} - \sigma_{ij} \right) c_{jk} \tag{5}$$

where the last passage is taken from BCE-TensorFlow for numerical stability. Note that the stationarity conditions

$$\partial_{b_{ik}} \mathcal{L} \stackrel{!}{=} 0 \tag{6}$$

$$\partial_{c_{ik}} \mathcal{L} \stackrel{!}{=} 0 \tag{7}$$

can't be split in a part dependent only by the adjacency matrix as for the Exponential Random Graph models [30]. Hence, LPCA hasn't a *sufficient* statistics and one has to use the whole adjacency matrix. The motivation for having two vectors per node boils down to the framework studied in [15]. Specifically, the authors analyzed a dating graph reporting the messages exchanged among the male-female users living in two different cities. Hence, they have introduced two vectors per node to grasp the heterophily (male \leftrightarrow female) and homophily (same city \circlearrowleft) "role" of each user. In the ION setting, we leave out this interpretation just considering them as parameters to be optimized.

A. Renormalizing the LPCA

The LPCA does not have a recipe to renormalize the parameters and produce an "up-scaled" version of it. Nonetheless, it is possible to model the multi-level structure $\{\mathbf{A}_{\ell} : \ell \geq 0\}$ either by *fitting* $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{\ell}$ at every level or by *coarse-graining* $(\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)})$ as given by

$$\check{p}_{IJ}^{(\ell)} := 1 - \prod_{i_0 \in I} \frac{1}{1 + e^{\langle \vec{b}_{i_0}, \vec{b}_{j_0} \rangle - \langle \vec{c}_{i_0}, \vec{c}_{j_0} \rangle}}$$

$$\tag{8}$$



FIG. 1. Trivial Network for Inconsistency of LPCA and CM. The blue nodes belong to community A whereas the red node to the community B.

where $I := \Omega_{0 \to \ell}(i_0), J := \Omega_{0 \to \ell}(j_0)$ are the block-nodes at level ℓ . However, $\mathbf{P}_{cg}^{(\ell)}$ spoils the *self-consistency*¹¹ of LPCA; a property that allows one functional form for all the levels. In particular, Equation 8 is a product of logistic functions which is not re-writtable as a logistic function.

Since we want to test the capability of the model to remain self-consistent, we will renormalize the parameters by summing the microscopic parameters Equation 17 as done for the MSM Equation 15 and check for its agreement with the empirical quantities.

As pointed out in section II G, in order to compute $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$, the computational complexity is higher than the *summed* $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$. Therefore, for the fairest comparison among the models, we will use $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}_{LPCA}$.

B. Inconsistency of the LPCA: a trivial example

By referring to Figure 1, the microscopic network of 3 nodes 0, 1, 2 merges into the community A, B containing respectively the nodes 0, 1 and the node 2, namely $A = \Omega(0) = \Omega(1), B = \Omega(2)$. In addition, to stress the point we will switch-off the dependence on $\vec{c_i}$. Therefore, the connection probability of the communities A, B from the Equation 18 as

$$\sigma(b_{AB}) = (1 + e^{-b_{AB}})^{-1}$$

which is different from the coarse-grained (Equation 8)

$$\sigma^{cg}(b_{AB}) = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-b_0 b_2}} \frac{1}{1 + e^{-b_1 b_2}}$$
$$= \frac{e^{-b_0 b_2} + e^{-b_1 b_2} + e^{-b_0 b_2} e^{-b_1 b_2}}{1 + e^{-b_0 b_2} + e^{-b_1 b_2} + e^{-b_0 b_2} e^{-b_1 b_2}}.$$

From the previous results, it is clear that from $\sigma^{cg}(b_{AB})$ one can't recover the $\sigma(b_{AB})$ by defining $b_A := f(b_0, b_1), b_B := b_2$ similarly to Equation 15. Therefore, the model is not renormalizable.

II. DERIVATION OF THE MULTI-SCALE PROBABILITY

Here, we derive the multi-scale model formulation enhanced with *vectors* (MSM). As in the main text, we will consider a coarse-graining procedure from 0 to $\ell \geq 0$ even though the treatment will hold for every pair $m, \ell + 1$ with $m \leq \ell$. See [17], for further details even for the following passages.

Before introducing the model, it is worth to recall the problem settings to generate the observed multi-scale structure. Concretely, let us consider the binary undirected adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$ at level 0 describing the microscopic interactions among the 0-nodes. Subsequently, a hierarchical and non-overlapping partition of the microscopic nodes $\{\Omega_\ell\}_{\ell\geq 0}$ prescribing the community (block-nodes) membership of the lower-level nodes. Concretely, the block-nodes $I:=i_\ell$ hosting all the i_0 nodes is obtained by

$$I := \Omega_{0 \to \ell-1}(i_0)$$

feature with self-consistency.

¹¹ As said, $\{\mathbf{A}_{\ell}: \ell \geq 0\}$ provides multiple representation of the same *generative process*. Hence, the model should mimic this

where we have defined $\Omega_{0\to\ell-1} := \Omega_{\ell-1} \circ \cdots \circ \Omega_0$. Lastly, a rule to assign a link among blocks, namely

$$a_{IJ} = 1 - \prod_{i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J} (1 - a_{i_0 j_0}) \tag{9}$$

where $a_{IJ} := a_{i_{\ell+1}j_{\ell+1}}^{(\ell)}, a_{i_0j_0} := a_{i_0j_0}^{(0)}$ and $J := j_{\ell} = \mathbf{\Omega}_{0 \to \ell-1}(j_0)$. Therefore, by iterating the procedure it is possible to create the nested set of networks describing the *original* phenomenon at different resolutions.

In order to model this architecture, one needs several assumptions. The first one requires that the MSM must describe the microscopic matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$. Similarly to section I, $\mathbf{A}^{(0)} \sim P^{(0)}(\mathbf{A}^{(0)}, \mathcal{X}^{(0)})$ subject to $P^{(0)}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{(0)}) = (P^{(0)})^T(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{(0)})$ and $\sum_{\mathbf{S} \in |\mathscr{A}^{(0)}|} P^{(0)}(\mathbf{S}, \mathcal{X}^{(0)}) = 1$ where $\mathscr{A}^{(0)}$ is the ensemble of all the binary symmetric graphs with N_0 nodes.

In line with [17], we further assume that

$$\mathcal{X}_{ij}^{(0)} := \begin{cases} \langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \frac{1}{2} \|\vec{x}_i\|^2 + w_i & \text{if } i = j \end{cases}$$
(10)

is given by a product (to-be-defined) between the D-dimensional vectors $\{\vec{x}_i\}_{i\in[1,N_\ell]}$ with additional node-wise parameters $\{w_i\}_{i\in[1,N_\ell]}$ only active in the self-loop part $(i_\ell=j_\ell)$. In particular, \vec{x}_i encodes the capability of node i to connect to the other nodes; whereas w_i its propensity for a self-interaction. Since the principles leading to an edge are different to the self-loop ones, we introduced two independent parameters. Furthermore, the matrix of parameters $\mathcal{X}^{(0)}$ could include also a dyadic relationship among the nodes. The higher order terms have been discarded since they will not be fully compatible with the hypothesis of "independent edges". For further details we refer to [17].

To highlight the parameter dependence of the model, in the following, we will use the notation $P^{(0)}(\mathbf{A}^{(0)}, \dot{\mathcal{X}}^{(0)}) := P^{(0)}(\mathbf{A}^{(0)}, \mathbf{X}_w^{(0)})$ where $\mathbf{X}_w^{(0)} := [\mathbf{X}, \vec{w}]$. Technically, $\mathbf{X}^{(0)} := [\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_{N_0}]^T \in N_0 \times D$ and $\vec{w}^{(0)} := \{w_{i_0}\}_{i \in [1, N_0]}$.

Fitted $\mathbf{X}_w^{(0)}$ at the ground level, the ensemble generated by the MSM contains multiple configurations that, after coarse-graining, lead to the observed macroscopic $\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}$ [17], i.e. $\{\mathbf{A}^{(0)}\}$ $\xrightarrow{\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{0} \to \ell-1}} \mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}$. In turns, this induces the probability of observing $\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}$ as

$$P_{\ell}(\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{X}_w^{(0)}) := \sum_{\substack{\Omega_0 \to \ell-1 \\ \mathbf{A}^{(0)}\}}} P_0(\mathbf{A}^{(0)}, \mathbf{X}_w^{(0)}). \tag{11}$$

To enforce the scale-invariance property, we require that the functional form of the MSM has to be independent from the chosen scale, i.e. $P_{\ell}(\cdot,\cdot)\stackrel{!}{=} P_{0}(\cdot,\cdot)$ $\forall \ell \geq 0$. Furthermore, that the model can generate the possible ℓ -graphs in two equivalent ways hierarchically or directly. The former one refers to Equation 11, and it prescribes to generate the 0-graph ensemble with probability $P(\mathbf{A}^{(0)}, \mathbf{X}_{w}^{(0)})$ and, then, coarse-graining them ℓ times via the partitions $\{\Omega_{k}\}_{k=0}^{\ell-1}$. The other way around, the second one requires to renormalize the parameters $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\widetilde{w}}^{(\ell)}$ and, then, directly model $\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}$ via $P(\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}, \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\widetilde{w}}^{(\ell)})$. Imposing both requirements

$$P(\mathbf{A}^{(\ell)}, \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\widetilde{w}}^{(\ell)}) \stackrel{!}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{\Omega}_{0 \to \ell-1}} P(\mathbf{A}^{(0)}, \mathbf{X}_{w}^{(0)}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)} \stackrel{!}{=} \check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$$

$$(12)$$

where we have defined the LHS and RHS of the first equation as $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ and $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ respectively. In other words, the form of the $P(\cdot,\cdot)$ will depend on the scale ℓ only through the renormalized parameters $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(\ell)}_{\widetilde{w}}$. Moreover, by assuming that the links are statistically independent, the previous equation yields

$$p_{IJ} \stackrel{!}{=} \check{p}_{IJ} \tag{13}$$

where $p_{IJ} := p_{IJ}(\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\widetilde{w}}^{(\ell)})$ and

$$\check{p}_{IJ} := 1 - \prod_{i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J} (1 - p(\vec{x}_{i_0}, \vec{x}_{j_0}, w_{i_0}))$$
(14)

depend, respectively, on the renormalized and the fitted parameters at level $\ell = 0$. Note that we didn't use \tilde{p}_{IJ} because the functional form would be *scale-invariant* and the only dependence on the scale is through the parameters IJ. The



FIG. 2. Simple graph where the nodes 0,1 merges into the community A whereas 2,3 in the block-node B. The gray dashed lines represent the non-existing links.

interpretation is similar to the Equation 9: the probability p_{IJ} that there is one among the block-nodes I, J is given by the probability that there is at least one link among the microscopic nodes $i_0 \in I, j_0 \in J$. Specifically, it requires that the model remains self-similar whereas the parameters renormalize under renormalization (scale-variant).

The RHS returns the coarse-grained probability for every model, e.g. the MSM and LPCA. The crucial difference is that for the SSM $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)} \neq \check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ (cfr. Equation 14) because they are scale-invariant. For a concrete example, we refer to the sections where the models have been introduced.

By taking the logarithm of both sides of the Equation 13, the only functional form compatible with that constraint

$$\ln(1 - p_{IJ}) = -\langle g(\vec{x}_I), g(\vec{x}_J) \rangle$$

where g(x) is a positive function such that $g(\vec{x}_I) := \sum_{i_0 \in I} g(\vec{x}_i)$. Proceeding as in the main reference, one may assume that g(y) := y for every level. In addition, the vectorial product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ should be bilinear in order to allow for Equation 13, namely $\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle := \vec{x}_i^T \mathbf{M} \vec{x}_j$. Still, since the connection probability is symmetric, the matrix \mathbf{M} could be set as the identity, i.e. $\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle := \vec{x}_i^T \vec{x}_j$ (see section II A). By taking the exponential of

$$\ln(1 - p_{IJ}) = -\langle \vec{x}_I, \vec{x}_J \rangle$$

one ends up with the (off-diagonal) *scale-invariant* probability Equation 16. For the self-loops part, the steps are similar to the ones described in the main reference.

A. Bilinearity Requirement

In this subsection, we describe why the $\langle *, * \rangle$ product must be bilinear and why **M** can be taken as the identity matrix given that the probability is symmetric. To start with, in Figure 2, there have been represented 4 nodes 0, 1, 2, 3 at level $\ell = 0$ merging, at level $\ell = 1$, into $A := \{0, 1\}$ and $B := \{2, 3\}$. Hence, from Equation 13, the non-existence of a link (gray dashed lines) among the communities A and B reads

$$e^{-\langle \vec{x}_A, \vec{x}_B \rangle} \stackrel{!}{=} \prod_{i \in A; j \in B} e^{-\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle} \quad \text{iff } e^{-\langle \vec{x}_1 + \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2 + \vec{x}_3 \rangle} \stackrel{!}{=} e^{-\langle \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2 \rangle + \langle \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_3 \rangle + \langle \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2 \rangle + \langle \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_3 \rangle}$$
(15)

and the rightmost side enforces that the $\langle *, * \rangle$ has to be a bilinear function.

As said in the main text, the connection probability is symmetric, namely $\mathbf{P} \stackrel{!}{=} \mathbf{P}^T$. In turns, this leads to $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}^T$. In addition, since $p_{ij} \in [0,1] \, \forall i,j,\, \mathbf{M}$ is also positive semidefined as $\vec{x}_i \mathbf{M} \vec{x}_j \geq 0 \, \forall i,j$. Therefore, \mathbf{M} has positive eigenvalues such that

$$\vec{x}_i^T \mathbf{M} \vec{x}_j = \vec{x}_i^T \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}^T \vec{x}_j = \vec{y}_i^T \vec{y}_j$$

where $\vec{y}_i := \mathbf{O}^T \vec{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D_+$ (cfr. Cholesky decomposition). Briefly, choosing an arbitrary (symmetric) \mathbf{M} matrix will lead to $\vec{x}_i = \mathbf{O} \vec{y}_i$ with \vec{y}_i are optimized with $M := \mathrm{Id}_{D \times D}$. Hence, for simplicity, we rely on $\mathbf{M} := \mathrm{Id}_{D \times D}$.

Lastly, fixing $\mathbf{M} := \mathrm{Id}_{D \times D}$, allows recovering the product among scalars $x_i x_j$ for D = 1. This was a successful way of modelling real world networks, e.g. [17, 30].

B. Loop parameters estimate

The log-likelihood regarding the self-loops reads

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\mathbf{X}_{w}|\mathbf{A}^{diagonal}\right) = \sum_{\{i \text{ s.t. } a_{ii}=1\}} \ln\left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|\vec{x}_{i}\|^{2} - w_{i}}\right) - \sum_{\{i \text{ s.t. } a_{ii}=0\}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\|\vec{x}_{i}\|^{2} + w_{i}\right)$$
(16)

which depends either on vectors $\{\vec{x}_i\}_{i\in[1,N_\ell]}$ but also on w_i . Since the probability is bounded, $w_i \geq -\frac{1}{2}\|\vec{x}_i\|^2$. Moreover, as for every node i there would be only one of the two terms in the above likelihood, w_i is going to take the values reported in Equation 13. Hence, after having obtained the $\{\vec{x}_i\}_{i\in[1,N_\ell]}$, we fixed w_i to exactly reproduce the self-loops at level $\ell=0$ as prescribed by Equation 13.

C. Gradient of the log-likelihood

To efficiently calculate the maximum of the MSM likelihood, one needs the analytical expression of the gradient. In particular, by differentiating with respect to the t-th component of the s-th embedding vector, one gets

$$\partial_{st} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i \le j} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{p_{ij}} - 1 \right) \partial_{st} \langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle \tag{17}$$

$$= \sum_{i \le j} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{p_{ij}} - 1 \right) \left(x_{it} \delta_{sj} + x_{jt} \delta_{si} \right) \tag{18}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{p_{ij}} - 1 \right) \left(x_{jt} \delta_{si} + x_{it} \delta_{sj} \right) + \sum_{i} \left(\frac{a_{ii}}{p_{ii}} - 1 \right) x_{it} \delta_{si}$$

$$\tag{19}$$

$$=\sum_{j} \left(\frac{a_{sj}}{p_{sj}} - 1\right) x_{jt} \tag{20}$$

(21)

where we have used

$$q_{ij} := e^{-\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle} \tag{22}$$

$$\frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial x_{st}} = q_{ij} \left[x_{jt} \delta_{is} + x_{it} \delta_{js} \right] \tag{23}$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln q_{ij}}{\partial x_{st}} = -\frac{\partial (x_i x_j)}{\partial x_{st}} = -\frac{1}{q_{ij}} \frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial x_{st}}.$$
(24)

Thus, by renaming the indexes,

$$\partial_{ik} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{j} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{p_{ij}} - 1 \right) x_{jk} \equiv \sum_{j} \left(\frac{a_{ij}}{1 - e^{-\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle}} - 1 \right) x_{jk} \tag{25}$$

Lastly, by leveraging on the gradient and the likelihood, we performed the optimization by means of three optimizers: Adam implemented from [39]; while Truncated-Conjugate Gradient and L-BFGS-B by means of the SciPy library [40].

D. Structural Equivalence is not Statistical Equivalence for multidimensional-node embeddings

Calculating the gradient Equation 25 for nodes i and i' at the maximum of the likelihood, one gets

$$\partial_{ik}\mathcal{L} \stackrel{!}{=} 0 \stackrel{!}{=} \partial_{i'k}\mathcal{L}. \tag{26}$$

By further assuming i and i' have same neighbors (Structural Equivalence - StructE), i.e. $\mathcal{N}(i) = \mathcal{N}(i')$, it is possible to rearrange the above equations into

$$\phi(x_{ik}) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{x_{jk}}{p_{ij}} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} x_{jk} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i')} \frac{x_{jk}}{p_{i'j}} =: \phi(x_{i'k}).$$
 (27)

where we have defined

$$\phi(y_{ik}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{y_{jk}}{1 - e^{-\langle \vec{y}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle}}.$$
(28)

For D = 1,

$$\phi(x_i) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{x_j}{1 - e^{-x_i x_j}} \tag{29}$$

is a monotonic function of x_i , thus there exists an inverse function ϕ^{-1} such that $\phi(x_i) \stackrel{!}{=} \phi(x_{i'}) \Rightarrow x_i = \phi^{-1}(\phi(x_i)) = x_i$. In other words, two nodes i, i' that have the same neighbors, they are statistically equivalent (StatE). The inverse implication is also true, i.e. $x_i = x_{i'} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(i) = \mathcal{N}(i')$ by following the same steps backwards. In conclusion, for D = 1, Structural Equivalence is equivalent to Statistical Equivalence: $x_i = x_{i'}$ if, and only if $\mathcal{N}(i) = \mathcal{N}(i')$.

This result does not hold for D > 1 since $\phi(y_i k)$ is not monotonic in $y_i k$ as it depends on the scalar product $\langle \vec{y}_i, \vec{x}_j \rangle$. However, if i, i' have the same neighbors, they have the same role in the network, and so the model should have the same parameters for the two nodes. Formally,

$$\mathcal{N}(i) = \mathcal{N}(i') \Leftrightarrow a_{ij} \equiv a_{i'j} \Rightarrow p_{ij} = p_{i'j} \Leftrightarrow \vec{x}_i = \vec{x}_{i'} \qquad \forall j \in [1, N_\ell].$$

By recalling the notation used before, we are imposing that StructE implies StatE.

To find the node embeddings in the reduce problem, one starts by defining the set of nodes which share the same neighbors as $\mathcal{S} := \{\mathcal{S}_i, \, \forall i \in [0, N-1]\}$ where $\mathcal{S}_i := \{j : \mathcal{N}(j) = \mathcal{N}(i)\}$ are the nodes with the same neighborhood with respect to the node i. Referring to Figure 2 and considering the gray dashed lines as existing connection, $\mathcal{S}_0 := 0, 1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 := 2, 3$. Secondly, by defining the node i with the lowest index among S_i , as the representative of that StructE class, one obtains a set of pivotal nodes related to StructE. At this point, the number of parameters decreased from $N \times D$ to $N_{\mathcal{S}} \times D$ where $N_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the number of elements the set \mathcal{S} has. In order to recover $\mathbf{X}_w^{(\ell)}$, the value of the representative parameter \vec{x}_i is copied to all the members of the class, formally

$$\{\vec{x}_i := \vec{x}_{i_r} \, \forall i : \mathcal{N}(i) \equiv \mathcal{N}(i_r)\} \qquad \forall i_r \in [0, N_S - 1]$$

where i_r are the representative nodes. In this way, it is possible to use the likelihood Equation 11 with fewer parameters than in the original formulation.

Since the selected optimizers ([40]) are not "stochastic", one may obtain the StatE between the embeddings by starting from the same initial conditions for StructE nodes. Indeed, the parameter updates will be the same as they depend on the neighborhood as shown by Equation 4, 25.

In conclusion, for D = 1, the StructE - StatE relied on the monotonic function $\phi(x_k)$; whereas it is not the case for D > 1. Therefore, to enforce StatE, one may reduce the problem and optimize only the representative of the StructE classes.

E. Removal of deterministic nodes

Network modelling assumes that the observed **A** is a realization of a random process. However, it may happen that some nodes were deterministic, i.e. fully-connected (FC) or disconnected (D) to the other nodes. Therefore, its behavior would be trivially recovered by setting the hidden variable of the FC nodes to infinity or the D nodes to zeros for the Equation 10. That is, there is no need of fitting a probabilistic model to grasp its role in the graph. For example, assume D=1 and that the nodes 1 is fully-connected whereas 0 is disconnected. After the optimization, they will end up having $x_i \to \infty \Rightarrow p_{1j} \equiv 1 \quad \forall j \text{ or } x_0 = 0 \Rightarrow p_{0j} \equiv 0 \quad \forall j$. In turn, since $\operatorname{Var}(a_{ij}) = p_{ij}q_{ij}$, $\operatorname{Var}(a_{1j}) = \operatorname{Var}(a_{0j}) = 0 \quad \forall j \text{ implying that they will not contribute on the ensemble fluctuation.}$ Hence, one may hard code their variable, as seen before, to account for their roles in the graph. This way of finding the deterministic node parameters doesn't spoil the renormalization of the parameters. Indeed, looking at Equation 15, a FC nodes would produce a FC block-node for every coarser level; whereas a vanishing parameter gives the freedom to the other terms in the summation.

F. From Constrains to Bounds

The MSM probability requires a positive inner products

$$\langle \vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_i \rangle \ge 0 \tag{30}$$

for every pair of nodes, in order to guarantee $p_{ij} \in [0,1] \forall i,j$.

Here, we will prove that the above constraints is equivalent of setting all vector components to be non-negative, namely $x_{ik} \geq 0$. Roughly, the spanned region by the embeddings is enclosed in one quadrant of the space, and it is possible to rotate the vectors to lay in the positive quadrant.

The steps to show this are the following. First, since we are interested on the sign among the vectors, one may restrict to the set of unit vectors $\{\vec{e}_j\}_{i\in[0,N-1]}$ where $\vec{e}_i:=\frac{\vec{x}_i}{\|\vec{x}_i\|}\in\mathbb{R}^D$ and assume $\vec{e}_0:=[1,0,\ldots]$. Taking into consideration also Equation 30, the considered set is

$$\mathbb{S} := \left\{ \vec{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D \text{ s.t. } 0 \le \langle \vec{e}_i, \vec{e}_j \rangle \le 1, \vec{e}_0 := [1, 0, \dots] \quad \forall i \in [0, N-1] \text{ and } j \in [0, N-1] \right\}$$

which by construction has to property that

$$\max_{i \in [1, N_{\ell}], j \in [1, N_{\ell}]} |\arccos(\langle \vec{e_i}, \vec{e_j} \rangle)| \le \frac{\pi}{2}$$

If one takes the most "clockwise" and "anticlockwise" vectors in the set S defined as

$$\vec{e}_c := \{ \vec{e}_i : \vec{e}_i \times v \ge 0, \, \forall v \in \mathbb{S} \} \tag{31}$$

$$\vec{e}_{ac} := \{ \vec{e}_i : \vec{e}_i \times v \le 0, \, \forall v \in \mathbb{S} \}, \tag{32}$$

by construction they form an angle $\theta_{a-ac} \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$. Therefore, if $\vec{e}_c = \vec{e}_0$ the treatment is finished since the vectors lay in the positive quadrant. On the other hand, if $\vec{e}_{ac} = \vec{e}_0$, the vectors lay in the negative quadrant and they can be rigidly rotated to lie on the positive quadrant, i.e. $x_{ik} \ge 0$.

G. Algorithmic Complexity

As described in the section IB, in order to describe a coarser graph without refitting the parameters, one should to use the RHS of Equation 13¹². Specifically, the algorithmic complexity to obtain one \check{p}_{IJ} is cN_IN_J where the evaluation of p_{ij} is assumed to have a complexity c. Hence, to compute the complexity of $\check{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$, one has to sum over all the pairs, i.e.

$$C_{SSM} = c \sum_{I>J} N_I N_J = \frac{c}{2} \sum_{I,J} N_I N_J = c \frac{N_0^2}{2}$$
(33)

where N_0 are the number of structural inequivalent nodes at $\ell = 0$. On the other hand, assuming the "sum" of vectors in Equation 15 of order O(1), the complexity of $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ (see Equation 16) reads

$$C_{MSM} \approx N_0(D+1) + c \frac{N_\ell(N_\ell - 1)}{2} \tag{34}$$

where the summation over the w_i parameters counts as N_0 operations and $\binom{N_\ell}{2}$ are all pairs at the level ℓ for the full $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$.

The improvement is reported by the ratio of the two complexities, namely

$$\frac{C_{MSM}}{C_{SSM}} \approx \frac{2(D+1)}{cN_0} + \frac{N_{\ell}(N_{\ell}-1)}{N_0^2} \approx \frac{1}{N_0} \left[1 + \frac{N_{\ell}(N_{\ell}-1)}{N_0} \right]. \tag{35}$$

Focusing on level $\ell = 3, N_3 = 87, N_0 = 972,$

$$\frac{\mathcal{C}_{MSM}}{\mathcal{C}_{SSM}} \approx \mathcal{O}(10^{-2}) \tag{36}$$

one saves two order of magnitude by proceeding with the summed MSM rather than the coarse-grained LPCA. Hence, by means of Equation 17, LPCA recovers the same complexity of summed MSM; thereby enabling for a comparison of equal complexity.

¹² This spoils its functional form, but this would be the only way to avoid refitting the same model at a higher scale

(a) AICs by model class for ION							
Model	Dim	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3		
LPCA		$0.5764 \\ 0.5072$		$egin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	0.3733 2.6648e+17		
	1	0.5784	0.6658	0.5408	0.4097		
	2	0.5516	0.6341	0.5129	0.3841		
	3	0.5434	0.6242	0.5012	0.3791		
	4	0.5378	0.6169	0.4984	0.3831		
	5	0.5336	0.6127	0.4985	0.4046		
MSM	6	0.5311	0.6088	0.4979	0.4232		
MOM	7	0.5304	0.6074	0.4968	0.4574		
	8	0.5287	0.6052	0.4976	0.5118		
	9	0.53	0.6073	0.498	0.5588		
	10	0.5305	0.6064	0.5002	0.6091		
	11	0.5311	0.6105	0.5117	0.6671		
	16	0.5365	0.6226	0.5328	0.9697		

(a) BICs by model class for ION							
Model	Dim	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3		
LPCA	(1, 1)	0.622 0.8718	0.7295	0.6605	0.7189		
	(8, 8)	0.8718	1.0856	1.3276	2.6648e + 17		
	1	0.6012	0.6975	0.5987	0.5825		
	2	0.5972	0.6976	0.6285	0.7296		
	3	0.6117	0.7194	0.6746	0.8974		
	4	0.6289	0.7439	0.7297	1.0741		
	5	0.6476	0.7714	0.7877	1.2684		
MSM	6	0.6678	0.7992	0.8449	1.4597		
	7	0.69	0.8295	0.9015	1.6667		
	8	0.7111	0.8591	0.9602	1.8939		
	9	0.7352	0.8929	1.0184	2.1136		
	10	0.7584	0.9237	1.0785	2.3367		
	11	0.7818	0.9595	1.1477	2.5675		
	16	0.9011	1.1303	1.4579	3.7339		

TABLE I. Normalized AIC and BIC scores tables for the models LPCA and MSM at different levels for the ION. The best scores are highlighted in green whereas the worst in red.

Principled Embedding Dimension via Information Criteria

To determine the "best" embedding dimension for LPCA and MSM, we used the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [27], [28]. These scores are defined as

$$AIC := 2K - 2\ln(\mathcal{L}) \tag{37}$$

$$BIC := K \ln(n) - 2 \ln(\mathcal{L}) \tag{38}$$

where K is the number of parameters, $n := \binom{N}{2}$ the number of observations and \mathcal{L} the likelihood of the model. They encode the trade-off between the goodness-of-fit $-\ln(\mathcal{L})$ and the complexity of the model. Therefore, the "best model" is the one with the minimum AIC or BIC; which one of the two remains a debated choice: the AIC is asymptotically equivalent to the Kullback-Leibler divergence among the generating model and a candidate one [27] whereas the BIC to the Description Length (DL) [28]. As the DL is the only one embodying the "trade-off" paradigm, we decided to select the minimum BIC criterion. In Equation 38, the scores are not comparable across scale, therefore, we normalized the AIC and BIC scores as

$$AIC_{\text{norm},\ell} := \frac{2}{n_{\ell}} K_{\ell} - \frac{2 \ln(\mathcal{L})}{n_{\ell}}$$

$$= 4 \left[\frac{D}{N_{\ell} - 1} - \frac{\ln(\mathcal{L})}{N_{\ell} (N_{\ell} - 1)} \right]$$
(39)

$$=4\left[\frac{D}{N_{\ell}-1}-\frac{\ln(\mathcal{L})}{N_{\ell}\left(N_{\ell}-1\right)}\right] \tag{40}$$

$$BIC_{\text{norm},\ell} := \frac{\ln(n_{\ell})}{n_{\ell}} K_{\ell} - \frac{2\ln(\mathcal{L})}{n_{\ell}}$$
(41)

$$\approx \frac{\ln(N_{\ell}) + \ln(N_{\ell} - 1)}{N_{\ell} - 1} D - 4 \frac{\ln(\mathcal{L})}{N_{\ell}(N_{\ell} - 1)}$$
(42)

where $K_{\ell} = N_{\ell}D$ and $n_{\ell} := {N_{\ell} \choose 2}$. This doesn't affect the ranking, but it provides the AIC and BIC per pair.

The results are summarized in Table I for the ION and Table II for the WTW where the best scores (minimum) are highlighted in green whereas the worst (maximum) in red. The comparison is provided among LPCA and MSM as they have a different functional forms especially in the combination of the parameters. We have considered only two levels for LPCA as the benchmark for lowest D and "maximum" D with respect to our computational facility. On the other hand, we spanned more dimensions for MSM to provide an extensive description of the model performances. Recall that, by increasing the level of coarse-graining, the network tends to be less complex: the Equation 9 likely densifies the network implying that the nodes will have more similar roles. Therefore, the *ideal* dimension D decreases. Lastly, the average BIC score is calculated to provide a global view of the model performances. Thus, the best model is the one with the lowest average BIC score across levels. Overall, the best models are LPCA-(1,1) and MSM-1 as BIC penalizes more than AIC the complexity of the model. However, in the following we will display the behavior also of the D=2,8,16 for MSM and D=(8,8) to assess the model performances at higher dimensions.

(a) AICs by model class for WTW

Model	Dim	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
LPCA	(1, 1)	0.6109	0.5636	0.572			0.444
	(8, 8)	0.4536	0.4309	0.5289	0.7033	1.0492	2.0645
MSM	1	0.6146	0.5637	0.5656	0.5649	0.5387	0.3991
	2	0.5807	0.5332	0.5389	0.5285	0.5016	0.3665
	3	0.5684	0.5483	0.5528	0.5519	0.5446	0.4753
	4	0.5567	0.5366	0.5522	0.5642	0.5645	0.4876
	5	0.5628	0.5295	0.5511	0.567	0.5825	0.5279
	6	0.5674	0.5356	0.5603	0.5946	0.6059	0.607
	7	0.5707	0.5424	0.5679	0.6174	0.6557	0.7085
	8	0.5181	0.4733	0.4959	0.5363	0.5764	0.7742
	9	0.5809	0.5649	0.6051	0.6526	0.7167	0.8852
	10	0.5923	0.5765	0.6198	0.6819	0.7609	0.994
	11	0.6017	0.5949	0.6362	0.7114	0.7962	1.0688
	16	0.557	0.5571	0.631	0.7292	0.9881	1.5484

(b) BICs by model class for WTW

Model	Dim	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
LPCA	(1, 1)	0.7813	0.7583	0.8004	0.8551	0.922	0.9868
LI CA	(8, 8)	1.8166	1.9881	2.3555	2.9326	3.958	6.4068
	1	0.6974	0.6578	0.677	0.6982	0.7088	0.6026
	2	0.7463	0.7215	0.7616	0.795	0.8417	0.7736
	3	0.8169	0.8306	0.8869	0.9518	1.0548	1.0859
	4	0.8881	0.9131	0.9976	1.0972	1.2448	1.3018
	5	0.977	1.0001	1.1079	1.2334	1.4329	1.5456
MSM	6	1.0645	1.1003	1.2284	1.3942	1.6264	1.8282
MSM	7	1.1506	1.2013	1.3473	1.5503	1.8462	2.1333
	8	1.1809	1.2263	1.3867	1.6025	1.9369	2.4025
	9	1.3265	1.4121	1.6073	1.8521	2.2474	2.7171
	10	1.4208	1.5177	1.7333	2.0147	2.4616	3.0295
	11	1.513	1.6303	1.8611	2.1774	2.6669	3.3078
	16	1.8825	2.0631	2.4126	2.8616	3.7093	4.8051

TABLE II. Normalized AIC and BIC scores tables for the models LPCA and MSM at different levels for the WTW. The best scores are highlighted in green whereas the worst in red.

I. Statistical Impossibility into the application of Train and Test Split

Since every pair is seen as a Bernoulli random variable not identically distributed [8, 41], this implies that every link has to be accounted in the training procedure since it is not already modelled by other pairs.

III. WORLD TRADE WEB RESULTS

In this section, we report the same results presented in the main text, but for the World Trade Web. The conclusions are the same as for the ING network.




FIG. 3. Left: Visualization of the Equation 13 where the LHS lies on the y-axis and the RHS on the x-axis. Right: Cross comparison among LPCA-(8,8) and MSM-16 focusing on the CC. The upper panel reports the expected $\{\langle CC_i \rangle\}_{j \in [1,N]}$ at level 0 whereas the lower at level 4. In addition, the first row refers to the LPCA-(8,8) and the second to MSM-16. The inset highlights the $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(\ell)}$ at that resolution level, namely 0 or 4.





FIG. 4. Fundamental Network Measurements at level 4 for the ION dataset. In the upper panel, the x-axis hosts the observed measurements whereas the y-axis the expected ones. In particular, from the left one finds the DEG, the ANND and the CC. The single inset depicts the scattered plots of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(4)}$ against $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(4)}$. In the lower panel, it is displayed the behavior of the network measurements as the degrees increase either for the observed quantities and the expected ones. One finds every expected value calculated with the fitted $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(4)}$ (blue) and the summed $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(4)}$ (orange) while the observed measures are depicted in azure. The left half of the figure refers to the LPCA-(8,8) model, whereas the right half of the figure to the MSM-16.



(a) Level 4 - LPCA-(8,8) - Summed, Fitted ROC and PR curves

(b) Level 4 - MSM-16 - Summed, Fitted ROC and PR curves

FIG. 5. Confusion matrices, ROC and PR curves at level 4 for the ION dataset. The left most side is occupied by the two confusion matrices for the fitted $\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{(4)}$ (upper) and the summed $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{(4)}$. The middle plot (ROC curves) reports the behavior of the TPR VS FPR as the threshold goes from 1 to 0 (reading the graphic left-to-right). As before, the two curves are associated with the fitted (blue) model and the summed (orange) one. The left half of the figure refers to the LPCA-(8,8) model, while the right half of the figure to the MSM-16.




FIG. 6. Left: Reconstruction Accuracy (y-axis) by model, level and network statistics. Right: Area Under the ROC and PR curves for the summed models by diminishing the number of nodes or, equivalently, increasing the scale. More concretely, the third point reports the AUC-ROC and PR from Figure 5 as y-coordinates while the x-coordinates are the number of nodes N_4 .




FIG. 7. Left: Rich-Club-Triangle Density at level 0. The plot shows the evolution of the $\rho^{(\ell)}(c)$ with respect to the degree k in azure solid dots. The other markers identify the expected $\langle \rho^{(\ell)}(c) \rangle$ by the models: LPCA-(1,1) (azure circles), LPCA-(8,8) (orange triangles), MSM-1 (green circles), MSM-4 (red circles), MSM-8 (violet crosses), MSM-16 (brown triangles). Right: Rich-Club-Triangle Density at level 4.

- [1] C. Song, S. Havlin, and H. A. Makse, Self-similarity of complex networks, Nature 433, 392 (2005).
- [2] E. A. Yilmaz, S. Balcisoy, and B. Bozkaya, A link prediction-based recommendation system using transactional data, Scientific Reports 13, 6905 (2023).
- [3] M. Zheng, G. García-Pérez, M. Boguñá, and M. Ángeles Serrano, Geometric renormalization of weighted networks (2023), arXiv:2307.00879 [physics.soc-ph].
- [4] F. Cerina, Z. Zhu, A. Chessa, and M. Riccaboni, World input-output network, PLOS ONE 10, e0134025 (2015).
- [5] G. Fagiolo, J. Reyes, and S. Schiavo, World-trade web: Topological properties, dynamics, and evolution, Phys. Rev. E 79, 036115 (2009).
- [6] M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 105, 1118 (2008).
- [7] V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre, Fast unfolding of communities in large networks, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2008, P10008 (2008).
- [8] J. Park and M. E. J. Newman, Statistical mechanics of networks, Physical Review E 70, 10.1103/physreve.70.066117 (2004).
- [9] D. Wang, P. Cui, and W. Zhu, Structural deep network embedding, in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '16 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2016) p. 1225–1234.
- [10] C. Aggarwal, G. He, and P. Zhao, Edge classification in networks, in 2016 IEEE 32nd International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE) (2016) pp. 1038–1049.
- [11] A. Grover and J. Leskovec, Node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks, in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '16 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2016) pp. 855–864.
- [12] M. Ou, P. Cui, J. Pei, Z. Zhang, and W. Zhu, Asymmetric transitivity preserving graph embedding, KDD, 1105 (2016).
- [13] S. Khanday and S. Parveen, Logistic regression based classification of spam and non-spam emails (2021).
- [14] C. S. et al., The impossibility of low-rank representations for triangle-rich complex networks, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 117, 5631 (2020), https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1911030117.
- [15] S. Chanpuriya, C. Musco, K. Sotiropoulos, and C. E. Tsourakakis, Node embeddings and exact low-rank representations of complex networks (2020).
- [16] S. Chanpuriya, R. A. Rossi, A. B. Rao, T. Mai, N. Lipka, Z. Song, and C. Musco, Exact representation of sparse networks with symmetric nonnegative embeddings, in *Not Published* (2021).
- [17] E. Garuccio, M. Lalli, and D. Garlaschelli, Multiscale network renormalization: Scale-invariance without geometry, Phys. Rev. Res. 5, 043101 (2023).
- [18] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space (2013), arXiv:1301.3781 [cs.CL].
- [19] A. Dalmia, G. J, and M. Gupta, Towards interpretation of node embeddings (International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 2018) pp. 945–952.
- [20] A. P. et al., Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library, CoRR abs/1912.01703 (2019), 1912.01703.
- [21] A. J. J. W. H. Terris, Global banks ranking (2024), accessed: 2024-09-05.
- [22] P. Villegas, T. Gili, G. Caldarelli, and A. Gabrielli, Laplacian renormalization group for heterogeneous networks, Nature Physics 19, 445 (2023).
- [23] K. S. Gleditsch, Expanded trade and gdp data, Journal of Conflict Resolution 46, 712 (2002), cited by: 968.
- [24] T. Mayer and S. Zignago, Notes on CEPII's distances measures: The GeoDist database, Working Papers 2011-25 (CEPII, 2011).
- [25] G. Fagiolo, J. Reyes, and S. Schiavo, The evolution of the world trade web: a weighted-network analysis, Journal of Evolutionary Economics 20, 479 (2010).
- [26] M. Di Vece, D. Garlaschelli, and T. Squartini, Reconciling econometrics with continuous maximum-entropy network models, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals 166, 112958 (2023).
- [27] J. E. Cavanaugh and A. A. Neath, The akaike information criterion: Background, derivation, properties, application, interpretation, and refinements, WIREs Computational Statistics 11, e1460 (2019), https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/wics.1460.
- [28] J. Zhang, Y. Yang, and J. Ding, Information criteria for model selection, WIREs Computational Statistics 15, e1607 (2023), https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/wics.1607.
- [29] W. Gu, A. Tandon, Y.-Y. Ahn, and F. Radicchi, Principled approach to the selection of the embedding dimension of networks, Nature Communications 12, 3772 (2021).
- [30] T. Squartini and D. Garlaschelli, Analytical maximum-likelihood method to detect patterns in real networks, New Journal of Physics 13, 083001 (2011).
- [31] C. R. Harris, K. J. Millman, S. J. van der Walt, R. Gommers, P. Virtanen, D. Cournapeau, E. Wieser, J. Taylor, S. Berg, N. J. Smith, R. Kern, M. Picus, S. Hoyer, M. H. van Kerkwijk, M. Brett, A. Haldane, J. F. del Río, M. Wiebe, P. Peterson, P. Gérard-Marchant, K. Sheppard, T. Reddy, W. Weckesser, H. Abbasi, C. Gohlke, and T. E. Oliphant, Array programming with NumPy, Nature 585, 357 (2020).

- [32] J. Cook and V. Ramadas, When to consult precision-recall curves, The Stata Journal 20, 131 (2020).
- [33] J. Davis and M. Goadrich, The relationship between precision-recall and roc curves, in *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML '06 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2006) p. 233–240.
- [34] T. Squartini, A. Almog, G. Caldarelli, I. van Lelyveld, D. Garlaschelli, and G. Cimini, Enhanced capital-asset pricing model for the reconstruction of bipartite financial networks, Phys. Rev. E 96, 032315 (2017).
- [35] D. Garlaschelli and M. Loffredo, Fitness-dependent topological properties of the world trade web, Physical review letters 93, 188701 (2004).
- [36] A. Baptista, R. J. Sánchez-García, A. Baudot, and G. Bianconi, Zoo guide to network embedding, Journal of Physics: Complexity 4, 042001 (2023), published 29 November 2023 ◆ ② 2023 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd.
- [37] M. Lalli and D. Garlaschelli, Geometry-free renormalization of directed networks: scale-invariance and reciprocity (2024), arXiv:2403.00235 [physics.soc-ph].
- [38] D. V. Godoy, Deep Learning with PyTorch Step-by-Step: A Beginner's Guide (leanpub.com, 2021).
- [39] D. Kingma and J. Ba, Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, International Conference on Learning Representations (2014).
- [40] P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, S. J. van der Walt, M. Brett, J. Wilson, K. J. Millman, N. Mayorov, A. R. J. Nelson, E. Jones, R. Kern, E. Larson, C. J. Carey, İ. Polat, Y. Feng, E. W. Moore, J. VanderPlas, D. Laxalde, J. Perktold, R. Cimrman, I. Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, C. R. Harris, A. M. Archibald, A. H. Ribeiro, F. Pedregosa, P. van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors, SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python, Nature Methods 17, 261 (2020).
- [41] E. T. Jaynes, Information theory and statistical mechanics, Physical Review 106, 620 (1957).