

Evolutionary method for finding communities in bipartite networks

Weihua Zhan^{1,*}, Zhongzhi Zhang^{2,3,†}, Jihong Guan^{1,‡} and Shuigeng Zhou^{2,3,§}

¹*Department of Computer Science and Technology,*

Tongji University, 4800 Cao'an Road, Shanghai 201804, China

²*School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China and*

³*Shanghai Key Lab of Intelligent Information Processing, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

(Dated: September 11, 2018)

An important step in unveiling the relation between network structure and dynamics defined on networks is to detect communities, and numerous methods have been developed separately to identify community structure in different classes of networks, such as unipartite networks, bipartite networks, and directed networks. Here, we show that the finding of communities in such networks can be unified in a general framework—detection of community structure in bipartite networks. Moreover, we propose an evolutionary method for efficiently identifying communities in bipartite networks. To this end, we show that both unipartite and directed networks can be represented as bipartite networks, and their modularity is completely consistent with that for bipartite networks, the detection of modular structure on which can be reformulated as modularity maximization. To optimize the bipartite modularity, we develop a modified adaptive genetic algorithm (MAGA), which is shown to be especially efficient for community structure detection. The high efficiency of the MAGA is based on the following three improvements we make. First, we introduce a different measure for the informativeness of a locus instead of the standard deviation, which can exactly determine which loci mutate. This measure is the bias between the distribution of a locus over the current population and the uniform distribution of the locus, i.e., the Kullback-Leibler divergence between them. Second, we develop a reassignment technique for differentiating the informative state a locus has attained from the random state in the initial phase. Third, we present a modified mutation rule which by incorporating related operation can guarantee the convergence of the MAGA to the global optimum and can speed up the convergence process. Experimental results show that the MAGA outperforms existing methods in terms of modularity for both bipartite and unipartite networks.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 02.10.Ox, 02.50.-r

I. INTRODUCTION

Complex network has gained overwhelming popularity as a powerful tool for understanding various complex systems from diverse fields, including the technical, natural, and social sciences, etc., which provides a unified perspective or method for studying these systems through modeling them as networks with nodes and edges respectively representing their units and interactions between units [1–6]. Generally, according to the types of node, networks can be classified into unipartite, bipartite and multipartite networks. As a typical class of real-world networks, bipartite networks, compared to unipartite ones, consist of two types of nodes, and edges exist only between distinct types of nodes. Examples of bipartite networks come from various fields, including scientific collaboration networks, actor-movie networks, and protein-protein interaction networks [1, 2, 7–9]. Multipartite networks with more than three types of nodes, are occasionally seen [10, 11].

It has been discovered [7] that most real networks share

a local clustering feature, i.e., groups of tight-knit nodes mutually connected to each other with sparser edges. These groups of nodes are generally referred to as communities or modules. From a topological point of view, a community may correspond to a functional unit because of its relative structural independence. In turn, community structure can critically affect diverse dynamics on networks. Therefore, identification of communities plays a key role in numerous related areas of complex networks, e.g., predicting protein function [12] and determining dynamics of systems [13–15]. The last few years have witnessed tremendous efforts in this direction [8, 15–26] (useful reviews include Refs. [27, 28]). Most previous studies are dedicated to deal with unipartite networks, while little attention has been paid to directed networks [23, 24] and bipartite networks [24–26].

It is of interest that unipartite and directed networks can be represented by bipartite networks as will be shown. Thus, detection of communities in unipartite networks or in directed networks can be transformed into the same task in bipartite networks. Given a bipartite modularity, those methods based on modularity maximization [16–19], in principle, can be applied to bipartite networks. However, they are expected to be affected by the resolution limit [29, 30] as in the unipartite case, which may result in the degeneracy problem [31]. This poses a challenge for the methods that return one solution. Instead, we present a modified adaptive genetic algorithm

*Electronic address: 08zhanwh@tongji.edu.cn

†Electronic address: zhangzz@fudan.edu.cn

‡Electronic address: jhguan@tongji.edu.cn

§Electronic address: sgzhou@fudan.edu.cn

to optimize the bipartite modularity [26]. The evolutionary method can return a better solution in a shorter time. Moreover, the method also can return multiple better solutions in multiple runs, which enables us to evaluate the reliability (or significance) of solutions without resorting to other technique as in [32, 33], as well as to obtain a superior solution by combining several better solutions when the degeneracy problem is severe.

In practice, there exist two distinct conceptual understandings of the community structure of a bipartite network. The first viewpoint for communities in the network is to consider each composed of two types of nodes with dense edges across them, which is similar to the view of unipartite cases [26]. An alternative view is that any community should contain only one type of nodes, which are closely connected through co-participation in several communities that consist of another type of nodes [24]. Guided by this view, the usual approach to identifying communities is to project the bipartite network onto one specific unipartite network as needed, and then identify communities in the projection. Guimerà *et al.* [24] recently presented a method for identifying communities of one type of nodes against the other type of nodes with a known community structure.

In this paper, we focus on dealing with the problem of identifying communities from the first viewpoint. We present a modified adaptive genetic algorithm (MAGA), based on the mutation-only genetic algorithm (MOGA), which is parameter-free unlike the traditional genetic algorithms. The method has no need to know in advance the number of communities and their sizes. In Sec. II, we first give a short review of Barber's modularity [26] and then show that unipartite networks and directed networks can be uniformly represented by bipartite networks. After the description of the MOGA in Sec. III A, we introduce a different measure for selecting loci to mutate in Sec. III B, and then develop the reassignment technique in Sec. III C. Further, we discuss how to select the population size in Sec. III D and address the issues of convergence and time complexity of the MAGA in Sec. III E. In Sec. IV, we apply the algorithm to model bipartite networks, several real bipartite networks, and unipartite networks. Finally, the conclusion is given.

II. BIPARTITE MODULARITY

The modularity introduced by Newman and Girvan [8] aims at quantifying the goodness of a particular division of a given network, and has been widely accepted as a benchmark index to measure and to compare the accuracy of various methods of community detection. The definition of this quantity is based on the idea that community structure definitely means a statistically surprising arrangement of edges, that is, the number of actual edges within communities should be significantly beyond that of the expected edges of a null model. In turn, a null model should have the same number of nodes and degree

distribution as the original network, while the edges of the null model are placed by chance.

Let k_i be the degree of nodes i , and M the total number of edges. Since in the null model [18] the probability for an edge being present between nodes i and j is $\frac{k_i k_j}{2M}$, the modularity quantifying the extent of the number of actual edges exceeding the expectation based on the null model network, can be formulated as follows:

$$Q = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left(A_{i,j} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_j) \quad (1)$$

where Q is the sum of the difference over all groups of the particular division, N is the network size, $A_{i,j}$ indicates the adjacent relation between nodes i and j , g_i represents the group the node i is assigned to, and the δ function takes the value of 1 if g_i equals g_j , 0 otherwise.

The value of Q ranges from -1 to 1. Given a network, a larger value generally indicates a more accurate division of the network into communities. Community structure detection thus can be formulated as a problem of modularity maximization, which often works well although it may suffer from a resolution problem [29, 30]. But on the other hand, due to the resolution limitation and the random fluctuation effect [34], it appears preferable for the divisions delivered by maximization modularity approaches to give an evaluation of their reliability [31–33, 35].

The above modularity is actually designed for unipartite networks. To be suitable for various networks, several variations of modularity based on different null models have been proposed, including weighted [36], directed [23], and bipartite modularity [24, 26]. A bipartite network with N nodes can be conveniently denoted by a duality (p, q) ($p + q = N$), where p and q respectively represent the numbers of the two types of nodes. We can renumber nodes such that in the sequence $1, 2, \dots, p, p + 1, \dots, N$, the leftmost p indices represent the first type of nodes and the remainder represent the second type of nodes. Then, Barber's bipartite modularity [26], which considers a community composed of distinct types of nodes in the network, can be written as

$$Q_b = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=p+1}^N \left(A_{i,j} - \frac{k_i k_j}{M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_j) \quad (2)$$

Immediately, a subtle difference between the two modularities in Eqs. (1) and (2) can be observed. It is of interest that a unipartite network can be equivalently represented as a bipartite one, and the bipartite modularity can recover the modularity for the original network. If each node i is represented by two nodes A_i and B_i and each edge $i-j$ represented by two edges A_i-B_j and A_j-B_i , then a unipartite network with N nodes and M edges is transformed into a corresponding bipartite network with $2N$ nodes and $2M$ edges. For example, the transformation of a simple unipartite network is shown in Fig. 1. Further, if we label N nodes A_i with $1, 2, \dots, N$ and la-




FIG. 1: Transformation of a simple unipartite network into a bipartite one. (a) An unipartite network with five nodes and six edges. (b) The bipartite network corresponding to (a).

bel B_i with $N + 1, N + 2, \dots, 2N$, then an edge i - j in the original network corresponds to two edges, i - $(N + j)$ and j - $(N + i)$. Using the bipartite modularity introduced in Eq. (2) on the induced bipartite network, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q_b &= \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=N+1}^{2N} \left(\tilde{A}_{i,j} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_j) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^N \left(\tilde{A}_{i,N+j'} - \frac{k_i k_{N+j'}}{2M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_{N+j'}) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left(A_{i,j} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_j) = Q \quad (3)
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have made use of the fact that the node A_i and B_i should be in an identical community and have the same degree. Thus, bipartite modularity can also be used to community detection in unipartite networks after being transformed.

We then turn to the modularity for directed unipartite networks, which are another important class of networks. The directed network can analogously be transformed to a bipartite network. A node i is represented by two nodes A_i and B_i as in unipartite networks, while a directed edge from i to j is represented as an edge between A_i and B_j , that is, set $\{A_i\}$ and set $\{B_i\}$ are the sources and the sinks. Again, using the Eq. (2) and the fact above, we

obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q_b &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=N+1}^{2N} \left(\tilde{A}_{i,j} - \frac{k_i k_j}{M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_j) \\
 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^N \left(\tilde{A}_{i,N+j'} - \frac{k_i k_{N+j'}}{M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_{N+j'}) \\
 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left(A_{i,j} - \frac{k_i^{\text{out}} k_j^{\text{in}}}{M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_j) \quad (4)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the term on right-hand side in the last equation is just the modularity for directed networks presented in [23]. The method for transforming directed networks into bipartite ones has been proposed by Guimerà *et al* [24], but their bipartite modularity is distinct from Barber's, as mentioned before.

Consequently, the bipartite network can be considered as a wider class of networks that provides a generic case for the problem of community structure detection. And Barber's bipartite modularity can served as a uniform objective for these methods of identifying communities based on optimization.

III. EVOLUTIONARY METHOD FOR COMMUNITY DETECTION

As a class of general-purpose tools to solve various hard problems, genetic algorithms have found wide application in bioinformatics, computer science, physics, engineering, and other fields. They are, based on the Darwinian principle of survival of the fittest, a kind of global optimization method simulating evolutionary processes of species in nature [37].

The evolutionary methods are easy to implement, and the process can be described as follows. The methods start with a stochastically created initial population with predefined size wherein individuals are known as chromosomes representing a set of feasible solutions to the problem at hand, with each associated with a fitness value. Then chromosomes are selected in proportion to their corresponding fitness so that those fitter individuals would will have multiple copies and less fit will be discarded in the new population. Next, genetic operators such as crossover and mutation are performed according to the respective specified ratios on the population. After these operations, the population of the next generation has been reproduced. The above process is iterated to evolve the current population toward better offspring until the termination criterion is met.

Since the number of divisions on any given network grows at least exponentially in the network size, the optimization of modularity is clearly an NP-hard problem that has been given a rigid proof in [38], which has motivated an array of heuristic methods including greedy agglomeration [9], simulated annealing (SA) [16], spectral relaxation (SR) [17, 18], extremal optimization (EO) [19]

and mathematical programming [39]. All these methods perform a point-point search, that is, transformation from one solution to a better one, and are susceptible to trapping in a local optimum. In contrast, genetic algorithms work with a population of solutions instead of a single solution. This implies that genetic algorithms are more robust because they perform concurrent searches in multiple directions which would make them effectively find better solutions.

However, for practitioners, a fundamental important problem is to choose appropriate parameters such as crossover rate and mutation rate, because they will seriously affect the performance of genetic algorithms. Furthermore, these parameters are closely related to the studied problems, and even for the same problem, they should adjust themselves in the course of the search. In the following, we would like to introduce an adaptive genetic algorithm recently presented by Szeto and Zhang [40] and then propose a modified version suited for community structure detection.

A. Mutation only Genetic algorithm

Traditional genetic algorithms assume that genetic operators indiscriminately act on each locus constituting the chromosome, but this is not always the case. Indeed, the recent research in human DNA [41] shows that mutation rates at different loci are very different from one another. Inspired by this, Ma and Szeto [42] reported on a locus-oriented adaptive genetic algorithm (LOAGA) that makes use of the statistical information inside the population to tune the mutation rate at an individual locus. Szeto and Zhang [40] further presented a new adaptive genetic algorithm, called the mutation only genetic algorithm (MOGA), which generalized the LOAGA by incorporating the information about the loci statistics in the mutation operator. In the MOGA, mutation is the only genetic operator, and the only required parameter is the population size. The MOGA was readdressed by Law and Szeto in [43], wherein it was extended to include a crossover operator. Here, the description for the MOGA is given on the basis of the later version.

The population matrix P has N_P stacked chromosomes with length L , with its entries $P_{ij}(t)$ representing the allele at locus j of the chromosome i at time (or generation) t . The rows of this matrix are ranked according to the fitness of the chromosomes in descending order, i.e., $f(i) \geq f(k)$ for $i < k$. The columns are ranked according to the standard deviation $\sigma_t(j)$ (its definition will given below) of alleles at locus j such that $\sigma_t(j) \geq \sigma_t(k)$ for $j < k$. In the MOGA, the fitness cumulative probability, as an informative measure for chromosome i relative to the landscape of fitness of the whole population, was introduced and defined as

$$C(i) = \frac{1}{N_P} \sum_{g \leq f(i)} N(g), \quad (5)$$

where $N(g)$ is the number of chromosomes whose fitness values equal g . Subsequently, the standard deviation $\sigma_t(j)$ over the allele distribution, as a useful informative measure for each locus j , is defined as

$$\sigma_j(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_P} (P_{ij}(t) - \overline{h_j(t)})^2 \times C(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_P} C(i)}}, \quad (6)$$

where the weighting factor $C(i)$ reflects the informative usefulness of the chromosome i , and $\overline{h_j(t)}$ is the mean of the alleles at locus j , given by

$$\overline{h_j(t)} = \frac{1}{N_P} \sum_{i=1}^{N_P} P_{ij}(t). \quad (7)$$

A locus with a smaller allele standard deviation was considered to be more informative than other loci, and vice versa. Indeed, this really makes sense in limited situations. For the initial population, the alleles at each locus j should satisfy a uniform distribution, so the standard deviation $\sigma_t(j)$ will be very high while the locus present is not informative. A typical optimization problem generally allows for a few global optima, so the loci with higher structural information are liable to take fewer alleles than allowed, thereby having smaller allele standard deviations. Therefore, the loci with higher deviations prefer mutating while the other loci (informative loci) remain to guide the evolution process.

Now we can describe the process for the MOGA. In each generation, we sweep the population matrix from top to bottom. Each row (a chromosome) is selected for mutation, with probability $\alpha(i) = 1 - C(i)$. According to Eq. (5), we have $\frac{1}{N_P} \leq C(i) \leq 1$. Then, a chromosome with a higher fitness value has fewer chances to be selected, and vice versa. In Particular, the first chromosome that has the highest fitness value will never be selected for mutation, while the last one will almost always undergo mutation for a large enough N_P , if N_P normally takes a value from 50 to 100 as De Jong suggested [44], for example, $\alpha(N_P) = 1 - \frac{1}{N_P} = 0.98$ for $N_P = 50$. If the current chromosome selected is i , then the number $N(i)$ of loci for mutation is prescribed as $N(i) = \alpha(i) \times L$. Thus, a selected chromosome with a higher fitness value has fewer loci to mutate, so that most of the informative loci remain; while a selected chromosome with a lower fitness value has more less-informative loci to mutate. In practice, we can mutate the $N(i)$ leftmost loci because they are less informative than others according to the above arrangement of loci.

Overall, the MOGA was expected to have a two-fold advantage over traditional genetic algorithms: first, because there is no need to input parameters except the population size it can be more available for solving various problems; second, the mechanism of adaptively adjusting parameters can make it more effectively perform and obtain better solutions if it works as expected.



FIG. 2: Encoding schema of a chromosome for a bipartite network (p, q) . B_{j_k} (for $k \leq p$) is the allele at the locus representing node A_k , which stands for a neighbor node of A_k in the network. Similarly, A_{i_k} (for $k \leq q$) is the allele at the locus representing node B_k .

B. Measure for the informativeness of loci

Despite these possible advantages, the MOGA cannot be directly applied to community structure detection due to a drawback that will be shown. Instead, we present a modified version of the MOGA, i.e., the MAGA, which is especially suited for the problem of community structure detection. We note that genetic algorithms have been applied to this problem in [45, 46], but these applications are based on standard genetic algorithms (SGAs).

We begin with the encoding schema of the genetic algorithm for finding communities in a bipartite network. A useful representation is the locus-based adjacency representation presented by Park and Song in [47] where it was used in clustering data and also has been used for community detection [46]. In this encoding schema, a chromosome consists of N loci with a locus for a node in the network, and the allele at a locus j is the label of one neighbor of node j in the network. In this way, a chromosome actually induces a graph that is often disconnected because of the reduction in connectivity relative to the original network. Given the connectivity of the community, decoding the division from a chromosome then amounts to finding all the connected components of the induced graph. For simplicity, we also call them the connected components of the chromosome.

Now, we apply the encoding schema to the case of bipartite networks. Given a bipartite network (p, q) , we label its nodes as noted above, i.e., we label nodes of type A with $1, 2, \dots, p$ while we label another type of nodes with $p+1, \dots, N$. Then a chromosome R for the network can be represented as that shown in Fig. 2. Since our objective is to find a division with as higher a modularity as possible, the fitness function can be defined directly in terms of the modularity. Based on the above representation for the chromosome, this function becomes

$$f(R) = Q_b(\pi_R) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=p+1}^N \left(A_{i,j} - \frac{k_i k_j}{M} \right) \delta(g_i, g_j), \quad (8)$$

where the parameter π_R emphasizes that the division on which the modularity is calculated is encoded by chromosome R .

Recall that in the MOGA the allele standard deviation is used to pick the loci to mutate. When applied to community structure detection, however, the measure generally will misguide the algorithm. Consider the sim-

TABLE I: Example of a population with three chromosomes. Fitness is calculated on the division induced from decoding the chromosome. Values in each column are the alleles at the locus.

Chro.	Fitness	Loc.1	Loc.2	Loc.3	Loc.4
R_1	0.5	100	20	4	8
R_2	0.3	100	50	5	12
R_3	0.2	10	50	6	7
σ		36.7243	15.8114	0.8165	2.0412

ple case in which the population consists only of three chromosomes, R_1 , R_2 , and R_3 , which in turn consist of four loci that have three alleles. Table I shows the allele distribution at these loci.

From Eqs. (5) and (6), the allele standard deviations for the four loci, $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ and σ_4 (henceforth, we omit the parameter t for simplicity), can be calculated to obtain

$$\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_4 > \sigma_3. \quad (9)$$

According to the selection criterion of the loci to mutate in the MOGA, σ_1 has the highest standard deviation and will be picked out.

In fact, the informativeness of a locus implies a certain bias, and vice versa. The initial population is generated randomly and each locus follows an approximately random distribution. From the uniform distribution, we have nothing on the structure of the optimal solution to the given problem. With gradual evolution, more and more fit members of the population will assume the same alleles at some loci, which may suggest some structural information of the optimal solutions; that is, the bias (or deviation) from the random distribution indicates the informativeness of the locus. In the simplest case such as the knapsack problem where each locus takes the value 1 or 0, the allele standard deviation amounts to the bias and the MOGA can work well [40].

For the current case, loci 3 and 4 should be selected with equally higher priority because their allele distributions are equally closer to their respective random distributions. Both loci 1 and 2 appear with a certain bias on their alleles, indicating that they are more informative than others. If the informativeness of each chromosome is taken into account, however, they are evidently different from one another. Locus 1 has a larger bias since the chromosomes with the same allele 100, i.e., R_1 and R_2 , have higher fitness. In contrast, locus 2 has a smaller bias since the chromosomes with the same allele 50, i.e., R_2 and R_3 , have lower fitness. Therefore, the correct order of mutation is

$$\text{locus 3} = \text{locus 4} > \text{locus 2} > \text{locus 1}, \quad (10)$$

where the equality means that the pair of loci have the same priority for mutation. Obviously, the allele standard deviation would severely misguide the MOGA in the current case.

The failure of the allele standard deviation stems from the fact that this measure is closely related to alleles at loci. However, the information contained in loci is actually not relevant to the particular values but solely determined by the bias relative to the random distribution. The method of measurement of the bias is thus crucial. Fortunately, we can use the Kullback-Leibler divergence [48] to describe the bias.

In the formalism of the MAGA, we explicitly represent a locus j as a discrete random variable X_j , and an allele at the locus is a value that X_j can take. Note that in the following the set of all alleles at the locus is denoted by X_j as well. Then the random distribution at the locus can be formally given by

$$\mathcal{Q}(X_j = x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|X_j|}, & \text{for each } x \in X_j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Let the allele distribution over the population be \mathcal{P} , defined by

$$\mathcal{P}(X_j = x) = \frac{\sum_{P_{ij}=x} f(i)}{\sum_i f(i)}. \quad (12)$$

We can mathematically define the bias μ as the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the two distributions, \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} :

$$\mu(j) = \sum_{x \in X_j} \mathcal{P}(X_j = x) \log \frac{\mathcal{P}(X_j = x)}{\mathcal{Q}(X_j = x)}, \quad (13)$$

The base of log is irrelevant, but it will change the value of bias, and in the following all the logs are taken to base 2. It is noteworthy that the quantity $0 \log 0$ should be interpreted as zero. As a Kullback-Leibler divergence, the bias is always non-negative and is zero if and only if $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}$. The intuitive explanation is that the amount of information a locus contains is always non-negative, and that we have to roll an unbiased dice if we have not any knowledge about something. Conversely, we can predict that an event will inevitably occur only when we have complete information about it.

Reconsidering the above example, we obtain $\mu_1 = 0.863$, $\mu_2 = 0.585$, and $\mu_3 = \mu_4 = 0.5145$. As a smaller bias indicates poorer information a locus contains, the locus should undergo mutation. Conversely, a larger bias means richer informativeness, and the locus should remain. Therefore, guided by the bias, the order of mutation is locus 3,4,2,1 or 4,3,2,1, which completely match the order in Eq. (10).

Furthermore, it can be observed that locus 2 has zero bias if it has only two alleles. The difference coming from the change of number of alleles would be normally concealed by the allele standard deviation. For these reasons, the bias appears superior to the allele standard deviation. A better alternative is to use the normalization of the bias as in our MAGA, which ranges from 0 to 1 being divided by $\log |X_j|$.

C. The reassignment technique for the locus statistic

It is so far acknowledged that the loci with random distributions should have the highest priority for mutation. However, in the community detection case this pre-supposition does not always hold. After the evolution of a certain number of generations, some communities or their main bodies will appear at the population scale. At present, a locus with a random distribution does not necessarily imply that it contains no information and should undergo mutation immediately. Generally, there exist in the network many nodes whose neighbors are all (or almost all) in the same communities and have a similar connection pattern or even are structurally equivalent nodes [49] that are connected to the same nodes. For such a node, if all (or most) of its neighbors presenting in the same connected component predominates in the current population, then the locus has a random distribution or an approximately random distribution. Therefore, we are required to differentiate the cases to avoid such misleading.

The reassignment technique is designed to deal with this problem. For a chromosome R , the element x is the allele at the locus j which is a neighbor of the node j . Check whether the component in which j lies includes other neighbors with smaller labels in the original network. If it is true and the neighbor with the smallest label is y , then the contribution from R , $\frac{f(R)}{\sum_i f(i)}$ that should be assigned to x now is reassigned to y if $x \neq y$. In this way, forward sweeping of the population matrix can obtain an updated allele distribution at the locus over the population, given by

$$\mathcal{P}^*(X_j = x) = \frac{\sum_{\mathcal{S}(i,j)=x} f(i)}{\sum_i f(i)}. \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{S}(i, j)$ is the node j 's neighbor with the smallest label that lies with j in the same component of the chromosome i .

TABLE II: Example of reassignment technique. Column 1 lists four chromosomes, column 2 is the fitness of the chromosomes, column 3 shows the alleles of locus 1, and the right four columns show whether the corresponding nodes are in the same connected component as node 1, with 1 indicating yes and 0 no.

Chro.	Fitness	Loc.1	Loc.2	Loc.3	Loc.4	Loc.5
R1	0.28	2	1	1	0	0
R2	0.25	3	0	1	1	0
R3	0.25	4	1	0	1	1
R4	0.22	5	0	1	0	1

An example using the technique as shown in Table II. Using Eq. (12), it is obvious that the locus 1 has an approximately random distribution and thus the bias is close to 0. Recalculating the distribution with the reassignment technique, however, we have $\mathcal{P}^*(X_1 = 2) =$




FIG. 3: Two possible schemes for changing the allele at locus j , where nodes represent loci and the directed edge $j \rightarrow i$ represents that the present allele at locus j is i , while undirected edges are irrelevant to the reassignment process. The black node is the node (locus) j , the nodes with dashed border are the allele nodes in this component, the gray ones are the influenced nodes and the others are indifferent ones. (a) The new target node 1 (new allele) is in the subgraph elicited from the node 3 (the present allele at locus j). (b) The new target node 1 is not in the subgraph elicited from the node 3.

0.53, $\mathcal{P}^*(X_1 = 3) = 0.47$, and $\mathcal{P}^*(X_1 = 4) = \mathcal{P}^*(X_1 = 5) = 0$, which is very different from the random distribution with bias 1.0026.

The idea behind the technique is well understood. Given a locus j , we can replace the present allele with any other allele that lies in the same component in a way that does not alter the connectivity of the component hence causing no change in the division encoded by the chromosome. To show its feasibility, we focus on the component in which j lies. Recall that a locus represents a node and the allele at the locus represents the unique neighbor the node adheres to. Consequently, the component is in the form of a directed graph with unitary out-degree for each node. There exist two possible schemes as shown in Fig. 3. Note that the undirected edges are irrelevant to the reassignment process; thus their directions can be disregarded.

In the scheme depicted in Fig. 3(a), we can directly change the allele from 3 to 1 but still maintain the connectivity of the component. For the scheme in Fig. 3(b), however, such direct altering of the allele will split the original component. To deal with this case, we study the travel in the component along directed edges, start-

ing from the node j . Since the subgraph elicited from node j is connected to the rest of the component through j , this travel must end in a node that has passed. Let the path be $j \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_{k-1} \rightarrow x_k$. When $x_k \neq j$, we can reestablish the connectivity by removing the last edge, reversing the direction of each edge in the path, and adding a new edge $x_1(3) \rightarrow j$. Note that the resultant graph meets with the constraint that any node has only one outgoing edge. Therefore, we can reset the alleles at those loci involved in the path. For example, in Fig. 3(b), the entire path is $j \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 2$, so we can set the alleles according to the path, $7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow j$. Now, the allele at the locus can be set to 1. As for the case $x_k = j$, we can directly alter the alleles as in the scheme in Fig. 3(a).

In the reassignment technique, we can also reassign the contribution from the chromosome to the allele with the maximum label that lies in the same component when performing locus statistics. More generally, the method can also work as long as we arbitrarily specify a fixed reassignment order for each locus, although different prescriptions may produce different biases.

Clearly, the reassignment technique is very useful for community structure detection although it would not work when applied to loci that have a single allele, i.e., the corresponding nodes in the network are leaves. Moreover, this special case can be readily eliminated by forbidding the mutation, which may bring about the additional merit that it naturally reduces the complexity of the problem. Since most real-world networks are scale-free where substantial number of leaf nodes exist, this merit will be very significant for finding communities in such networks.

D. Population size

As in the MOGA, the unique parameter required to be provided in the MAGA is the population size. The parameter may have significant influence on the application of genetic algorithms. De Jong's experiment on a small suite of test functions showed [44] that the best population size was 50-100 for these functions. There are also other empirical studies and theoretical analyses of this parameter [50, 51]. In practice, De Jong's setting has been widely adopted, which may be because this choice gives a good tradeoff between the quality of the solution and the cost of computation in many cases.

This popularity of the setting, however, does not exclude the development of genetic algorithms working with a variable population size. A few examples of the class of algorithms can be found in [52–54]. Although one of these mechanisms may be beneficial to be incorporated into MAGA, in this work we does not take it into account.

Since we expect that all alleles at a locus can simultaneously appear in the population, a population size that is greater than the degrees of most nodes in the net-

work would be preferable. As mentioned before, most real-world networks are scale-free, so the degrees of most nodes in these networks are smaller than 50. Considering this fact and the cost of large population size, we would like to take a fixed value from the interval between 50 and 200.

E. Convergence and its speeding up

The MOGA was reported to perform well in the application to solve the knapsack problem [40], where all the loci have two alleles, 0 and 1. For many cases, however, its performance will be hindered by two factors. One factor is the misguiding by the allele standard deviation mentioned above. The other is that in the evolution of each generation the fittest individual(s) actually will not participate in the mutation unless others supersede it (them).

In fact, despite fulfilling the elite preservation strategy [55, 56] that assures convergence for a SGA toward the global optimum, the MOGA does not guarantee such convergence and even may end with a nonlocal optimum solution. Consider a case where the $N_P - 1$ fittest chromosomes have identical fitness and the remaining one has a lower fitness value. Those fittest should be passed to the next generation while the remaining one will mutate with very high probability. If the mutation happens to produce a chromosome with the same fitness as the others, this will unexpectedly terminate the evolutionary process.

Moreover, it is helpful to notice that the present fittest chromosomes, if not a local optimum, always can perform a local search to reach a local optimum. Consequently, it is preferable to modify the rule for mutation so as to allow for local search, which refers to performing a random mutation on a single locus. The mutation operation is powerful in that it may lead to a node moving between different components, a component splitting or two components merging.

Interestingly, we found that in many cases it may be useful for the local search to perform a special splitting operation with a low probability (for example, 0.1). The splitting operation on a component drawn randomly can be implemented by a bipartitioning in the spectral method [17, 18, 57]. Let the number of edges in the component be M_c . For the power method, it needs $O(N)$ multiplications to converge the lead vector of a matrix of size N , which leads to a run time $O(N^2)$ for a bipartition in the spectral method [17]. In order to not increase the time complexity of each generation's evolution, the multiplication is executed at most $N \log N / M_c$ times.

Combining the above considerations, the overall procedure of the MAGA for community detection can be described as follows.

(1) The connectivity of the network of interest is fed into the MAGA. The algorithm then creates N_P initial feasible solutions, each locus of which is initiated with a

random allele.

(2) At each generation, the MAGA first duplicates 10% the fittest chromosomes of previous generation for the current generation.

(3) The MAGA then reproduces $0.9N_P$ individuals by selecting from the previous generation in proportion to their fitness to prepare for mutation.

(4) The fitness and the fitness cumulative probability for chromosomes are evaluated using Eqs. (8) and (5), respectively; immediately, the bias for each locus using Eqs. (13) and (14) is evaluated, and then these loci are ranked according to their biases.

(5) The individuals reproduced in step 3 are swept, and the chromosome i selected with the same probability $1 - C(f(i))$ as in the MOGA; if the chromosome is chosen then the mutation aforementioned is performed, otherwise a local search for the fitter individuals is performed.

(6) Steps 2–5 are repeated until a certain termination criterion has been met. Otherwise, the MAGA outputs the best partition with the highest fitness.

Since in step 3 the fitter individuals incline to be reproduced because of their higher fitness, step 4 enables the reproduced fittest individuals always to perform a local search. Step 2 maintains the elite preservation strategy in case of the destruction of the strategy in step 5. In this way, the MAGA not only can converge to the global optima, also can speed up the process.

The most time-consuming operations in each generation are evaluating the bias and fitness with $O(M)$ time, and ranking the loci with $O(N \log N)$ time. This ranking operation has seemingly slightly higher complexity than an $O(M)$ operation if the network is sparse. In fact, it can be performed faster than those operations with $O(M)$ time since the latter need to be repeated N_P times. Therefore, the overall time cost for each generation of the MAGA is $O(M)$ like that of SGAs.

IV. RESULTS

In this section, we empirically study the effectiveness of the MAGA by applying it to model bipartite networks and several real bipartite networks. In both cases, we show that MAGA is superior to SGAs and the MOGA [59], and it also can compete with the nice BRIM (bipartite, recursively induced modules) [26] algorithm that dedicated to bipartite networks. We also tested the performance on several real unipartite networks, comparing with several well-known methods for unipartite networks in the literature.

A. Model bipartite networks

To test how well our algorithm performs, we have applied it to model bipartite networks with a known community structure. A model network can be constructed

in two steps. The first step is to determine the layout of nodes in the network, i.e., to specify the number of communities N_C , and the numbers of nodes of two types included in each community N_A and N_B , as well as to assign group membership to these nodes. Next, the dispersion of edges is determined by specifying the intra-community and intercommunity link probabilities p_{in} and p_{out} , such that $p_{in} \geq p_{out}$.

For simplicity, all communities assume the same values of N_A and N_B . We set $N_C = 5$, $N_A = 12$, and $N_B = 8$ as used in [26]. One might expect that as p_{in} is markedly greater than p_{out} the networks exemplifying the model have significant community structure that tends to be detected. Conversely, as p_{out} approaches p_{in} , the network examples become more uniform and their modular structure becomes more obscure. In this experiment, p_{in} is fixed at the value of 0.9 while p_{out} is varied by tuning p_{out}/p_{in} from 0.1 to 0.9 with steps of 0.1. We have tested on such models the performance of the MAGA as well as of the SGA and the MOGA, each exemplified with ten networks. On each example we ran these algorithms ten times.

For evaluating the quality of solutions, both the modularity and the normalized mutual information (NMI) [27] are useful. But the NMI is more suitable for the current case since the optimal (correct) division of the model network is known in advance. This measure takes its maximum value of 1 when the found division perfectly matches with the known division while it takes 0, the minimum value, when they are totally independent of each other. Accordingly, we employed the stop criterion that the algorithms reach the predefined generation size (maximum number of generations) or the NMI reaches its maximum value.

Figures 4 and 5 display the performance comparison between such genetic algorithms for $p_{out}/p_{in} = 0.1$ and $p_{out}/p_{in} = 0.2$, respectively. The generation size is set to 2000. For both cases, the MAGA and the SGA remarkably outperform the MOGA. From Fig. 4 (a), we can see that the the MAGA is appreciably faster than the SGA, although both perform well since the mutual information rapidly exceeds 0.9. In our test, each run of MAGA on all ten example networks consistently gave the optimal division, i.e., produced 100 numbers of generations less than 2000. For the SGA, 97 runs gave the optimum division. Their distributions of the number of generations needed to reach the optimum, reported in Figs. 4(b) and 4(c) further reveal their difference in speed (in terms of the number of generations).

When $p_{out}/p_{in} = 0.2$, it is more difficult to identify their community structure of the example networks relative to the previous ones. The SGA succeeded in obtaining the optimum division in 32 runs. In sharp contrast, each run of the MAGA gave the optimum division. More information on the distributions of the number of generations is provided in Fig. 5 (a). Also, in Fig. 5(b), the variations of the mutual information with regard to the SGA and the MAGA illuminate that there exists a




FIG. 4: (Color online) Performance on bipartite model networks with $p_{in} = 0.9$ and $p_{out}/p_{in} = 0.1$. The generation size is set to 2000. (a) Variation of normalized mutual information over first 500 generations. (b) Distribution of the number of generations needed to reach the optimum using the SGA. More than half the number of generations are over 200. (c) Distribution of the number of generations needed to reach the optimum using the MAGA. There are 83 runs in which the number of generations is less than 200.

greater performance difference between them than in the case of $p_{out}/p_{in} = 0.1$.

Even for $p_{out}/p_{in} = 0.1$, the MOGA was not observed to reach the optimum solution in its first 2000 generations was not observed. Actually, the MOGA performed so poorly that it was even much slower than the SGA as shown in Figs. 4 (a) and 5 (b). We argue that the main




FIG. 5: (Color online) Performance on model networks with $p_{\text{in}} = 0.9$ and $p_{\text{out}}/p_{\text{in}} = 0.2$. The generation size is set to 2000. (a) Distributions of the number of generations to reach the optimum using the SGA and MAGA. There are 32 black circle points and 100 red box points respectively representing the number of generations needed to reach the optimum using the SGA and MAGA. Most numbers of generations for the SGA are distributed above 1000 while for the MAGA most are below 800. (b) Variation of normalized mutual information with the number of generations. Each point is the average over the 100 runs.

reason for this is that the use of an incorrect informative measure for the loci has misguided the algorithm.

We have made a more extensive performance comparison. Figure shows the variations of accuracy of the MAGA and SGA as well as BRIM against changes of $p_{\text{out}}/p_{\text{in}}$. For the model networks, assigning each of the nodes from the smaller groups to its own module is a better strategy for BRIM that will lead to a precise division. To be fair [60], we picked the best division from the ten runs on each sample network and then averaged over ten examples for a particular $p_{\text{out}}/p_{\text{in}}$.




FIG. 6: (Color online) Variation of performance of the algorithms with different $p_{\text{out}}/p_{\text{in}}$. Each point is the average over ten sample networks. For $p_{\text{out}}/p_{\text{in}} = 0.1$ and 0.2 , the generation size is set to 2000; for other values, the size is set to 3000.

B. Southern women network

As the first example of a real bipartite network, we study the southern women network [61]. The social network consists of 18 women and 14 events for which the data were collected by Davis *et al.* in the 1930s, describing the participation of the women in these events. It has been extensively used as a typical instance for investigating the problem of finding cohesive groups hidden in social networks; see Ref. [25] for a useful review.

We have performed the MAGA ten times on this network, with the population size 100 and the generation size 3000. Unlike the BRIM algorithm for which initial state is important, initial states are generally irrelevant (or weaker relevant) for genetic algorithms to they can succeed in finding a quite good solution. For each run, the MAGA found the best solution so far, with $Q = 0.3455$.

Figure 7 shows the community structure identified in the southern women network using the MAGA. This division is exactly the same as that found with BRIM with the initial strategy that begins with assigning all events to a single community. We have also applied the SGA and the MOGA to this network with the same population size and generation size. A simple performance comparison between them is shown in Table III, which lists the success times for reaching the best solution, the minimum (MinGen) and maximum number of generations (MaxGen) to reach the optimum, and the average normalized mutual information (I_{norm}^*), and average modularity (Q^*).

No matter what we are concerned about, the speed or the quality, the MAGA again has an evident advantage




FIG. 7: (Color online) Southern women network (dashed lines indicate the division found by the MAGA). Each community consists of those nodes with the same color (level of scale), including women and events represented by box and triangle events respectively.

over the SGA and MOGA. Table IV shows the accuracy of the MAGA in comparison with other methods.

TABLE III: Performance comparison between the SGA, MOGA and MAGA on the southern women network. Each algorithm runs ten times. Here, success means that the algorithms have found the best solution before they reaches the generation size 3000.

Method	Succ.	MinGen.	MaxGen.	I_{norm}^*	Q^*
SGA	4	2011	2924	0.8923	0.3454
MOGA	0	—	—	0.7997	0.3448
MAGA	10	87	1830	1	0.3455

Most previous studies assigned these women to groups depending on their interests. Davis *et al.* [61] assigned the women to two groups, labeled 1-9 and 9-18. Woman 9 can be considered as an overlapping node of the two groups in a sense, but should be exclusively included in one group by the currently used community definition. We may label the division with 9 and 1-8 in the same group as “Davis 1”, and the alternative division (9 is grouped with 10-18) as “Davis 2”.

Doreian *et al.* [62] took the definition of a bipartite community composed of two types of nodes and proposed several divisions, with the accuracy of the division with the highest modularity shown in Table IV. We call the BRIM algorithm using the strategy of (1) assigning all events to a single module and (2) assigning each event to its own module “BRIM 1” and “BRIM 2,” respectively. Barber [26] reported its accuracy when using such strategies on the network; these results also can be found in Table IV.

TABLE IV: Performance comparison on the southern women network, where some data are drawn from [26].

Method	Communities	Q^*	I_{norm}^*
MAGA	4	0.3455	1
BRIM 1	4	0.3455	1
BRIM 2	2	0.3212	0.5803
Davis 1	2	0.3106	0.4466
Davis 2	2	0.3184	0.4513
Doreian	3	0.2939	0.6077




FIG. 8: (Color online) Distributions of the divisions returned by the SGA, MOGA and MAGA. The black horizontal line indicates the best bipartite modularity reported in [26] using the BRIM algorithm.

C. Scotland corporate interlock network

The second real-world bipartite network we have used as a test on is the Scotland corporate interlock network [63]. This network describes the corporate interlock pattern between 136 directors and the 108 largest joint stock companies during 1904-1905. As it is disconnected, we focus merely on its largest component, which comprises 131 directors and 86 firms. In the following, the word “network” consistently indicates this component.

The BRIM algorithm found poorer divisions of this network with $Q = 0.5663$ and $Q = 0.3987$, using the strategies of assigning all directors to unique modules or to the same module. With the adaptive binary search technique, the BRIM algorithm, when using the strategy of randomly assigning directors to modules, may find a much better solution with $Q = 0.663(\pm 0.002)$. Based on the experimental results, the author of [26] suggested that the network comprise approximately 20 communities.

Similarly, we have examined the performance of three algorithms on this network by running ten times with the same settings as before. Figure 8 shows the distributions

of the solutions returned by SGA, MOGA, and MAGA. Obviously, both the SGA and MAGA definitely exhibit higher accuracy than BRIM and the MOGA.

Moreover, the MAGA appears preferable to the SGA. In the experiment, the modularity of the best division found by the SGA, $Q = 0.7070$, is less than those of the best two divisions (π_1 and π_2) found by the MAGA with $Q = 0.7093$ and $Q = 0.7089$. On the other hand, as shown in Fig. 8, for the MAGA most of the ten divisions including the best two are found during the first 2000 generations while for the SGA six of the ten divisions are found after 2000 generations.

In closing, we would like to give a simple evaluation of the reliability of the solutions. We calculated the normalized mutation information between any pairs of solutions returned by the MAGA. The maximum value of the NMI is between π_1 and π_2 and is equal to 0.9191, indicating that they are very similar. Simultaneously, for each solution, we calculated the average of the NMI between that division and other divisions. We found that π_2 has the largest value, 0.8459, and π_1 has the third largest value, 0.8248. These facts lend confidence in the reliability of the optimum divisions obtained, π_1 and π_2 . Figure 9 shows the community structure of this network according to π_2 . Clearly, the MAGA indeed has given a very accurate division of this network.

D. Unipartite networks

The MAGA can also be applied to unipartite networks by optimizing the bipartite modularity after the transformation as mentioned in Sec. II. Being a kind of genetic algorithm, however, the MAGA can directly optimize the unipartite modularity as the SGA does [46], which distinguishes it from certain methods such as the SR method which is required to develop different versions for different classes of networks [17, 18, 23, 26]. Furthermore, the modularity consistency revealed in Sec. II means that the MAGA can also more effectively optimize unipartite modularity so that we only focus on the comparison with those well-known methods, including the Girvan-Newman (GN) algorithm [7], EO [27], SR [17, 18], and SA [16].

To test the performance of the MAGA on unipartite networks, we have considered several real networks with different scales: the Zachary karate club network [64], the jazz musicians network [65] (Jazz), the *Caenorhabditis elegans* metabolic network [66] (*C. elegans*), the email network of University Rovira i Virgili [67] (Email), a trust network of users of the Pretty-Good-Privacy (PGP) algorithm for information security [68], and a coauthorship network of scientists working in condensed matter physics [69] (Cond-mat).

The EO and SR methods clearly outperform the original method for detecting communities (the GN method); they may both be viewed as the representatives of modularity maximization approaches in that they can achieve

a good tradeoff between speed and accuracy. As shown in Table V, the MAGA almost consistently outperforms the EO and SR methods for these networks. Interestingly, for the Zachary network the MAGA found the accurate solution with $Q = 0.4198$ [39, 75], while neither the EO nor SR method can find it in spite of the fact that the network is very simple. Furthermore, for the larger networks the gap in performance tends to widen; for example, the maximum modularity difference approaches 18% (11%) relative to the EO (SR) method for the largest network studied.

Even when compared with SA method, which is widely considered as the most accurate modularity maximization method, the MAGA may give a higher modularity while significantly reduce the time cost. In fact, the SA method theoretically allows finding the global optima of modularity, but the exponential complexity restricts it only to finding a better local optimum and to resolving the network of scale only up to 10^4 . The performance of the SA listed in Table V was reported in running on an Intel PC with two 3.2 GHz processors in [39], wherein the authors proposed an accurate method that can be competitive with the SA method but has very high memory demand. We ran the MAGA ten times for all the networks, with predefined generation size, on an Intel PC with two 2.93 GHz processors. The last two columns of Table V shows the number of generations and the running time needed to find the maximum modularity in the runs.

V. CONCLUSION

We have shown both that unipartite and directed networks can be equivalently represented as bipartite networks, and their modularity is just the corresponding bipartite modularity. This implies that bipartite networks can be considered as an extensive class of networks including unipartite and directed networks, and that detecting communities in bipartite networks provides a uniform framework for solving the problem in various networks. Therefore, methods for detecting community structure of bipartite networks generally can be applied to unipartite and directed networks.

We have presented an adaptive genetic algorithm, the MAGA, for the task of community structure detection. This algorithm is based on the MOGA which was presented with the aim of improving the performance of traditional genetic algorithms. But we have shown that the MOGA has a poor performance as applied to this task. In fact, we have revealed the MOGA would be misguided by the allele standard deviation and does not guarantee the convergence to global optima. In the MAGA, we introduced a different measure for the informativeness of loci, a modified rule for mutation and a reassignment technique. These ingredients jointly make the MAGA more effectively optimize objective function for community structure detection. The experiments on




FIG. 9: (Color online) Scotland corporate interlock network (dashed lines indicate the division found by the MAGA). Each community consists of those nodes with the same color(level of scale), including firms and directors represented by boxes and triangles respectively.

TABLE V: Performance comparison of the MAGA, Girvan-Newman (GN), extremal optimization (EO), spectral relaxation (SR), and simulated annealing (SA) methods in terms of modularity and running time (only for the SA and MAGA) for unipartite networks. The modularity in bold font represents the maximum modularity obtained for the network, with the corresponding number of generations and time shown in the last two columns. The running time for the SA or MAGA is measured in minutes (min) or seconds (s).

Network	Size	GN	EO	SR	SA(0.999)		MAGA			
					Q	Time	GenSize	Q	Generations	Time
Zachary	34	0.401	0.419	0.419	0.420	12s	100	0.420	5	0.1s
Jazz	198	0.405	0.445	0.442	0.445	58min	8000	0.445	7222	19min
C.elegans	453	0.403	0.434	0.435	0.450	146min	8000	0.452	3487	12min
E-mail	1133	0.532	0.574	0.572	0.579	1143min	10000	0.581	9280	72min
PGP	10680	0.816	0.846	0.855	-	-	20000	0.881	19867	610min
Cond-mat	27519	-	0.679	0.723	-	-	30000	0.802	29995	3517min

bipartite (model and real) networks have consistently shown that the MAGA outperforms the MOGA, SGA, and BRIM. Compared to BRIM, another advantage is that the MAGA can automatically determine the number of communities. The results on unipartite networks indicate that the global optimization method is indeed more accurate than the EO and SR methods as expected, and that it also can attain or even outperform the accuracy of the SA method in a significantly shorter time, which is crucial for analyzing large networks.

The time complexity of each generation evolution of the MAGA is $O(M)$, and the overall time demand of this algorithm depends on the population size and the generation size [70]. Although the MAGA can theoret-

ically find the global optima of an objective function, the quality of solutions delivered by the MAGA rests in practice on the generation size given the population size. Owing to the lower complexity of each generation evolution, we can run enough generations to get a high-quality solution. Empirical results showed that the MAGA can effectively resolve the community structure of networks at many scales up to 10^5 , which have covered many kinds of real networks such as social, metabolic, and technology networks. Beyond these scales there are several nice local methods available [71–74], while the performance of our algorithm on networks with such scales needs to be further explored. On the other hand, since a parallel implementation of the MAGA allows each of the

most time-consuming operations on N_P chromosomes to be simultaneously calculated by assigning them to multiprocessors of a highly efficient computer, it seems that even for networks of millions of nodes the MAGA is still a promising method for accurate detection of their community structure.

Methodologically, the MAGA for community detection is based on the idea of optimization. So the accuracy is determined by the selection of an objective function. Here, we use the (bipartite) modularity as the object to optimize, which certainly may suffer from the resolution problem although this may not be severe for many real networks. On the one hand, the resolution problem essentially is favorable for gaining deeper insight into the structure of networks [36]. On the other hand, the effect of this problem may be circumvented or alleviated as needed. For example, the MAGA can perform network preprocessing with random walk [75] before optimizing or take an alternative objective function [76] instead of the modularity. Also we can combine several high-quality solutions to obtain a more accurate division of the network of interest [32, 72].

Overall, the MAGA enables us to accurately and effectively detect community structure for various networks

including bipartite, unipartite, directed, and weighted networks so long as it takes the corresponding modularity as the fitness function. The evolutionary method can return multiple high-quality solutions with no bias, which may provide some useful information on the reliability of the solutions of interest and may be combined in a way to obtain a better solution. Finally, we believe that as an effective discrete optimization method (the special reassignment technique can be switched off as needed) it will find more applications in many fields.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Basic Research Program of China under Grant No. 2007CB310806, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 61074119, No. 60873040 and No. 60873070, Shanghai Leading Academic Discipline Project No. B114. J.-H. G. was also supported by the Shanghai Education Development Foundation under Grant No. 09SG23.

-
- [1] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, *Nature (London)*, **393**, 440 (1998).
 - [2] A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999).
 - [3] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 47 (2002).
 - [4] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, *Evolution of Networks: From Biological Nets to the Internet and WWW* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2003).
 - [5] M. E. J. Newman, *SIAM Rev.* **45**, 167 (2003).
 - [6] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D.-U. Hwang, *Phy. Rep.* **424**, 175 (2006).
 - [7] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99**, 7821 (2002).
 - [8] M. E. J. Newman and M. Girvan, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 026113 (2004).
 - [9] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 066133 (2004).
 - [10] N. Neubauer and K. Obermayer (Unpublished).
 - [11] T. Murata, in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web*, edited by M. Rappa, P. Jones, J. Freire and S. Chakrabarti (ACM Press, New York, 2010), pp. 1159-1160.
 - [12] A. Vazquez, A. Flammini, A. Maritan and A. Vespignani, *Nature Biotechnol.* **21**, 6 (2003).
 - [13] S. Gupta, R. M. Anderson, and R. M. May, *AIDS* **3**, 807 (1989).
 - [14] G. Yan, Z. Q. Fu, J. Ren, W.-X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 016108 (2007).
 - [15] A. Arenas, A. Díaz-Guilera, and C. J. Pérez-Vicente, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 114102 (2006).
 - [16] R. Guimerà and L. A. N. Amaral, *Nature (London)* **433**, 895 (2005).
 - [17] M. E. J. Newman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **103**, 8577 (2006).
 - [18] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 036104 (2006).
 - [19] J. Duch and A. Arenas, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 027104 (2005).
 - [20] H. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 041908 (2003).
 - [21] F. Radicchi, C. Castellano, F. Cecconi, V. Loreto, and D. Parisi, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **101**, 2658 (2004).
 - [22] G. Palla, I. Derényi, I. Farkas, and T. Vicsek, *Nature (London)* **435**, 814 (2005).
 - [23] E. A. Leicht and M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 118703 (2008).
 - [24] R. Guimerà, M. Sales-Pardo, and L. A. N. Amaral, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 036102 (2007).
 - [25] L. C. Freeman, in *Dynamic Social Network Modeling and Analysis: Workshop Summary and Papers*, edited by R. Breiger, C. Carley, and P. Pattison (The National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2003), pp. 39-97.
 - [26] M. J. Barber, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 066102 (2007).
 - [27] L. Danon, A. Díaz-Guilera, J. Duch and A. Arenas, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2005) P09008.
 - [28] S. Fortunato, *Phys. Rep.* **486**, 75 (2010).
 - [29] S. Fortunato and M. Barthélemy, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **104**, 36 (2007).
 - [30] J. M. Kumpula, J. Saramaki, K. Kaski, and J. Kertesz, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **56**, 41 (2007).
 - [31] B. H. Good, Y.-A. deMontjoye and A. Clauset, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 046106(2010).
 - [32] M. Sales-Pardo, R. Guimerà, A. A. Moreira, and L. A. N. Amaral, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **104**, 15224 (2007).
 - [33] A. Lancichinetti, F. Radicchi and J.J. Ramasco, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 046110 (2010).
 - [34] R. Guimerà, M. Sales-Pardo and L.A.N. Amaral, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 025101(R) (2004).
 - [35] B. Karrer, E. Levina and M.E.J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 046119 (2008).

- [36] A. Arenas, J. Duch, A. Fernández, and S. Gómez, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 176 (2007).
- [37] J. H. Holland, *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems* (University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1975)
- [38] U. Brandes, D. Delling, M. Gaertler, R. Görke, M. Hofer, Z. Nikoloski, and D. Wagner, *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data En.* **20**, 38 (2008).
- [39] G. Agarwal, D. Kempe, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **66**, 409 (2008).
- [40] K. Y. Szeto and J. Zhang, in *Large-Scale Scientific Computing*, edited by I. Lirkov, S. Margenov, and J. Wasniewski, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* Vol. 3743 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006), pp. 189-196.
- [41] B. Brinkmann et al, *Am. J. Hum. Genet* **62**, 1408 (1998).
- [42] C. W. Ma and K. Y. Szeto, in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Recent Advances in Soft Computing*, edited by L. Lofti (Springer-Verlag, 2004), pp.410-415.
- [43] N. L. Law and K. Y. Szeto, in *Proceeding of the 20th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, edited by M. Veloso (AAAI Press, Menlo Park, CA, 2007), pp. 2330-2334.
- [44] K. A. De Jong, Ph. D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1975.
- [45] M. Tasgin, A. Herdagdelen, and H. Bingol, e-print arXiv:0711.0491.
- [46] C. Pizzuti, in *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*, edited by G. Rudolph et al., *Lecture Notes in Computer Sciences* Vol. 5199(Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008), pp. 1081-1090.
- [47] Y. Park, M. Song, in *Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference on Genetic Programming*, edited by J. R. Koza et al. (Morgan Kaufmann Publisher, Los Altos, CA, 1998), pp. 568-575.
- [48] S. Kullback, R. A. Leibler, *Annals of Math. Stat.* **22**, 79 (1951).
- [49] F. Lorrain and H. White, *J. Math. Sociol.* **1**, 49 (1971).
- [50] J. J. Grefenstette, *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern.* **16**, 122 (1986).
- [51] D. E. Goldberg, in *Proceedings of the third International Conference on Genetic Algorithms*, edited by J. Schaffer (Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, Los Altos, CA, 1989), pp. 70-79.
- [52] J. Arabas, Z. Michalewicz, J. Mulawka, in *Proceedings of the First IEEE Conference on Evolutionary Computation*, edited by D.B. Fogel (IEEE Press, Piscataway, New Jersey, 1994), pp. 73-78.
- [53] M. Affenzeller, S. Wagner, and S. Winkler, in *The 11th International Conference on Computer Aided Systems Theory*, edited by R. Moreno-Díaz, F. Pichler and A. Quesada-Arencibia, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* Vol. 4739 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007), pp. 820-828.
- [54] T. Hu, S. Harding and W. Banzhaf, *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines*, **11** 205 (2010).
- [55] J. C. Bean, *ORSA J. Computing* **6**, 154(1994).
- [56] From the discussion in Sec. III A, the MOGA will duplicate the fittest individual(s) to a next generation.
- [57] After the bipartitioning, we need to update the chromosome by encoding the two resulting groups of nodes. This can be implemented in time of $O(m)$ by the breadth-first search algorithm [58], where m is the total number of edges of these nodes involved.
- [58] A. V. Aho, J. D. Ullman, and J. E. Hopcroft, *Data Structures and Algorithms* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1983).
- [59] Since the splitting operation can be incorporated into the SGA in a certain way, to make a fair comparison between the MAGA and SGA, all the results on bipartite networks we reported do not involve the operation. For all the tested unipartite networks the operation is employed and may improve the efficacy of the MAGA, even if it often yields a rough bipartition.
- [60] Picking the best one of the run on each example is reasonable because the population size is moderate so that it can be increased and hence improve the accuracy of each run; that is, we adopted a better strategy as is done in BRIM.
- [61] A. Davis, B. B. Gardner, and M. R. Gardner, *Deep South* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1941).
- [62] P. Doreian, V. Batagelj and A. Ferligoj, *Soc. Networks* **26**, 29 (2004).
- [63] J. Scott and M. Hughes, *The Anatomy of Scottish Capital: Scottish Companies and Scottish Capital, 1900-1979* (Croom Helm, London, 1980).
- [64] W. W. Zachary, *J. Anthropological Res.* **33**, (1977).
- [65] P. Gleiser and L. Danon, *Adv. Complex Syst.* **6**, 565 (2003).
- [66] H. Jeong, B. Tombor, R. Albert, Z. N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabási, *Nature (London)* **407**, 651 (2000).
- [67] R. Guimerà, L. Danon, A. Díaz-Guilera, A. Giralt, and A. Arenas, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 065103 (2003).
- [68] X. Guardiola, R. Guimera, A. Arenas, A. Diza-Guilera, and L. A. N. Amaral, e-print cond-mat/0206240.
- [69] M. E. J. Newman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **98**, 404 (2001).
- [70] A simple strategy for selection of the generation size consist of two steps: (1) Run the algorithm with an empirical value of generation size 5-10 times. For smaller networks the generation size can take a value as large as ten times of the network size, while for larger networks a value equal to the network size can be used. (2) Appropriately increase the generation size according to the results and the average time cost if the MAGA does not converge. If these results are very different and the time cost is low, this may indicate that the generation size should be mediated with a large increment; otherwise, it may need a small increment. Generally, this adjustment should be made at most twice or three times.
- [71] A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato and J. Kertész, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 033015 (2009).
- [72] U. N. Raghavan, R. Albert and S. Kumara, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 036106 (2007).
- [73] I. X. Y. Leung, P. Hui, P. Liò and J. Crowcroft, *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 066107 (2009).
- [74] P. Ronhovde and Z. Nussinov, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 046114 (2010).
- [75] D. L. Lai, H. T. Lu and C. Nardini, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 066118 (2010).
- [76] M. Rosvall and C. Bergstrom, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **105**, 1118 (2008).