

Block Models and Personalized PageRank

Isabel Kloumann
Center for Applied Mathematics
Cornell University
imk36@cornell.edu

Johan Ugander
Management Science & Engineering
Stanford University
jugander@stanford.edu

Jon Kleinberg
Department of Computer Science
Cornell University
kleinber@cs.cornell.edu

May 4, 2017

Abstract

Methods for ranking the importance of nodes in a network have a rich history in machine learning and across domains that analyze structured data. Recent work has evaluated these methods through the *seed set expansion problem*: given a subset S of nodes from a community of interest in an underlying graph, can we reliably identify the rest of the community? We start from the observation that the most widely used techniques for this problem, personalized PageRank and heat kernel methods, operate in the space of *landing probabilities* of a random walk rooted at the seed set, ranking nodes according to weighted sums of landing probabilities of different length walks. Both schemes, however, lack an a priori relationship to the seed set objective. In this work we develop a principled framework for evaluating ranking methods by studying seed set expansion applied to the stochastic block model. We derive the optimal gradient for separating the landing probabilities of two classes in a stochastic block model, and find, surprisingly, that under reasonable assumptions the gradient is asymptotically equivalent to personalized PageRank for a specific choice of the PageRank parameter α that depends on the block model parameters. This connection provides a novel formal motivation for the success of personalized PageRank in seed set expansion and node ranking generally. We use this connection to propose more advanced techniques incorporating higher moments of landing probabilities; our advanced methods exhibit greatly improved performance despite being simple linear classification rules, and are even competitive with belief propagation.

1 Introduction

The challenge of contextually ranking nodes in a network has emerged as a problem of canonical significance in many domains, with a particularly rich history of study in social and information networks [35, 25, 20, 19]. An active line of recent work has focused on the problem of *seed set expansion* in networks [6, 7, 30, 36, 40, 41, 27], a fundamental version of node ranking with the following natural definition.

In the seed set expansion problem, we are given a graph G representing some form of social or information network, and there is a hidden community of interest that we would like to find, corresponding to an internally well-connected set of nodes. We know a small subset S of the nodes in this community, and from this “seed set” S we would like to expand outward to find the rest of

the community — by ordering the rest of the nodes outside S according to some ranking criterion, and proposing nodes in this order as additional members of the community. This problem arises in a wide range of domains, including settings where we are trying to find web pages that are related to a set of examples, to identify a social group from a set of sample members provided by a domain expert, or to help a user automatically populate a group they are defining in an online social-networking application.

A recent focus in the work on this problem has been the power of approaches based on random-walk methods, including versions of *personalized PageRank* [21, 23, 27] and physical analogues based on the heat equation for graphs [9, 26]. These techniques can be viewed as operating on the following quantities: for each node v in the graph, and each number of steps k , we let r_k^v denote the probability that a random walk on the graph ends up at v after exactly k steps, starting from a particular seed node in S (or a node chosen uniformly at random from S). Methods based on PageRank and heat kernels then combine these values $\{r_k^v\}$ using particular functional forms as *discriminant functions*—a phrase coined by Fisher to describe functions for classification [15]—that produce a “score” for each node v with the structure $score(v) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k r_k^v$ for coefficients $\{w_k\}$. The seed set can be expanded by considering nodes in decreasing order by score [26, 27]. Geometrically, these rankings amount to sweeps through the space of landing probabilities with hyperplanes normal to some vector, where personalized PageRank and the heat kernel method correspond to different choices of normal vectors.

These methods are elegant in their formulation and have also shown to be both quite powerful and scalable [24, 8, 26]. At the same time, their success has left open a number of very basic questions. In particular, if we think of the *landing probabilities* $\{r_k^v\}$ over nodes v and steps k as providing us with a rich set of features relevant to membership in the community of interest, then it becomes clear that personalized PageRank and heat kernel formulations are simply specific, and apparently arbitrary, ways of combining these features using hand-constructed weight coefficients $\{w_k\}$.

Motivations for the specific form of these two scores have come from several domains. These include the *random surfer model* for PageRank [35] consisting of a mixture of random-walk steps and random jumps, as well as results connecting both PageRank and heat kernel quantities to bounds on sparse cuts [5, 10] and regularized solutions to the min-cut problem [18]. Even here, however, there has not been an argument that any of these measures are optimally combining the random walk landing probabilities under a specific objective, nor has there been a direct connection between any of these measures and the problem that seed expansion seeks to solve.

Is there a principled reason why the expressions for PageRank or the heat kernel represent the “right” way to combine the information coming from random walks, or could there be better approaches? And is there a formal framework available for deriving or at least motivating effective ways of combining random walk probabilities? Given the diverse and important applications where PageRank and heat kernel methods have seen successes, we consider a broader examination of the space of methods for combining available random walk information, appreciating that the approaches in existing work are simply particular points in that space.

The key observation we pursue in this work is that a basic model of separable structure in graphs known as the stochastic block model [22] can be employed to model the presence of a seed set in the graph, allowing us to derive principled methods for ranking nodes in the space of landing probabilities. We focus our attention on a two-block stochastic block model, where one block of nodes corresponds to the community of a labelled seed set, while the other block of nodes corresponds to its complement, the remainder of the graph. In this setting the problem of finding the hidden community of interest has a correct answer with respect to an underlying graph generation process, and hence methods for combining landing probabilities of random walks can be

evaluated according to their ability to find this answer.

For this two-block stochastic block model we first derive the centroids, for each block, in the space of landing probabilities. Studying this space, we make the surprising observation that the optimal hyperplane for performing a linear sweep between the two centroids is asymptotically concentrated for large graphs on the weights of personalized PageRank, for a specific choice of the PageRank parameter corresponding to parameters of the stochastic block model. This connection between personalized PageRank and stochastic block models is a novel bridge between two otherwise disconnected literatures, and gives a strong motivation for using personalized PageRank in contextual ranking and seed set expansion problems.

Beyond simple linear discriminant rules, we observe block models can be used to propose more advanced scoring methods in the space of landing probabilities, and our analysis points to important ways in which personalized PageRank can be strengthened. Although its geometric orientation is optimal with regards to the landing probability centroids, personalized PageRank does not account for the variance or covariance of these landing probabilities, e.g. how the 2-hop landing probabilities from a given seed correlate with the 3-hop landing probabilities from that seed. We derive weights that correctly incorporate these variances and covariances and we show that relative to the stochastic block model benchmark, this new family of measures significantly outperforms personalized PageRank.

2 Discriminant Functions for Stochastic Block Models

The *stochastic block model* (SBM) [22], also known as the planted partition model [11, 13], is a distribution over graphs that generalizes the Erdős-Rényi random graph model $G(n, p)$ [14] to include a planted block structure. It can be described in terms of the following process for constructing a random graph $G = (V, E)$. There is a partition of the nodes into C disjoint sets (blocks) V_1, \dots, V_C , where $|V_i| = n_i = \pi_i n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^C \pi_i = 1$, together with a $C \times C$ matrix P whose entries are in $[0, 1]$. The entry p_{ij} of matrix P specifies the probability of a node in V_i being connected to a node in V_j : $\Pr((u, v) \in E | u \in V_i, v \in V_j) = p_{ij}$. Each edge is formed independently of all others.

A stochastic block model is thus completely described by the parameters n , $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_C)$, and P , and we let $G(n, \pi, P)$ denote the distribution over graphs with the given parameters. We allow self-loops and derive results for both directed and undirected graphs, where the latter case constrains P to be symmetric. The Erdős-Rényi random graph model $G(n, p)$, with n and p scalar, is an undirected one-block special case.

We will first place particular focus on two-block models ($C = 2$), where the block V_a denotes the community of the seed set (the *seed community*) and the block V_b denotes the remainder of the graph. This two-block special case is sometimes also known as the *affiliation model* [17]. A key point is that the nodes in V_a and V_b will have different landing probabilities, suggesting that discriminant functions in the space of landing probabilities can be used to classify node membership in V_a . We then generalize this approach to the case of $C > 2$ blocks, where we seek a binary classification between nodes in two aggregate classes, “in” and “out”, now possibly composed of several heterogeneous blocks, $V_a = \cup_{i \in S} V_i$ for $S \subset \{1, \dots, C\}$, and $V_b = \cup_{i \in T} V_i$ for $T = \{1, \dots, C\} \setminus S$.

To perform our classifications, we will focus on two particular classes of discriminant functions: geometric discriminant functions and Fisherian discriminant functions. *Geometric discriminant functions* perform a linear sweep through the feature space from one centroid a to another centroid b , $f(r) = w^T r$ for $w = (a - b)$, scoring points based on their inner product with the vector connecting the two centroids. This score will increase as one moves from b to a in the space.

Fisherian discriminant functions employ a descriptive model where the two classes of points are described by their first two moments using multivariate Gaussians $N(a, \Sigma_a)$ and $N(b, \Sigma_b)$ in the feature space, scoring points based on their relative probabilities of belonging to the two Gaussians. The special case of $\Sigma_a = \Sigma_b = I$ is equivalent to a geometric discriminant function, but in general the Fisherian approach can account for heterogeneous variance and covariance across and between features to make a more principled discrimination.

Geometric discriminant functions

Recall that r_k^v , the k -step landing probability of a node v given a seed node in an underlying graph, is the probability that a random walk beginning at that seed node will be at v after exactly k steps. We map each node v to a vector of its first K landing probabilities $(r_1^v, r_2^v, \dots, r_K^v)$, and ask what these vectors look like in graphs generated by a stochastic block model.

Let (a_1, \dots, a_K) denote the centroid of the landing probabilities for nodes in the in-class, and let (b_1, \dots, b_K) denote the centroid of the landing probabilities for nodes in the out-class. The geometric discriminant function $f(r^v) = (a - b)^T r^v$ will then rank each node $v \in V$ based on the node's vector of landing probabilities $(r_1^v, \dots, r_K^v) \in [0, 1]^K$. In this notation personalized PageRank assigns scores according to the infinite sum $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha^k r_k^v$, for a parameter $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$, and the heat kernel method assigns scores by $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-t} t^k}{k!} r_k^v$ for a parameter $t > 0$. Truncating these methods to a finite walk length K , both methods then amount to linear discriminant functions for particular weight vectors $w_{PPR}(\alpha) = (\alpha, \alpha^2, \dots, \alpha^K)$ and $w_{HK}(t) = (e^{-1}t, \frac{e^{-2}t^2}{2}, \dots, \frac{e^{-t}t^K}{K!})$. Note that the PageRank parameter α is often interpreted as the ‘‘teleportation’’ probability of a teleporting random walk, requiring α be non-negative, but under the above interpretation the personalized PageRank is well-defined for $-1 < \alpha < 0$ as well.

2.1 PageRank and SBMs: Two Identical Communities

We now establish an asymptotic equivalence between personalized PageRank and geometric classification of stochastic block models in the space of landing probabilities, the main theoretical result of our work. We begin by stating and proving our results for the special case of an SBM with two identical communities. We then state the more general connection between personalized PageRank and the geometric discriminant weight vector for SBMs with C non-identical blocks. A proof of the more general result is given in the appendix.

Proposition 1. *Let G_n be an n -node graph generated from a two-block stochastic block model $G(n, \pi, P)$ with equally sized communities ($\pi_1 = \pi_2 = 1/2$), $N = n/2$, and with $p_{11} = p_{22} = p_{in} > 0$ and $p_{12} = p_{21} = p_{out} > 0$. Let $\hat{w} = \hat{a} - \hat{b}$ be the geometric discriminant weight vector in the space of landing probabilities (1-step through K -step, K fixed) between the empirical block centroids $(\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_K)$ and $(\hat{b}_1, \dots, \hat{b}_K)$.*

For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists an n sufficiently large such that $\|N\hat{w} - N\Psi\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where:

(a) $\Psi = \Psi(p_{in}, p_{out}, n)$ is a vector with the k^{th} coordinate specified by $\Psi_k = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{A_k - B_k}{A_k + B_k} \right)$ where A_k and B_k are solutions to the linear homogeneous matrix recurrence relation:

$$\begin{cases} A_k = N(p_{in}A_{k-1} + p_{out}B_{k-1}) \\ B_k = N(p_{out}A_{k-1} + p_{in}B_{k-1}), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with initial conditions $A_0 = 1, B_0 = 0$.

(b) this recurrence relation can be solved exactly, leading to a closed-form expression for Ψ :

$$\Psi_k = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{p_{in} - p_{out}}{p_{in} + p_{out}} \right)^k,$$

and thus the geometric discriminant weight vector \hat{w} is asymptotically equivalent to $w_{PPR}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha = \frac{p_{in} - p_{out}}{p_{in} + p_{out}}$.

The above proposition relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 1 (Concentration for $C = 2$ identical blocks). *Let G_n be an n -node graph generated from a two-block stochastic block model $G(n, \pi, P)$ with equally sized communities ($\pi_1 = \pi_2 = 1/2$), $N = n/2$, and P fixed with $p_{ij} > 0, \forall i, j$, where the first block is designated the seed block.*

For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there is an n sufficiently large such that the random landing probabilities $(\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_K)$ and $(\hat{b}_1, \dots, \hat{b}_K)$ for a uniform random walk on G_n starting in the seed block satisfy the following conditions with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for all $k > 0$:

$$N\hat{a}_k \in \left[(1 - \epsilon) \frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k}, (1 + \epsilon) \frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k} \right] \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$N\hat{b}_k \in \left[(1 - \epsilon) \frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k}, (1 + \epsilon) \frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k} \right], \quad (3)$$

where A_k, B_k are the solutions to the matrix recurrence relation

$$\begin{cases} A_k = N(p_{in}A_{k-1} + p_{out}A_{k-1}) \\ B_k = N(p_{out}B_{k-1} + p_{in}B_{k-1}), \end{cases}$$

with $A_0 = 1, B_0 = 0$.

A proof of the lemma is given in in the appendix. With the lemma as given we now prove Proposition 1.

Proof (of Proposition 1). First we will use the lemma to show that the coordinates of the weight vector $\hat{w} = \hat{a} - \hat{b}$ are concentrated as specified. From Lemma 1 we have that for any $\epsilon_1 > 0, \delta > 0$ there exists an n sufficiently large such that

$$(1 - \epsilon_1) \frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k} < N\hat{a}_k < (1 + \epsilon_1) \frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k} \quad (4)$$

$$(1 - \epsilon_1) \frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k} < N\hat{b}_k < (1 + \epsilon_1) \frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k} \quad (5)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

As a result, whenever this containment holds we have that

$$\frac{A_k - B_k}{A_k + B_k} - \epsilon_1 < N(\hat{a}_k - \hat{b}_k) < \frac{A_k - B_k}{A_k + B_k} + \epsilon_1. \quad (6)$$

This expression can be simplified by recasting the central quantities in terms of the geometric discriminant weight vector $\hat{w} = \hat{a} - \hat{b}$, and that the outer terms can be cast in terms of the vector defined above, $\Psi_k = \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{A_k - B_k}{A_k + B_k} \right)$, yielding

$$N\Psi_k - \epsilon_1 < N\hat{w}_k < N\Psi_k + \epsilon_1, \quad (7)$$

or equivalently: $|N\hat{w}_k - N\Psi_k| \leq \epsilon_1$.

This expression furnishes us with a coordinate-wise bound for each of the K coordinates of the geometric discriminant weight vector, and under the containment event of Lemma 1 we have that they all hold jointly with probability $1 - \delta$. Choosing $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon/K$ achieves the requisite bound on the 1-norm of the vector $N\hat{w} - N\Psi$.

We have established the asymptotic equivalence between the geometric discriminant weight vector \hat{w} and Ψ , defined in terms the solutions to the matrix recurrence in (1). Next we identify a closed-form expression for the diagonalization of \mathbf{R} , and thereby for A_k , B_k , and Ψ_k : with the $\vec{C}_k = \begin{pmatrix} A_k \\ B_k \end{pmatrix}$ and the initial conditions $A_0 = 1$ and $B_0 = 0$, we compute \vec{C}_k by iterative application of \mathbf{R} : $\vec{C}_k = \mathbf{R}\vec{C}_{k-1} = \mathbf{R}^k\vec{C}_0$. To identify a closed form expression for \mathbf{R}^k requires a diagonalization of \mathbf{R} such that $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}^{-1}$ for diagonal \mathbf{D} , and thus $\mathbf{R}^k = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^k\mathbf{U}^{-1}$. For $\mathbf{R} = N \begin{pmatrix} p_{in} & p_{out} \\ p_{out} & p_{in} \end{pmatrix}$ we have the following closed form diagonalization, where $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}$:

$$\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $\lambda_1 = N(p_{in} - p_{out})$ and $\lambda_2 = N(p_{in} + p_{out})$. With the initial conditions $A_0 = 1$, $B_0 = 0$ it follows that the solution to the recurrence relations in (1) then simplify to:

$$A_k = \frac{\lambda_1^k + \lambda_2^k}{2}, \quad B_k = \frac{-\lambda_1^k + \lambda_2^k}{2}. \quad (9)$$

Finally, we have that $N\Psi_k$ simplifies to

$$N\Psi_k = \left(\frac{A_k - B_k}{A_k + B_k} \right) = \frac{\lambda_1^k}{\lambda_2^k} = \left(\frac{p_{in} - p_{out}}{p_{in} + p_{out}} \right)^k. \quad (10)$$

Personalized PageRank with $\alpha_* = \frac{p_{in} - p_{out}}{p_{in} + p_{out}}$ employs precisely the weights $(\alpha_*)^k$. \square

A few remarks are in order. First, the scalar factor N that differs between the derived weights and $w_{PPR}(\alpha_*)$ does not change the relative ranking of the nodes, since ranking according to the discriminant function $f_1(r^v) = w^T r^v$ or $f_2(r^v) = Nw^T r^v$ is equivalent. Second, the criteria that the stochastic block model be dense ($p_{ij} > 0$ and fixed) is necessary for the proof, and it is unclear if a similar result holds for a sparse block model. Third, the centroid derivations work even when the edge probability is higher between blocks than within blocks — i.e. for disassortative block models as well as assortative ones.

The simple expression $\alpha_* = (p_{in} - p_{out}) / (p_{in} + p_{out})$ for the optimal α for geometric classification provides a useful interpretation of the choice of α in personalized PageRank: α close to 0 is best for identifying very strong planted partitions, $p_{in} \gg p_{out}$, while α close to 1 is best when the planted partition is very weak and the difference $p_{in} - p_{out}$ is small.

2.2 PageRank and SBMs: C Blocks

We now state a second proposition that offers a more general connection between the geometric discriminant weight vector for arbitrary SBMs with C blocks, the solutions to a matrix recurrence, and personalized PageRank. A proof of this more involved proposition is given in the appendix. In the C -block case, the problem is to distinguish between two classes of nodes: an in-class that may be comprised of nodes in several blocks, and an out-class comprised of the complement to the




Figure 1: Theoretical predictions and empirical calculations for a 4-block SBM with $n = 2048$. The parameters π_i and p_{ij} of the model are given in the appendix and satisfy Lemma 2 with the block partition $S = \{1, 2\}$ and $T = \{3, 4\}$. Left: An exemplar adjacency matrix for a single realization of an SBM. Upper right: theoretical and empirical landing probability centroids for the in-class (a_1, \dots, a_K) (blocks 1 and 2, blue) and out-class (b_1, \dots, b_K) (blocks 3 and 4, red), shown with empirical [.15%, 99.85%] quantiles from 1000 SBM realizations. Lower right: difference between the empirically optimal weights \hat{w}_k , computed from the empirical centroids \hat{a} and \hat{b} in the upper panel, and our theoretical prediction Ψ_k .

in-class. We denote these in- and out-classes as $S \subset \{1, \dots, C\}$ and $T = \{1, \dots, C\} \setminus S$, respectively, and the number of nodes in each class as $n_S = \sum_{i \in S} n_i$ and $n_T = \sum_{i \in T} n_i = n - n_S$.

Proposition 2. *Let G_n be an n -node graph generated from a stochastic block model $G(n, \pi, P)$ with C communities and π fixed, where $n_i = \pi_i n$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$, $\sum_{i=1}^C \pi_i = 1$, and $p_{ij} > 0$ fixed, $\forall i, j$. Let \hat{w} be the geometric discriminant weight vector in the space of landing probabilities (1-step through K -step, K fixed) between two fixed sets of block classes S and T of G_n of size $n_S = \sum_{i \in S} n_i$ and $n_T = \sum_{i \in T} n_i$, where S and T partition $\{1, \dots, C\}$.*

For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists an n sufficiently large such that $\|n_S \hat{w} - n_S \Psi\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where:

(a) $\Psi = \Psi(\{x_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^C, n, \pi)$ is a vector with coordinates specified by the solution to a C -dimensional linear homogeneous matrix recurrence relation $x_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^C n_i p_{ij} x_{j,k-1}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$.

(b) If $\sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ij} = \sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ik}$ for each $j, k \in J$ for each $I, J \in \{S, T\}$, then Ψ is the solution to a 2-dimensional linear homogeneous matrix recurrence and the closed-form solution for Ψ follow from diagonalizing the corresponding 2×2 matrix.

(c) Assuming that the blocks are identically distributed, then

$$n_S \Psi_k = \left(\frac{(p_{in} - p_{out})}{C p_{out} + (p_{in} - p_{out})} \right)^k,$$

in which case the geometric discriminant weight vector is asymptotically equivalent to personalized PageRank.

As with Proposition 1, this proposition makes heavy use of a concentration lemma analogous to Lemma 1, stated and proven as Lemma 2 in the appendix. We also employ an additional lemma, Lemma 3, also stated and proven in the appendix. The result establishes ways in which the optimality of personalized PageRank holds even when the two communities have non-trivial substructure.

A major consequence of Proposition 2 is that the asymptotically optimal geometric discriminant function for an arbitrary stochastic block model, without any specification of balanced block sizes or

expected degrees, can be derived from an uncomplicated C -dimensional matrix recurrence relation. Special circumstances lead this recurrence to have a particularly concise asymptotic form equivalent to personalized PageRank. But the general solvability of the asymptotically optimal geometric discriminant function holds for arbitrary block models.

In Figure 1 we see that the asymptotic centroids show near-perfect agreement with the empirical centroids for an example block model with $C = 4$ non-identical blocks on $n = 2048$ nodes (π and P are given in the appendix). We also see that the empirical variance of the coefficients can be highly non-uniform, with the 1-step landing probabilities exhibiting much greater variance than the landing probabilities after subsequent steps. This observation motivates our next approach, where we explicitly consider these heterogeneous variances, as well as covariances between the landing probabilities of different step lengths.

Fisherian discriminant functions

The above geometric approach is a special case of the more general probabilistic approach to deriving discriminant functions proposed by Fisher, and we will now derive such functions that consider both the centroids and covariances of the sets of landing probabilities.

A Fisherian discriminant function captures the first two moments (mean and variance) of the landing probabilities for each class (the in-class and out-class). The classes are described by multivariate Gaussians $N(a, \Sigma_a)$ and $N(b, \Sigma_b)$ for the in-class and out-class, respectively. Here a and b are the same centroids as were derived earlier. Note that we are not assuming these point sets obey multivariate Gaussian distributions, but we are simply using the Gaussians to capture the first two moments of the point sets.

Following a standard derivation from quadratic discriminant analysis, let $z^v \in \{0, 1\}$ be the assignment of each node $v \in V$ to one of the two classes, with $z^v = 1$ denoting the seed node class. The probabilities of a given $r = (r_1, \dots, r_K)$ belonging to each class are then:

$$\Pr(r|z = 1) \propto |\Sigma_a|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(r - a)^T \Sigma_a^{-1} (r - a)\right), \quad (11)$$

$$\Pr(r|z = 0) \propto |\Sigma_b|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(r - b)^T \Sigma_b^{-1} (r - b)\right). \quad (12)$$

Let $\pi_a = \Pr(z = 1)$ denote the probability that a given node is in the in-class. When the parameters of the stochastic block model are known it is clear that $\pi_a = n_a / (n_a + n_b)$. The log of the likelihood ratio then becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) &= \ln \frac{\Pr(r|z = 1) \Pr(z = 1)}{\Pr(r|z = 0) \Pr(z = 0)} \\ &= \underbrace{(\Sigma_a^{-1} a - \Sigma_b^{-1} b)^T r}_{w} + r^T \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{2} \Sigma_b^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_a^{-1}\right)}_W r + \underbrace{-\frac{1}{2} \left(a^T \Sigma_a^{-1} a - b^T \Sigma_b^{-1} b + \ln \frac{|\Sigma_a|}{|\Sigma_b|} \right)}_{w_0} + \ln \frac{\pi_a}{1 - \pi_a} \\ &= w^T r + r^T W r + w_0, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where we've identified the vector w , matrix W , and scalar w_0 to simplify notation. In ranking contexts we can safely ignore w_0 , which is constant for all nodes. (13) thus provides a quadratic discriminant function for ranking in-class membership in a manner that accounts for the covariance structure of the different landing probabilities, e.g. how the landing probability at a node u after k steps covaries with the landing probability after $k + 1$ steps.

If we assume $\Sigma_a = \Sigma_b = \sigma^2 I$, we recover the earlier geometric discriminant function

$$g_1(r) = \sigma^{-2} (a - b)^T r + C, \quad (14)$$




Figure 2: The performance of various seed set expansion classifiers: Belief Propagation (black), personalized PageRank (green), and heat kernel (blue), Lin-SBMRank (magenta), and Quad-SBMRank (red). Left: The Pearson correlation r between the recovered labeling and the true labeling for a SBM on $n = 128$ nodes, with $n_a = n_b = 64$ and expected degree $\langle d \rangle = 16$, as a function of the out/in balance c_{out}/c_{in} . Right: The cumulative recall of two stochastic block models corresponding to $c_{out}/c_{in} = 0.6$ and 0.66 , respectively, from the left hand panel (or $p_{in} = 0.3$, $p_{out} = 0.2$ and $p_{in} = 0.3125$, $p_{out} = 0.1875$). The legends indicate the recalls at $k = 64$.

up to an arbitrary additive constant C , and observe that the earlier geometric approach corresponds to a uniform and independent variance assumption on the two point clouds in the space of landing probabilities. In a slightly more general setting assuming $\Sigma_a = \Sigma_b = \Sigma$, meaning that the two covariance matrices are identical, (13) reduces to

$$g_2(r) = [\Sigma^{-1}(a - b)]^T r + C, \quad (15)$$

again up to an arbitrary additive constant C . This discriminant function is still linear, but can have a very different form than $g_1(r)$. While we have shown that personalized PageRank takes a principled approach to ranking seed community membership, the covariance structure of the landing probabilities suggests that much better linear discriminant functions with the form of (15) rather than (14) — let alone quadratic functions with the form of (13) — exist for graphs where the structure can reasonably be motivated as coming from a stochastic block model with two classes of blocks.

Learning model parameters

All the above theoretical derivations assume known parameters, but in practical contexts the parameters of the stochastic block model that inform the choice of α as well as the covariance matrices must be learned. Recent results have developed consistent estimators for the parameters of two-community stochastic block models for an observed graph, with two separate estimation regimes: known and unknown block sizes [17, 2, 3, 4]. The former regime admits a closed-form consistent estimator for the edge probabilities, while the latter regime formulates a tractable composite likelihood function. We focus on the former regime of two-block SBMs with known block sizes, and will further focus on the special case of $p_{aa} = p_{bb} = p_{in}$, $p_{ab} = p_{out}$ (also known as the affiliation model) for which known consistent estimators \hat{p}_{in} and \hat{p}_{out} are reproduced in the appendix.

For the unknown covariance matrices used in Fisherian discriminant functions, given the parameter estimates \hat{p}_{in} , \hat{p}_{out} and $n_a = n_b$ known, we can also estimate the covariance matrices Σ_a and Σ_b , from simulations of an adequate number of stochastic block models with the learned parameters.

3 Computational Results

We now evaluate our optimal geometric and Fisherian approaches to seed set expansion on graphs that have been generated by stochastic block models, where ground truth community structure is defined from the generative process.

We begin by examining how well classifications based on our discriminant functions correlate with the underlying true partitioning of the SBMs being considered, a standard test of inference methods for SBMs. While exact recovery of planted partitions has been shown possible in regimes where the two blocks are well separated (where $|p_{in} - p_{out}|$ is large enough) [11, 13, 38], recent work has shown that recovering a partition that is correlated with the underlying partition is still possible even in some contexts when exact recovery is impossible, up to a recently identified resolution limit [12, 33].

Figure 2A shows the Pearson correlation r between the recovered partition and the ground truth partition for various discriminant functions on a SBM with $n = 128$ nodes, $n_a = n_b$, and average degree $\langle d \rangle = 16$. Our covariance-adjusted methods recover a correlated partition up to the same resolution limit as Belief Propagation, and they slightly out-perform Belief Propagation in the regime just beyond the resolution limit. Meanwhile personalized PageRank (without any covariance adjustment) and heat kernel perform poorly by comparison.

In Figure 2B and C we see cumulative recall curves for a SBM with $n_a = n_b = 64$ nodes and two choices of p_{in} and p_{out} (given in the caption). The personalized PageRank classification is ranked according to (14), whereas Lin-SBMRank and Quad-SBMRank have the forms of (15) and (13) respectively. The recall curves measure the recall of the classification methods seeded with a single node seed set and attempting to return a seed block of m nodes, as a function of m . We see that that our quadratic discriminant function has considerably improved recall over ordinary personalized PageRank, identifying the first 64 nodes with high recall. In contrast we see that personalized PageRank (with either α_{est} , based on estimated parameters, or α_* , based on the true parameters) and heat kernel (with $t = 2$) perform the task with comparable recalls. Our linear method that utilizes a single covariance matrix for the two classes exhibits a recall nearly identical to the fully quadratic method.

Our interest here is on classifications in the space of landing probabilities. Belief Propagation, which does not work within this framework, has been recently shown to achieve correlated classification up to the resolution limit [12, 33, 44], as have modified spectral methods applied to different non-standard analogs of the Laplacian matrix known as the non backtracking matrix [28] and the Bethe-Hessian [37]. We thus take Belief Propagation as a benchmark for optimal performance, but at the cost of additional computation complexity. For a more comprehensive discussion of Belief Propagation, see the appendix. The random walks that underly our landing probabilities are standard uniform random walks, and it is an interesting open question whether classifiers in the space of landing probabilities of alternative random walks (e.g. non-backtracking random walks) may yield even better approaches.

4 Discussion

This work contributes a principled motivation for personalized PageRank’s success in contextually ranking nodes in graphs. Personalized PageRank and heat kernel methods both rank using linear discriminant functions in the space of random walk landing probabilities. We show that personalized PageRank in fact arises as the optimal geometric discriminant function in the space of landing probabilities for classifying nodes in a hidden seed community in a stochastic block model. Building on this connection between stochastic block models and personalized PageRank, we develop more complex covariance-adjusted linear and quadratic approaches to classification in the space of landing probabilities. We see that these classifiers dramatically outperforms personalized PageRank and heat kernel methods for recovering seed sets in graphs generated from stochastic block models.

The connection between personalized PageRank and stochastic block models is surprising, and

we see it pointing toward a wide range of related research questions. Can the recent rigorous results for the resolution limit of stochastic block models [33] provide insights into a broader class of contextual ranking problems? Is there an alternative classification algorithm (or alternative graph model) where heat kernel methods emerge as optimal? Can other new or existing machine learning or ranking methods be motivated through principled analyses of structured models? There are also a host of further questions that would serve to improve the details of the specific approach we outline here. Can the joint distribution of random walk landing probabilities be modeled more explicitly than by a multivariate Gaussian (approximating just the first two moments)? The potential application of our quadratic discriminant classifier to diverse contextual ranking problems suggests revisiting the broad range of applied problems where PageRank has found success.

A Additional Proofs for 2–dimensional Case

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Lemma 1. *Let G_n be an n -node graph generated from a two-block stochastic block model $G(n, \pi, P)$ with equally sized communities ($\pi_1 = \pi_2 = 1/2$), $N = n/2$, and P fixed with $p_{ij} > 0, \forall i, j$, where the first block is designated the seed block.*

For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there is an n sufficiently large such that the random landing probabilities $(\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_K)$ and $(\hat{b}_1, \dots, \hat{b}_K)$ for a uniform random walk on G_n starting in the seed block satisfy the following conditions with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for all $k > 0$:

$$N\hat{a}_k \in \left[(1 - \epsilon) \frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k}, (1 + \epsilon) \frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad (16)$$

$$N\hat{b}_k \in \left[(1 - \epsilon) \frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k}, (1 + \epsilon) \frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k} \right], \quad (17)$$

where A_k, B_k are the solutions to the matrix recurrence relation

$$\begin{cases} A_k = N(p_{in}A_{k-1} + p_{out}A_{k-1}) \\ B_k = N(p_{out}B_{k-1} + p_{in}B_{k-1}), \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

with $A_0 = 1, B_0 = 0$.

Proof. We first introduce some useful notation. Let V_a denote the set of nodes in the seed block and V_b denote the complement. We define the following walk counts from the seed to each node, which are random variables under the randomness of the block model:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_k^u &= \# \text{ paths from } s \text{ to } u \in V_a \text{ of length } k, \\ \hat{B}_k^u &= \# \text{ paths from } s \text{ to } u \in V_b \text{ of length } k. \end{aligned}$$

The seed node $s \in V_a$ is given and fixed, and therefore suppressed in our notation. We denote the number of walks of length k originating at s and ending in V_a and V_b , respectively, as:

$$\hat{A}_k = \sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{A}_k^u, \quad \hat{B}_k = \sum_{u \in V_b} \hat{B}_k^u. \quad (19)$$

We see then that the random aggregate landing probabilities, the probabilities that a k -step walk starting at a seed node in V_a ends in V_a , and the probability that it ends in V_b , are then:

$$\hat{a}_k = \frac{1}{n_a} \frac{\hat{A}_k}{\hat{A}_k + \hat{B}_k}, \quad \hat{b}_k = \frac{1}{n_b} \frac{\hat{B}_k}{\hat{A}_k + \hat{B}_k}. \quad (20)$$

Our proof strategy is to show that these quantities \hat{a}_k and \hat{b}_k concentrate around expressions given in terms of the solutions A_k and B_k of a recurrence. We then show concentration for the quantities $A_k/(A_k + B_k)$ and $A_k/(A_k + B_k)$; notably, they concentrate around values that are not their expectations.

An obstruction to simply taking the expectations of the walk counts $E[\hat{a}_k]$ and $E[\hat{b}_k]$ (and showing concentration around the ratio of expectations) is that counting length- k walks for $k > 1$ requires counting walks that possibly revisit edges, creating a dependence between walk counts of different lengths. The recurrence solutions A_k and B_k that we will analyze can in fact be thought of as the expected walk counts on a slightly different random graph model, where the edges are independently resampled after each walk step. What our analysis effectively shows is that the walk counts on the stochastic block model (our model of interest) concentrate on the expected walk counts of that alternative model (where edges are independently resampled at after each walk step). This connection between models is mentioned only as an optional pedagogical tool, and is not essential to understanding our proof.

We now return to the walk-count random variables \hat{a}_k and \hat{b}_k in a graph G_n drawn from the stochastic block model. Suppose we are given $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ as in the statement of the lemma, and we seek bounds for a specific walk length $k \leq K$. We choose $\gamma_2 > 0$ small enough that $(1 - \gamma_2)/(1 + \gamma_2) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and $(1 + \gamma_2)/(1 - \gamma_2) \leq 1 + \epsilon$; we then choose γ small enough that $(1 - \gamma)^K \geq 1 - \gamma_2$ and $(1 + \gamma)^K \leq 1 + \gamma_2$.

Let \hat{M}_{uv} be a matrix of independent Bernoulli random variables, indicating the edge event when (u, v) is an edge in the graph G_n . Notice that $\sum_{u \in V} \hat{M}_{uv}$ is the random out-degree of node v . We observe that each node $v \in V_a$ has in expectation a total of d_{aa} or d_{ab} edges to nodes in V_a or V_b , where

$$d_{aa} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{M}_{uv} \right] = Np_{in}, \quad d_{ab} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{M}_{uv} \right] = Np_{out}, \quad (21)$$

and similarly $d_{ba} = Np_{out}$ and $d_{bb} = Np_{in}$. When the expectations p_{in}, p_{out} are fixed in n we can use standard multiplicative Chernoff bounds to bound the probabilities of $4n$ bad events. We have that for any $\gamma > 0$ and any $i, j \in \{a, b\}$:

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \notin [(1 - \gamma)d_{ij}, (1 + \gamma)d_{ij}] \right) \leq C_1 e^{-n} \quad (22)$$

for some constant C_1 for any $v \in V_j$. Across all i, j pairs there are $4n$ bad events, and we want to lower bound the probability of there being no bad event. By the union bound we have that

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \in [(1 - \gamma)d_{ij}, (1 + \gamma)d_{ij}], \forall v \in V_j, \forall i, j \right) \geq 1 - 4C_1 n e^{-n}. \quad (23)$$

Thus, it is clear that for any $\gamma > 0$ and any $\delta > 0$, there exists an n sufficiently large such that the probability that none of the degrees exceed a multiplicative factor of $(1 \pm \gamma)$ is at least $1 - \delta$. Assuming this containment succeeds, which is to say assuming

$$\sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \in [(1 - \gamma)d_{ij}, (1 + \gamma)d_{ij}], \quad \forall v \in V_j, \forall i, j, \quad (24)$$

then the rest of the proof argument is deterministic. The next step of our proof strategy is to show that we also have

$$\hat{A}_k \in [(1 - \gamma_2)A_k, (1 + \gamma_2)A_k] \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{B}_k \in [(1 - \gamma_2)B_k, (1 + \gamma_2)B_k] \quad (25)$$

whenever the stated containment event holds.

We give a proof by induction. First we define a new set of variables:

$$\hat{H}_k^u = \begin{cases} \hat{A}_k^u & \text{if } u \in V_a, \\ \hat{B}_k^u & \text{if } u \in V_b. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

We then begin with the base case, furnishing an upper bound on \hat{A}_1 :

$$\hat{A}_1 = \sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{H}_1^u = \sum_{u \in V_a} \sum_{v \in V} \hat{M}_{uv} \hat{H}_0^v \quad (27)$$

$$= \sum_{v \in V_a} \hat{H}_0^v \sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{M}_{uv} + \sum_{v \in V_b} \hat{H}_0^v \sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{M}_{uv} \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \sum_{v \in V_a} \hat{H}_0^v (1 + \gamma) d_{aa} + \sum_{v \in V_b} \hat{H}_0^v (1 + \gamma) d_{ab} \quad (29)$$

$$= (1 + \gamma) d_{aa} = (1 + \gamma) A_1. \quad (30)$$

Notice that in the last step we have identified the expectation in (21) and A_1 from (18) in the lemma statement. Using a similar set of steps one can easily see that $(1 - \gamma)A_1 \leq \hat{A}_1$ and $(1 - \gamma)B_1 \leq \hat{B}_1 \leq (1 + \gamma)B_1$ also hold.

Next, for our induction we assume that

$$\hat{A}_k \in [(1 - \gamma)^k A_k, (1 + \gamma)^k A_k], \quad (31)$$

$$\hat{B}_k \in [(1 - \gamma)^k B_k, (1 + \gamma)^k B_k], \quad (32)$$

and want to show that the above implies that

$$\hat{A}_{k+1} \in [(1 - \gamma)^{k+1} A_{k+1}, (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} A_{k+1}], \quad (33)$$

$$\hat{B}_{k+1} \in [(1 - \gamma)^{k+1} B_{k+1}, (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} B_{k+1}]. \quad (34)$$

We upper-bound \hat{A}_{k+1} :

$$\hat{A}_{k+1} = \sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{H}_{k+1}^u = \sum_{u \in V_a} \sum_{v \in V} \hat{M}_{uv} \hat{H}_k^v \quad (35)$$

$$= \sum_{v \in V_a} \hat{H}_k^v \sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{M}_{uv} + \sum_{v \in V_b} \hat{H}_k^v \sum_{u \in V_a} \hat{M}_{uv} \quad (36)$$

$$\leq \hat{A}_k (1 + \gamma) d_{aa} + \hat{B}_k (1 + \gamma) d_{ab} \quad (37)$$

$$\leq (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} A_k d_{aa} + (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} B_k d_{ab} \quad (38)$$

$$= (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} A_{k+1}, \quad (39)$$

where in the last inequality we use the induction hypothesis and the last equality again identifies (18) from the lemma statement. We observe that $\hat{A}_{k+1} \leq (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} A_{k+1}$, and similar steps furnish the lower bound $(1 - \gamma)^{k+1} A_{k+1} \leq \hat{A}_{k+1}$ and that $(1 - \gamma)^{k+1} B_{k+1} \leq \hat{B}_{k+1} \leq (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} B_{k+1}$, completing the proof by induction.

As a result, we have:

$$\hat{A}_k \in [(1 - \gamma)^k A_k, (1 + \gamma)^k A_k] \text{ and } \hat{B}_k \in [(1 - \gamma)^k B_k, (1 + \gamma)^k B_k]. \quad (40)$$

Since γ was chosen such that $(1 - \gamma)^K \geq 1 - \gamma_2$ and $(1 + \gamma)^K \leq 1 + \gamma_2$ we then have that

$$\hat{A}_k \in [(1 - \gamma_2)A_k, (1 + \gamma_2)A_k] \text{ and } \hat{B}_k \in [(1 - \gamma_2)B_k, (1 + \gamma_2)B_k], \quad (41)$$

as desired in (25). We then also have that for $\hat{A}_k + \hat{B}_k$,

$$\hat{A}_k + \hat{B}_k \in [(1 - \gamma_2)(A_k + B_k), (1 + \gamma_2)(A_k + B_k)]. \quad (42)$$

Finally, since ϵ satisfies $(1 - \gamma_2)/(1 + \gamma_2) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and $(1 + \gamma_2)/(1 - \gamma_2) \leq 1 + \epsilon$ based on our choice of γ_2 we have

$$\frac{\hat{A}_k}{\hat{A}_k + \hat{B}_k} \in [(1 - \epsilon)\frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k}, (1 + \epsilon)\frac{A_k}{A_k + B_k}], \quad (43)$$

$$\frac{\hat{B}_k}{\hat{A}_k + \hat{B}_k} \in [(1 - \epsilon)\frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k}, (1 + \epsilon)\frac{B_k}{A_k + B_k}]. \quad (44)$$

These final containments hold whenever the original containment in (24) holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, completing the proof. \square

Notice that a closed-form expression for $\vec{C}_k = \begin{pmatrix} A_k \\ B_k \end{pmatrix}$ can be obtained by diagonalizing $\mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} Np_{in} & Np_{out} \\ Np_{out} & Np_{in} \end{pmatrix}$, that is, identifying $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{U}^{-1}$ for diagonal \mathbf{D} such that $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}^{-1}$ and thus $\vec{C}_k = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^k\mathbf{U}^{-1}\vec{C}_0$.

B Proofs for C-dimensional Case

In this section of the appendix we build up a more general connection between stochastic block models on $C > 2$ blocks, geometric classification in the space of landing probabilities, and personalized PageRank. The main result of the section is Proposition 2, which relies on two lemmas. The first lemma, Lemma 2, is a concentration lemma analogous to Lemma 1. The second lemma, Lemma 3, provides useful sufficient conditions for a closed form diagonalization employed in the proof of the ultimate proposition.

To further motivate Lemma 3 we note that it is non-trivial to identify a closed form diagonalization of the general $C \times C$ matrix R . For the geometric discriminant weight vector we can identify the two aggregate quantities $\sum_{i \in S} x_{ik}$ and $\sum_{i \in T} x_{ik}$, which correspond to the aggregate number of walks landing in S versus T ; in particular we do not need, as ends themselves, the walk counts to each individual block $\{x_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$. Under the specified degree homogeneity conditions (on the parameters characterizing blocks in the two sets, S and T), we can directly formulate a 2×2 recurrence relation for $\sum_{i \in S} x_{ik}$ and $\sum_{i \in T} x_{ik}$, and circumvent the $C \times C$ diagonalization. Lemma 3 makes this correspondence precise by demonstrating that when all nodes have the same expected degree and number of edges to nodes in the in-class, we may pivot from studying a C -dimensional recurrence for $\{x_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$ to a 2-dimensional recurrence in terms of the aggregate quantities $\sum_{i \in S} x_{ik}$ and $\sum_{i \in T} x_{ik}$.

We leverage the simplification sanctioned by Lemma 3 to identify a closed form solution for Ψ and observe that under the stated additional conditions, the geometric discriminant weight vector for the C -block problem is again asymptotically equivalent to personalized PageRank.

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Lemma 2. Let G_n be an n -node graph generated from a stochastic block model $G(n, \pi, P)$ with C communities and π fixed, where $n_i = \pi_i n$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$, $\sum_{i=1}^C \pi_i = 1$, and $p_{ij} > 0$ fixed, $\forall i, j$.

For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there is an n sufficiently large such that the random landing probabilities $(\hat{y}_i^1, \dots, \hat{y}_i^K)$ for $i \in 1, \dots, C$ for a uniform random walk starting at a uniformly random node in block j with probability x_{j0} satisfy the following conditions with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for all $k > 0$:

$$n_i \hat{y}_{ik} \in \left[(1 - \epsilon) \frac{x_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C x_{jk}}, (1 + \epsilon) \frac{x_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C x_{jk}} \right] \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}, \quad (45)$$

where $\{x_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$ are the solutions to the matrix recurrence relation

$$x_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^C R_{ij} x_{j,k-1} \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}. \quad (46)$$

with initial conditions $\{x_{j0}\}_{j=1}^C$.

Proof. We again begin by introducing some useful notation. Let the node set V be composed of C disjoint subsets V_1, \dots, V_C constituting the nodes in the C blocks of the model. We define the following walk counts from a seed node s to each node, which are random variables under the randomness of the block model:

$$\hat{X}_{ik}^u = \# \text{ paths from } s \text{ to } u \in V_i \text{ of length } k, \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}.$$

The seed node $s \in V_j$ for some distinguished $j \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ is given and fixed, and therefore suppressed in our notation. We denote the number of walks of length k originating at s and ending in V_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ as:

$$\hat{X}_{ik} = \sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{X}_{ik}^u. \quad (47)$$

We see that the random aggregate landing probabilities, the probabilities that a k -step walk starting at a seed node in j ends in community i , are then:

$$\hat{y}_{ik} = \frac{1}{n_i} \frac{\hat{X}_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C \hat{X}_{jk}}. \quad (48)$$

Our proof strategy is to show that these quantities, $\{\hat{y}_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$, concentrate around expressions given in terms of the solutions $\{x_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$. The values $\left\{ \frac{x_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C x_{jk}} \right\}_{i=1}^C$ that we will show the $\{\hat{y}_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$ concentrate around are notably not their expectations.

As in the two-block case, an obstruction to simply taking the expectations of the walk counts $\left\{ \hat{X}_{ik} \right\}_{i=1}^C$ (and showing concentration around the ratio of expectations) is that counting length- k walks for $k > 1$ requires counting walks that possibly revisit edges, creating a dependence between walk counts of different lengths. The recurrence solutions $\{x_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$ that we will analyze can in fact be thought of as the expected walk counts on a slightly different random graph model, where the edges are independently resampled after each walk step. What our analysis effectively shows is that the walk counts on the stochastic block model, our model of interest, concentrate on the expected

walk counts of that alternative model. As in the proof of Lemma 1, this connection between models is mentioned only as an optional pedagogical tool, and is not essential to understanding our proof.

In Lemmas 3 we introduce the recurrence relations:

$$x_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^C R_{ij} x_{j,k-1} \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}, \quad (49)$$

$$\text{where } x_{i0} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = i_S \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

and establish that under certain conditions on the parameters of the SBM we can identify general closed-form solutions for \mathbf{U} , \mathbf{D} , and \mathbf{U}^{-1} where $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}^{-1} = \mathbf{R}$, which allows us to obtain a closed form solution for $\{x_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$. We emphasize, however, that the containments in (45) proved herein are valid even when the closed-form expressions for $\{x_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$ are not known, i.e. even when a closed-form diagonalization of \mathbf{R} has not been identified.

We now return to the walk count random variables $\{\hat{X}_{ik}\}_{i=1}^C$ in a graph G_n drawn from the stochastic block model. Suppose we are given $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ as in the statement of the lemma, and we seek bounds for a specific walk length $k \leq K$. We choose $\gamma_2 > 0$ small enough that $(1 - \gamma_2)/(1 + \gamma_2) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and $(1 + \gamma_2)/(1 - \gamma_2) \leq 1 + \epsilon$; we then choose γ small enough that $(1 - \gamma)^K \geq 1 - \gamma_2$ and $(1 + \gamma)^K \leq 1 + \gamma_2$.

Let \hat{M}_{uv} be a matrix of independent Bernoulli random variables, indicating the edge event when (u, v) is an edge in the graph G_n . Notice that $\sum_{u \in V} \hat{M}_{uv}$ is the random out-degree of node v . We observe that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, C\}$, each node $v \in V_j$ has in expectation a total of d_{ij} edges to nodes in V_i , where

$$d_{ij} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \right] = \sum_{u \in V_i} p_{ij} = n_i p_{ij}.$$

When the expectations p_{ij} are fixed in n we can use standard multiplicative Chernoff bounds to bound the probabilities of $4n$ bad events. We have that for any $\gamma > 0$ and any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, C\}$:

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \notin [(1 - \gamma)d_{ij}, (1 + \gamma)d_{ij}] \right) \leq C_1 e^{-n} \quad (51)$$

for some constant C_1 for any $v \in V_j$. Across all i, j pairs there are $4n$ bad events, and we want to lower bound the probability of there being no bad event. By the union bound we have that

$$\Pr \left(\sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \in [(1 - \gamma)d_{ij}, (1 + \gamma)d_{ij}], \forall v \in V_j, \forall i, j \right) \geq 1 - 4C_1 n e^{-n}. \quad (52)$$

Thus, it is clear that for any $\gamma > 0$ and any $\delta > 0$, there exists an n sufficiently large such that the probability that none of the degrees exceed a multiplicative factor of $(1 \pm \gamma)$ is at least $1 - \delta$. Assuming that this containment succeeds, which is to say assuming

$$\sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \in [(1 - \gamma)d_{ij}, (1 + \gamma)d_{ij}], \forall v \in V_j, \forall i, j, \quad (53)$$

then the rest of the proof is deterministic. The next step of our proof strategy is to show that we also have

$$\hat{X}_{ik} \in [(1 - \gamma_2)x_{ik}, (1 + \gamma_2)x_{ik}] \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\} \quad (54)$$

whenever the stated containment event holds.

We give a proof by induction. First we define a new set of variables:

$$\hat{H}_k^u = \begin{cases} \hat{X}_{ik}^u & \text{if } u \in V_i, \\ \end{cases} \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}. \quad (55)$$

We then begin with the base case, furnishing an upper bound on \hat{X}_{i1} for each $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$:

$$\hat{X}_{i1} = \sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{H}_1^u = \sum_{u \in V_i} \sum_{v \in V} \hat{M}_{uv} \hat{H}_0^v = \sum_{j=1}^C \sum_{v \in V_j} \hat{X}_{j0}^v \sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \quad (56)$$

$$\leq (1 + \gamma) \sum_{j=1}^C \sum_{v \in V_j} \hat{X}_{j0}^v d_{ij} = (1 + \gamma) \sum_{j=1}^C d_{ij} x_{j0} = (1 + \gamma)x_{i1} \quad (57)$$

where in the final steps we used the initial conditions that imply $\sum_{v \in V_j} \hat{X}_{j0}^v = x_{j0}$. Using a similar set of steps one can easily see that $\hat{X}_{i1} \geq (1 - \gamma)x_{i1}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ also holds.

Next, for our induction we assume that

$$\hat{X}_{ik} \in [(1 - \gamma)^k x_{ik}, (1 + \gamma)^k x_{ik}] \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}, \quad (58)$$

and want to show that the above implies that

$$\hat{X}_{i,k+1} \in [(1 - \gamma)^{k+1} x_{i,k+1}, (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} x_{i,k+1}] \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}. \quad (59)$$

We upper-bound $\hat{X}_{i,k+1}$:

$$\hat{X}_{i,k+1} = \sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{H}_{k+1}^u = \sum_{j=1}^C \sum_{v \in V_j} \hat{X}_{jk}^v \sum_{u \in V_i} \hat{M}_{uv} \quad (60)$$

$$\leq (1 + \gamma) \sum_{j=1}^C \sum_{v \in V_j} \hat{X}_{jk}^v d_{ij} = (1 + \gamma) \sum_{j=1}^C \hat{X}_{jk} d_{ij} \quad (61)$$

$$\leq (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^C x_{jk} d_{ij} = (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} x_{i,k+1}, \quad (62)$$

where for the upper bound in (61) we use the containment guarantee from (53), and for the upper bound in (62) we use the induction hypothesis. We observe that $\hat{X}_{i,k+1} \leq (1 + \gamma)^{k+1} x_{i,k+1}$, and similar steps furnish the lower bound $\hat{X}_{i,k+1} \geq (1 - \gamma)^{k+1} x_{i,k+1}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$, completing the proof by induction.

As a result, we have:

$$\hat{X}_{ik} \in \left[(1 - \gamma)^k x_{ik}, (1 + \gamma)^k x_{ik} \right] \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}. \quad (63)$$

Since γ was chosen such that $(1 - \gamma)^K \geq 1 - \gamma_2$ and $(1 + \gamma)^K \leq 1 + \gamma_2$ we then have that

$$\hat{X}_{ik} \in [(1 - \gamma_2)x_{ik}, (1 + \gamma_2)x_{ik}] \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}, \quad (64)$$

as desired in (54). We then also have that for $\sum_{i=1}^C \hat{X}_{ik}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^C \hat{X}_{ik} \in \left[(1 - \gamma_2) \left(\sum_{i=1}^C \hat{x}_{ik} \right), (1 + \gamma_2) \left(\sum_{i=1}^C \hat{x}_{ik} \right) \right]. \quad (65)$$

Finally, since ϵ satisfies $(1 - \gamma_2)/(1 + \gamma_2) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and $(1 + \gamma_2)/(1 - \gamma_2) \leq 1 + \epsilon$ based on our choice of γ_2 , we have

$$\frac{\hat{X}_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C \hat{X}_{jk}} \in \left[(1 - \epsilon) \frac{\hat{x}_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C \hat{x}_{jk}}, (1 + \epsilon) \frac{\hat{x}_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C \hat{x}_{jk}} \right], \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$$

This final containment holds whenever the original containment in (53) holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, completing the proof. \square

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3

Lemma 3. *Let V_1 and V_2 denote a partition of $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and let R be an $n \times n$ matrix such that for $I \in \{1, 2\}$ and $J \in \{1, 2\}$,*

$$\sum_{i \in V_I} R_{ij} = \sum_{i \in V_I} R_{ik} = d_{IJ} \text{ for all } j, k \in V_J.$$

Suppose that $\{x_i^k\}_{i=1}^n$ are solutions to the recurrence

$$x_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^n R_{ij} x_{j,k-1}, \quad (66)$$

for some specified initial conditions $\{x_{i0}\}_{i=1}^n$, and that w_k, z_k are the solutions to the recurrence

$$\begin{pmatrix} w_k \\ z_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d_{11} & d_{12} \\ d_{21} & d_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w_{k-1} \\ z_{k-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (67)$$

with initial conditions $w_0 = \sum_{i \in V_1} x_{i0}$ and $z_0 = \sum_{i \in V_2} x_{i0}$, and where d_{IJ} is as specified above. Then $w_k = \sum_{i \in V_1} x_{ik}$ and $z_k = \sum_{i \in V_2} x_{ik}$.

Proof. We give a proof by induction in k . First we address the base case, $k = 1$. By expanding the matrix multiplication in (67) and isolating w_1 we have:

$$w_1 = d_{11} w_0 + d_{12} z_0 \quad (68)$$

$$= d_{11} \sum_{j \in V_1} x_{j0} + d_{12} \sum_{j \in V_2} x_{j0} \quad (69)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V_1} \sum_{j \in V_1} R_{ij} x_{j0} + \sum_{i \in V_1} \sum_{j \in V_2} R_{ij} x_{j0} \quad (70)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V_1} \sum_{j \in V} R_{ij} x_{j0} = \sum_{i \in V_1} x_{i1} \quad (71)$$

where in (69) we used the initial conditions w_0 and z_0 , in (70) we used the definition of d_{IJ} , and in (71) we used the definition of x_1 from (66). A similar set of steps can be used to verify the base case z_1 .

For our induction we assume that

$$w_k = \sum_{i \in V_1} x_{ik} \text{ and } z_k = \sum_{i \in V_2} x_{ik} \quad (72)$$

and want to show that this implies that

$$w_{k+1} = \sum_{i \in V_1} x_{i,k+1} \text{ and } z_{k+1} = \sum_{i \in V_2} x_{i,k+1}. \quad (73)$$

We follow a similar set of steps to (68) - (71):

$$w_{k+1} = d_{11}w_k + d_{12}z_k \quad (74)$$

$$= d_{11} \sum_{j \in V_1} x_{jk} + d_{12} \sum_{j \in V_2} x_{jk} \quad (75)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V_1} \sum_{j \in V_1} R_{ij}x_{jk} + \sum_{i \in V_1} \sum_{j \in V_2} R_{ij}x_{jk} \quad (76)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V_1} \sum_{j \in V} R_{ij}x_{jk} = \sum_{i \in V_1} x_{i,k+1} \quad (77)$$

where we use the induction hypothesis in (75), the definition of d_{IJ} in (76), and the definition of x_{jk} from (66) is used in (77). Again using a similar set of steps leads to the analogous equality $z_k = \sum_{i \in V_2} x_{i,k+1}$, thus completing the proof by induction. \square

B.3 Proof of Proposition 2

Proposition 2. *Let G_n be an n -node graph generated from a stochastic block model $G(n, \pi, P)$ with C communities and π fixed, where $n_i = \pi_i n$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$, $\sum_{i=1}^C \pi_i = 1$, and $p_{ij} > 0$ fixed, $\forall i, j$. Let \hat{w} be the geometric discriminant weight vector in the space of landing probabilities (1-step through K -step, K fixed) between two fixed sets of block classes S and T of G_n of size $n_S = \sum_{i \in S} n_i$ and $n_T = \sum_{i \in T} n_i$, where S and T partition $\{1, \dots, C\}$.*

For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists an n sufficiently large such that $\|n_S \hat{w} - n_S \Psi\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where:

(a) $\Psi = \Psi(\{x_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^C, n, \pi)$ is a vector with coordinates specified by the solution to a C -dimensional linear homogeneous matrix recurrence relation $x_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^C n_i p_{ij} x_{j,k-1}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$.

(b) If $\sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ij} = \sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ik}$ for each $j, k \in J$ for each $I, J \in \{S, T\}$, then Ψ is the solution to a 2-dimensional linear homogeneous matrix recurrence and the closed-form solution for Ψ follow from diagonalizing the corresponding 2×2 matrix.

(c) Assuming that the blocks are identically distributed, then

$$n_S \Psi_k = \left(\frac{(p_{in} - p_{out})}{C p_{out} + (p_{in} - p_{out})} \right)^k,$$

in which case the geometric discriminant weight vector is asymptotically equivalent to personalized PageRank.

Proof. By Lemma 2 we have that for a fixed walk length k , the landing probabilities \hat{y}_{ik} , $i = 1, \dots, C$, concentrate around quantities given by the solutions to the C -dimensional linear matrix

recurrence $x_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^C R_{ij} x_{j,k-1}$. Specifically, for any $\epsilon_1 > 0$, $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$n_i \hat{y}_{ik} \in \left[(1 - \epsilon_1) \frac{x_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C x_{jk}}, (1 + \epsilon_1) \frac{x_{ik}}{\sum_{j=1}^C x_{jk}} \right]. \quad (78)$$

We now define $f_k = \sum_{i \in S} x_{ik}$ and $g_k = \sum_{i \in T} x_{ik}$. The aggregate probabilities of a k -step walk starting at a seed node in S or T are, respectively, $\frac{\sum_{i \in S} n_i \hat{y}_{ik}}{n_S}$ and $\frac{\sum_{i \in T} n_i \hat{y}_{ik}}{n_T}$. These aggregate probabilities obey the following containment whenever the containments (78) are all satisfied:

$$\sum_{i \in S} n_i \hat{y}_{ik} \in \left[(1 - \epsilon_1) \frac{f_k}{f_k + g_k}, (1 + \epsilon_1) \frac{f_k}{f_k + g_k} \right], \quad (79)$$

$$\sum_{i \in T} n_i \hat{y}_{ik} \in \left[(1 - \epsilon_1) \frac{g_k}{f_k + g_k}, (1 + \epsilon_1) \frac{g_k}{f_k + g_k} \right]. \quad (80)$$

The coordinates of the geometric discriminant weight vector that we seek to characterize are given by

$$n_S \hat{w}_k = n_S \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in S} n_i \hat{y}_{ik}}{n_S} - \frac{\sum_{i \in T} n_i \hat{y}_{ik}}{n_T} \right). \quad (81)$$

We obtain the following containments:

$$n_S \hat{w}_k \in [n_S \Psi_k - \epsilon_1 \Phi_k, n_S \Psi_k + \epsilon_1 \Phi_k], \quad \text{where } \Psi_k = \frac{1}{f_k + g_k} \left(\frac{f_k}{n_S} - \frac{g_k}{n_T} \right), \quad \Phi_k = n_S \frac{\frac{1}{n_S} f_k + \frac{1}{n_T} g_k}{f_k + g_k}. \quad (82)$$

If $n_S \leq n_T$ then clearly $\Phi_k \leq 1, \forall k$. If $n_S > n_T$ then $\Phi_k \leq n_S/n_T = (\sum_{i \in S} \pi_i)/(\sum_{i \in T} \pi_i), \forall k$. Since the class proportions π_i are all fixed, we can choose a constant $C > \max [1, (\sum_{i \in S} \pi_i)/(\sum_{i \in T} \pi_i)]$ and $\epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon/C$ such that:

$$\|n_S \hat{w} - n_S \Psi\|_1 \leq \epsilon, \quad (83)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, as desired.

Notice that Ψ_k depends on both f_k and g_k , which in turn depend on all x_{ik} , the solutions to a C -dimensional recurrence relation. We will now show that when the conditions in part (b) of the proposition are satisfied, the recurrence reduces to a 2-dimensional recurrence relation in f_k and g_k only.

To compute a closed form expression for Ψ_k we must find a closed form expression for the sums $\sum_{i \in S} x_{ik}$ and $\sum_{i \in T} x_{ik}$. We can now employ Lemma 3, which requires $\sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ij} = \sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ik}$ for each $j, k \in J$, meaning that each node in I has the same expected number of edges to J for $I, J \in \{S, T\}$. Note that this requirement is less restrictive than the two-dimensional stochastic block model, as the partition S and T could have structure: we only require that, for each combination $(I, J) \in \{(S, S), (S, T), (T, S), (T, T)\}$, the expected number of edges from a node in I to nodes in J is homogeneous. This constraint on the degree of nodes within and between the partitions indicates that $\sum_{i \in I} R_{ij} = \sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ij}$ satisfies the conditions required by Lemma 3. Thus to compute the closed-form solutions necessary for the geometric discriminant weight vector we need not solve the C -dimensional matrix recurrence, but instead can solve a two dimensional recurrence:

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_k \\ g_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d_{11} & d_{12} \\ d_{21} & d_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{k-1} \\ g_{k-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (84)$$

where $f_k = \sum_{i \in S} x_{ik}$ and $g_k = \sum_{i \in T} x_{ik}$ as before, with initial conditions $f_0 = \sum_{i \in S} x_{i0}$ and $g_0 = \sum_{i \in T} x_{i0}$ and where $d_{IJ} = \sum_{i \in I} n_i p_{ij}$ for any choice of $j \in J$ and $I, J \in \{S, T\}$.

Letting $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{11} & d_{21} \\ d_{12} & d_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\vec{C}_k = \begin{bmatrix} f_k \\ g_k \end{bmatrix}$ we have the simple recursion $\vec{C}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{R}} \vec{C}_{k-1}$. By induction we have that $\vec{C}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{R}}^k \vec{C}_0$, where \vec{C}_0 are the initial conditions.

We seek to diagonalize $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$. When $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ is diagonalizable we have $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}^k = (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}^{-1})^k = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^k\mathbf{U}^{-1}$, where \mathbf{D} is a diagonal matrix with the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$, λ_1 and λ_2 , along the diagonal, and \mathbf{U} is a matrix with the corresponding eigenvectors of $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ as its columns. We will derive \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{D} exactly (below) and thus can derive \vec{C}_k exactly for all k . In this case, we denote the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ and the matrix containing its eigenvectors are given by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mathbf{U}$:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}(d_{11} + d_{22} - \phi), \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}(d_{11} + d_{22} + \phi), \quad \mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{d_{11} - d_{22} - \phi}{2d_{12}} & \frac{d_{11} - d_{22} + \phi}{2d_{12}} \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (85)$$

where $\phi = \sqrt{(d_{11} - d_{22})^2 + 4d_{12}d_{21}}$.

To establish the above solutions to the diagonalization we will show that $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}$ for \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{D} specified in (85). We begin by respectively multiplying the two pairs of matrices:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{d_{11}}{2d_{12}}(d_{11} - d_{22} - \phi) + d_{21} & \frac{d_{11}}{2d_{12}}(d_{11} - d_{22} + \phi) + d_{21} \\ \frac{1}{2}(d_{11} - d_{22} - \phi) + d_{22} & \frac{1}{2}(d_{11} - d_{22} + \phi) + d_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (86)$$

$$\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\lambda_1(d_{11} - d_{22} - \phi)}{2d_{12}} & \frac{\lambda_2(d_{11} - d_{22} + \phi)}{2d_{12}} \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (87)$$

and immediately can observe that indeed $(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{U})_{12} = (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D})_{12}$ and $(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{U})_{22} = (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D})_{22}$. By distributing λ_1 and λ_2 in $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D})_{11}$ and $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D})_{21}$ and simplifying we can observe:

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{U})_{11} - (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D})_{11} = (\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{U})_{21} - (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D})_{21} = \frac{(d_{11} - d_{22})^2 + 4d_{12}d_{21} - \phi^2}{4d_{12}} = 0 \quad (88)$$

where in the last step we use the definition of ϕ as $\phi = \sqrt{(d_{11} - d_{22})^2 + 4d_{12}d_{21}}$. We thus establish that $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}$.

The recurrence in (84) has the following general solution in terms of the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$:

$$f_k = \frac{\lambda_1^k U_{11}(g_0 U_{12} - f_0 U_{22}) - \lambda_2^k U_{12}(g_0 U_{11} - f_0 U_{21})}{U_{12}U_{21} - U_{11}U_{22}} \quad (89)$$

$$g_k = \frac{\lambda_1^k U_{21}(g_0 U_{12} - f_0 U_{22}) - \lambda_2^k U_{22}(g_0 U_{11} - f_0 U_{21})}{U_{12}U_{21} - U_{11}U_{22}}. \quad (90)$$

Assuming $d_{11} + d_{12} = d_{21} + d_{22}$, as assumed in part (b) of the proposition statement, leads to $\lambda_1 = d_{12} + d_{22}$, $\lambda_2 = -d_{21} + d_{22}$, and $\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} d_{12}/d_{21} & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus (89) and (90) simplify to

$$f_k = \frac{d_{12}\lambda_1^k + d_{21}\lambda_2^k}{d_{12} + d_{21}}, \quad g_k = \frac{d_{21}(\lambda_1^k - \lambda_2^k)}{d_{12} + d_{21}}. \quad (91)$$

We thus establish part (b) of the proposition, that Ψ_k depends only on the solution of a 2-dimensional recurrence relation.

For the special case of the blocks being characterized by identical parameters, $n_S \Psi_k$ reduces to weights equivalent to personalized PageRank for a particular choice of α . To see this, we will denote the number of nodes in each of the C identically distributed blocks as $N = n/C$, and the number of blocks in the in- and out-classes, S and T , as $|S|$ and $|T|$, where $|S|$ and $|T|$ are integers that sum to C .

Thus in this case we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{11} &= N((|S| - 1)p_{out} + p_{in}), & d_{12} &= N|S|p_{out}, \\ d_{22} &= N((|T| - 1)p_{out} + p_{in}), & d_{21} &= N|T|p_{out}, \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

where λ_1 , λ_2 , and $f_k + g_k$ reduce to:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2} (N|S|p_{out} + N((|T| - 1)p_{out} + p_{in})) = np_{out} + \frac{n}{C}(p_{in} - p_{out}), \quad (93)$$

$$\lambda_2 = -N|T|p_{out} + N((|T| - 1)p_{out} + p_{in}) = \frac{n}{C}(p_{in} - p_{out}), \quad (94)$$

$$f_k = \frac{|S|\lambda_1^k + |T|\lambda_2^k}{C}, \quad (95)$$

$$g_k = \frac{|T|(\lambda_1^k - \lambda_2^k)}{C}, \quad (96)$$

and $n_S \Psi_k$ reduces to:

$$n_S \Psi_k = \frac{n_S}{f_k + g_k} \left(\frac{f_k}{n_S} - \frac{g_k}{n_T} \right) = \frac{n_S}{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_1^k} \left(\left(\lambda_1^k + \frac{|T|}{|S|} \lambda_2^k \right) - (\lambda_1^k - \lambda_2^k) \right) = \frac{|S|}{C} \left(\frac{|T|}{|S|} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right)^k \quad (97)$$

$$= \left(\frac{(p_{in} - p_{out})}{Cp_{out} + (p_{in} - p_{out})} \right)^k. \quad (98)$$

The weights derived here are again precisely the weights employed by personalized PageRank for

$$\alpha = \frac{p_{in} - p_{out}}{Cp_{out} + (p_{in} - p_{out})}. \quad \square$$

We see that Proposition 1 is simply a special case of Proposition 2: for $C = 2$ we recover $\alpha = \frac{p_{in} - p_{out}}{p_{in} + p_{out}}$, as in Proposition 1.

C Details of Belief Propagation

Given a C -block stochastic block model $G(n, \pi, P)$, the probability of observing an adjacency matrix A and block assignments $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$ — where $q_i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ assigns node i to a block class — with parameters $\theta = (C, \pi, P)$ is:

$$\Pr(A, \{q_i\}_{i=1}^n | \theta) = \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n p_{q_i, q_j}^{A_{ij}} (1 - p_{q_i, q_j})^{1 - A_{ij}} \prod_{k=1}^C \pi_{q_k}. \quad (99)$$

When an adjacency matrix A has been observed, we obtain the following log-likelihood function for $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$:

$$\ell(\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n; A, \theta) = \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \left(A_{ij} \log p_{q_i, q_j} + (1 - A_{ij}) \log(1 - p_{q_i, q_j}) \right) + \sum_{k=1}^n \log \pi_{q_k}. \quad (100)$$

Maximizing this log-likelihood over possible assignments $\{q_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is NP-hard in general (by a reduction from graph bisection), though an EM algorithm can be applied to find local maxima [38]. The EM approach is understood to perform decently well in graphs where there is sufficiently unambiguous block structure, but recent work has shown that the more powerful method known as belief propagation (BP) is able to recover labels that are correlated with the ground truth labels under considerably weaker conditions on the unambiguousness of the block structure [12].

Belief propagation (BP) has been found to make much better inferences than EM approaches in practice, reaching the known *resolution limit* (also called the *detectability threshold*) for the problem [16]. We describe belief propagation here in order to benchmark our classification algorithms against the best known methods for the problem. It is important to keep in mind that belief propagation is a much more empowered and computationally demanding algorithm than the classification algorithms Lin-SBMRank and Quad-SBMRank that we present and study in the main text of this work. Those algorithms are all restricted to simple discriminative classification rules in the space of random walk landing probabilities, classifying individual nodes independently based on these probabilities. In contrast, belief propagation performs a global joint inference of all node labels.

While BP lacks rigorous guarantees for general stochastic block models, two recent algorithms [32, 29] inspired by the basic mechanics of BP have recently admitted rigorous analyses on sparse graphs, showing that they are capable of identifying labels correlated with the true labels all the way up to the known resolution limit for the problem. Both algorithms are acknowledged as impractical in practice and no implementation has been studied. A recent semidefinite programming relaxation of the likelihood maximization should also be of interest to the reader [1]; it has been implemented in practice and found to be quite effective, though its analysis obtains slightly weaker rigorous guarantees than the rigorous analyses of the two other recent algorithms above. We do not employ any of these three algorithms, focusing instead on ordinary belief propagation.

The analysis of belief propagation tends to rely heavily on metaphors from statistical physics. In this section we outline the basic motivation for belief propagation’s performance, and then specify the precise instantiation of belief propagation that we employ in this work.

Belief Propagation and SBMs in theory Belief propagation (BP) is a message passing algorithm for the inference of joint distributions of random variables with conditional dependencies represented by graphs. Belief propagation infers marginal distributions of unobserved variables of such models, commonly called *graphical models*. When the graph underlying a graphical model is a tree, the BP algorithm is known to converge on a fixed point that minimizes an objective function known as the *Bethe free energy* of the joint probability distribution represented by the model [42]. On more general graphs, when it does converge then the fixed point it converges upon must be a stationary point (though not necessarily a global minima) of the Bethe free energy. Belief propagation is therefore widely applied beyond the context of trees, in what is sometimes specified as *loopy belief propagation*, named after the presence of cycles (loops) in the graph. The procedure we describe here is an instance of loopy belief propagation, though we refer to it simply as belief propagation (or BP).

Belief propagation has recently been adapted for the inference of block labels for graphs realized from stochastic block models, where the block labels are viewed as unobserved latent variables [12].

It can be shown that any minimum of the Bethe free energy is a maximum of the log-likelihood of the stochastic block model [34, 43]. Thus, if a graph realized under the SBM is a tree then belief propagation will quickly converge upon the maximum likelihood estimate of the SBM parameters (these parameters include the assignment of nodes to block classes). Note that this does not contradict the NP-hardness of maximizing the likelihood on graphs in general. For a graph realized under the SBM that is not a tree, the convergence upon the global maximum of the likelihood under BP is no longer guaranteed. In fact, loopy BP is not guaranteed to converge on any solution at all, though some sufficient conditions for convergence on non-trees are known [31]. When it does converge, however, it is a stationary point of the likelihood.

Despite the lack of rigorous results, BP is widely understood to find good solutions (solutions with near-maximal likelihood) in practice. We study BP for blocks of equal size only, however note that recent work have successfully adapted BP to block models with unequal group sizes [45].

A method known as *belief optimization* is worth mentioning, as it attempts to optimize the Bethe free energy directly to a local minima, thus avoiding BPs lack of convergence guarantees [39]. This approach is closely related to maximizing the stochastic block model likelihood directly via EM [38]. Belief optimization is slower than BP when BP does converge, and thus is less often used in practice.

Belief Propagation and SBMs in practice We now present a distilled presentation of sparse-SBM-BP, the instantiation of belief propagation that we employ for inferring latent node labels in stochastic block models. The presentation here is largely a reproduction of the derivation in [12] with added clarifications. Our derivations are specific to the case of C blocks with equal sizes n , forming a graph on $N = Cn$ nodes. Let $c_{sr} = np_{sr}$ be the known expected degree between class s and r and let $\pi_s = C/n$ denote the proportion of nodes in block s .

Let ψ_s^i denote the *belief* that node i belongs to class s . The BP equations are then defined as the following recursively defined conditional marginal probabilities $\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j}$, also called *messages*:

$$\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{Z^{i \rightarrow j}} \pi_s \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^n \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r}^{A_{ik}} \left(1 - \frac{c_{s,r}}{N}\right)^{1-A_{ik}} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right], \forall i, j, s, \quad (101)$$

where the beliefs ψ_t^i are aggregated up as:

$$\psi_s^i = \frac{1}{Z^i} \pi_s \prod_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r}^{A_{ij}} \left(1 - \frac{c_{s,r}}{N}\right)^{1-A_{ij}} \psi_r^{j \rightarrow i} \right], \forall i, s. \quad (102)$$

In these two equations $Z^{i \rightarrow j}$ and Z^i are both normalizing constants determined by the constraints $\sum_{t=1}^C \psi_t^{i \rightarrow j} = 1$ and $\sum_{t=1}^C \psi_t^i = 1$.

The BP algorithm consists of iterating the BP equations in (101) until, hopefully, convergence. When these BP equations converge to a fixed point then the beliefs ψ_s^i in (102) are a stationary point of the Bethe free energy of the graphical model underlying the stochastic block model, an objective with close ties to the model likelihood as discussed above.

Notice that each of the $O(N^2)$ message equations in (101) contains $N - 1$ terms, meaning that each iteration of the BP equations requires $O(N^3)$ computation. For sparse graphs the following heuristic approximation dramatically simplifies the computation [12]. We first separate the product in (101) into neighbor nodes ($k \in \partial i$) and non-neighbor nodes ($k \notin \partial i$):

$$\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{Z^{i \rightarrow j}} \pi_s \prod_{\substack{k \in \partial i \\ k \neq j}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right] \prod_{\substack{k \in \partial i \\ k \neq j}} \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right], \forall i, j, s. \quad (103)$$

We now employ a sequence of three heuristic approximations. First, we use that $(1 - x) \approx \exp(-x)$ for small x :

$$\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{Z^{i \rightarrow j}} \pi_s \exp \left(-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{k \notin \partial i \\ k \neq j}} \sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right) \prod_{\substack{k \in \partial i \\ k \neq j}} \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right], \forall i, j, s. \quad (104)$$

Second, for non-neighbors in the internal sum the difference between summing over strictly non-neighbors $k \notin \partial i$ and all nodes $k = 1, \dots, N$ is small:

$$\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{Z^{i \rightarrow j}} \pi_s \exp \left(-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right) \prod_{\substack{k \in \partial i \\ k \neq j}} \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right], \forall i, j, s. \quad (105)$$

Third, for non-neighbor pairs the messages $\psi_r^{k \rightarrow i}$ are approximately the beliefs ψ_r^k , $\psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} = \psi_r^k + O(1/N)$, for all r and all k independent of the destination i . We obtain:

$$\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{Z^{i \rightarrow j}} \pi_s \exp \left(-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^k \right) \prod_{k \in \partial i} \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right], \forall i, j, s. \quad (106)$$

We now observe that the terms $\xi_s := \pi_s \exp \left(-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^k \right)$ do not depend on i or j and can be computed for each s once per iteration of the BP equations. We further note that the only message equations used in the iteration are those for (i, j) pairs that are neighbors in the graph. We thus obtain the following simplified *sparse BP* equations for stochastic block model label inference, replacing the dense equations in (101) and (102) with:

$$\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{Z^{i \rightarrow j}} \xi_s \prod_{\substack{k \in \partial i \\ k \neq j}} \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{k \rightarrow i} \right], \quad (i, j) \in E, \quad s = 1, \dots, C, \quad (107)$$

$$\xi_s = \pi_s \exp \left(-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^k \right), \quad s = 1, \dots, C, \quad (108)$$

$$\psi_s^i = \frac{1}{Z^i} \xi_s \prod_{j \in \partial i} \left[\sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \psi_r^{j \rightarrow i} \right], \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad s = 1, \dots, C. \quad (109)$$

Here, as before, $Z^{i \rightarrow j}$ and Z^i are normalizing constants determined by the constraints $\sum_{t=1}^C \psi_t^{i \rightarrow j} = 1$ and $\sum_{t=1}^C \psi_t^i = 1$. For a sparse graph where the maximum degree d is bounded $O(1)$ in n there are just $O(dN)$ BP equations with an overall computational cost is thus $O(d^2 N)$ per iteration, much less than $O(N^3)$ for the standard BP algorithm before the heuristics were applied.

Notice that in the original BP equations (101) only the messages $\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j}$ were computed each iteration, whereas the sparse BP equations in Eqs. (107)-(109) above compute the beliefs ψ_s^i as part of computing the messages $\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j}$. Once the messages converge upon a fixed point then the beliefs can be used for classification by assigning nodes the class with the highest belief.

Initial conditions The sparse BP equations in Eqs. (107)-(109) are defined recursively, and must begin somewhere. In this work we employ the following initializations. We begin by setting the beliefs according to the known class proportions, $\psi_s^{i,(0)} = \pi_s$ for $s = 1, \dots, C$. For the case of $\pi_s = 1/C$ (balanced class sizes) we then obtain initial conditions on each ξ_s :

$$\xi_s^{(0)} = \frac{1}{C} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{NC} \sum_{r=1}^C c_{s,r} \right), \quad s = 1, \dots, C. \quad (110)$$

Lastly, we initialize the messages $\psi_s^{i \rightarrow j, (0)}$ uniformly at random. As we require that $\sum_{s=1}^C \psi_s^{i \rightarrow j} = 1$, this uniformly random initialization is achieved by either (a) sampling each message independently from the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ and then normalizing each message by the sum over all messages corresponding to their (i, j) pair, or equivalently (b) sampling each vector of messages corresponding to an (i, j) pair from $\text{Dir}(1, \dots, 1)$, the uniform Dirichlet distribution.

We halt the iteration when the equations in (107) are converged below some predefined numerical tolerance on the update difference or the number of iterations exceeds some predefined max iteration count.

Application to the seed set expansion problem Belief propagation performs an optimization over all labelings of the nodes of the graph, without necessarily utilizing any information about labelled nodes. In order to adapt BP to the seed set expansion problem that we study, we simply fix the beliefs about the seed set such that if the seed set $S \subset V$ belongs to class s then:

$$\psi_s^i = 1, \forall i \in S, \quad \psi_t^i = 0, \forall i \in S, t \neq s. \quad (111)$$

These beliefs are given at initialization and also maintained during the iteration of the BP equations; the beliefs about the seed set are not updated. Beliefs about all other nodes $i \notin S$ (those nodes not in the labeled seed set) are initialized according to the known class proportions minus an appropriate adjustment for what is known about the seed set:

$$\psi_s^i = \frac{\frac{1}{C}n - |S|}{n - |S|}, \forall i \notin S, \quad \psi_t^i = \frac{\frac{1}{C}n}{n - |S|}, \forall i \notin S, t \neq s. \quad (112)$$

D Additional Computational Results and Discussion

Exemplar SBM Parameters In Figure 1A of the main text we illustrate the adjacency matrix for a four-block SBM with $n = 2048$, $\pi = [491/2048, 532/2048, 471/2048, 554/2048]$ and $P = \begin{pmatrix} 0.4 & 0.15 & 0.08 & 0.04 \\ 0.15 & 0.38 & 0.04 & 0.08 \\ 0.06 & 0.08 & 0.37 & 0.16 \\ 0.06 & 0.04 & 0.18 & 0.36 \end{pmatrix}$. If considering a seed node from block 1, the block partition $S = \{1, 2\}$ and $T = \{3, 4\}$ leads this 4-block SBM with non-identical blocks to satisfy the portions of Proposition 2 that apply to non-identical block models.

Numerical Considerations for Covariance Matrices The covariance matrices describe the covariances between the landing probabilities for a random walk starting at the seed node and walking 1 to K steps. For large step counts the landing probabilities begin to converge upon the stationary distribution of a random walk, meaning that the covariance between step $K - 1$ and K becomes very high. In general the last several columns of the covariances matrices become strongly collinear for large values of K . To mitigate against ill-conditioned matrix inversions, we restrict the maximum number of steps K included in our landing probability space in a manner that keeps the condition numbers $\kappa(\Sigma_a)$ and $\kappa(\Sigma_b)$ both below 10^{10} . In practice this empirically amounts to performing our analysis in the space of landing probabilities for the first $K = 6$ steps.




Figure S1: (A)-(C) Heatmaps: the Pearson correlation r between the inferred partition and true partition as a function of $p_{aa} = p_{bb} = p_{in}$ and $p_{ab} = p_{out}$ in four settings. Red is high ($r = 1$) and blue is low ($r = 0$). Using a personalized PageRank discriminant function ranking based on (A) a fixed choice of $\alpha = 0.7$ (corresponding to $p_{in} = 0.6$, $p_{out} = 0.1$), (B) α^* set by the true values of p_{in} and p_{out} , and (C) our normalized linear function Lin-SBMRank, $g_2(r) = \Sigma^{-1}(a - b)^T r$, for the true values of p_{in} and p_{out} . The quadratic discriminant function Quad-SBMRank, not shown, is similar to Lin-SBMRank.

Further Performance Results For SBMs As an illustration of the improved performance of our algorithm for recovering partitions correlated with the ground truth, Figure S1 shows heat maps of the Pearson correlation r of various methods as a function of p_{in} and p_{out} . We clearly see that our normalized linear classification performs significantly better through the space of stochastic block model parameters; the quadratic classification (not shown in this figure) produces a heat map that's visually very similar to the one for the normalized linear classification (with slightly higher performance). We note that all these methods require knowledge or estimation of the underlying parameters — in Figure S1A we see that when the discriminant function is configured with a fixed set of parameters that are far from the true values the classification can be quite poor.

SBM Parameter Estimation We employ the following consistent estimators for the parameters of a stochastic block model $G((n_a, n_b), P)$ where $p_{11} = p_{22} = p_{in}$, $p_{12} = p_{out}$, also known as the affiliation model, as due to Allman et al. [3]. Given an observed adjacency matrix A , then

$$\hat{p}_{out} = \frac{(s_3 - s_2 s_3) m_1^3 + (s_2^3 - s_3) m_2 m_1 + (s_3 s_2 - s_2^3) m_3}{(m_1^2 - m_2)(2s_2^3 - 3s_3 s_2 + s_3)}, \quad \hat{p}_{in} = \frac{m_1 + (s_2 - 1) \hat{p}_{out}}{s_2}, \quad (113)$$

where

$$s_2 = n_a^2 + n_b^2, \quad (114)$$

$$s_3 = n_a^3 + n_b^3, \quad (115)$$

$$m_1 = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^n A_{ij}, \quad (116)$$

$$m_2 = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i,j,k=1, i \neq j \neq k}^n A_{ij} A_{ik}, \quad (117)$$

$$m_3 = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i,j,k=1, i \neq j \neq k}^n A_{ij} A_{ik} A_{jk}. \quad (118)$$

Acknowledgements. Supported in part by a Simons Investigator Award, an ARO MURI grant, a Google Research Grant, a Facebook Faculty Research Grant, and a David Morgenthaler II Faculty Fellowship.

References

- [1] Emmanuel Abbe, Afonso S Bandeira, and Georgina Hall. Exact recovery in the stochastic block model. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 62(1):471–487, 2016.
- [2] Elizabeth S Allman, Catherine Matias, and John A Rhodes. Identifiability of parameters in latent structure models with many observed variables. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 3099–3132, 2009.
- [3] Elizabeth S Allman, Catherine Matias, and John A Rhodes. Parameter identifiability in a class of random graph mixture models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 141(5):1719–1736, 2011.
- [4] Christophe Ambroise and Catherine Matias. New consistent and asymptotically normal parameter estimates for random-graph mixture models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(1):3–35, 2012.
- [5] Reid Andersen, Fan Chung, and Kevin Lang. Local graph partitioning using pagerank vectors. In *FOCS*, pages 475–486, 2006.
- [6] Reid Andersen and Kevin J Lang. Communities from seed sets. In *WWW*, pages 223–232, 2006.
- [7] James P Bagrow. Evaluating local community methods in networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2008(05):P05001, 2008.
- [8] Bahman Bahmani, Abdur Chowdhury, and Ashish Goel. Fast incremental and personalized pagerank. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 4(3):173–184, 2010.
- [9] Fan Chung. The heat kernel as the pagerank of a graph. *PNAS*, 104(50):19735–19740, 2007.
- [10] Fan Chung. A local graph partitioning algorithm using heat kernel pagerank. *Internet Mathematics*, 6(3):315–330, 2009.
- [11] Anne Condon and Richard M Karp. Algorithms for graph partitioning on the planted partition model. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 18(2):116–140, 2001.
- [12] Aurelien Decelle, Florent Krzakala, Cristopher Moore, and Lenka Zdeborová. Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications. *Physical Review E*, 84(6):066106, 2011.
- [13] Martin E. Dyer and Alan M. Frieze. The solution of some random np-hard problems in polynomial expected time. *Journal of Algorithms*, 10(4):451–489, 1989.
- [14] Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi. On random graphs. *Publ. Math. Debrecen.*, 6:290–297, 1959.
- [15] Ronald A Fisher. The use of multiple measurements in taxonomic problems. *Annals of Eugenics*, 7(2):179–188, 1936.

- [16] Santo Fortunato and Marc Barthelemy. Resolution limit in community detection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(1):36–41, 2007.
- [17] Ove Frank and Frank Harary. Cluster inference by using transitivity indices in empirical graphs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 77(380):835–840, 1982.
- [18] David Gleich and Michael Mahoney. Anti-differentiating approximation algorithms: A case study with min-cuts, spectral, and flow. In *ICML*, pages 1018–1025, 2014.
- [19] David F Gleich. Pagerank beyond the web. *SIAM Review*, 57(3):321–363, 2015.
- [20] Pankaj Gupta, Ashish Goel, Jimmy Lin, Aneesh Sharma, Dong Wang, and Reza Zadeh. Wtf: The who to follow service at twitter. In *WWW*, pages 505–514, 2013.
- [21] Taher H Haveliwala. Topic-sensitive pagerank. In *WWW*, pages 517–526. ACM, 2002.
- [22] Paul W Holland, Kathryn Blackmond Laskey, and Samuel Leinhardt. Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social Networks*, 5(2):109–137, 1983.
- [23] Glen Jeh and Jennifer Widom. Scaling personalized web search. In *WWW*, pages 271–279. ACM, 2003.
- [24] Sepandar Kamvar, Taher Haveliwala, Christopher Manning, and Gene Golub. Exploiting the block structure of the web for computing pagerank. *Stanford University Technical Report*, 2003.
- [25] Jon M Kleinberg. Authoritative sources in a hyperlinked environment. In *SODA*, pages 668–677, 1998.
- [26] Kyle Kloster and David F Gleich. Heat kernel based community detection. In *KDD*, pages 1386–1395, 2014.
- [27] Isabel M Kloumann and Jon M Kleinberg. Community membership identification from small seed sets. In *KDD*, pages 1366–1375. ACM, 2014.
- [28] Florent Krzakala, Cristopher Moore, Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, Allan Sly, Lenka Zdeborová, and Pan Zhang. Spectral redemption in clustering sparse networks. *PNAS*, 110(52):20935–20940, 2013.
- [29] Laurent Massoulié. Community detection thresholds and the weak ramanujan property. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 694–703. ACM, 2014.
- [30] Andrew Mehler and Steven Skiena. Expanding network communities from representative examples. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 3(2):7, 2009.
- [31] Joris M Mooij and Hilbert J Kappen. Sufficient conditions for convergence of the sum-product algorithm. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 53(12):4422–4437, 2007.
- [32] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. A proof of the block model threshold conjecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.4115*, 2013.
- [33] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. Belief propagation, robust reconstruction, and optimal recovery of block models. *COLT*, 2014.

- [34] Radford M Neal and Geoffrey E Hinton. A view of the em algorithm that justifies incremental, sparse, and other variants. In *Learning in graphical models*, pages 355–368. Springer, 1998.
- [35] Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Terry Winograd. The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. Technical report, Stanford InfoLab, 1998.
- [36] Jason Riedy, David A Bader, Karl Jiang, Pushkar Pande, and Richa Sharma. Detecting communities from given seeds in social networks. Technical Report GT-CSE-11-01, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2011.
- [37] Alaa Saade, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. Spectral clustering of graphs with the bethe hessian. In *NIPS*, pages 406–414, 2014.
- [38] Tom AB Snijders and Krzysztof Nowicki. Estimation and prediction for stochastic blockmodels for graphs with latent block structure. *Journal of Classification*, 14(1):75–100, 1997.
- [39] Max Welling and Yee Whye Teh. Belief optimization for binary networks: A stable alternative to loopy belief propagation. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth conference on Uncertainty in artificial intelligence*, pages 554–561. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 2001.
- [40] Joyce Jiyoung Whang, David F Gleich, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Overlapping community detection using seed set expansion. In *CIKM*, pages 2099–2108, 2013.
- [41] Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. Defining and evaluating network communities based on ground-truth. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Workshop on Mining Data Semantics*, page 3. ACM, 2012.
- [42] Jonathan S Yedidia, William T Freeman, and Yair Weiss. Understanding belief propagation and its generalizations. *Exploring artificial intelligence in the new millennium*, 8:236–239, 2003.
- [43] Pan Zhang, Florent Krzakala, Jörg Reichardt, and Lenka Zdeborová. Comparative study for inference of hidden classes in stochastic block models. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2012(12):P12021, 2012.
- [44] Pan Zhang and Christopher Moore. Scalable detection of statistically significant communities and hierarchies, using message passing for modularity. *PNAS*, 111(51):18144–18149, 2014.
- [45] Pan Zhang, Christopher Moore, and MEJ Newman. Community detection in networks with unequal groups. *Physical Review E*, 93(1):012303, 2016.