

Temporal Betweenness Centrality on Shortest Walks Variants

Mehdi Naima

Sorbonne Université, CNRS, LIP6, F-75005 Paris, France.

Contributing authors: mehdi.naima@lip6.fr;

Abstract

Betweenness centrality has been extensively studied since its introduction in 1977 as a measure of node importance in graphs. This measure has found use in various applications and has been extended to temporal graphs with time-labeled edges. Recent research by Buß et al. [Buß et al \(2020\)](#) and Rymar et al. [Rymar et al \(2021\)](#) has shown that it is possible to compute the shortest walks betweenness centrality of all nodes in a temporal graph in $O(n^3 T^2)$ and $O(n^2 m T^2)$ time, respectively, where T is the maximum time, m is the number of temporal edges, and n is the number of nodes. These approaches considered walks that do not take into account contributions from intermediate temporal nodes.

In this paper, we study the temporal betweenness centrality on classical walks that we call *passive*, as well as on a variant that we call *active* walks, which takes into account contributions from all temporal nodes. We present an improved analysis of the running time of the classical algorithm for computing betweenness centrality of all nodes, reducing the time complexity to $O(n m T + n^2 T)$. Furthermore, for active walks, we show that the betweenness centrality can be computed in $O(n m T + n^2 T^2)$. We also show that our results hold for different shortest walks variants.

Finally, we provide an open-source implementation of our algorithms and conduct experiments on several real-world datasets of cities and contact traces. We compare the results of the two variants on both the node and time dimensions of the temporal graph, and we also compare the temporal betweenness centrality to its static counterpart. Our experiments suggest that for the shortest foremost variant looking only at the first **10%** of the temporal interaction is a good approximation for the overall top ranked nodes.

Keywords: Graph algorithms, Experimental algorithms, Betweenness Centrality, Temporal Graphs, Shortest Paths, Time centrality, restless walks

1 Introduction

Betweenness centrality is a well-known centrality measure in static graphs that aims to identify central nodes in a graph. Centrality measures assign a value to each node (or edge) in based to its importance (centrality). In a static graph, the betweenness centrality of a node is based on the number of shortest paths passing through that node. It was introduced by Freeman in [Freeman \(1977\)](#). This centrality has been studied extensively in the literature and is a classical measure in network analysis used in a variety of domains such as social networks [Burt \(2004\)](#), transports [Puzis et al \(2013\)](#), biology [Narayanan \(2005\)](#); [Yoon et al \(2006\)](#) and scientific collaboration networks [Leydesdorff \(2007\)](#). Additionally, betweenness centrality has been utilized as an efficient method for graph partitioning and community detection [Girvan and Newman \(2002\)](#). Brandes in [Brandes \(2001\)](#) introduced a method for computing betweenness centrality of a whole graph in $O(nm+n^2)$ which remains the fastest known algorithm.

Recently, betweenness centrality has been extended to dynamic graph formalisms such as temporal graphs [Kostakos \(2009\)](#) and stream graphs [Latapy et al \(2018\)](#). The generalization of betweenness centrality to a temporal setting is not unique, and many optimality criteria have been considered in the literature [Buß et al \(2020\)](#); [Rymar et al \(2021\)](#); [Tsalouchidou et al \(2020\)](#); [Tang et al \(2010\)](#); [Kim and Anderson \(2012\)](#); [Latapy et al \(2018\)](#), including shortest walks, fastest walks, foremost walks, and shortest fastest walks. However, for this paper, we only focus on the shortest walks (minimal number of hops) criteria which has also been studied in [Buß et al \(2020\)](#); [Rymar et al \(2021\)](#) as it is the most straightforward generalization of the static case. It is then possible to define the betweenness centrality of a node v at time t by:

$$B(v, t) = \sum_{s \neq v \neq z \in V} \frac{\sigma_{sz}(v, t)}{\sigma_{sz}},$$

where $\frac{\sigma_{sz}(v, t)}{\sigma_{sz}}$ is the fraction of shortest temporal walks from s to z that pass through node v at time t . Recent results on temporal betweenness centrality, tried with success to adapt Brandes algorithm to the temporal setting [Buß et al \(2020\)](#); [Rymar et al \(2021\)](#). For shortest walks their approach lead to time complexities of $O(n^3 T^2)$ and $O(n^2 m T^2)$ to compute the betweenness of a whole temporal graph. However, their algorithms considered only what we call *passive* temporal walks in which the walk only exists when it arrives at a certain temporal node, and moreover, they did not apply Brandes algorithm to its full extent as we shall see.

In a temporal walk, when there is a delay between steps like starting from a node u , the walk transitions to node u_1 at time t_1 , then later transitions to node u_2 at time t_2 . Many existing works consider that such a walk contributes to the betweenness of u_1 only at time t_1 , while we investigate the more general and more natural version in which the walk contributes to the betweenness of u_1 for all times between t_1 and t_2 . Indeed, removing u_1 at any of these times makes the walk unfeasible. To this end, we consider both what we call *passive* and *active* shortest walks, so that active walks exist all along a node until leaving it while passive walks correspond to the more classical version. For the classical **passive shortest walks**, we improve the time analysis of

Buß et al (2020) and show that the Betweenness centrality of the whole graph can be computed in $O(nmT + n^2T)$. This bound increases to $O(nmT + n^2T^2)$ if considering **active shortest walks**. We also show that these bounds are still true for **shortest k -restless walks** where it is not possible to stay more than k time units on the same node and for **shortest foremost walks** where we want to reach a node as soon as possible. For all stated criteria the results also hold on their *strict* versions where traversing a node takes one time unit. Our time analysis results show that we can use Brandes approach to its full extent in the temporal setting since when the temporal graph is static (i.e its edges exist at only one timestamp) our analysis reduces to the state of art algorithm on static graphs Brandes (2001). In fact active walks were considered in Latapy et al (2018); Tang et al (2010) but not on shortest walks (number of transitions) and we also seek to have a *systematic* study of all these shortest walks variants as was the case in Buß et al (2020); Rymar et al (2021) by designing a single algorithm for all these variants which was not the aim of these works.

We also provide an open-source implementation in C++ and use it to assess the differences between active and passive variants on real-world temporal graphs in both their *node* and *time* dimensions. On the *node dimension* of the temporal graph we compare temporal betweenness centrality to the static betweenness centrality computed on the aggregated graph. Our experiments show that the temporal and static betweenness centrality rankings of nodes are close to each others with the static betweenness running 100 times faster. On the *time dimension* our experiments show that the active variant that we propose gives more importance to central times in contrast with the passive classical variant where first the times of the graph are the most important. Finally, our experiments suggest that for the shortest foremost variant looking only at the first 10% of the temporal interactions is a good approximation for the overall top ranked nodes.

The paper is organized as follows, in Section 2 we introduce our formalism that is a modified version of Rymar et al (2021). We start by defining active and passive walks and giving a motivation for the study of active walks. We end this section by defining the betweenness centrality of a temporal node. In Section 3 we give the statement of our main Theorem 1 followed by a discussion of the results. After that in Section 4 we give the main ideas and algorithms to prove our results with more details given in Section 6. Finally, Section 5 presents our experimental results. We mainly focus on the differences of behaviours between active and passive walks and show that the rankings of temporal nodes are moderately correlated on real-world datasets. We end this paper with some perspectives in Section 7.

2 Formalism

We use a formalism close to the ones used in Buß et al (2020); Rymar et al (2021). We define a directed temporal graph G as a triple $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ such that V is the set of vertices, $T \in \mathbb{N}$, is the maximal time step with $[T] := \{1, \dots, T\}$ and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq V \times V \times [T]$ is the set of temporal arcs (transitions). We denote by $n := |V|$ and $m := |\mathcal{E}|$. We call $V \times [T]$ the set of temporal nodes. Then $(v, w, t) \in \mathcal{E}$ represents a temporal arc from v to w at time t .




Fig. 1: A temporal graph having nodes $V = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and $T = 7$ with arrows representing the set \mathcal{E} . The walk $W = [(a, b, 1), (b, c, 5)]$ can be denoted as $W = a \xrightarrow{1} b \xrightarrow{5} c$. (left) Walks are passive then $\mathcal{V}(W) = [(a, 1), (b, 1), (c, 5)]$ marked in red. (right) Walks are active then $\mathcal{V}(W) = [(a, 1), (b, 1), (b, 2), (b, 3), (b, 4), (b, 5), (c, 5)]$ marked in blue.

Definition 1 (Temporal walk). *Given a temporal graph $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$, a temporal walk W is a sequence of transitions $e \in \mathcal{E}^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $e = (e_1, \dots, e_k)$, with $e_i = (u_i, v_i, t_i)$ such that for each $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ of $u_{i+1} = v_i$ and $t_i \leq t_{i+1}$.*

The **length** of a temporal walk W denoted $len(W)$ is its number of transitions. We also denote by $arr(W)$ the time of the last transition of W . We can associate a type of walks to consider on a temporal graph. We will study in this paper two types of walks on temporal graphs that are called **active** and **passive** walks. We will denote the type of walks considered on a temporal graph G by

$$\text{type}(G) \in \{act, pas\},$$

where *pas* stands for passive and *act* for active. The important difference between active and passive walks is that, a passive walk only exists on node transitions, therefore a passive walk that arrive to v at time t and leaves v at t' only exists on node v for a single time t , while an active walk exists on v for all times $t \leq i \leq t'$. This difference is formally defined in the following definition.

Definition 2 (Visited temporal nodes). *For a temporal graph G , fix a walk type. Let W be a temporal walk such that $len(W) = k$ and let $k > 0$. Then the list of visited temporal nodes $\mathcal{V}(W)$ is given by:*

$$\mathcal{V}(W) = \begin{cases} [(u_1, t_1)] + [(v_i, t_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k], & \text{if } \text{type}(G) = pas \\ [(u_1, t_1)] + \left(\biguplus_{i=1}^{k-1} [(v_i, t) \mid t_i \leq t \leq t_{i+1}] \right) + [(v_k, t_k)] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $+$ denotes list concatenation and \biguplus is used for concatenation of several lists.

We will denote by $W[-1]$ the last visited temporal node corresponding to the last element in $\mathcal{V}(W)$. Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph with $\text{type}(G) = active$. We can denote a temporal walk using an arrow notation. For instance $W = [(a, b, 1), (b, c, 5)]$ of the temporal graph in Figure 1 by $W = a \xrightarrow{1} b \xrightarrow{5} c$. See Figure 1 for an example of these concepts. This distinction between active and passive walks is important since the authors of recent results in this line of research [Buß et al \(2020\)](#); [Rymar et al \(2021\)](#) consider only passive walks. A temporal walk is called a **path** if

each node $v \in V$ in the list of visited nodes appears exactly once. Moreover, a temporal walk W is a **strict** temporal walk if for each transition time label is strictly larger than the previous one, that is for $2 \leq i \leq k, t_i > t_{i-1}$. Otherwise, the temporal walk is a **non-strict** temporal walk. Finally, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a temporal walk is **k -restless** if the difference between two consecutive transitions time stamps $t_i - t_{i-1} \leq k$.

Example 1 (Motivation example for the study of active walks). *Consider a message passing temporal network $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ where V is a set of machines (computers or routers) and a temporal arc $(u, v, t) \in \mathcal{E}$ corresponds to a message sent from u to v at time t . Suppose that Figure 1 represents this graph. Take for instance node c at time 4. At this time node c is retaining a message that arrived from b at time 2 and another one that arrived from d at time 3. Therefore, node c at time 4 is retaining important information. It is important to make sure that machine c is not disconnected from the network at this time to carry this information to other nodes. However, considering the classical passive of temporal walks in Burt (2004); Rymar et al (2021) $(c, 4)$ is not visited by any temporal walk in the graph and get 0 value for its betweenness centrality. On the other hand this information is entirely captured by active variant that we propose.*

A walk W is an $s - v$ walk if W starts in node s and ends in node v , we denote by W_{sv} the set of all $s - v$ walks. In this paper we consider 3 variants of shortest temporal walks. Shortest here refer to minimizing the number of transitions (length) of the temporal walk. These variants are:

- Shortest walks (sh) which minimize the walk length over all walks going from a node to another,
- Shortest k -restless walks (sh- k) which minimize the walk length over all k -restless walks going from a node to another and
- Shortest foremost (sh-fm) walks which minimize the walk length over all walks going from one node and arriving the earliest in time to the other.

For each one of these criteria. We need to define the shortest possible length of temporal walks from a node to another.

$$c_s^{sh}(v) = \min_{W \in W_{sv}} (\text{len}(W)) \quad (\text{shortest}) \quad (2)$$

$$c_s^{sh-k}(v) = \min_{\substack{W \in W_{sv}, \\ W \text{ is } k\text{-restless}}} (\text{len}(W)) \quad (\text{shortest } k\text{-restless}) \quad (3)$$

$$c_s^{fm}(v) = \min_{W \in W_{sv}} (\text{arr}(W) \cdot n + \text{len}(W)) \quad (\text{shortest foremost}) \quad (4)$$

Note that the definition of $c_s^{fm}(v)$ ensures only considering walks arriving first and then minimizing over their lengths.

Remark 1. *Shortest walks are necessarily paths while this is not true in general for shortest k -restless walks. In fact, finding a k -restless path has been shown to be NP-hard in Casteigts et al (2021). As a consequence we will use the term walks in general because we want to encompass all variants.*

For an active temporal walk W we will denote by W_t with $t > \text{arr}(W)$ the extension of W on its last node to t . Formally, $\mathcal{V}(W_t) = \mathcal{V}(W) + [(v_k, t') \mid \text{arr}(W) < t' \leq t]$ where

v_k is the arrival node of W . For example, on the graph of Figure 1, $W = a \xrightarrow{1} b \xrightarrow{5} c$. Then $\mathcal{V}(W_7) = [(a, 1), (b, 1), (b, 2), (b, 3), (b, 4), (b, 5), (c, 5), (c, 6), (c, 7)]$. Now we can define:

Definition 3 (Set of shortest walks). *Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph and fix a cost. Then*

$$\mathcal{W}^\star = \begin{cases} \bigcup_{s,z \in V, s \neq z} \{W | W \in W_{sz}, \text{len}(W) = c_s^\star(z)\}, & \text{if type}(G) = \text{pas} \\ \bigcup_{s,z \in V, s \neq z} \{W_T | W \in W_{sz}, \text{len}(W) = c_s^\star(z)\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\star \in \{sh, sh - k, fm\}$.

The reason for the extension of the walks to the last time will be made clear in Section 6.

Remark 2. *If we allow $k = \infty$ in the k -restless setting, then $c_s^{sh}(v) = c_s^{sh-\infty}(v)$ and $\mathcal{W}^{sh} = \mathcal{W}^{sh-\infty}$ since the shortest walk criteria allows all walks regardless of difference in transition time between edges. Therefore, we will only focus on showing our results on k -restless criteria for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

We see that \mathcal{W} is the set of shortest walks between any pair of nodes, it keeps only walks with an overall shortest value.

Definition 4. *Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph. Fix a walk type, a cost and let $s, v, z \in V$ and $t \in [T]$. Let \mathcal{W}^\star be as in Definition 3. Then,*

- σ_{sz} is the number of $s - z$ walks in \mathcal{W}^\star .
- $\sigma_{sz}(v, t)$ is the number of $s - z$ walks $W \in \mathcal{W}^\star$, such that W passes through (v, t) that is $(v, t) \in \mathcal{V}(W)$ according to Definition 2.

We note that σ_{sz} depends only on the cost considered while $\sigma_{sz}(v, t)$ depends on both the cost and the walk type considered.

Definition 5. *Given a temporal graph $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$, a walk type and a cost. We define*

$$\delta_{sz}(v, t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sigma_{sz} = 0, \\ \frac{\sigma_{sz}(v, t)}{\sigma_{sz}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \delta_{s\bullet}(v, t) = \sum_{z \in V} \delta_{sz}(v, t).$$

Definition 6 (Betweenness centrality of a temporal node). *Given a temporal graph $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ and a walk type. The betweenness centrality of node v at time t is:*

$$B(v, t) = \sum_{\substack{s, v, z \in V, \\ s \neq v \neq z}} \delta_{sz}(v, t). \quad (5)$$

According to our definitions there are 2 walk types and 3 costs considered. Therefore, we have 6 different variants that can be considered corresponding to any combination of walk type and cost. Now, from the preceding we define

$$\hat{B}(v, t) = \sum_{s, z \in V} \delta_{sz}(v, t) \implies \hat{B}(v, t) = \sum_{s \in V} \delta_{s\bullet}(v, t).$$

The quantities $B(v, t)$ and $\hat{B}(v, t)$ are related through:

$$B(v, t) = \hat{B}(v, t) - \sum_{w \in V} (\delta_{vw}(v, t) + \delta_{wv}(v, t)) = \hat{B}(v, t) - \delta_{v \bullet}(v, t) - \sum_{w \in V} \delta_{wv}(v, t) \quad (6)$$

For instance on Figure 1, considering **passive** shortest walks (approach used in Buß et al (2020); Rymar et al (2021)), $B(b, 1) = 2$, and $\forall t > 1, B(b, t) = 0$ while if we consider **active** shortest walks we have $B(b, 1) = B(b, 2) = 2, B(b, 3) = B(b, 4) = 1$ showing that the **active** version takes into account contributions from intermediate temporal nodes in shortest paths while it is not true for the **passive** version.

From the betweenness centrality of a temporal node we can get an overall betweenness centrality of a node v and an overall betweenness centrality of a time.

Definition 7 (Overall betweenness of a node and overall betweenness of a time).

$$B(v) = \sum_{t \in [T]} B(v, t), \quad B(t) = \sum_{v \in V} B(v, t). \quad (7)$$

3 Results

While the authors of Buß et al (2020); Rymar et al (2021) focus on computing $B(v)$ for all $v \in V$, we focus on the computation of $B(v, t)$. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1. *Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph. For passive walks, the betweenness centrality of all temporal nodes can be computed in $O(n^2 T + n m T)$ considering shortest, shortest k -restless and shortest foremost walks. For active walks, the betweenness centrality of all temporal nodes can be computed in $O(n^2 T^2 + n m T)$ considering shortest and shortest k -restless walks. Both results hold for strict and non-strict versions.*

Proof. We leave the proof of Theorem 1 to the end of Section 4. □

	Rymar et al (2021)	Buß et al (2020)	Theorem 1
Shortest (passive)	$O(n^2 m T^2)$	$O(n^3 T^2)$	$O(n^2 T + nmT)$
Shortest k -restless (passive)	$O(n^2 m T^2)$	-	$O(n^2 T + nmT)$
Shortest foremost (passive)	$O(n^2 m T^2)$	$O(n^3 T^2)$	$O(n^2 T + nmT)$
Shortest (active)	-	-	$O(n^2 T^2 + nmT)$
Shortest k -restless (active)	-	-	$O(n^2 T^2 + nmT)$

Table 1: Improvement of previously known results by Theorem 1. The results on active walks were not studied in this form to our knowledge. All results hold for non-strict and strict variants.

Discussion. The authors of Buß et al (2020); Rymar et al (2021) showed that for passive walks, the overall betweenness of nodes $B(v)$ (not temporal nodes) can be computed in $O(n^3 T^2)$ and $O(n^2 m T^2)$ respectively. Since the maximal number of temporal arcs is $(n - 1)^2 T$, our bounds are always better than the previously known

ones. Additionally, in the introduction we mentioned using *Brandes approach to its full extent*, since these previous approaches when $T = 1$ reduce to $O(n^3)$ and $O(n^2 m)$ while our analysis lead to $O(nm + n^2)$. Therefore our approach leads to the static optimal time algorithm if the temporal graph is static. Table 1 summarises our results compared to the other two when taking the overall betweenness of nodes.

It is worth to note that out of the 6 variants mentioned only the active version of shortest foremost can not be computed using our algorithm. In Section 7 we discuss why the same result on active shortest foremost walks does not hold.

4 Main algorithms and proofs

According to Remark 2 we only need to consider 3 variants in our proofs that are (active, k -restless), (passive, k -restless) and (passive, shortest foremost) since $k = \infty$ covers the classical shortest walks criteria. We will prove our results for both (active, k -restless), (passive, k -restless) walks and in Section 6.2 give the necessary details for (passive, shortest foremost) variant.

We denote by $W_{s(v,t)}^{pas,k}$ the set of **passive** k -restless $s - (v, t)$ walks and by $W_{s(v,t)}^{act,k}$ the set of **active** k -restless $s - (v, t)$ walks. These are defined as:

$$W_{s(v,t)}^{k,pas} = \{W | W \in W_{sv}, arr(W) = t, W \text{ is } k\text{-restless}\} \\ \cup \{\epsilon | s = v, (s, w, t) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ for some } w \in V\},$$

where ϵ denotes the empty walk. For active walks there can be two types of walks, either the last transition of the walk is (w, v, t) which we call an exact- $s - (v, t)$ walk or, the walk arrived earlier to v at time $t' < t$. Then:

$$W_{s(v,t)}^{k,act} = \{W | W \in W_{sv}, arr(W) \leq t, W \text{ is } k\text{-restless}\} \\ \cup \{\epsilon | s = v, (s, w, t) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ for some } w \in V\}.$$

Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph. Fix a source $s \in V$ and a walk type. Then, for every temporal node $(v, t) \in V \times [T]$ we define the optimal cost from s to temporal node (v, t) . Formally:

$$c_s^{k,*}(v, t) = \min_{W \in W_{s(v,t)}^{*,k}} (len(W)),$$

where $* \in \{pas, act\}$. If the set of $s - v$ walks is empty then $c_s^{k,*}(v, t) = c_s^{fm,pas}(v, t) = \infty$. Now, the overall optimal values from s to any time on node v as defined in Equation (3) can be computed as:

$$c_s^{k,*}(v) = \min_{t \in [T]} (c_s^{k,*}(v, t)).$$

Finally, for fixed walk type we say that a temporal $s - (v, t)$ walk W is an **optimal** $s - (v, t)$ k -restless walk if $c(W) = c_s^{k,*}(v, t)$. Similarly an $s - z$ walk W is an **optimal** $s - z$ k -restless walk if $c(W) = c_s^{k,*}(z)$. In the active type, a walk W can be optimal to

t	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
$c_a^{\infty,pas}(b,t)$	∞	1	∞	∞	∞	3	∞
$c_a^{\infty,act}(b,t)$	∞	1	1	1	1	1	1
v	a	b	c	d	e		
$c_a^{sh}(v)$	0	1	2	3	∞		
$c_a^{sh}(v)$	0	1	2	3	∞		

Table 2: Values of $c_s^{\infty,*}(v,t)$ and $c_s^{sh}(v)$ on the temporal graph of Figure 1. (Upper part) values of $c_a^{\infty,*}(b,t)$ for passive walks (1st row), and for active walks (2nd row) and for all $t \in [T]$. (Lower part) Overall optimal values of $c_a^{sh}(v)$ for all $v \in V$.

different times on v . For instance on the graph of Figure 1. The walk $W = a \xrightarrow{1} b \xrightarrow{2} c$, W is an optimal $a - (c, 2)$ walk and W is also an optimal $a - (c, 4)$ walk.

The two major steps of the proof are the following. First step is to build a predecessor graph from a fixed node $s \in V$ efficiently. This predecessor graph allows then to compute the contributions of node $s \in V$ to the betweenness centrality of all other nodes. Second step is to find a recurrence that allows to compute the aforementioned contributions efficiently. Proposition 5 and Proposition 6 correspond to these steps. For all quantities defined in the paper when the distinction between active and passive walks is needed we write pas for passive and act for active in the superscript like $\delta_{ab}^{act}(v,t)$, means we want $\delta_{ab}(v,t)$ for active walks on the considered temporal graph. Otherwise we will drop the superscript when not necessary for instance writing $c_s(v,t)$ instead of $c_s^{k,*}(v,t)$.

Given a temporal graph and walk type. We denote by $\mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}$ the set of **optimal** $s - (v,t)$ **walks**. That is

$$\mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*} = \{W | W \in \mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}, \text{len}(W) = c_s^{k,*}(v,t)\}$$

Definition 8 (Exact optimal $s - (v,t)$ walks). *We say that an $s - (v,t)$ walk W is an exact optimal $s - (v,t)$ walk if $W \in \mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}$ and $\text{arr}(W) = t$. We denote by $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}$ the set of all exact optimal $s - (v,t)$ walks.*

Note that for passive walks $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}$ coincide while this is not true in general for active walks. A consequence of our framework is that the empty walk is an exact $s - (s,t)$ whenever there exists at least one node $w \in V$ with $(s,w,t) \in \mathcal{E}$. Then $c_s(s,t) = 0$. The predecessor graph in temporal settings has been used in Rymar et al (2021); Buß et al (2020). Here, we extend its definition to encompass active walks as well.

In order to simplify notations we will drop the superscript that is used to identify k and the walk type. For instance we will write $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s(v,t)}$ instead of $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}$ instead of $\mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}^{k,*}$. The superscript will be added whenever necessary to distinguish




Fig. 2: The predecessor graphs of shortest paths from node a on the temporal graph of Figure 1. (left) the walks are considered active and (right) the walks are considered passive.

between the walk types active and passive. However, it should be clear to the reader that k and the walk type are always fixed.

Definition 9 (predecessor set, successor set). *Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph, fix a walk type and a source $s \in V$, then for all $w \in V, w \neq s$, let $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s,(v,t)}$ be the set of exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walks:*

$$\begin{aligned} pre_s(w, t') = & \{(v, t) \in V \times [T] \mid \exists m \in \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s,(w,t')}, m = s \xrightarrow{t_1} \dots \xrightarrow{t} v \xrightarrow{t'} w\} \\ & \cup \{(s, t') \mid \exists m \in \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s,(w,t')}, m = s \xrightarrow{t'} w\}. \end{aligned}$$

The successor set of a node $succ_s(w, t') = \{(v, t) \mid (w, t') \in pre_s(v, t)\}$.

Definition 10 (Predecessor graph). *The predecessor graph $G_s = (V_s, E_s)$ is the directed graph obtained from pre_s , whose arcs are given by*

$$E_s = \{((v, t), (w, t')) \mid (v, t) \in pre_s(w, t')\},$$

and its vertices V_s are the ones induced by E_s .

An example of the predecessor graph for active and passive walks on shortest walks (i.e $k = \infty$) is depicted on Figure 2. As we shall see, a path in the predecessor graph represents a unique walk in the temporal graph. The next Proposition gives the relationship between these quantities.

Remark 3.

The predecessor graph G from node s in the active case is a subgraph of the predecessor graph G' in the passive case. See Figure 2 for an example.

Lemma 1. *Fix $s \in V$. There is a one-to-one correspondence between a path p in the predecessor graph G_s starting from node (s, t) for some $t \in [T]$ and ending in (v, t') and an exact shortest $s - (v, t')$ walk.*

Lemma 2. *The predecessor graph G_s from $s \in V$ is acyclic.*

We define $\overline{\sigma}_{s,(v,t)} = |\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s,(v,t)}|$ which corresponds to the number of optimal exact $s - (v, t)$ walks. We also denote by $\sigma_{s,(v,t)}$ the number of optimal $s - (v, t)$ walks, then $\sigma_{s,(v,t)} = |\mathcal{W}_{s,(v,t)}|$.

Proposition 2. For any temporal node (v, t) , there holds that:

$$\bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (v, t) \neq V_s, \\ 1 & \text{if } (v, t) \in V_s \text{ and } v = s, \\ \sum_{(w,t') \in \text{pre}_s(v,t)} \bar{\sigma}_{s(w,t')} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

In the next proposition we need to distinguish between the two walk types.

Proposition 3. Let $s \in V$, $G_s = (V_s, E_s)$ be the predecessor graph from node s and for any temporal node $(v, t) \in V \times [T]$:

$$\sigma_{s(v,t)}^{pas} = \begin{cases} \bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t)}^{pas} & \text{if } (v, t) \in V_s, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}, \quad \sigma_{s(v,t)}^{act} = \sum_{\substack{t' \leq t, \exists W \in \overline{W}_{s,(v,t')} \\ c(\overline{W}_t) = c_s(v,t)}} \bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t')}^{act} \quad (9)$$

Finally it is straight forward to compute for all $v \in V$ and $t \in [T]$, σ_{sv} and $\sigma_{sv}(v, t)$ from the preceding. The same relation applies for both types:

$$\sigma_{sv} = \sum_{\substack{t \in [T] \\ c_s(v,t) = c_s(v)}} \bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t)}, \quad \sigma_{sv}(v, t) = \begin{cases} \sigma_{s(v,t)} & \text{if } c_s(v, t) = c_s(v) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

We use a temporal BFS algorithm variant of the one used in [Buß et al \(2020\)](#). The relaxing technique builds the shortest $s - (v, t)$ walks and for active walks it checks if the extension of a walk arriving to (w, t') is also shortest to (w, t'') with $t'' > t'$. The procedure is defined in function RELAX of Algorithm 1.

Definition 11 (Exactly reachable temporal nodes). Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph, fix a walk type and a source $s \in V$. Then we define:

$$ER_s = \{(v, t) \mid (v, t) \in V \times [T], \overline{W}_{s(v,t)} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Proposition 4. Algorithm TEMPORAL_BFS solves the shortest walk problem for a temporal graph $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$. That is For all $(v, t) \in ER_s$, $\text{dist}[v][t] = c_s(v, t)$, $\text{pre}[v][t] = \text{pre}_s(v, t)$ and (v, t) is added exactly once in the queue Q .

Proposition 5. Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph, fix a walk type and a source $s \in V$, then the predecessor graph G_s can be computed in $O(mT + nT)$.

Corollary 1. For both walk types and for all $v \in V$ and $t \in [T]$ the quantities $\sigma_{s(v,t)}$ and $\delta_{sv}(v, t)$ can be computed for all temporal nodes (v, t) in $O(nT + mT)$.

The main result allowing to efficiently compute the contributions from a node s to the betweenness centrality of all others is an extension of the recurrence found by Brandes in [Brandes \(2001\)](#). This recurrence has been adapted to temporal graphs in [Buß et al \(2020\)](#); [Rymar et al \(2021\)](#) and here we extend it further for active walks. We first define $\text{before}_{G_s}(v, t)$ to be the largest time t' such that $t' \leq t$ and $(v, t') \in V_s$. Therefore if $(v, t) \in V_s$, then $\text{before}_{G_s}(v, t) = t$. Let $G_s = (V_s, E_s)$ be the predecessor graph of node s , then:

Algorithm 1 Predecessor graph from node s

Input: $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$: a temporal graph, s : a node in G , k : maximal waiting time for k -restless walks.
Output: A dictionary $dist$ containing shortest values $c_s(v, t)$ to temporal nodes. A dictionary pre that contains the set of predecessor temporal nodes.

```

1: function TEMPORAL_BFS( $G, s, k$ )
2:    $pre, dist, Q = \text{INITIALIZATION}(G, s)$ 
3:    $Q' = \text{EMPTY\_QUEUE}(), \ell = 1$ 
4:   while  $Q \neq \emptyset$  do
5:     for  $(a, t)$  in  $Q$  do
6:       for  $a \xrightarrow{t'} b \in \mathcal{E}$  such that (not  $((s = a)$  and  $(t' \neq t))$ ) do
7:         if  $(s = a)$  or  $((t' \geq t)$  and  $(t' - t) \leq k)$  then
8:            $\text{RELAX}(a, b, t, t', pre, dist, Q', \ell, k)$ 
9:         end if
10:        end for
11:      end for
12:       $\ell = \ell + 1$ 
13:       $(Q, Q') = (Q', \text{EMPTY\_QUEUE}())$ 
14:    end while
15:  return  $pre, dist$ 
16: end function

1: function INITIALIZATION( $G, s$ )
2:    $Q = \text{EMPTY\_QUEUE}()$ 
3:    $dist[v] = \{t : \infty, \forall t \in \{0, \dots, T\}\} \forall v \in V$ 
4:    $pre[v] = \{t : \{\}, \forall t \in \{0, \dots, T\}\} \forall v \in V$ 
5:   for  $t \in \{t' \mid \exists w \in V, s \xrightarrow{t'} w \in \mathcal{E}\}$  do
6:      $dist[s][t] = 0, pre[s][t] = \{\text{nil}, \text{nil}\}$ 
7:      $Q.\text{ENQUEUE}(s, t)$ 
8:   end for
9:   return  $pre, dist, Q$ 
10: end function

1: function RELAX( $a, b, t, t', dist, pre, Q, \ell, k$ )
2:   if  $(dist[b][t'] = \infty)$  or  $(dist[b][t'] \geq \ell)$  and  $|pre[b][tp] \setminus \{t\}| = 0$  then
3:      $dist[b][t'] = \ell, pre[b][t'] = \{t\}$ 
4:      $Q.\text{ENQUEUE}(b, t')$ 
5:     for  $t'' \in \{r \mid \exists w, w \xrightarrow{r} b \in \mathcal{E}, (r > t' \text{ and } (r - t') \leq k)\}$  do  $\triangleright$  for passive walks, ignore this loop.
6:        $\text{RELAX\_EXTEND}(b, t'', pre, dist, \ell)$ 
7:     end for
8:   end if
9:   if  $dist[b][t'] = \ell$  then
10:     $pre[b][t'].\text{ADD}((a, t))$ 
11:   end if
12: end function

13: function RELAX\_EXTEND( $b, t', dist, pre, \ell$ )
14:   if  $dist[b][t'] > \ell$  then
15:      $dist[b][t'] = \ell, pre[b][t'] = \{t\}$ 
16:   end if
17: end function

```

Proposition 6 (General contribution). *Fix a node $s \in V$, a walk type, then if we are considering active walks for any temporal node $(v, t) \in V \times [T]$:*

$$\delta_{s\bullet}^{act}(v, t) = \delta_{sv}^{act}(v, t) + \sum_{\substack{t'' := \text{before}_{G_s}(v, t) \\ (w, t') \in \text{succ}_s(v, t'') \\ t' \geq t}} \frac{\sigma_{s(v, t)}^{act}}{\sigma_{s(w, t')}^{act}} \delta_{s\bullet}^{act}(w, t'), \quad (11)$$

if we are considering passive walks then for $(v, t) \in V_s$

$$\delta_{s_\bullet}^{pas}(v, t) = \delta_{sv}^{pas}(v, t) + \sum_{\substack{(w, t') \in succ_s(v, t) \\ t' \geq t}} \frac{\sigma_{s(v, t)}^{pas}}{\sigma_{s(w, t')}^{pas}} \delta_{s_\bullet}^{pas}(w, t'). \quad (12)$$

Proposition 6 allows to compute the values of δ_{s_\bullet} by recurrence for all temporal nodes by starting the recurrence from the sources of G_s . Finally, to compute the betweenness centrality of the whole temporal graph it suffices to sum δ_{s_\bullet} for all $s \in V$ and use the correction formula given in Equation (6) needed to go from $\hat{B}(v, t)$ to $B(v, t)$. These steps are summarised in Algorithm 2. In the Algorithm function COUNT_WALKS applies Equation (8) to compute $\bar{\sigma}_{s(v, t)}$ for all $v \in V$ and $t \in [T]$ and then applies Equation (9) to compute σ_{sv} for all $v \in V$ and $\delta_{sv}(v, t)$ for all $v \in V$ and $t \in [T]$. Finally, function COUNT_WALKS returns a dictionary *del* containing the values of $\delta_{sv}(v, t)$ for all $v \in V$ and $t \in [T]$ and another dictionary *sig* containing the values of $\sigma_{s(v, t)}$ for all $v \in V$ and $t \in [T]$.

For active walks, we finally need to ensure that the general contribution is also computed for temporal nodes not lying on the predecessor graph. We discuss this in the Appendix and show that the values of these temporal nodes can be computed on the fly during the general contribution recurrence provided that we order the predecessor graph which adds a factor in the final complexity of active walks.

Algorithm 2 Computes the values of $B(v, t)$ for all temporal nodes

Input: $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$: a temporal graph, k : maximal waiting time for restless walks or $k = \infty$ for shortest walks.

Output: $B(v, t), \forall v \in V, t \in [T]$

```

1: function BETWEENNESS_CENTRALITY( $G, k$ )
2:    $B(v, t) = 0, \forall v \in V, t \in [T]$ 
3:   for  $s \in V$  do
4:      $pre, d = \text{TEMPORAL\_BFS}(G, s, k)$  ▷ Algorithm 1
5:      $del, sig = \text{COUNT\_WALKS}(pre, d, s)$  ▷ Apply Corollary 1
6:      $cum = \text{CONTRIBUTIONS}(G, pre, del, sig)$  ▷ see Appendix 6
7:      $\text{UPDATE\_BETWEENNESS}(B, cum, del)$  ▷ Apply Equation (6)
8:   end for
9:   return  $B$ 
10: end function

```

Proof of Theorem 1. For active and passive walks, the total cost of the predecessor graph construction in (Line 4) of Algorithm 2 is for any node $s \in V$ in $O((n + m)T)$. Then we can compute all necessary quantities for the main recurrence (Line 5). This is also done in $O((n + m)T)$ as well as explained in Corollary 1. The recurrence of Proposition 6 computing all contributions from node $s \in V$ (Line 6) can be computed in $O((n + m)T)$ for passive walks. However, for active walks the same computations can be done and by ordering the predecessor graph we can compute contributions of temporal nodes not lying on the predecessor graph (see discussion in Appendix 6). The predecessor graph ordering costs then $O(nT^2)$ and the overall cost of (Line 6) is $O(nT^2 + mT)$ for active walks. Finally, the application of the correction formula in Line 7 can be done in $O(nT)$. \square

5 Experimental results

For our experiments we built our algorithms on top of the code of [Buß et al \(2020\)](#). We implemented our algorithms with the different possible variants. We focus next on the variants of active and passive shortest walks, passive and active shortest k -restless walks for k being equal to 10% of the lifetime of the graph and passive shortest foremost walks.

We summarize here our main findings:

- The active variants takes more time to be computed than the passive one as stated by Theorem 1 but this difference starts to emerge with large networks. Table 3.
- On the importance of times $B(t)$, the active variant points the importance of central times where central become more important in comparison with the passive variant. Figure 3.
- The rankings between (passive shortest), (active shortest) and the betweenness centrality computed on the aggregated static graph are positively correlated. There are more differences between these variants when looking at the intersection of the top ranked 10-nodes. Figure 4.
- Predicting the top 10 ranked nodes by looking only at the first few interactions is much more accurate for passive shortest foremost variant compared to the others. Figure 5.

dataset	nodes	events	edges	agg_edges	Buß	sh pas	sh act	sh-rl act	sh-rl pas	sh-fm pas	static
gre	1547	1300	113112	3680	1924.1	2921.2	9067.7	1496.3	5535.6	3839.8	21.156
ren	1407	10825	107384	3718	2480.7	3343.4	26144	1656.3	22379.	3329.3	29.046
bel	1917	1132	120951	6440	2530.8	3512.9	12691.	2056.5	8111.3	3753.4	45.057
kuo	549	1211	30545	1952	169.45	242.67	683.99	119.67	514.47	240.69	1.9935
prim	242	3100	125773	16634	1146.2	1701.6	454.91	761.39	435.49	1597.1	4.0661
hs11	126	5609	28539	3418	75.741	98.333	101.61	40.064	89.428	107.29	0.3405
hs12	180	11273	45047	4440	208.56	287.82	371.63	142.94	384.21	299.61	0.9211
hp	75	9453	32424	2278	121.75	170.15	76.980	75.908	59.653	177.97	0.1877
ht	113	5246	20818	4392	43.157	61.687	63.644	34.362	65.114	66.632	0.2166
wp	92	7104	9827	1510	12.020	16.154	51.370	7.4984	50.847	17.592	0.0782

Table 3: Statistics for the datasets. From left to right number of nodes (nodes), number of times (events), number of temporal edges (edges), number of edges in the static representation of G . The execution time in seconds of (Buß) implementation of [Buß et al \(2020\)](#), Algorithm 2 active shortest (sh act), passive shortest (sh pas), active shortest k -restless (sh-rl act), passive shortest restless (sh-rl pas), passive shortest foremost (sh-fm) and on the aggregated static graph of G .

Our code is open-source¹ and is written in C++. We used an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4210R CPU 2.40GHz without parallel processes. The datasets are divided into two types. Public transport datasets [Kujala et al \(2018\)](#). The datasets are: gre (grenoble), ren (rennes), bel (belfast) and kuo (kuopio) and social contact traces from [sociopatterns.org](#) namely: prim (primaryschool), hs11 (HighSchool2011), hs12 (HighSchool2012), hp (Hospital Ward), ht (HyperText) and wp (Workplace). All datasets are available publicly.

¹github.com/busyweaver/code_temporal_betweenness.

On table 3 we give information about the datasets that we used as well as running times of our algorithms and the one of Buß et al (2020). Our implementation is complementary to theirs since the authors of Buß et al (2020) compute the overall betweenness centrality of nodes $B(v)$ for passive shortest walks. In comparison, our implementation computes all the values of $B(v, t)$, $B(v)$ and $B(t)$ for both active and passive variants. We note that according to Theorem 1 the active version is slower than its passive counterpart and the difference becomes more clear on larger graphs while on smaller networks the execution times are more comparable and for some instances the active version is slower than the passive one. This happens whenever the overall cost of ordering the predecessor graphs is less important than the overall gain in the sizes of the predecessor graphs which are smaller in the active case, see Remark 3.




Fig. 3: Distribution of time centrality values $B(t)$ for the datasets. Each column represents a dataset. (1st row) correspond to the distribution of $B(t)$ for passive shortest, (2nd row) active shortest, (3rd row) passive shortest restless, (4th row) active shortest restless and (5th row) passive shortest foremost. The x-axis represents the renormalized life time of the temporal graph and the y-axis represents the values of $B(t)$ grouped into 20 bars.

On Figure 3, we see that the distribution of the values of $B(t)$ are much more concentrated around central times (those in the middle of the temporal graph) for the shortest active walks than for shortest passive walks due to the contribution of intermediary node (first two rows) showing the difference between active and passive walks. For passive shortest walks important times tend to be in the beginning of the lifetime of the graph since many shortest walks can be formed when starting walks early in time and combining times later on. Finally, for passive foremost variant (last

row) the most important times are seen in the beginning of the graph due to the fact that this measure is focused on temporal walks arriving the earliest.




Fig. 4: Heatmap of betweenness centrality of $B(v)$ comparisons of the datasets. (left) Kendall-tau rank correlation rankings and (right) intersection rate of the top 20 nodes. In the figure act stands for active variant, pas for passive variant, sh-rl_act active shortest restless, sh-rl_pas passive shortest restless and stat for the static betweenness centrality on the aggregated graph.

We compared the ranking correlation and intersection size of the different proposed variants together with the static betweenness centrality on the aggregated graph gives. We also compared shortest and shortest k -restless variants together. On Figure 4 we see that the rankings and intersection of top 20 nodes of $B(v)$ for several real world datasets show that passive betweenness centrality and the static one have a high correlation for all our datasets, always higher than the correlation between the active and static one (rows 4 and 5). Our results suggest that if we want an approximate ranking of $B(v)$ for passive (and to a lesser extent active) shortest walks, the static betweenness centrality gives a good approximation to it and runs much faster (100 times faster for all our datasets) than the temporal version. While the comparison between active temporal betweenness centrality and the static one show less correlation in general. The comparison between active and passive variants shows high correlation for $B(v)$ while the behaviour is largely different for $B(t)$ between active and passive

variants. We also notice that the ranking correlation and intersection size is higher between passive variant of shortest and shortest k -restless than it is with its active counterpart (first two rows). If we care about arriving first to nodes (passive shortest foremost version) we see that the correlations with the betweenness on the static aggregated graph has a low correlation (last row).

Finally, in many practical applications we have access only to the first few interactions of the graph but we still want to predict the node rankings. Here we focus on predicting the overall node ranking $B(v)$ rather than the temporal one $B(v, t)$ - in fact it has been argued in a close context that predicting the temporal node centrality evolution is difficult [Magnien and Tarissan \(2015\)](#) -. In order to do so we introduce **Definition 12** (The graph of first μ times of G). Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph and let $\mu \in [0, 1]$, and let then $G^{\leq \mu} = (V, \mathcal{E}', \mu T)$ with $\mathcal{E}' = \{(u, v, t) \mid (u, v, t) \in \mathcal{E}, t \leq \mu T\}$.




Fig. 5: Each column corresponds to a dataset. (1st row) correspond to the distribution of $B(t)$ for passive shortest, (2nd row) active shortest, (3rd row) passive shortest restless, (4th row) active shortest restless and (5rd row) passive shortest foremost. Each graph has on its x-axis the μ values and on its y-axis the size of the intersection between top 10 ranked nodes of nodes $B_G(v)$ of the temporal graph G and top 10 ranked nodes of the $B_{G^{\leq \mu}}(v)$.

Our results are summarized in Figure 5 in which each plot corresponds to how well are the top 10 nodes ranked when looking only at the first times of the graph. Therefore, the faster each plot reaches 10 the fewer interactions we need to observe to correctly identify the top 10 ranked nodes. It turns out that this depends on the criteria that we consider. For instance, considering passive shortest foremost variant

(3rd row) looking at the first 10% interactions gives a good approximation of the top ranked nodes. In fact this is in accordance with the last row of Figure 3 where we see that most important times $B(t)$ in the graphs are the ones in the beginning of it.

6 Details of the proofs

A path in the predecessor graph will be denoted $(s, t_1) \rightarrow (v_1, t_1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (v_n, t_n)$. We also use the operator \oplus for the concatenation of walks.

Proof of Lemma 1. By induction we show that a path in the predecessor graph G_s starting at node s corresponds to an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk. Let p be a path in the predecessor graph. Then $p \equiv p' \rightarrow (v, t)$ for some path p' . Let (w, t') be the last node in p' . By induction hypothesis, suppose that p' corresponds to an exact optimal $s - (w, t')$ walk P' . Since $((w, t'), (v, t)) \in E_s$, this implies that there exists an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk M that passes through (w, t') before arriving to (v, t) . Let $M \equiv M' \oplus (w \xrightarrow{t'} v)$. M' is necessarily an exact optimal $s - (w, t')$ walk since else M would not be an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk. Now M' and P' are both exact optimal $s - (w, t')$ walks implying that they have the same length. Since M extends M' with a single edge then $c_s(v, t) = c_s(w, t') + 1$. Therefore, $P \equiv P' \oplus (w \xrightarrow{t'} v)$ is an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk as well. On the other hand, We show by induction that an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk P corresponds to a single path in G_s starting at (s, i) for some time i . Let (w, t') be the last node appearance before (v, t) . Then $P \equiv P' \oplus (w \xrightarrow{t'} v)$. P' is an exact optimal $s - (w, t')$ walk. Then by induction hypothesis, let p' be the corresponding path in predecessor graph. Then $((w, t'), (v, t)) \in E_s$ and the path $p \equiv p' \rightarrow (v, t)$ is a path in the predecessor graph. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Using Lemma 1, there are no exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walks containing cycles because else we could immediately construct an exact $s - (v, t)$ walk W without cycles and $len(W) < c_s(v, t)$ which is impossible. Hence the predecessor graph from s is a acyclic. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. We know that $\bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t)}$ corresponds to the number of walks in the predecessor graph from s ending in (v, t) by Proposition 1. By induction any optimal exact $s - (v, t)$ walk comes from a predecessor (w, t') with $(w, t') \in pre_s(v, t)$. Each optimal exact $s - (w, t')$ walk can be extended uniquely by appending $(w \xrightarrow{t'} v)$ to it and make it an optimal exact $s - (v, t)$ walk. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. For passive walks, the set $\mathcal{W}_{s(v,t)}$ of optimal- $s - (v, t)$ walks and the set $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s(v,t)}$ of exact optimal- $s - (v, t)$ walks coincide. Therefore, $\sigma_{s(v,t)}^{pas} = \bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t)}$. For active walks, since an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk W can still be an optimal $s(v, t')$ walk for $t' > t$ if $c_s(v, t) = c_{s(v,t')}$ since the walks extend after their last transition. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. We show that at the start i -th iteration of Line 4 in Algorithm 1, all temporal nodes which are exactly reachable have $dist[v][t] = c_s(v, t) = i$, and for temporal nodes (v, t) with an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk $(v, t) \in Q$ and $pre[v][t] = pre_s(v, t)$ and (v, t) is added exactly once to the queue. The property is true just before entering the loop the first time. Only temporal nodes (s, t) where

$(s, w, t) \in \mathcal{E}$ for some $w \in V$ are in the queue. The condition (not $(s = a)$ and $(t' \neq t)$) can only be met during the first iteration of the main loop. It ensure that all paths of length 1 created have their first appearance time at the time of their first transition. Suppose that the property holds for iteration $i - 1$. Then at iteration i . All temporal nodes in Q are such that $\text{dist}[v][t] = c_s(v, t) = i - 1$ and each of them has an exact optimal $s - (v, t)$ walk to it. Each one of them is scanned for its outgoing neighbors (w, t') and relaxed using function RELAX of Algorithm 1.

If (w, t') was never reached neither with an exact walk arriving to it or with an extended walk (only happens in active type). Then $\text{dist}[w][t'] = \infty$ and (w, t') is added to the queue and $\text{dist}[w][t']$ set to i . If (w, t') was reached before then $\text{dist}[w][t'] < \infty$. If it was reached with a prior loop $j < i$ nothing happens. If it was reached exactly by a prior (z, t') in the same loop, then (w, t') is not added to the queue and $\text{dist}[w][t']$ is set to i since neither branches of condition in Line 2 is met. Finally, if (w, t') was reached by an extended (w, t') of the same loop i then $\text{dist}[w][t']$ is set to i and $\text{pre}[w][t'] = \{\}$. Then the condition ($\text{dist}[b][t'] \geq \ell$ and $|\text{pre}[b][tp]| = 0$) is met and (w, t') is added to the queue and its predecessor list will have size > 0 ensuring (w, t') is not added another time. In all cases (w, t') is added exactly once. By definition all optimal exact $s - (w, t')$ walks have the same length and therefore all predecessor's of (w, t') are added in the same loop. Finally all predecessors of (w, t') arise in the same iteration i and since $\text{dist}[w][t'] = i$ they are all added in the predecessor set. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. By using a queue each temporal node $(v, t) \in ER_s$ is scanned at most one time by TEMPORAL_BFS of Algorithm 1 as it was shown in Proposition 4. Then the same temporal arc $(v, w, t) \in \mathcal{E}$, can be relaxed up to T times in Line 4 of Algorithm 1 and T other times in Line 5 in function RELAX of Algorithm 1. Remember that each temporal nodes in ER_s is added at most once to the queue. Thus the overall time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $O(mT + nT)$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. For passive walks, $\bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t)}$ and hence $\sigma_{s(v,t)}$ can be computed recursively from the predecessor graph. Then σ_{sz} and $\sigma_{sv}(v, t)$ can be computed using Equation (10). For active walks $\bar{\sigma}_{s(v,t)}$ can be computed recursively from the predecessor graph and then $\sigma_{s(v,t)}$ can be computed using Equation (9). σ_{sz} and $\sigma_{sv}(v, t)$ can be computed using Equation (10) as in the passive case. \square

Definition 13 (arc dependency). *Fix a node s and a type of walks. Then, $\delta_{sz}(v, t, (v, w, t'))$ denotes the fraction of optimal $s - z$ -walk in \mathcal{W} that go through the node appearance (v, t) and then use the temporal arc $(v, w, t') \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Lemma 3. *Let $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$ be a temporal graph, fix a type of walks and a node $s \in V$. Let $G_s = (V_s, E_s)$ be the predecessor graph from s . Let (v, t) be a temporal node and $(v, w, t') \in \mathcal{E}$. If $\delta_{sz}(v, t, (v, w, t')) > 0$, then*

$$\delta_{sz}(v, t, (v, w, t')) = \frac{\sigma_{s(v,t)} \sigma_{sz}(w, t')}{\sigma_{s(w,t')} \sigma_{sz}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3. For passive walks, only temporal nodes $(v, t) \in V_s$ can have strictly positive values of $\delta_{sz}(v, t, (v, w, t'))$. The proof then corresponds to the one in Rymar

et al (2021) by noticing that the fraction $\frac{\sigma_{sz}(w,t')}{\sigma_{s(w,t')}$ corresponds to the number of optimal suffixes starting at (w,t') and ending in z . For active walks the fraction $\frac{\sigma_{sz}(w,t')}{\sigma_{s(w,t')}$ also corresponds to the number of optimal suffixes starting at (w,t') and ending in z . However, if in Definition 3, we would not have extended the optimal walks to W_T , this fraction would not correspond to the suffixes when $z = w$. Apart from this detail the rest of the proof also follows from the same reference. \square

Proof of Proposition 6. The proofs closely follows the one in Rymar et al (2021) by using Lemma 3. In the passive case the proof is the same. In the active case, we notice that (v,t) might not belong to V_s . Therefore all shortest paths passing through (v,t) will pass through the first $t'' < t$ with $(v,t'') \in V_s$. Hence, the index of the sum looks at the successors of (v,t'') in G_s and only need to consider those successors (w,t') with $t' \geq t$ so that these paths pass through (v,t'') then (v,t) and then go to (w,t') . The rest of the proof follows Rymar et al (2021). \square

6.1 Discussion of general contribution for temporal nodes not lying on the predecessor graph

For active walks, let $G_s = (V_s, E_s)$ be the predecessor graph from s . Let $t' = before_{G_s}(v,t)$. Then $\sigma_{s(v,t)} = \sigma_{s(v,t')}$. This result can be seen since we know that $t' \leq t$, and $(v,t') \in V_s$. If $t' = t$ the result is immediate. If $t' < t$, then $(v,t) \notin V_s$, and therefore there are no exact optimal $s - (v,t)$ walks. All the optimal $s - (v,t)$ walks arrive from t' . As a consequence:

$$\delta_{s\bullet}^{act}(v,t) = \delta_{sv}^{act}(v,t) + \sum_{\substack{t'' := before_{G_s}(v,t) \\ (w,t') \in succ_s(v,t'') \\ t' \geq t}} \frac{\sigma_{s(v,t'')^{act}}}{\sigma_{s(w,t')^{act}} \delta_{s\bullet}^{act}(w,t')}, \quad (13)$$

This last Equation ensures that for active walks the computation $\delta_{s\bullet}^{act}(v,t)$ for temporal nodes $(v,t) \notin V_s$ can be done on the fly while computing $\delta_{s\bullet}^{act}(v,t')$ with $t' = before_{G_s}(v,t)$. This implies computing the elements (w,t'') of the successor set of (v,t) in a decreasing order of time and give the value $\delta_{s\bullet}^{act}(v,t)$ before the sum has completed since we need to stop when the elements (w,t'') have $t'' < t$.

Algorithm 3 Compute the values of $\delta_{s\bullet}(v, t)$ for a temporal graph G

Input: $G = (V, \mathcal{E}, T)$: a temporal graph, $G_s = (V_s, E_s)$ the predecessor graph of s , del the values of $\delta_{sv}(v, t)$ for all (v, t) and sig the values of $\sigma_{s(v, t)}$ for all (v, t)

Output: A dictionary cum containing the values of $cum[(v, t)] = \delta_{s\bullet}(v, t), \forall v \in V, t \in [T]$

```
1: function CONTRIBUTIONS( $G, G_s, del, sig$ )
2:    $cum(v, t) = 0, \forall v \in V, t \in [T]$ 
3:    $visited = \{\}$ 
4:   for  $(v, t) \in sources(G_s)$  do ▷ sources are nodes with no incoming edges
5:     GENERAL_REC( $(v, t), cum, G, G_s, del, sig, visited$ )
6:   end for
7:   return  $cum$ 
8: end function

1: function GENERAL_REC( $(v, t), cum, G, G_s, del, sig, visited$ )
2:   if  $(v, t)$  not in visited then
3:      $su = 0$ 
4:     for  $t' \in \{t'' | \exists ((v, t), (w, t'')) \in E_s\}$ , in decreasing order do ▷ Ordering is necessary only for
       active walks
5:       for  $w \in \{((v, t), (w, t')) \in E_s\}$  do
6:         GENERAL_REC( $(w, t'), cum, G, G_s, del, sig, visited$ )
7:          $su = su + \frac{sig[(v, t)]}{sig[(w, t')]} cum(w, t')$ 
8:       end for
9:       INTER_CONTRIBUTION( $(v, t), t', G_s, cum, del, su, visited$ ) ▷ for passive walks ignore this
       instruction
10:    end for
11:     $cum[(v, t)] = su + del[(v, t)]$ 
12:     $visited.ADD((v, t))$ 
13:  end if
14: end function

15: function INTER_CONTRIBUTION( $(v, t), t', G_s, cum, del, su, visited$ )
16:    $t'' = t' - 1$ 
17:   while  $t'' \geq t$  and  $before_{G_s}(v, t'') = t$  and  $(v, t'') \notin visited$  do
18:      $cum[(v, t'')] = del[(v, t'')] + su$ 
19:      $visited.ADD((v, t''))$ 
20:      $t'' = t'' - 1$ 
21:   end while
22: end function
```

6.2 Passive shortest foremost and strict variants

For passive shortest foremost variant. We can define:

$$c_s^{fm, pas}(v, t) = \min_{W \in W_{s(v, t)}^{pas, \infty}} (arr(W)n + len(W))$$

If the set of $s - v$ walks is empty then $c_s^{fm, pas}(v, t) = \infty$. In this way the values of $c_s^{fm, pas}(v)$ as defined in Equation (4) coincide with $\min_{t \in [T]} c_s^{fm, pas}(v, t)$. We notice that the predecessor graph G from node s in the passive case of sh- ∞ is the same as the predecessor graph G' of sh-fin in the passive case. This comes from the fact that all $s - (v, t)$ walks have the same arrival time t (remember that we consider only passive type in the foremost setting). Therefore, $c_s^{fm, pas}(v, t) = c_s^{\infty, pas}(v, t) + t \cdot n$ for all temporal nodes (v, t) . However, σ_{sv} and $\sigma_{sv}(v, t)$ will be different since $c_s^{fm}(v) \neq c_s^{sh-\infty}(v)$ in general. The same results and proofs then hold in the same way except the values of $B(v, t)$ become different. For strict version of all variants considered. The only change to be made in Algorithm 1 is on Line 7 by replacing $t' \geq t$ with $t' > t$. The extension of the recurrence in Proposition 6 is immediate as it is the case in Rymar et al (2021).

7 Conclusion

The main reason why our formalism does not hold on the active variant of shortest foremost walks is the lack of prefix optimality in this variant. For instance, on the graph of Figure 1, $c_a(d, 6) = 30 + 3 = 33$ and the walk $W = a \xrightarrow{1} b \xrightarrow{5} c \xrightarrow{6} d$ and $W \in \mathcal{W}_{a(d,6)}$, since $arr(W) \cdot n + len(W) = 33$. on the other hand $c_a(c, 5) = 10 + 2 = 12$ while $W' = a \xrightarrow{1} b \xrightarrow{5} c$ and $W' \notin \mathcal{W}_{a(c,5)}$ since $arr(W') \cdot n + len(W') = 27$ and therefore the predecessor graph does not account exactly for the set $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{s(v,t)}$ (see Lemma 1) as it is the case for the other two variants whether on active or passive walks. Our results leave an open question on whether it is possible to characterize cost functions that can be solved using a temporal BFS as we did for the three variants of this paper in the same vein of Rymar et al (2021).

Our results improve the theoretical time analysis of previously known methods to compute the temporal betweenness centrality on shortest paths variants. It would be interesting to know if these results could be improved or if it is not the case to extend known hardness complexity results on static betweenness centrality such that Borassi et al (2016) to the temporal case.

Another direction is to look for guaranteed approximations to the temporal betweenness centrality which started to be studied recently in Santoro and Sarpe (2022); Cruciani (2023).

Finally, the temporal betweenness centrality has been defined in different time dependent formalisms such that Stream Graphs Latapy et al (2018); Simard et al (2021) that allow for continuous time and it would be interesting to find out if the same kind of results hold in that setting as well.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Matthieu Latapy and Clémence Magnien for their support and the many discussions we had around this subject. The author is also grateful to Maciej Rymar for taking time to explain their results on this subject and kind conversations.

References

- Borassi M, Crescenzi P, Habib M (2016) Into the square: On the complexity of some quadratic-time solvable problems. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 322:51–67
- Brandes U (2001) A faster algorithm for betweenness centrality. *Journal of mathematical sociology* 25(2):163–177
- Burt RS (2004) From structural holes: The social structure of competition. *The new economic sociology: a reader* pp 325–348
- Buß S, Molter H, Niedermeier R, et al (2020) Algorithmic aspects of temporal betweenness. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp 2084–2092
- Casteigts A, Himmel AS, Molter H, et al (2021) Finding temporal paths under waiting time constraints. *Algorithmica* 83(9):2754–2802
- Cruciani A (2023) On approximating the temporal betweenness centrality through sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:230408356*
- Freeman LC (1977) A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry* pp 35–41
- Girvan M, Newman ME (2002) Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 99(12):7821–7826
- Kim H, Anderson R (2012) Temporal node centrality in complex networks. *Physical Review E* 85(2):026107
- Kostakos V (2009) Temporal graphs. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 388(6):1007–1023
- Kujala R, Weckström C, Darst RK, et al (2018) A collection of public transport network data sets for 25 cities. *Scientific data* 5(1):1–14
- Latapy M, Viard T, Magnien C (2018) Stream graphs and link streams for the modeling of interactions over time. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 8(1):1–29
- Leydesdorff L (2007) Betweenness centrality as an indicator of the interdisciplinarity of scientific journals. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58(9):1303–1319
- Magnien C, Tarissan F (2015) Time evolution of the importance of nodes in dynamic networks. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE/ACM international conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining 2015*, pp 1200–1207

- Narayanan S (2005) The betweenness centrality of biological networks. PhD thesis, Virginia Tech
- Puzis R, Altshuler Y, Elovici Y, et al (2013) Augmented betweenness centrality for environmentally aware traffic monitoring in transportation networks. *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems* 17(1):91–105
- Rymar M, Molter H, Nichterlein A, et al (2021) Towards classifying the polynomial-time solvability of temporal betweenness centrality. In: *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, Springer, pp 219–231
- Santoro D, Sarpe I (2022) Onbra: Rigorous estimation of the temporal betweenness centrality in temporal networks. In: *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pp 1579–1588
- Simard F, Magnien C, Latapy M (2021) Computing betweenness centrality in link streams. arXiv preprint arXiv:210206543
- Tang J, Musolesi M, Mascolo C, et al (2010) Analysing information flows and key mediators through temporal centrality metrics. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Social Network Systems*, pp 1–6
- Tsalouchidou I, Baeza-Yates R, Bonchi F, et al (2020) Temporal betweenness centrality in dynamic graphs. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics* 9:257–272
- Yoon J, Blumer A, Lee K (2006) An algorithm for modularity analysis of directed and weighted biological networks based on edge-betweenness centrality. *Bioinformatics* 22(24):3106–3108