

# Proof for OCDIB: An Information Bottleneck-Guided Approach for Overlapping Community Detection

## A. CommIB Analysis

In this section, we provide a detailed analysis of the proposed CommIB. This provides the theoretical guarantee that OCDIB can learn salient community-specific node representations for overlapping community detection.

The objective function w.r.t. CommIB is defined as follows

$$\max \mathcal{MI}(Y_k; H_k) - \beta \cdot \mathcal{MI}(H_k; H_g). \quad (1)$$

The former  $\mathcal{MI}(Y_k; H_k)$  part is the mutual information between the community label  $Y_k$  and the community-specific node representation  $H_k$ , which can be calculated as follows

$$\mathcal{MI}(Y_k; H_k) = \iint dy_k dh_k p(y_k, h_k) \log \frac{p(y_k, h_k)}{p(y_k) p(h_k)}, \quad (2)$$

$$= \iint dy_k dh_k p(y_k, h_k) \log(p(y_k | h_k)) + \mathcal{H}(Y_k), \quad (3)$$

$$\geq \iint dy_k dh_k p(y_k, h_k) \log(q(y_k | h_k)), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}(Y_k)$  is the entropy of  $Y_k$  and can be ignored due to its non-negativity. Since the distribution of  $p(y_k | h_k)$  is intractable, we use the variational distribution  $q(y_k | h_k)$  for approximation. The  $p(y_k, h_k)$  can be formulated as

$$p(y_k, h_k) = \int dh_g p(h_g, h_k, y_k) = \int dh_g p(h_g, y_k) p(h_k | h_g), \quad (5)$$

and the lower bound of the first term can be calculated as

$$\mathcal{MI}(Y_k; H_k) \geq \iiint dy_k dh_g dh_k p(h_g, y_k) p(h_k | h_g) \log(q(y_k | h_k)). \quad (6)$$

We maximize the lower bound of the  $\mathcal{MI}(Y_k, H_k)$  to maximize itself. As discussed in Eq. (??), we assume that  $p(H_k | H_g)$  follows a normal distribution, while the variational distribution  $q(Y_k | H_k)$  is obtained by an MLP.  $p(h_g, y_k)$  can be estimated using an empirical distribution. When maximizing this lower bound, we are maximizing the prediction accuracy in a particular community, in other words, maximizing the information between community-specific node representations and the target community. In this way, we can encourage OCDIB of learning community-specific node representations that contain discriminative information for community detection.

The upper bound of the former term  $\mathcal{MI}(H_g; H_k)$  can be calculated as

$$\mathcal{MI}(H_g; H_k) = \iint dh_g dh_k p(h_g, h_k) \log \frac{p(h_k | h_g)}{p(h_k)}. \quad (7)$$

We use  $t(h_k)$  as a variational approximation for  $p(h_k)$ . The distribution  $p(h_k)$  is intractable, which is also replaced by a variational approximation. Thus, the upper bound of  $\mathcal{MI}(H_g; H_k)$  can be formulated as

$$\mathcal{MI}(H_g; H_k) \leq \iint dh_g dh_k p(h_g, h_k) \log \frac{p(h_k | h_g)}{t(h_k)}, \quad (8)$$

$$= \iiint dy_k dh_g dh_k p(y_k, h_g, h_k) \log \frac{p(h_k | h_g)}{t(h_k)}, \quad (9)$$

$$= \iiint dy_k dh_g dh_k p(h_g, y_k) p(h_k | h_g) \log \frac{p(h_k | h_g)}{t(h_k)}, \quad (10)$$

where  $p(h_g, y_k)$  can be estimated as before and the rest of the upper bound is the KL divergence between  $p(h_k | h_g)$  and  $t(h_k)$ . While minimizing the upper bound, OCDIB tries to minimize the KL divergence between  $p(h_k | h_g)$  and  $t(h_k)$ . Therefore, we aim to reduce the dependence of the  $H_k$  distribution on  $H_g$ , which eliminates the redundant information reserved in  $H_k$ .

Substituting the above results into the original equation, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{MI}(Y_k; H_k) - \beta \cdot \mathcal{MI}(H_k; H_g) \\ & \geq \iiint dy_k dh_g dh_k p(h_g, y_k) p(h_k | h_g) \log(q(y_k | h_k)) \\ & \quad - \beta \cdot \iiint dy_k dh_g dh_k p(h_g, y_k) p(h_k | h_g) \log \frac{p(h_k | h_g)}{t(h_k)}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Combining our previous analysis, the objective function can finally be formalized as:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{CommIB} = & - \sum_{k=1}^K [\mathbb{E}_{H_k \sim p(H_k | H_g)} \log(q(Y_k | H_k))] \\ & + \beta \cdot KL(p(H_k | H_g) | t(H_k)). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$