





Community structure

The building blocks of complex networks




Modules and communities

Sample of Belgian mobile phone network




Modules and communities

In network science we call a ***community*** a group of nodes that have a higher likelihood of connecting to each other than to nodes from other communities.



Modules and communities


- **Social networks** are full of easy to spot communities related, for instance, to our friends' circles (work, family, hobbies, neighborhood, etc).



Collaboration network between scientists working at the Santa Fe Institute.

Modules and communities

- **Social networks** are full of easy to spot communities related, for instance, to our friends' circles (work, family, hobbies, neighborhood, etc).




A famous dataset (70's): The Zachary's Karate Club

Zachary recorded the split of the club in two during his observation period.

Modules and communities

- **Social networks** are full of easy to spot communities related, for instance, to our friends' circles (work, family, hobbies, neighborhood, etc).




A famous dataset (70's):
The Zachary's Karate Club

The 1st scientist at any conference on networks who uses Zachary's karate club as an example is awarded a price!

Modules and communities

- **Biological networks:** Biology is moving beyond genes focusing on how groups of molecules form functional modules to carry specific cellular functions.




Modules and communities

- ***Biological networks:*** Biology is moving beyond genes focusing on how groups of molecules form functional modules to carry specific cellular functions.
- E.g., proteins that are involved in the same diseases tend to interact with each other, inspiring researchers to seek for ***disease modules***. The idea is that each disease may be linked to a well-defined neighborhood of the cellular network.

Modules and communities


- **Technological networks:** e.g. sample of the web graph consisting of the pages of a web site and their mutual hyperlinks, which are directed.




Modules and communities

You can also see it as general unsupervised clustering technique

Grouping a set of objects in such a way that objects in the same group (called a cluster) are more similar (in some sense) to each other than to those in other groups (clusters).



Subjectivity of Community Definition




Defining communities (examples)

Connectedness + density hypothesis

Maximum Cliques

Group of nodes with direct links to all members of the community.



Note: Here we're highlighting the highest order clique of this network (a square), yet there are several three-node cliques on this network.


Defining communities (examples)

Connectedness + density hypothesis

Strong communities

Each node i in a community C has more links within the community than with the rest of the graph.

$$k_i^{\text{internal}}(C) > k_i^{\text{external}}(C)$$




Defining communities (examples)

Connectedness + density hypothesis

Weak communities

The total internal degree of a community exceeds its total external degree

$$\sum_{i \in C} k_i^{\text{internal}}(C) > \sum_{i \in C} k_i^{\text{external}}(C)$$



Note: The green nodes represent one of many possible weak communities.

How many communities do we have?


A partition is a division of a network into an arbitrary number of groups, such that each node belongs to a single group.

How many partitions can we have in a network of size N?

(this is provided by the Bell Number)

We are surfing in very large landscape of possible solutions...

Any brute-force technique will fail!



The 52 partitions of a set with 5 elements

How many communities do we have?


A partition is a division of a network into an arbitrary number of groups, such that each node belongs to a single group.

How many partitions can we have in a network of size N?

(this is provided by the Bell Number)

We are surfing in very large landscape of possible solutions...


Any brute-force technique will fail!



Graph partitioning

In standard graph partitioning (e.g. Kernighan-Lin Algorithm) the number and size of communities are pre-defined; in community detection both parameters are unknown.


Kernighan-Lin Algorithm (ex: 2 partitions). Randomly assign partitions. Test all swaps of nodes among partitions recording the resulting change in the number of links connecting different communities (the cut size). Greedily accept the swap which offers the best reduction.



Graph partitioning

In standard graph partitioning (e.g. Kernighan-Lin Algorithm) the number and size of communities are pre-defined; in community detection both parameters are unknown.

The main content of hundreds of published papers on network communities consists on the search for the algorithm which provides the best partitioning given a certain measure of “quality”.



Modularity

hard clustering, i.e., no overlap!

Also referred to as ***Q-modularity***

Compare two networks: our given network and its zero modularity counterpart (the uniformly random network with the same sequence of degrees).

Let us assume that a network of E links is divided into n modules,

$r = 1, 2, \dots, n$, with E_r links in module r .

$(k_r = \text{total degree of nodes in } r)^2$

$$M = \frac{1}{E} \sum_{r=1}^n E_{r \mid \text{net}} - \frac{1}{E} \sum_{r=1}^n E_{r \mid \text{random counterpart}}$$

$2E$

Internal links within
module r

Internal links in module r
for a randomized network

Modularity

Compare two networks: our given network and its zero modularity counterpart (the uniformly random network with the same sequence of degrees).

The previous expression can be shown to be equivalent to

$$M = \sum_{r=1}^n \left[\frac{E_{r \text{ | net}}}{E} - \left(\frac{k_r}{2E} \right)^2 \right]$$

k_r = total degree of nodes in r

Internal links within
module r

Internal links in module r
for a randomized network

Modularity

Compare two networks: our given network and its zero modularity counterpart (the uniformly random network with the same sequence of degrees).

The previous expression can be shown to be equivalent to

$$M = \sum_{r=1}^n \left[\frac{E_{r \text{ | net}}}{E} - \left(\frac{k_r}{2E} \right)^2 \right]$$

One can also imagine this quantity as a “local” modularity M_r associated with community r

k_r = total degree of nodes in r

It provides a measure of the difference between the real wiring of the links and the expected number of links between each pair of vertices (belonging to this community) if the network is randomly rewired

Modularity (extensions)

In the most recent literature on graph clustering several modifications and extensions of modularity can be found.

Example: Modularity can be easily extended to graphs with **weighted edges**. The degrees are replaced by the sum of the weights of edges adjacent to the vertex (a.k.a., *strength*), and the number of edges by the sum of weights (W).

$$M = \sum_{r=1}^n \left[\frac{W_{r \text{ | net}}}{W} - \left(\frac{S_r}{2W} \right)^2 \right]$$

sum of the weights of the internal edges of module r

sum of the strengths of the vertices of r.


Modularity

$$M = \sum_{r=1}^n \left[\frac{E_r}{E} - \left(\frac{k_r}{2E} \right)^2 \right]$$

1

OPTIMAL PARTITION


$$M = 0.41$$



3

SINGLE COMMUNITY


$$M = 0$$



2

SUBOPTIMAL PARTITION


$$M = 0.22$$



4

NEGATIVE MODULARITY

$$M = -0.12$$



Let us analyze some popular algorithms...



networkx.algorithms.community.commodities

```
networkx.algorithms.community.centrality.girvan_newman
```

networkx.algorithms.community.centrality.girvan_newman

girvan_newman(*G*, *most_valuable_edge=None*) [source]


Finds communities in a graph using the Girvan–Newman method.

Parameters:


- *G* (*NetworkX graph*)
- *most_valuable_edge* (*function*) – Function that takes a graph as input and

The Girvan-Newman algorithm

Based on *link centrality* measures. Examples:



Link Betweenness




Random-Walk Betweenness


As node betweeness, link betweeness of a link (i,j) is proportional to the number of shortest paths between all node pairs that run along the link (i,j) .

The Girvan-Newman algorithm

Based on *link centrality* measures. Examples:



Link Betweenness




Random-Walk Betweenness


A pair of nodes (m, n) are chosen at random. A walker starts at m , randomly following links until it reaches n . Betweenness of a link i,j is the probability that the link is crossed by the walker after averaging over all possible choices for the starting nodes m and n .

The Girvan-Newman algorithm

(w/ betweenness centrality)





1. Compute the (betweenness) centrality of each link.
2. Remove the link with highest centrality.
3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 until all links are removed.




The Girvan-Newman algorithm

(w/ betweenness centrality)





The modularity function, M , helps us select the optimal cut.




Number of cuts

The Girvan-Newman algorithm

(w/ betweenness centrality)




The dendrogram of communities



Horizontal cuts correspond to partitions of the graph in communities.

A small parenthesis on hierarchical structures

All these layers, irrespectively of its modularity value, may provide interesting features. Example: Collaboration networks in science.




M.E.J. Newman. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks.
Physical Review E, 69:066133, 2004.


Network Science, 2023/24

A small parenthesis on hierarchical structures


Hierarchical dendrogram




Non-hierarchical
dendrogram



Two contrasting examples of dendograms for two networks. The left dendrogram indicates what is often referred as a hierarchical organization of a network.



The modularity function, M , helps us select the optimal cut.




Optimizing modularity w/ a greedy algorithm

Newman, Phys Rev E 69:066133 (2004).

This time I won't break links. I will just assign a community to each node.

1. Start with all vertices as isolates (number of nodes = number of communities)
2. Identify the community pair for which ΔM is maximal and merge them.
3. Repeat 2 until all nodes merge into a single community.
4. Select the partition for which M is maximal (or $-M$ is minimal)



Optimizing modularity w/ a greedy algorithm

Newman, Phys Rev E 69:066133 (2004).

This time I won't break links. I will just assign a community to each node.

1. Start with all vertices as isolates (number of nodes = number of communities)
2. Identify the community pair for which ΔM is maximal and merge them.
3. Repeat 2 until all nodes merge into a single community.
4. Select the partition for which M is maximal (or $-M$ is minimal)

This processes can be improved by using simulated annealing rather than greedy search.


Guimerà & Amaral, Nature 2005

Optimizing modularity w/ simulated annealing

main idea


Guimerà & Amaral, Nature 2005

1. Start with all vertices as isolates (number of nodes = number of communities)
2. Select randomly a community pair and merge them if $\Delta M > 0$. If $\Delta M < 0$ accept the change anyway with a probability $p = \text{Exp}[-(M_{\text{new}} - M_{\text{old}})/T]$.
3. Repeat 2 until all nodes merge into a single community, progressively reducing T (temperature) until $T=0$.



Optimizing modularity w/ simulated annealing

Simulated Annealing



Optimizing modularity w/ simulated annealing

Guimerà & Amaral, Nature 2005


In its standard implementation Guimerá and Amaral combine two types of “moves” (with a SA at each level):

local moves: where a single vertex is shifted from one cluster to another, taken at random;

global moves: consisting of merges and splits of communities.


- In practical applications, one typically combines n^2 local moves with n global ones in one iteration.
- The method can potentially come very close to the true modularity maximum, but it is slow (max number of nodes $\sim 10^4$).

Optimizing modularity w/ Genetic algorithms




Optimizing modularity w/ Genetic algorithms

Community structures for Zachary karate club network



Girvan-Newman algorithm



Genetic algorithm

As the SA it can be quite accurate, yet very slow for large N!

Conclusions so far

Several algorithms compete to be the most used method in community detection. **We have discussed a few:**

Girvan-Newman
algorithm
grounded on
link centrality

Divisive procedures

Greedy optimization
(Newman)

Simulated-Annealing & GAs
(Guimerá-Amaral & Shuzhuo et al)

Modularity optimization

Conclusions so far

Several algorithms compete to be the most used method in community detection. **Before getting into a few more...**

Let's return back to the nature of the problem we're facing.

Girvan-Newman
algorithm
grounded on
link centrality

Divisive procedures

Greedy optimization
(Newman)

Simulated-Annealing & GAs
(Guimerá-Amaral & Shuzhuo et al)

Cfinder: Clique
Percolation method
(Vicsek et al.)

Overlapping Communities

Louvain Method
A Multi-Level optimization
(Blondel et al.)

Modularity optimization

The limits of modularity


Why is this optimization problem so hard to solve?

- Extremely large landscape.
- **Problematic landscapes for optimization** ↗
- **The maxima of modularity is often misleading** ↗
- **Resolution limit** ↗

Problematic landscapes

(Good, Montjoye, and Clauset, 2009)

We are trying to find a maximum in here:




the modularity function is not peaked around a single optimal partition, but has a high modularity plateau

Problematic landscapes

(Good, Montjoye, and Clauset, 2009)


We are trying to find a maximum in here:




the modularity function is not peaked around a single optimal partition, but has a high modularity plateau

Resolution limit


Fortunato & Barthélemy, Resolution limit in community detection. PNAS, 104:36–41, 2007.



$M=0.867$




$M=0.871$



$M=0.80$


Resolution limit

Fortunato & Barthélémy, Resolution limit in community detection. PNAS, 104:36–41, 2007.




M=0.867

Any community finding
algorithm based on
Modularity, cannot detect
communities beyond a
certain resolution limit
(which can be computed)




M=0.871



M=0.80

Louvain method


A Multi-Level Aggregation Method for optimizing modularity



Louvain method

The main steps of the Louvain algorithm. Each pass consists of two steps:

1ST PASS




STEP I – Modularity Optimization

Modularity is optimized by local changes. For each node calculate the change in modularity in case the node joins the community of each immediate neighbor.

Louvain method

The main steps of the Louvain algorithm. Each pass consists of two steps:

1ST PASS




STEP II – Community aggregation

Construct a new network whose nodes are the communities identified in Step I. The weight of the link between two nodes is the sum of the weight of the links between the nodes in the corresponding communities.


Louvain method

The main steps of the Louvain algorithm. Each pass consists of two steps:

2ND PASS



STEP I



STEP II



The sum of steps I and II is called a pass. The network obtained after each pass is processed again until no further increase in modularity is possible.

Overlapping communities

While the existence of a nested community structure has long been appreciated by sociologists and within graph partitioning methods, the algorithms discussed so far force each node into a single community.


Examples of solutions:

1. **CFinder** (clique percolation)

[Palla et. al., Nature 446, 664 (2007)]

1. Link clustering


[Ahn et al, Nature, 466, 761 (2010)]



Clique percolation algorithm (<http://www.cfinder.org/>)



Palla et. al., Nature 446, 664 (2007)

Cliques ($k=3$)...



\Rightarrow


	1	2	3	4	5
1	0	1	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	1	0
4	0	0	1	0	1
5	0	0	0	1	0



Two k cliques are considered adjacent if they share $k-1$ nodes

Clique percolation algorithm (<http://www.cfinder.org/>)


Palla et. al., Nature 446, 664 (2007)



	1	2	3	4	5
1	0	1	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	1	0
4	0	0	1	0	1
5	0	0	0	1	0

Representing overlapping communities


The network of characters in Victor Hugo's 1862 novel *Les Misérables*. Two characters are connected if they interact directly with each other in the story.



Community size distribution

The community size distribution P_{N_c} predicted by different community finding algorithms.

Many studies report fat tailed community size distributions, implying that numerous small communities coexist with a few very large ones.



Conclusions so far

Several algorithms compete to be the most used method in community detection. Here we provided some well-known examples:

**Girvan-Newman
algorithm
grounded on
link centrality**

Divisive procedures

**Greedy optimization
(Newman)**

**Simulated-Annealing & GAs
(Guimerá-Amaral & Shuzhuo et al)**

**Cfinder: Clique
Percolation method
(Vicsek et al.)**

Overlapping Communities

**Louvain Method
A Multi-Level optimization
(Blondel et al.)**

Modularity optimization

How should we assess the *running time* of each algorithm?

Algorithmic complexity

Several algorithms compete to be the most used method in community detection ($n=\# \text{ nodes}$, $m=\# \text{ edges}$)

Author	Ref.	Label	Order
Girvan & Newman Clauset et al. Blondel et al. Guimerà et al. Radicchi et al. Palla et al. Van Dongen	(Girvan and Newman, 2002; Newman and Girvan, 2004) (Clauset <i>et al.</i> , 2004) (Blondel <i>et al.</i> , 2008) (Guimerà and Amaral, 2005; Guimerà <i>et al.</i> , 2004) (Radicchi <i>et al.</i> , 2004) (Palla <i>et al.</i> , 2005) (Dongen, 2000a)	GN Clauset et al. Blondel et al. Sim. Ann. Radicchi et al. Cfinder MCL	$O(nm^2)$ $O(n \log^2 n)$ $O(m)$ parameter dependent $O(m^4/n^2)$ $O(\exp(n))$ $O(nk^2)$, $k < n$ parameter
Rosvall & Bergstrom Rosvall & Bergstrom Donetti & Muñoz Newman & Leicht Ronhovde & Nussinov	(Rosvall and Bergstrom, 2007) (Rosvall and Bergstrom, 2008) (Donetti and Muñoz, 2004, 2005) (Newman and Leicht, 2007) (Ronhovde and Nussinov, 2009)	Infomod Infomap DM EM RN	parameter dependent $O(m)$ $O(n^3)$ parameter dependent $O(m^\beta \log n)$, $\beta \sim 1.3$

Algorithmic complexity




Several algorithms compete to be the most used method in community detection ($n=\# \text{ nodes}$, $m=\# \text{ edges}$)

Author	Ref.	Label	Order
Eckmann & Moses	(Eckmann and Moses, 2002)	EM	$O(m\langle k^2 \rangle)$
Zhou & Lipowsky	(Zhou and Lipowsky, 2004)	ZL	$O(n^3)$
Latapy & Pons	(Latapy and Pons, 2005)	LP	$O(n^3)$
Clauset et al.	(Clauset <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	NF	$O(n \log^2 n)$
Newman & Girvan	(Newman and Girvan, 2004)	NG	$O(nm^2)$
Girvan & Newman	(Girvan and Newman, 2002)	GN	$O(n^2m)$
Guimerà et al.	(Guimerà and Amaral, 2005; Guimerà <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	SA	parameter dependent
Duch & Arenas	(Duch and Arenas, 2005)	DA	$O(n^2 \log n)$
Fortunato et al.	(Fortunato <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	FLM	$O(m^3n)$
Radicchi et al.	(Radicchi <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	RCCLP	$O(m^4/n^2)$
Donetti & Muñoz	(Donetti and Muñoz, 2004, 2005)	DM/DMN	$O(n^3)$
Bagrow & Bollt	(Bagrow and Bollt, 2005)	BB	$O(n^3)$
Capocci et al.	(Capocci <i>et al.</i> , 2005)	CSCC	$O(n^2)$
Wu & Huberman	(Wu and Huberman, 2004)	WH	$O(n + m)$
Palla et al.	(Palla <i>et al.</i> , 2005)	PK	$O(\exp(n))$
Reichardt & Bornholdt	(Reichardt and Bornholdt, 2004)	RB	parameter dependent

Running time

- While community identification algorithms do not check all partitions, their computational cost still varies widely, determining their speed and consequently the size of the network they can handle.
- The computational complexity of the algorithms shows that one of the most efficient is the Louvain algorithm ($\sim O(N \log N)$). The least efficient is CFinder with $O(e^N)$.
- This scaling matters if we need to find communities in very large networks. To get a sense of the true speed of these algorithms we may also measure their actual running time in real datasets.

Running time



How should we assess the *accuracy* of each algorithm?

Let us check two popular benchmarks, artificial nets with a pre-defined community structure.


Girvan-Newman (GN) Benchmark

An example of a neat benchmark consists of $N=128$ nodes partitioned into $n_c=4$ communities of size $N_c=32$.

Each node is connected with probability p_{int} to the N_c-1 nodes in its community and with probability p_{ext} to the $3N_c$ nodes in the other three communities.


This creates a control parameter

$$\mu = \frac{k^{ext}}{k^{ext} + k^{int}}$$





Girvan-Newman (GN) Benchmark

Example: Greedy optimization vs simulated annealing (SA)




Girvan-Newman (GN) Benchmark



Lancichinetti-Fortunato-Radicchi (LFR) Benchmark


Generates networks in which both the node degrees and community sizes follow a power law.



Lancichinetti-Fortunato-Radicchi (LFR) Benchmark

Generates networks in which both the node degrees and community sizes follow a power law.


The screenshot shows the NetworkX project homepage with a blue header. On the left, there's a logo for NetworkX 2.5, a search bar labeled "Search docs", and a "Install" button. On the right, the URL "networkx.generators.community.LFR_benchmark_graph" is shown, along with the function signature: `LFR_benchmark_graph(n, tau1, tau2, mu, average_degree=None, min_degree=None, max_degree=None, min_community=None, max_community=None, tol=1e-07, max_iters=500, seed=None)`. Below the URL, there's a link "[source]".



Lancichinetti-Fortunato-Radicchi (LFR) Benchmark


Generates networks in which both the node degrees and community sizes follow a power law.

- ① Start with N isolated nodes.
- ② Assign each node to a community (of size N_c) where N_c follows the power law dist. Also assign a degree to each node taken from a power-law dist.
- ③ Each receives an internal degree $(1-\mu)k_i$ and an external degree (μk_i) .
- ④ Randomly attach open stubs taking into account internal and external links.




Lanchinetti-Fortunato-Radicchi (LFR) Benchmark

Once again de Louvain method provides good results.




Final remarks: Communities and link weights

Social Networks. The more time two individuals spend together, the more likely that they share friends. Consequently communities in social networks tend to be nucleated around strong ties. Links connecting different communities are weaker in comparison.



Final remarks: Communities and link weights

Biological and Technological Networks. If the link weights are driven by the need to transport information or materials, as it is often the case in technological and biological systems, strong ties are between communities. In contrast links within communities are weaker in comparison.




Same network, yet highlighting link's betweenness centrality. This is the idea of Granovetter's idea of the *strength of weak ties*.


LPA – Label Propagation Algorithm

U. N. Raghavan, R. Albert, and S. Kumara (Phys Rev E 2007)


Typical steps of the Label Propagation Algorithm:



At each iteration, each node updates its label to match the one with the maximum weight.



This continues until all nodes have updated their labels




3 clusters are identified.


LPA – Label Propagation Algorithm

U. N. Raghavan, R. Albert, and S. Kumara (Phys Rev E 2007)



Typical steps of the Label Propagation Algorithm:



At each iteration, each node updates its label to match the one with the maximum weight.



This continues until all nodes have updated their labels




3 clusters are identified.

Final remarks: Temporal networks

Changes in a network's wiring diagram can have multiple consequences for communities: birth of new communities, growth and contraction, communities can merge with each other or split into several smaller communities, etc.

Studies focusing on social and communication networks offer several insights into the changes communities experience.

For instance, membership of large communities changes faster with time than the membership of smaller communities.




Final remarks: Temporal networks


Also, communities may be cyclic and completely change in time.

Depending on how information is aggregated with may get completely different results. Example: Call patterns

Four communities in a sample of a mobile phone network.



Same network at midnight




Final remarks: Temporal networks


Also, communities may be cyclic and completely change in time.

Depending on how information is aggregated with may get completely different results. Example: Call patterns

Four communities in a sample of a mobile phone network.



Same network at noon



Final remarks: Other questions

- **Do We Really Have Communities?**

Community finding algorithms are designed to identify communities, whether they are there or not.

- **Must all Nodes Belong to Communities?**

Current algorithms force all nodes into communities.

- **Can we cope with dense networks?**

Most networks are sparse. Yet, with improvements in data collection, many real network maps will likely gain numerous links and overlapping communities, calling for new algorithms.

Final remarks: Other questions

- **Community vs Function?**

Can we correlate communities and functions in biological networks.

- **How much we will gain from parallelizing these algorithms?**

Must current algorithms do not take this possibility into account
(note: it can be difficult!).

- **Problem specific algorithms**

community finding algorithms run behind many social networks sites, like Facebook, Twitter, or LinkedIn, demanding specific requirements and modularity measures.

Understanding of community organization continues to develop rapidly, offering increasingly accurate tools to diagnose the local structure of large networks.