On Improving the Cohesiveness of Graphs by Merging Nodes: Supplementary Materials

[If a preview does not appear properly, please download the file]

1. Full experimental results

In this section, we show the full results of our experiments which we cannot put all in the main text due to the space limit.

1.1. Main experiments

Experimental settings. For each dataset, we conduct experiments for each $k \in \{5, 10, 15, 20\}$. We use $b = 10$, check 100 inside nodes and 50 outside nodes, and n_c, the number of pairs to check in each round, takes a value in $\{1, 2, 5, 10, 15, 20\}$. We conduct all the experiments on a machine with i9-10900K CPU and 64GB RAM. All algorithms are implemented in C++, and complied by G++ with O3 optimization.

In Tables 4 to 17, we report the full results of each dataset for all the considered parameters.

1.2. Sampling experiments

Experimental settings. For each dataset and each $k \in \{5, 10, 15, 20\}$, we randomly sample $10,000$ **inside-inside (II)/inside-outside (IO)/outside-outside (OO)** mergers. For each experimental setting (dataset and k) and each case (II/IO/OO), we do five independent trials. We do this for one round (i.e., the budget $b = 1$).

In Figures 1 to 14, we report the full results of each dataset. In each plot, the x-axis represents the sampling size, and for each sampling size $1 \leq x \leq 10000$, the corresponding y value represents the best performance among the first x sampled mergers. We report the mean value and the standard deviation of five independent trials.

1.3. Heuristics experiments

Experimental settings. We study IOMs and IIMs separately. For each dataset and each $k \in \{5, 10, 15, 20\}$, we report the best performance among the mergers using the 100 inside nodes chosen by each node-heuristic (heuristic that chooses inside nodes), and report the best performance among the 10 mergers chosen by each pair-heuristic (heuristic that chooses pairs to be merged). The candidate mergers that each pair-heuristic chooses among are those using the 100 inside nodes chosen by the node-heuristic IP which performs best among all the considered node-heuristics.

In Tables 18 to 31, we report the full results of each dataset.

1.4. Effectiveness studies

Merging nodes is much more effective than adding edges in enhancing graph cohesiveness and robustness. For each measure, we report the change of it when we do 10 times of merging nodes or adding edges, over five independent trials, with the original value below the measure name. For each measure, the first result of merging nodes that is better than adding 10 edges is marked in bold and underlined.

Experimental settings.

- the Erdös-Rényi model: networkx.gnp_random_graph(n=50, p=0.1).
- the Watts–Strogatz small-world model: networkx.connected_watts_strogatz_graph(n=50, k=7, p=0.1).
- the Holme-Kim powerlaw-cluster model: networkx.powerlaw_cluster_graph(n=50, m=3, p=0.1, seed=42).

In Tables 1-3, we provide the results using the three different random graph models.

1.5. A case study on relato

We conduct a case study on *relato*, in order to check which nodes are merged together when we apply BATMAN, the proposed algorithm. In the *relato* dataset, each node represents a company (mainly in the IT field) and each edge represents some business-partner relationship between two companies.

Table 1. Results of the effectiveness study using the Erdös-Rényi model.For each measure, we report the change of it when we do 10 times of merging nodes or adding edges, over five independent trials, with the original value below the measure name. For each measure, the first result of merging nodes that is better than adding 10 edges is marked in bold and underlined.

measure	# operations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
VB	merging	83.1	**<u>79.2</u>**	75.5	71.9	68.4	65.4	62.5	59.9	57.5	55.4
87.3	adding	86.2	85.4	84.7	84.1	83.5	83.0	82.5	82.1	81.6	81.2
EB	merging	23.3	21.6	**<u>20.0</u>**	18.6	17.4	16.3	15.2	14.2	13.3	12.4
25.3	adding	24.6	24.1	23.6	23.2	22.8	22.5	22.1	21.7	21.4	21.1
ER	merging	714.8	633.0	**<u>570.2</u>**	515.7	468.5	427.0	389.3	355.2	325.1	297.5
834.8	adding	776.1	739.5	712.3	689.9	671.1	654.0	639.7	626.0	613.1	601.3
NC	merging	3.1	3.6	**<u>4.0</u>**	4.3	4.7	5.0	5.4	5.7	6.0	6.2
2.7	adding	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.9
SG	merging	3.1	3.7	**<u>4.3</u>**	4.7	5.2	5.5	5.9	6.2	6.5	6.8
2.3	adding	2.5	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.9	4.0

We use BATMAN on relato with $(k, b, n_i, n_o, n_c) = (10, 100, 100, 50, 10)$. After $b = 100$ rounds, the size of $(k = 10)$-truss increases from 89041 to 94944.

- Only 110 nodes participate in the 100 mergers.
- There are 7 groups of companies consisting of more than two companies are merged together:
  - (size = 28) Apple Inc., Experian, Ameriprise, Peavey, REC Solar, Salesforce, Cubic, Kirin, RSA, Hanold Associates, Novatek, SKS, Interbrand, Hewlett Packard, Cemex, Beijing Enterprises, space150, NuGen, InSite, Wesco, Thomas & Betts, Bloom Energy, Ashland, Oshkosh Corporation, Azul Systems, ADC, BTG, Palantir; This group consists of a giant company (Apple Inc.) and 27 relatively small companies in various fields; This kind of mergers usually happen in real-world situations.
  - (size = 22) SAP, CloudBees, DragonWave, Klocwork, SunTrust, Basho, Merry Maids, Signal, Xcerra, SGI, Veeva, SWIFT, Mitsui & Co, Hologic, Comdata, Martin Agency, Spectra Energy, Zensar Technologies, United Rentals, ThreatMetrix, IMG College, NAVTEQ; Similarly, this group consists of a giant company SAP and 21 relatively small companies in various fileds.
  - (size = 19) Oracle, Airwatch, Amylin Pharmaceuticals, E2open, BMO Financial Group, Cyber-Ark Software, UC Berkeley, MedImmune, Petco, Piper Aircraft, Wheel Pros, Aker Solutions, Swiss Life, Torch, Brooks Brothers, RWE Group, Bell Mobility, Calabrio, Compal Electronics; Similar to the previous two groups, where the giant company is Oracle.
  - (size = 12) Google, Databricks, SimpliVity, Azul, Henry Schein, Apple, Newport News, HCL Technologies America, HP, AES, Hewlett Packard Enterprise, Marshall Aerospace; Similarly, the giant company is Google.
  - (size = 11) IBM, Nine Entertainment, Gores, OneSpot, TALX, Kaiser Aluminum, Coty, JC Penney, Scivantage, Ch2m Hill, State bank of India; Similarly, the giant company is IBM; It is interesting to see State bank of India here.
  - (size = 8) Facebook, VCE, SDL, Reval, MAXIM INTEGRATED, NEC, ThyssenKrupp, Commonwealth Bank of Australia; Similarly, the giant company is Facebook; Again, we see a foreign bank here (Commonwealth Bank of Australia).
  - (size = 4) Amazon Web Services, Hewlett-Packard, Xignite, Gainsight; This group is a bit different, both Amazon Web Services and Hewlett-Packard giant companies, while Xignite and Gainsight are two relatively small data and market companies.
  - (size = 2) Cisco, YourEncore; This is a combination between Cisco which corresponds to the node with highest node-degree in the dataset and a fairly small company YourEncore.
  - (size = 2) Intel, Mimecast; This is also a combination between a large company and a small company.

Table 2. Results of the effectiveness study using the Watts-Strogatz small-world model.For each measure, we report the change of it when we do 10 times of merging nodes or adding edges, over five independent trials, with the original value below the measure name. For each measure, the first result of merging nodes that is better than adding 10 edges is marked in bold and underlined.

measure	# operations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
VB	merging	**<u>70.1</u>**	67.7	65.5	63.5	61.7	60.0	58.5	56.9	55.3	53.7
72.58	adding	72.3	72.1	71.9	71.7	71.4	71.3	71.1	70.9	70.7	70.5
EB	merging	10.2	**<u>9.6</u>**	9.1	8.6	8.1	7.6	7.2	6.8	6.4	6.0
10.8	adding	10.6	10.6	10.5	10.4	10.3	10.2	10.1	10.0	9.9	9.9
ER	merging	343.1	**<u>319.2</u>**	296.3	274.3	253.4	233.9	215.3	198.2	182.1	167.2
369.0	adding	364.6	360.7	356.8	353.1	349.6	346.1	342.8	339.7	336.8	333.9
NC	merging	8.0	8.4	**<u>8.8</u>**	9.2	9.5	9.8	10.1	10.4	10.7	11.0
7.5	adding	7.6	7.8	7.9	8.0	8.2	8.3	8.4	8.5	8.6	8.7
SG	merging	3.1	3.7	**<u>4.3</u>**	4.7	5.2	5.5	5.9	6.2	6.5	6.8
2.3	adding	2.5	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.9	4.0

  - (size = 2) Amazon, Purdue University; In this dataset, Amazon Web Services and Amazon are two separate nodes; It is interesting to see that Purdue University can help Amazon through a merger between these two entities.

- Conclusion: the main case is that a giant company gets merged with a large number of companies in various fields, which is also the most common case in real-world situations; it is fairly uncommon for two relatively large companies to be merged together, but not totally impossible.

Table 3. Results of the effectiveness study using the Holme-Kim powerlaw-cluster model.For each measure, we report the change of it when we do 10 times of merging nodes or adding edges, over five independent trials, with the original value below the measure name. For each measure, the first result of merging nodes that is better than adding 10 edges is marked in bold and underlined.

measure	# operations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
VB	merging	**<u>73.4</u>**	69.5	65.8	63.0	60.8	59.1	57.4	55.8	54.2	52.6
77.5	adding	76.9	76.4	76.0	75.6	75.2	74.9	74.5	74.2	73.8	73.5
EB	merging	9.7	**<u>8.8</u>**	8.1	7.5	7.0	6.6	6.3	5.9	5.6	5.3
10.6	adding	10.4	10.3	10.2	10.1	10.0	9.8	9.7	9.6	9.5	9.4
ER	merging	276.1	**<u>254.7</u>**	236.3	219.8	204.4	190.1	176.7	164.0	152.0	140.7
300.2	adding	296.4	293.1	289.9	287.1	284.3	281.8	279.3	277.0	274.7	272.6
NC	merging	7.0	**<u>7.7</u>**	8.3	8.7	9.3	9.7	10.1	10.5	10.9	11.2
6.5	adding	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.8	6.9	6.9	7.0	7.1	7.2	7.3
SG	merging	2.8	**<u>3.6</u>**	4.3	4.8	5.6	6.1	6.6	7.1	7.6	8.1
1.7	adding	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0

algorithm	n_c	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
BM	1	(190, 0.163258)	(588, 0.395745)	(1303, 0.452645)	(1527, 0.373819)
	2	(194, 0.297094)	(844, 0.630798)	(1376, 0.682457)	(1528, 0.434685)
	5	(200, 0.433535)	(953, 0.704848)	(1344, 0.748737)	(1445, 0.441133)
	10	(212, 0.536766)	(974, 0.868098)	(1343, 0.780103)	(1634, 0.503709)
	15	(215, 0.753264)	(947, 1.10923)	(1366, 1.040943)	(1634, 0.580716)
	20	(215, 0.939869)	(947, 1.321407)	(1278, 1.090379)	(1201, 0.571081)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(194, 0.282179)	(844, 0.611814)	(1376, 0.671509)	(1528, 0.423497)
	5	(206, 0.349339)	(895, 0.661047)	(1304, 0.698516)	(1487, 0.456046)
	10	(213, 0.552619)	(896, 0.864929)	(1458, 0.778773)	(1124, 0.480327)
	15	(207, 0.691299)	(911, 1.08249)	(1406, 0.950659)	(1159, 0.512248)
	20	(221, 0.916641)	(974, 1.288419)	(1379, 1.12371)	(1159, 0.565624)
II	1	(190, 0.138759)	(908, 0.306687)	(1303, 0.411716)	(774, 0.333101)
	2	(204, 0.210995)	(908, 0.383291)	(1408, 0.472175)	(757, 0.343574)
	5	(211, 0.315223)	(896, 0.516913)	(1348, 0.546718)	(1178, 0.374554)
	10	(214, 0.484388)	(978, 0.681726)	(1435, 0.634548)	(754, 0.400293)
	15	(213, 0.687604)	(947, 0.908359)	(1448, 0.813922)	(820, 0.470702)
	20	(225, 0.839121)	(947, 1.11379)	(1256, 0.883392)	(820, 0.499459)
IO	1	(139, 0.145697)	(588, 0.35929)	(1417, 0.416889)	(1527, 0.36234)
	2	(138, 0.210198)	(636, 0.430234)	(1290, 0.491398)	(1238, 0.391185)
	5	(138, 0.303721)	(588, 0.563956)	(1411, 0.578495)	(1099, 0.407051)
	10	(145, 0.45026)	(697, 0.731267)	(1320, 0.722222)	(1634, 0.463949)
	15	(145, 0.620213)	(641, 0.958933)	(1452, 0.844707)	(1657, 0.520014)
	20	(145, 0.799318)	(643, 1.167234)	(1452, 0.991405)	(1608, 0.574232)
NT	1	(73, 1.316854)	(428, 1.131434)	(833, 0.762351)	(626, 0.377389)
	2	(72, 2.450766)	(504, 2.046731)	(1072, 1.327413)	(796, 0.54811)
	5	(81, 4.92864)	(465, 4.243704)	(1135, 2.765242)	(1140, 1.070902)
	10	(101, 7.167055)	(587, 6.50248)	(1089, 4.260347)	(1153, 1.559173)
	15	(109, 7.344824)	(590, 6.496875)	(1114, 4.242718)	(1129, 1.541246)
	20	(112, 7.488949)	(595, 6.70923)	(1287, 4.406364)	(1148, 1.600867)
NE	1	(93, 0.074646)	(263, 0.130554)	(394, 0.190378)	(1137, 0.209669)
	2	(93, 0.104544)	(263, 0.168751)	(394, 0.221188)	(1137, 0.21616)
	5	(93, 0.201608)	(263, 0.289639)	(394, 0.31141)	(1137, 0.249993)
	10	(129, 0.353582)	(433, 0.479871)	(888, 0.464709)	(1084, 0.300897)
	15	(93, 0.511208)	(263, 0.682291)	(394, 0.580377)	(1137, 0.359938)
	20	(93, 0.660565)	(263, 0.875819)	(394, 0.736546)	(1137, 0.39993)
RD	1	(35, 0.09364)	(42, 0.202609)	(174, 0.277664)	(351, 0.30549)
	2	(23, 0.124586)	(219, 0.251621)	(313, 0.308926)	(343, 0.307641)
	5	(39, 0.194363)	(264, 0.309078)	(619, 0.360495)	(376, 0.324811)
	10	(66, 0.391954)	(261, 0.557491)	(652, 0.526545)	(654, 0.404832)
	15	(56, 0.514945)	(479, 0.710561)	(660, 0.631788)	(749, 0.446687)
	20	(66, 0.695103)	(401, 0.935773)	(817, 0.815195)	(662, 0.491332)

Table 4. The full results of the main experiments on *email*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
BM	1	(149, 0.506361)	(462, 0.948327)	(505, 1.133406)	(675, 1.171536)
	2	(152, 1.02818)	(620, 1.508909)	(505, 1.773869)	(1095, 1.66875)
	5	(158, 1.483856)	(640, 1.972026)	(631, 2.177783)	(1029, 2.040044)
	10	(163, 2.351635)	(675, 2.764291)	(678, 2.927482)	(1093, 2.70812)
	15	(177, 3.252112)	(675, 3.850927)	(636, 3.978673)	(1124, 3.711568)
	20	(172, 4.169596)	(678, 4.697119)	(678, 4.983967)	(1099, 4.534922)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(152, 0.987369)	(620, 1.519664)	(505, 1.732861)	(1095, 1.669056)
	5	(158, 1.337278)	(652, 1.808965)	(513, 2.116939)	(1076, 1.996077)
	10	(164, 2.316492)	(675, 2.789305)	(617, 2.940854)	(1176, 2.733471)
	15	(164, 3.114176)	(682, 3.624242)	(617, 3.789719)	(1135, 3.48443)
	20	(171, 4.126044)	(678, 4.729749)	(678, 4.77951)	(1075, 4.421955)
II	1	(149, 0.463815)	(490, 0.796277)	(505, 1.034633)	(675, 1.115816)
	2	(149, 0.820292)	(556, 1.177575)	(612, 1.378685)	(662, 1.40776)
	5	(154, 1.353022)	(550, 1.731343)	(617, 1.878777)	(797, 1.890962)
	10	(171, 2.127139)	(627, 2.483068)	(678, 2.662917)	(877, 2.489292)
	15	(185, 3.103649)	(633, 3.549826)	(678, 3.586211)	(847, 3.418032)
	20	(185, 4.020618)	(616, 4.406482)	(678, 4.429359)	(896, 4.202753)
IO	1	(70, 0.485909)	(462, 0.868455)	(393, 1.137245)	(981, 1.218973)
	2	(84, 0.825116)	(531, 1.240481)	(393, 1.477159)	(1141, 1.487601)
	5	(89, 1.337836)	(653, 1.739939)	(387, 1.996417)	(1266, 1.920456)
	10	(89, 2.119162)	(654, 2.572274)	(352, 2.759679)	(1158, 2.568547)
	15	(90, 3.014986)	(672, 3.503828)	(411, 3.686824)	(1226, 3.380297)
	20	(90, 3.88141)	(657, 4.368629)	(349, 4.635049)	(1200, 4.090064)
NT	1	(25, 4.802132)	(185, 4.553131)	(165, 4.410222)	(212, 4.128859)
	2	(25, 8.323137)	(265, 8.190111)	(175, 7.638757)	(241, 6.939943)
	5	(20, 17.131463)	(276, 16.749262)	(232, 15.494895)	(264, 14.106341)
	10	(20, 27.410854)	(283, 27.03053)	(264, 24.976688)	(289, 22.699999)
	15	(24, 27.212796)	(273, 26.827285)	(296, 24.811599)	(301, 22.458058)
	20	(27, 27.993103)	(219, 27.642417)	(292, 25.626299)	(310, 23.035773)
NE	1	(9, 0.483263)	(0, 0.610785)	(0, 0.757779)	(0, 0.890101)
	2	(9, 0.629466)	(0, 0.787201)	(0, 0.907253)	(0, 1.020575)
	5	(9, 1.168563)	(0, 1.28736)	(0, 1.409836)	(0, 1.496966)
	10	(16, 1.890344)	(0, 2.065769)	(0, 2.246718)	(0, 2.158495)
	15	(9, 2.793643)	(0, 2.996425)	(0, 3.136047)	(0, 3.003932)
	20	(9, 3.632236)	(0, 3.903284)	(0, 3.904875)	(0, 3.791944)
RD	1	(-7, 0.478493)	(-1, 0.722488)	(-14, 0.951511)	(-157, 1.147531)
	2	(1, 0.645246)	(10, 0.931899)	(11, 1.160903)	(5, 1.293247)
	5	(1, 1.021822)	(23, 1.284559)	(9, 1.480335)	(38, 1.562286)
	10	(14, 1.992733)	(32, 2.313069)	(77, 2.51362)	(86, 2.488989)
	15	(12, 2.675058)	(34, 3.037993)	(36, 3.234321)	(46, 3.125762)
	20	(10, 3.640068)	(117, 4.074742)	(115, 4.248889)	(49, 4.021556)

Table 5. The full results of the main experiments on *facebook*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
BM	1	(2660, 7.633889)	(759, 4.289924)	(606, 3.520721)	(738, 3.435266)
	2	(2660, 11.775407)	(759, 5.206878)	(635, 3.837289)	(753, 3.84938)
	5	(2601, 13.85089)	(941, 5.995754)	(749, 4.323002)	(923, 3.913824)
	10	(2606, 17.86887)	(974, 7.244179)	(674, 4.795776)	(967, 4.370866)
	15	(2606, 22.462996)	(940, 8.762238)	(677, 5.658468)	(870, 5.10412)
	20	(2606, 26.806823)	(960, 10.224163)	(705, 6.411012)	(888, 5.76321)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(2660, 11.641451)	(759, 5.143468)	(635, 3.952877)	(753, 3.644825)
	5	(2644, 13.210472)	(866, 5.820045)	(617, 4.187215)	(818, 3.821646)
	10	(2601, 17.397328)	(937, 7.049637)	(762, 4.711021)	(867, 4.349421)
	15	(2606, 21.439289)	(983, 8.432824)	(705, 5.630066)	(867, 5.113627)
	20	(2606, 26.201712)	(951, 10.179697)	(719, 6.563192)	(870, 5.757685)
II	1	(2660, 7.014586)	(759, 4.099205)	(507, 3.402992)	(535, 3.265395)
	2	(2644, 8.570758)	(866, 4.560648)	(518, 3.426621)	(538, 3.325384)
	5	(2601, 11.002977)	(906, 5.279612)	(617, 3.9874)	(564, 3.80108)
	10	(2606, 15.256073)	(936, 6.663428)	(682, 4.563828)	(571, 4.192416)
	15	(2606, 19.08951)	(954, 7.858194)	(655, 5.383557)	(651, 4.826672)
	20	(2606, 23.448812)	(944, 9.089351)	(682, 6.010336)	(622, 5.58813)
IO	1	(563, 7.180937)	(666, 4.328697)	(606, 3.496552)	(738, 3.371479)
	2	(618, 8.639106)	(414, 4.809814)	(689, 3.638419)	(912, 3.561971)
	5	(598, 10.839214)	(610, 5.62101)	(772, 4.184578)	(921, 3.808747)
	10	(604, 14.174811)	(595, 6.497019)	(796, 4.620337)	(923, 4.280902)
	15	(618, 18.288144)	(594, 7.977383)	(807, 5.632297)	(837, 5.012554)
	20	(612, 22.374368)	(640, 9.567872)	(807, 6.256049)	(837, 5.788372)
NT	1	(532, 7.518926)	(371, 4.91902)	(409, 4.087247)	(380, 3.841569)
	2	(530, 12.03291)	(287, 6.96289)	(443, 5.47965)	(419, 4.904233)
	5	(577, 22.764435)	(300, 12.170004)	(470, 8.886947)	(416, 7.767748)
	10	(613, 39.233378)	(332, 21.191422)	(523, 14.484679)	(445, 12.271197)
	15	(613, 38.239648)	(359, 18.641235)	(590, 13.312159)	(515, 11.42225)
	20	(613, 41.894058)	(411, 19.597006)	(629, 13.746571)	(542, 11.971981)
NE	1	(219, 2.906677)	(78, 2.720494)	(116, 2.747374)	(184, 2.789192)
	2	(219, 3.663202)	(78, 2.963913)	(116, 2.88292)	(184, 2.912347)
	5	(219, 5.929757)	(78, 3.733847)	(116, 3.341918)	(184, 3.293982)
	10	(316, 9.966511)	(170, 5.009166)	(191, 4.191981)	(346, 3.908425)
	15	(219, 13.353948)	(78, 6.313105)	(116, 4.734477)	(184, 4.500818)
	20	(219, 17.166411)	(78, 7.551934)	(116, 5.43375)	(184, 5.182752)
RD	1	(3, 4.93581)	(50, 3.678218)	(-68, 3.118525)	(-2, 3.084485)
	2	(9, 5.627936)	(2, 3.963403)	(115, 3.250154)	(54, 3.154718)
	5	(6, 7.074868)	(77, 4.426632)	(181, 3.55516)	(271, 3.391911)
	10	(27, 11.565817)	(111, 6.226378)	(165, 4.524875)	(335, 4.239357)
	15	(17, 14.382752)	(167, 6.908416)	(112, 5.006554)	(282, 4.594821)
	20	(52, 19.584597)	(129, 8.378082)	(238, 5.881316)	(348, 5.450063)

Table 6. The full results of the main experiments on *brightkite*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
BM	1	(511, 4.331406)	(2251, 5.445484)	(2293, 5.092611)	(4206, 5.190955)
	2	(511, 7.368159)	(2251, 7.866471)	(2486, 6.35433)	(4054, 6.097935)
	5	(544, 9.032235)	(2371, 8.981611)	(2590, 7.032122)	(4067, 6.437749)
	10	(526, 11.510036)	(2419, 11.134309)	(2668, 8.266657)	(3971, 6.609456)
	15	(552, 15.222338)	(2419, 14.188718)	(2738, 9.63729)	(4320, 7.399298)
	20	(556, 18.698971)	(2464, 16.68068)	(2738, 11.13879)	(4326, 7.999017)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(511, 7.321111)	(2251, 7.676253)	(2486, 6.339604)	(4054, 6.03925)
	5	(554, 8.473394)	(2260, 8.626599)	(2509, 7.061166)	(4270, 6.04146)
	10	(561, 11.800697)	(2391, 11.205999)	(2673, 8.185404)	(3982, 6.583055)
	15	(526, 14.552206)	(2419, 13.813283)	(2668, 9.529306)	(4116, 7.424883)
	20	(526, 18.264272)	(2419, 16.406695)	(2738, 11.096055)	(4220, 7.607183)
II	1	(511, 3.870919)	(2251, 4.976404)	(2293, 4.810573)	(4206, 4.784768)
	2	(554, 5.19664)	(2260, 5.952932)	(2587, 5.369132)	(4178, 4.922209)
	5	(561, 7.048542)	(2391, 7.489798)	(2736, 5.913927)	(3951, 5.258277)
	10	(526, 10.603894)	(2419, 10.044706)	(2696, 7.635753)	(4324, 5.678987)
	15	(542, 13.509703)	(2419, 12.478366)	(2696, 8.871025)	(4297, 6.356354)
	20	(557, 17.138216)	(2464, 14.813504)	(2803, 10.09049)	(4297, 7.013217)
IO	1	(253, 3.62462)	(807, 5.110506)	(1941, 5.200724)	(2661, 5.386959)
	2	(267, 4.718587)	(838, 5.855962)	(1810, 5.676982)	(3195, 5.39356)
	5	(303, 6.34697)	(919, 7.50673)	(1756, 6.367354)	(3077, 5.783836)
	10	(298, 8.802689)	(946, 9.613448)	(1975, 7.534384)	(3732, 6.110118)
	15	(288, 11.671551)	(953, 11.961914)	(2002, 9.285292)	(3706, 6.872089)
	20	(278, 14.307012)	(933, 14.2551)	(2009, 10.585216)	(3873, 7.553795)
NT	1	(134, 10.738631)	(783, 7.442617)	(1648, 5.438749)	(3330, 4.277926)
	2	(142, 18.263571)	(826, 11.940534)	(1749, 7.689251)	(3470, 5.097733)
	5	(238, 36.935501)	(895, 21.992599)	(1924, 12.950219)	(3465, 7.417933)
	10	(242, 53.261851)	(875, 35.932222)	(1949, 21.180753)	(3888, 11.740368)
	15	(242, 58.864717)	(927, 34.930516)	(1959, 19.943574)	(3457, 10.411915)
	20	(244, 61.634726)	(928, 37.404548)	(1888, 21.231685)	(3629, 10.944137)
NE	1	(96, 1.883449)	(333, 2.670745)	(369, 3.156782)	(1273, 3.440137)
	2	(96, 2.50555)	(333, 3.098938)	(369, 3.420798)	(1273, 3.596383)
	5	(96, 3.918953)	(333, 4.518043)	(369, 4.203173)	(1273, 4.062471)
	10	(150, 6.508428)	(473, 6.744301)	(677, 5.571919)	(1337, 4.780549)
	15	(96, 9.349192)	(333, 9.112854)	(369, 6.814711)	(1273, 5.572274)
	20	(96, 11.92908)	(333, 11.537116)	(369, 8.080567)	(1273, 6.342468)
RD	1	(2, 2.086758)	(16, 3.947758)	(73, 4.294525)	(218, 4.13741)
	2	(7, 2.612672)	(103, 4.312337)	(215, 4.549018)	(1276, 4.31771)
	5	(2, 3.625463)	(131, 5.261591)	(594, 5.061123)	(1770, 4.634283)
	10	(10, 6.822703)	(300, 8.060247)	(772, 6.506863)	(1994, 5.512082)
	15	(12, 9.075867)	(284, 10.132303)	(825, 7.534221)	(2504, 5.927042)
	20	(23, 12.33712)	(360, 12.98275)	(845, 9.166356)	(2724, 6.702388)

Table 7. The full results of the main experiments on *enron*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
BM	1	(1880, 10.71228)	(3239, 15.911818)	(1202, 13.304726)	(1309, 12.044654)
	2	(1880, 19.355977)	(3239, 21.000184)	(1423, 13.881173)	(1154, 12.016041)
	5	(1914, 25.084593)	(3210, 24.484485)	(1487, 14.438804)	(1230, 11.795518)
	10	(1897, 34.753535)	(3305, 31.267398)	(1668, 14.691768)	(1282, 11.975049)
	15	(1897, 46.433482)	(3305, 38.903798)	(1668, 15.861955)	(1419, 12.384224)
	20	(1897, 57.769216)	(3305, 45.976823)	(1735, 17.265859)	(1327, 12.78748)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(1880, 18.920002)	(3239, 20.863257)	(1423, 13.529899)	(1154, 11.746036)
	5	(1865, 23.131213)	(3239, 23.511837)	(1727, 13.829663)	(1225, 11.902334)
	10	(1914, 34.562731)	(3305, 30.660947)	(1670, 14.639725)	(1289, 11.906666)
	15	(1897, 43.864536)	(3305, 37.108482)	(1573, 15.868421)	(1247, 12.38159)
	20	(1897, 55.831186)	(3305, 45.19937)	(1716, 17.017798)	(1377, 13.189475)
II	1	(1880, 9.928412)	(3239, 15.159316)	(1494, 12.704985)	(974, 11.709136)
	2	(1865, 14.008636)	(3239, 17.550303)	(1670, 13.081662)	(969, 11.524561)
	5	(1914, 20.544462)	(3305, 21.620116)	(1779, 13.34531)	(993, 12.081781)
	10	(1897, 31.228379)	(3305, 27.702994)	(1579, 14.490075)	(1037, 11.943175)
	15	(1897, 41.566679)	(3305, 34.459385)	(1591, 15.280399)	(1037, 12.185434)
	20	(1897, 51.697639)	(3305, 41.698888)	(1678, 16.12399)	(986, 12.690062)
IO	1	(446, 10.507681)	(1486, 15.723185)	(1202, 13.027482)	(1309, 11.839805)
	2	(487, 14.628238)	(1884, 18.08194)	(1472, 13.024111)	(1384, 11.741507)
	5	(464, 21.155257)	(1663, 22.202272)	(1597, 13.652119)	(1239, 11.755369)
	10	(486, 30.477748)	(1694, 27.723429)	(1651, 14.424961)	(1440, 11.875024)
	15	(500, 40.967156)	(2122, 34.057724)	(1651, 15.465994)	(1494, 12.399112)
	20	(500, 52.151216)	(1935, 42.542172)	(1797, 16.509463)	(1431, 12.686913)
NT	1	(185, 15.613714)	(1459, 14.178798)	(1011, 12.249921)	(773, 11.548451)
	2	(263, 25.216267)	(1498, 18.081384)	(838, 12.964268)	(776, 11.626199)
	5	(374, 49.21995)	(1889, 28.206763)	(1070, 14.966518)	(717, 12.372918)
	10	(491, 86.139788)	(2015, 51.823022)	(902, 23.426422)	(967, 17.74904)
	15	(463, 88.918728)	(2016, 47.755671)	(1401, 19.107009)	(996, 13.495021)
	20	(477, 99.358816)	(2015, 54.490456)	(1352, 19.638155)	(828, 13.64916)
NE	1	(12, 7.222833)	(0, 10.950282)	(20, 11.108081)	(428, 11.147636)
	2	(12, 9.055707)	(0, 12.183232)	(20, 11.29506)	(428, 11.223747)
	5	(12, 15.460855)	(0, 15.839832)	(20, 11.986463)	(428, 11.414039)
	10	(148, 25.873818)	(138, 22.346785)	(16, 12.837359)	(90, 11.690283)
	15	(12, 35.600186)	(0, 29.10255)	(20, 13.885689)	(428, 12.032483)
	20	(12, 46.373334)	(0, 34.820893)	(20, 14.854479)	(428, 12.373706)
RD	1	(0, 8.070257)	(0, 13.770937)	(0, 12.127693)	(88, 11.294168)
	2	(7, 9.89358)	(1, 15.024687)	(8, 12.293329)	(96, 11.355414)
	5	(1, 13.864795)	(0, 17.633792)	(3, 12.70848)	(273, 11.566043)
	10	(13, 26.739019)	(27, 25.426077)	(74, 13.92805)	(174, 11.872816)
	15	(25, 34.082305)	(204, 31.451282)	(138, 14.873115)	(401, 12.145065)
	20	(22, 46.099643)	(190, 38.863589)	(260, 16.012712)	(440, 12.447638)

Table 8. The full results of the main experiments on *hepph*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
BM	1	(6502, 14.009076)	(7422, 14.679457)	(5780, 16.213886)	(4647, 15.751298)
	2	(6502, 22.344013)	(7422, 20.710244)	(6210, 19.447721)	(4934, 16.959438)
	5	(6637, 29.08989)	(7533, 25.647605)	(6681, 23.093492)	(5281, 17.980626)
	10	(6637, 40.696907)	(7533, 34.454681)	(6437, 26.957407)	(4942, 20.196656)
	15	(6637, 52.941491)	(7598, 44.065532)	(6437, 31.977536)	(4901, 22.260134)
	20	(6637, 64.841984)	(7598, 53.258305)	(6424, 37.207439)	(4818, 24.122128)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(6502, 22.395535)	(7422, 20.669226)	(6210, 19.259234)	(4934, 17.382814)
	5	(6566, 26.95458)	(7383, 24.252107)	(6296, 21.941935)	(4760, 17.675723)
	10	(6637, 40.199188)	(7533, 34.247148)	(6258, 26.508954)	(5099, 20.104714)
	15	(6637, 50.061666)	(7533, 42.551266)	(6437, 31.300332)	(4868, 22.052029)
	20	(6637, 64.309491)	(7598, 53.074237)	(6437, 37.134823)	(5091, 24.256497)
II	1	(6502, 13.020298)	(7422, 14.011352)	(5780, 15.102904)	(4647, 15.371281)
	2	(6566, 17.572612)	(7383, 17.345369)	(6198, 16.74011)	(4505, 15.681111)
	5	(6637, 24.936549)	(7533, 22.787584)	(6498, 20.076558)	(4522, 16.746233)
	10	(6637, 36.842822)	(7598, 32.665774)	(6444, 24.675284)	(4522, 18.867458)
	15	(6637, 48.663534)	(7598, 41.064545)	(6601, 29.358617)	(4573, 20.916193)
	20	(6637, 60.973164)	(7598, 50.015291)	(6512, 34.012869)	(4567, 22.750986)
IO	1	(724, 12.581297)	(3232, 14.817602)	(5554, 16.286631)	(4633, 16.595315)
	2	(724, 16.798537)	(3302, 18.140384)	(5114, 17.774026)	(4654, 16.344556)
	5	(731, 23.663116)	(3363, 23.349389)	(5266, 20.962841)	(4906, 17.199864)
	10	(733, 33.785853)	(3429, 31.778832)	(5325, 25.200098)	(5058, 19.132696)
	15	(739, 46.322793)	(3509, 41.170955)	(5029, 30.604151)	(5198, 22.107354)
	20	(730, 56.169985)	(3338, 50.081576)	(5029, 35.782734)	(5165, 23.562279)
NT	1	(675, 24.167564)	(3003, 20.321986)	(3953, 17.597147)	(4306, 15.468346)
	2	(687, 39.750607)	(3061, 30.566673)	(4127, 23.683506)	(4380, 18.519992)
	5	(751, 78.414224)	(2945, 55.958911)	(4683, 38.628292)	(4697, 26.570887)
	10	(757, 127.379362)	(3214, 93.788406)	(4968, 65.970313)	(4836, 43.972665)
	15	(781, 131.775808)	(3350, 93.01329)	(4982, 60.001404)	(4954, 37.727108)
	20	(781, 142.780931)	(3180, 102.161783)	(5155, 64.922102)	(4925, 39.824714)
NE	1	(275, 7.370404)	(874, 10.173047)	(1324, 11.814216)	(491, 12.521565)
	2	(275, 9.37843)	(874, 11.923304)	(1324, 12.848376)	(491, 12.910815)
	5	(275, 15.794254)	(874, 17.237137)	(1324, 15.893406)	(491, 14.346997)
	10	(357, 26.582149)	(1279, 26.279711)	(1653, 21.400361)	(774, 16.745987)
	15	(275, 37.006772)	(874, 34.932669)	(1324, 25.826337)	(491, 19.091083)
	20	(275, 47.663125)	(874, 43.770436)	(1324, 30.826765)	(491, 21.424672)
RD	1	(15, 9.700132)	(53, 13.060758)	(251, 14.402305)	(333, 14.10091)
	2	(40, 11.891144)	(204, 14.965532)	(870, 15.397589)	(1703, 14.681986)
	5	(117, 16.139847)	(850, 18.510415)	(1505, 17.313076)	(2159, 15.575501)
	10	(118, 29.474276)	(908, 29.621664)	(1907, 23.615062)	(2917, 18.531446)
	15	(139, 37.421587)	(829, 36.361822)	(2366, 27.304857)	(2919, 19.847579)
	20	(135, 50.370877)	(1083, 46.770155)	(2524, 32.542717)	(3014, 22.616209)

Table 9. The full results of the main experiments on *epinions*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
BM	1	(1399, 7.953749)	(1806, 7.376449)	(1302, 8.720494)	(1193, 8.159371)
	2	(1399, 13.250584)	(1806, 11.222614)	(1859, 10.938343)	(1332, 9.812224)
	5	(1404, 16.606493)	(1821, 13.930346)	(1920, 13.012133)	(1400, 11.523038)
	10	(1435, 21.827349)	(1872, 18.522814)	(1766, 15.586085)	(1303, 13.396541)
	15	(1467, 28.570891)	(1872, 24.503237)	(1574, 20.184689)	(1312, 16.084518)
	20	(1467, 34.881025)	(1876, 29.810441)	(1662, 23.744555)	(1326, 18.67953)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(1399, 13.108872)	(1806, 10.868075)	(1859, 10.784598)	(1332, 10.09833)
	5	(1407, 15.511006)	(1821, 12.975058)	(1905, 12.289557)	(1279, 11.266874)
	10	(1435, 22.817317)	(1834, 18.198366)	(1952, 15.547785)	(1329, 13.307694)
	15	(1435, 27.209416)	(1806, 23.174056)	(1820, 19.458249)	(1323, 16.130359)
	20	(1445, 35.29857)	(1872, 29.688204)	(1590, 23.624911)	(1336, 18.755269)
II	1	(1399, 7.347652)	(1806, 7.081155)	(1728, 7.402999)	(1193, 7.493956)
	2	(1407, 9.912281)	(1821, 9.027593)	(1649, 8.69315)	(1224, 8.236692)
	5	(1435, 13.420627)	(1821, 12.348087)	(1724, 10.95328)	(1272, 9.71036)
	10	(1445, 22.163684)	(1872, 17.916443)	(1645, 14.745402)	(1316, 12.522046)
	15	(1467, 25.681819)	(1876, 22.858826)	(1645, 18.432552)	(1324, 14.675866)
	20	(1467, 32.023161)	(1876, 28.102126)	(1709, 22.085486)	(1342, 17.1649)
IO	1	(344, 6.962134)	(734, 7.338649)	(1302, 8.383445)	(1078, 8.590261)
	2	(327, 9.15968)	(729, 9.38972)	(1293, 9.778422)	(1198, 9.346424)
	5	(373, 12.85268)	(811, 12.347115)	(1361, 11.731662)	(1247, 10.700964)
	10	(363, 17.719778)	(742, 16.525877)	(1436, 15.063044)	(1230, 12.823346)
	15	(352, 23.680394)	(809, 21.543639)	(1524, 19.290959)	(1133, 16.408843)
	20	(354, 29.439376)	(809, 26.545)	(1524, 22.326641)	(1295, 18.101346)
NT	1	(273, 17.075997)	(608, 12.542701)	(1186, 10.383663)	(974, 9.07537)
	2	(264, 29.446356)	(752, 20.999337)	(1090, 16.217407)	(1282, 13.211717)
	5	(278, 57.006561)	(774, 41.079849)	(1189, 30.793082)	(1438, 23.824083)
	10	(284, 95.389934)	(854, 69.297485)	(1335, 52.808828)	(1500, 41.780687)
	15	(284, 93.791758)	(879, 66.696617)	(1377, 50.005423)	(1513, 38.528761)
	20	(286, 97.925998)	(880, 71.977105)	(1389, 53.819828)	(1615, 40.939716)
NE	1	(166, 3.621131)	(533, 4.608468)	(656, 5.246678)	(878, 5.60472)
	2	(166, 4.709424)	(533, 5.584783)	(656, 5.87103)	(878, 6.110478)
	5	(166, 7.966682)	(533, 8.348632)	(656, 7.968597)	(878, 7.644592)
	10	(240, 13.274469)	(557, 13.109462)	(789, 11.400203)	(1073, 10.386018)
	15	(166, 18.819954)	(533, 18.035512)	(656, 14.98909)	(878, 12.661607)
	20	(166, 24.10867)	(533, 22.786093)	(656, 18.558893)	(878, 15.229757)
RD	1	(35, 4.760348)	(109, 6.44393)	(108, 7.065213)	(94, 7.287121)
	2	(42, 5.93591)	(147, 7.444798)	(305, 7.930402)	(347, 7.920304)
	5	(59, 7.972565)	(256, 9.458135)	(514, 9.439179)	(723, 8.825496)
	10	(82, 14.790045)	(261, 15.718018)	(653, 13.987663)	(807, 12.326806)
	15	(113, 18.800661)	(315, 18.947982)	(658, 16.484998)	(900, 13.760862)
	20	(108, 25.363641)	(340, 25.863805)	(566, 20.477926)	(806, 16.893236)

Table 10. The full results of the main experiments on *relato*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
BM	1	(18200, 20.066584)	(1525, 10.278747)	(1093, 9.362024)	(732, 8.8609)
	2	(18200, 30.911228)	(1631, 10.966134)	(1081, 9.880414)	(601, 8.934576)
	5	(17886, 37.100711)	(1769, 11.868651)	(1170, 10.131934)	(727, 9.160244)
	10	(17886, 47.582482)	(1815, 12.89966)	(1228, 10.930069)	(724, 9.874507)
	15	(17886, 59.291739)	(1634, 14.067592)	(1221, 12.1711)	(737, 10.838254)
	20	(17886, 71.037556)	(1634, 15.437461)	(1228, 13.320627)	(756, 11.759433)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(18200, 31.367987)	(1631, 10.950923)	(1081, 9.631465)	(601, 8.898312)
	5	(18200, 35.502089)	(1777, 11.500195)	(1111, 10.015313)	(675, 9.169323)
	10	(17886, 47.871221)	(1618, 12.671074)	(1259, 10.910955)	(753, 9.767921)
	15	(17886, 57.456869)	(1815, 14.061171)	(1236, 11.888506)	(727, 10.982649)
	20	(17886, 71.596376)	(1634, 15.462811)	(1236, 12.980841)	(748, 11.536748)
II	1	(18200, 18.671986)	(1525, 9.813701)	(860, 9.093311)	(510, 8.63311)
	2	(18200, 23.279586)	(1698, 10.157537)	(862, 9.126792)	(537, 8.703942)
	5	(17886, 29.692579)	(1514, 10.802643)	(1083, 9.729115)	(570, 9.060151)
	10	(17886, 40.454163)	(1508, 12.003224)	(979, 10.872554)	(571, 9.79806)
	15	(17886, 52.286336)	(1586, 13.291565)	(1210, 11.522062)	(573, 10.516353)
	20	(17886, 62.886783)	(1537, 15.036476)	(1187, 12.597883)	(553, 11.15737)
IO	1	(3932, 19.492647)	(1398, 10.281061)	(1093, 9.361074)	(732, 8.828502)
	2	(3731, 23.300827)	(1554, 10.593149)	(1080, 9.357446)	(770, 9.018518)
	5	(3725, 29.477057)	(1542, 11.187701)	(1155, 9.99313)	(798, 9.323371)
	10	(3725, 39.646281)	(1567, 12.319004)	(1170, 10.702775)	(738, 9.72672)
	15	(3725, 50.968981)	(1443, 13.853482)	(1170, 11.932157)	(788, 10.766915)
	20	(3725, 61.487066)	(1499, 15.024706)	(1173, 12.932639)	(802, 11.435084)
NT	1	(3713, 15.530225)	(1048, 9.655758)	(777, 8.969255)	(495, 8.575624)
	2	(3838, 22.892191)	(1259, 11.657735)	(759, 10.429413)	(554, 9.588718)
	5	(3906, 42.422152)	(1374, 16.689715)	(717, 13.836441)	(652, 12.155182)
	10	(3751, 77.338054)	(1407, 25.30496)	(694, 20.404779)	(697, 17.628668)
	15	(3792, 77.208547)	(1445, 23.562442)	(815, 18.741732)	(736, 16.094562)
	20	(3792, 88.151785)	(1566, 24.759263)	(746, 19.567629)	(744, 16.827505)
NE	1	(719, 8.593711)	(610, 7.798539)	(375, 7.781)	(657, 7.841317)
	2	(719, 10.628516)	(610, 8.030336)	(375, 7.939821)	(657, 7.975527)
	5	(719, 16.820136)	(610, 8.773347)	(375, 8.54328)	(657, 8.386603)
	10	(1565, 27.174709)	(823, 9.991018)	(539, 9.470157)	(755, 9.209895)
	15	(719, 37.641159)	(610, 11.284551)	(375, 10.396356)	(657, 9.836579)
	20	(719, 47.937585)	(610, 12.481733)	(375, 11.305846)	(657, 10.579446)
RD	1	(26, 13.311316)	(53, 9.054355)	(45, 8.633299)	(56, 8.333059)
	2	(133, 15.341061)	(203, 9.317372)	(202, 8.856714)	(109, 8.478147)
	5	(1028, 19.566863)	(348, 9.954583)	(347, 9.187858)	(207, 8.818307)
	10	(1123, 32.759762)	(403, 11.688949)	(537, 10.80347)	(229, 9.698891)
	15	(1417, 40.345749)	(503, 12.404703)	(482, 11.102026)	(282, 10.363468)
	20	(879, 52.582941)	(518, 13.748626)	(502, 12.081631)	(336, 11.073083)

Table 11. The full results of the main experiments on *slashdot*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
BM	1	(3078, 9.137355)	(6872, 23.077852)	(3216, 28.016744)	(1601, 31.364135)
	2	(3078, 15.931743)	(6872, 35.356373)	(3216, 34.519191)	(2532, 34.329742)
	5	(3078, 22.583234)	(7438, 46.274978)	(3717, 41.788776)	(2658, 39.501804)
	10	(2942, 33.817354)	(7410, 67.306994)	(3689, 52.481098)	(3066, 47.082249)
	15	(2942, 46.665795)	(7376, 89.841317)	(3760, 66.716082)	(3237, 55.769771)
	20	(2942, 57.968247)	(7487, 111.159931)	(3786, 79.026608)	(3260, 66.239228)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(3078, 16.044073)	(6872, 35.108201)	(3216, 33.769681)	(2532, 33.472693)
	5	(3078, 20.728486)	(6977, 43.846302)	(3393, 39.830286)	(2466, 37.913488)
	10	(2942, 33.712189)	(7387, 65.986137)	(3705, 52.399195)	(3076, 47.011571)
	15	(2942, 43.736657)	(7410, 83.202126)	(3877, 64.562998)	(2991, 55.601181)
	20	(2942, 57.613948)	(7376, 109.244064)	(3694, 78.403743)	(3278, 66.61477)
II	1	(3078, 8.383145)	(6872, 21.465917)	(3216, 26.426679)	(2381, 29.018141)
	2	(3078, 13.202961)	(6977, 29.534145)	(3393, 30.959716)	(2445, 31.939913)
	5	(2942, 20.100729)	(7387, 41.521061)	(3705, 38.231511)	(2989, 36.817633)
	10	(2942, 31.696554)	(7376, 61.768423)	(3694, 51.451934)	(3278, 45.83766)
	15	(2942, 44.12425)	(7487, 82.986386)	(3786, 62.135343)	(3260, 53.732327)
	20	(2942, 56.538565)	(7487, 104.331364)	(3819, 75.139627)	(3260, 63.18732)
IO	1	(419, 9.144208)	(2292, 23.211475)	(2594, 27.894258)	(1601, 30.808521)
	2	(425, 13.140243)	(2464, 30.368479)	(2583, 31.953489)	(2105, 33.214502)
	5	(439, 20.094935)	(2403, 43.179821)	(2345, 38.853809)	(2286, 37.464285)
	10	(447, 30.193815)	(2458, 60.519335)	(2342, 50.122045)	(2339, 45.529253)
	15	(409, 41.46253)	(2458, 82.493371)	(2373, 64.779021)	(2129, 57.230257)
	20	(409, 52.13128)	(2435, 99.477884)	(2252, 76.79444)	(2127, 65.92331)
NT	1	(365, 25.020149)	(2017, 32.740586)	(2035, 32.208022)	(1695, 32.031095)
	2	(380, 41.080853)	(2017, 46.1374)	(2170, 41.072028)	(1874, 38.400952)
	5	(391, 81.016286)	(2240, 81.933398)	(2385, 63.984136)	(2047, 55.264581)
	10	(391, 133.656234)	(2378, 138.864884)	(2562, 105.211061)	(1881, 88.877944)
	15	(412, 136.512992)	(2381, 145.23193)	(2699, 103.561808)	(1920, 84.221371)
	20	(415, 147.788968)	(2519, 163.972721)	(2715, 115.110821)	(1935, 92.756394)
NE	1	(146, 8.032294)	(116, 20.242908)	(142, 23.902179)	(196, 25.865214)
	2	(146, 10.182026)	(116, 23.973655)	(142, 26.298077)	(196, 27.51254)
	5	(146, 16.575301)	(116, 35.209148)	(142, 33.098032)	(196, 32.672331)
	10	(241, 27.0287)	(492, 54.028916)	(581, 45.354465)	(388, 41.016239)
	15	(146, 38.067553)	(116, 72.680811)	(142, 55.833599)	(196, 49.720338)
	20	(146, 48.803032)	(116, 91.74155)	(142, 67.307069)	(196, 58.03318)
RD	1	(66, 8.209677)	(99, 21.610461)	(11, 26.46422)	(2, 28.758133)
	2	(56, 10.330515)	(121, 25.326023)	(122, 28.75007)	(67, 30.611359)
	5	(113, 14.586695)	(243, 32.846758)	(275, 33.366299)	(79, 33.651221)
	10	(174, 28.085976)	(332, 57.08309)	(297, 47.721802)	(137, 44.519811)
	15	(176, 36.432143)	(385, 70.733631)	(278, 56.186387)	(369, 50.485354)
	20	(185, 49.585751)	(625, 94.054384)	(429, 69.665654)	(338, 60.714386)

Table 12. The full results of the main experiments on *syracuse*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
BM	1	(13584, 42.918833)	(6208, 37.637487)	(4041, 33.792637)	(3162, 31.89478)
	2	(13584, 67.972448)	(6208, 46.788955)	(4041, 37.013729)	(3455, 30.918941)
	5	(13575, 86.737187)	(6752, 57.790389)	(3823, 39.597373)	(3831, 32.481303)
	10	(13599, 119.925492)	(6726, 73.331638)	(4003, 45.031304)	(3831, 34.853393)
	15	(13599, 157.43262)	(6609, 92.880868)	(4032, 53.166402)	(3883, 37.619268)
	20	(13599, 194.824569)	(6768, 108.651844)	(3854, 59.337779)	(3883, 39.708514)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(13584, 68.083202)	(6208, 46.390997)	(4041, 37.020529)	(3455, 30.987662)
	5	(13534, 81.61071)	(6677, 54.475581)	(3832, 39.988916)	(3885, 32.167532)
	10	(13575, 119.566966)	(6752, 73.701732)	(3896, 44.986285)	(3831, 34.600187)
	15	(13599, 152.357478)	(6707, 87.71731)	(4003, 52.026007)	(4122, 37.404323)
	20	(13599, 194.678042)	(6609, 111.009044)	(4032, 58.400001)	(3885, 40.207563)
II	1	(13584, 39.784097)	(6208, 35.406014)	(4041, 33.207643)	(3155, 30.838721)
	2	(13534, 53.167858)	(6677, 40.995739)	(3832, 33.814285)	(3050, 29.701283)
	5	(13575, 73.246415)	(6752, 51.249537)	(3896, 37.390047)	(3634, 31.497672)
	10	(13599, 106.95152)	(6609, 68.252545)	(4032, 44.07337)	(3231, 34.835858)
	15	(13599, 141.721769)	(6823, 85.316382)	(4032, 49.657822)	(3667, 35.776236)
	20	(13599, 177.902717)	(6823, 102.361751)	(3837, 55.366453)	(3667, 38.565606)
IO	1	(1180, 36.660868)	(1394, 34.937324)	(2062, 34.445082)	(3162, 32.699253)
	2	(1475, 49.889538)	(1401, 41.541774)	(2236, 34.817455)	(2604, 31.520299)
	5	(1475, 69.707858)	(1732, 51.103882)	(2536, 39.362832)	(3156, 32.904191)
	10	(1579, 99.048102)	(1743, 67.193724)	(2516, 43.292258)	(3219, 33.990909)
	15	(1556, 137.172782)	(1855, 87.183607)	(2375, 50.947088)	(3754, 37.311674)
	20	(1556, 172.371989)	(1698, 104.317272)	(2593, 56.394751)	(3859, 39.280838)
NT	1	(1577, 47.474689)	(2267, 35.795039)	(2200, 31.486294)	(2080, 28.850227)
	2	(2078, 74.812402)	(2283, 47.830792)	(2509, 36.376688)	(2133, 30.553379)
	5	(2188, 141.600142)	(2510, 76.865257)	(2699, 48.753152)	(2611, 35.919703)
	10	(2188, 230.624679)	(2515, 122.091206)	(2866, 72.79768)	(2667, 50.070531)
	15	(2035, 248.787257)	(2583, 127.339392)	(2809, 69.564209)	(2794, 44.51512)
	20	(2038, 280.394172)	(2566, 143.537395)	(2907, 74.808112)	(2757, 47.333103)
NE	1	(329, 21.047036)	(438, 24.928693)	(300, 26.296863)	(176, 26.673974)
	2	(329, 28.007259)	(438, 28.143183)	(300, 27.413802)	(176, 27.1633)
	5	(329, 45.821058)	(438, 37.908263)	(300, 30.91087)	(176, 28.71001)
	10	(574, 78.649986)	(702, 54.212184)	(917, 37.518702)	(439, 31.280486)
	15	(329, 110.359272)	(438, 70.787691)	(300, 42.592056)	(176, 34.128857)
	20	(329, 139.094946)	(438, 88.008542)	(300, 48.424284)	(176, 36.65451)
RD	1	(0, 28.390049)	(1, 31.537561)	(116, 30.250711)	(72, 28.421338)
	2	(6, 34.359303)	(75, 34.768408)	(9, 31.355581)	(493, 28.907215)
	5	(7, 46.523486)	(82, 41.281639)	(557, 33.869331)	(983, 29.929439)
	10	(21, 86.319679)	(158, 62.431811)	(428, 40.812047)	(989, 33.312353)
	15	(22, 108.426765)	(197, 73.398591)	(418, 44.921136)	(1245, 35.22558)
	20	(37, 146.327001)	(333, 92.227997)	(849, 51.733232)	(1628, 37.525779)

Table 13. The full results of the main experiments on *gowalla*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
BM	1	(2156, 17.250765)	(4639, 34.457268)	(4558, 50.228279)	(3348, 62.148935)
	2	(2156, 28.167689)	(4639, 51.946555)	(4558, 68.217324)	(3348, 79.537184)
	5	(2169, 39.767643)	(4828, 70.161341)	(4815, 88.415418)	(3600, 95.969509)
	10	(2209, 59.279109)	(4991, 104.108203)	(5175, 122.547026)	(4051, 127.31719)
	15	(2169, 80.004062)	(4991, 136.618916)	(5372, 159.781998)	(4617, 160.744555)
	20	(2181, 101.828541)	(4991, 172.50932)	(5372, 199.099672)	(4652, 189.724944)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(2156, 28.096701)	(4639, 52.097043)	(4558, 68.635538)	(3348, 78.514117)
	5	(2169, 36.565866)	(4639, 64.364222)	(4720, 81.717093)	(3480, 90.34128)
	10	(2169, 59.696621)	(4656, 102.948816)	(5221, 121.257137)	(3851, 125.697294)
	15	(2209, 76.146773)	(4991, 129.479459)	(5175, 152.444814)	(3853, 152.075571)
	20	(2241, 99.555031)	(4991, 168.191196)	(5372, 196.499618)	(4051, 188.770842)
II	1	(2156, 15.817059)	(4639, 33.14413)	(4558, 48.953266)	(3348, 61.198515)
	2	(2169, 23.972167)	(4639, 45.983909)	(4720, 63.230449)	(3480, 73.074145)
	5	(2169, 36.35377)	(4656, 65.563888)	(5221, 84.586214)	(3851, 91.057811)
	10	(2241, 60.956302)	(4991, 98.907459)	(5372, 121.011317)	(4051, 122.64463)
	15	(2173, 77.744099)	(4991, 132.748716)	(5372, 158.346635)	(4652, 154.625164)
	20	(2340, 100.499021)	(4991, 168.338879)	(5372, 195.343929)	(4599, 185.53489)
IO	1	(585, 15.390641)	(1665, 33.078106)	(2011, 49.502759)	(2408, 62.065986)
	2	(588, 23.13957)	(1653, 44.773951)	(1850, 62.257377)	(2217, 73.81874)
	5	(584, 33.783655)	(1524, 62.245573)	(2022, 82.289333)	(2352, 91.868419)
	10	(574, 51.673385)	(1516, 90.121998)	(2173, 113.223071)	(2593, 119.825747)
	15	(580, 70.769903)	(1516, 121.838574)	(2169, 145.921236)	(2342, 150.819693)
	20	(582, 88.914154)	(1517, 149.250357)	(2095, 177.999262)	(2400, 180.99605)
NT	1	(476, 58.926643)	(1558, 64.954823)	(1915, 71.927896)	(1748, 77.397144)
	2	(545, 99.766209)	(1596, 101.376652)	(2067, 102.452668)	(2105, 100.385736)
	5	(589, 200.149661)	(1748, 191.729642)	(2353, 177.370222)	(2209, 159.370979)
	10	(589, 334.970778)	(1870, 319.254124)	(2590, 288.175274)	(2651, 250.22854)
	15	(603, 325.665102)	(1940, 317.799222)	(2678, 293.884366)	(2481, 256.016475)
	20	(607, 346.781807)	(1940, 349.985538)	(2790, 324.063543)	(2600, 285.047393)
NE	1	(309, 13.788904)	(216, 28.110017)	(190, 43.50338)	(113, 55.991149)
	2	(309, 17.40175)	(216, 33.555561)	(190, 49.712142)	(113, 62.696089)
	5	(309, 28.33458)	(216, 50.846547)	(190, 68.710448)	(113, 79.404135)
	10	(329, 47.057335)	(695, 79.058022)	(434, 102.175082)	(392, 108.591515)
	15	(309, 65.575881)	(216, 108.238793)	(190, 132.052858)	(113, 137.83236)
	20	(309, 83.175236)	(216, 137.192202)	(190, 163.539437)	(113, 166.78048)
RD	1	(0, 14.388134)	(0, 31.767857)	(0, 48.771893)	(20, 62.0023)
	2	(1, 18.149702)	(5, 37.393978)	(55, 55.114615)	(116, 67.78141)
	5	(2, 25.468295)	(12, 48.794362)	(66, 67.796522)	(26, 79.191418)
	10	(12, 47.65298)	(19, 85.499047)	(100, 108.456509)	(81, 115.707457)
	15	(13, 61.772505)	(46, 105.917868)	(104, 130.881632)	(270, 137.866356)
	20	(17, 84.348169)	(32, 140.406237)	(201, 168.625494)	(217, 172.471614)

Table 14. The full results of the main experiments on *twitter*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
BM	1	(5792, 32.22977)	(25273, 32.191346)	(12588, 38.239932)	(1068, 44.567476)
	2	(5406, 51.697749)	(25523, 48.436832)	(14172, 52.23859)	(993, 54.257068)
	5	(4919, 69.780089)	(25445, 66.888133)	(14820, 68.372353)	(1085, 66.340954)
	10	(6309, 105.836748)	(25574, 100.419997)	(14715, 101.620759)	(149189, 100.941726)
	15	(7288, 135.667083)	(25574, 132.941585)	(15129, 130.15164)	(149188, 124.15587)
	20	(7494, 170.204321)	(25672, 168.079383)	(17087, 165.087614)	(149176, 156.316675)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(5406, 51.869004)	(25523, 48.432708)	(14172, 52.378278)	(993, 54.443817)
	5	(6741, 64.559927)	(25445, 60.918173)	(15350, 63.883068)	(1507, 63.765601)
	10	(6986, 101.530793)	(26344, 98.349682)	(14347, 101.317042)	(148768, 99.605697)
	15	(6992, 129.077426)	(25586, 126.146423)	(14669, 129.259442)	(1929, 107.28004)
	20	(7047, 168.380577)	(25586, 166.89998)	(18161, 161.833963)	(2362, 134.152945)
II	1	(5792, 30.174098)	(25273, 31.20066)	(12588, 37.185525)	(1887, 43.346764)
	2	(5792, 43.317874)	(25453, 43.40582)	(14225, 48.705107)	(2014, 50.856149)
	5	(5948, 63.137128)	(25465, 64.157894)	(19593, 65.183179)	(1495, 65.033025)
	10	(6385, 96.344019)	(25398, 97.407013)	(22378, 99.228458)	(119139, 88.479309)
	15	(6380, 129.943815)	(25692, 133.076064)	(17087, 127.554944)	(1930, 110.292199)
	20	(7090, 162.720907)	(25684, 167.108386)	(14767, 158.833008)	(119139, 135.438184)
IO	1	(4675, 29.207645)	(8406, 31.45901)	(13057, 36.980751)	(1068, 43.652551)
	2	(3658, 41.505399)	(20216, 42.844049)	(13337, 47.190616)	(1611, 51.012466)
	5	(5096, 59.139864)	(20619, 61.069498)	(14106, 63.702171)	(148768, 69.591456)
	10	(5091, 88.221983)	(8406, 91.471204)	(15410, 90.407044)	(149176, 94.918306)
	15	(5087, 119.665234)	(20720, 121.399374)	(17017, 117.710842)	(149188, 121.505219)
	20	(5264, 150.64538)	(8406, 155.302002)	(16280, 146.199353)	(149190, 147.688692)
NT	1	(1347, 85.938826)	(2766, 75.619618)	(11628, 66.656098)	(0, 59.299755)
	2	(1347, 121.679605)	(1690, 86.804609)	(8219, 82.54612)	(930, 81.934731)
	5	(1447, 206.327432)	(3680, 135.998975)	(4050, 110.855094)	(743, 124.472368)
	10	(1706, 314.501682)	(6224, 243.396519)	(10790, 230.891864)	(710, 190.639052)
	15	(1992, 390.721497)	(6225, 302.550387)	(27415, 267.379108)	(1697, 203.172245)
	20	(2121, 417.767729)	(6225, 342.265757)	(10872, 291.925606)	(847, 224.827101)
NE	1	(18, 23.140345)	(1605, 30.113673)	(15, 35.068699)	(0, 41.998658)
	2	(18, 29.351086)	(1605, 36.695096)	(15, 40.527794)	(0, 47.790536)
	5	(18, 48.526995)	(1605, 54.255724)	(15, 56.555583)	(0, 60.634051)
	10	(649, 80.425189)	(2740, 84.403829)	(15, 82.86777)	(0, 83.096467)
	15	(18, 109.869827)	(1605, 114.536891)	(15, 109.623321)	(0, 105.489152)
	20	(18, 140.707342)	(1605, 148.581678)	(15, 137.350974)	(0, 127.577672)
RD	1	(0, 24.450804)	(1, 31.233218)	(-11, 36.223551)	(-48, 41.869068)
	2	(0, 30.485499)	(2, 37.26326)	(0, 41.262597)	(25, 45.953401)
	5	(0, 42.50117)	(2, 49.479786)	(0, 51.695204)	(0, 54.720054)
	10	(1, 80.653146)	(1, 85.758497)	(17, 84.920984)	(9, 82.029572)
	15	(0, 102.999965)	(4, 108.338868)	(111, 104.065065)	(62, 98.417199)
	20	(1, 139.453087)	(10, 146.111188)	(3, 135.508874)	(25, 124.279489)

Table 15. The full results of the main experiments on *stanford*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
BM	1	(34727, 96.815317)	(13903, 88.077645)	(7313, 79.695829)	(7933, 74.58187)
	2	(34727, 163.800204)	(13903, 101.660277)	(7358, 84.292301)	(8619, 75.905248)
	5	(35472, 210.667127)	(13712, 116.792159)	(7474, 90.294164)	(8364, 79.933056)
	10	(35483, 296.104172)	(13549, 141.735323)	(6773, 101.146874)	(9058, 85.75348)
	15	(35483, 379.843322)	(13549, 167.357328)	(6773, 112.453282)	(8655, 92.784557)
	20	(35483, 470.990498)	(13549, 193.362098)	(6773, 123.598105)	(8801, 99.734185)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(34727, 162.052522)	(13903, 101.409627)	(7358, 84.475508)	(8619, 75.585538)
	5	(35057, 196.236969)	(13650, 112.538271)	(6727, 89.331761)	(8552, 79.23621)
	10	(35472, 291.866031)	(13549, 141.026136)	(6823, 100.507107)	(8891, 85.741432)
	15	(35483, 363.928129)	(13549, 163.431182)	(6761, 110.469261)	(8861, 91.665476)
	20	(35483, 467.948006)	(13549, 193.633128)	(6773, 123.979598)	(8967, 99.959984)
II	1	(34727, 91.237944)	(13903, 86.955482)	(7313, 79.52332)	(7933, 74.978634)
	2	(35057, 126.056803)	(13650, 96.646623)	(7361, 82.315159)	(8332, 75.345899)
	5	(35472, 175.673164)	(13549, 111.462079)	(7773, 89.368702)	(8364, 78.324265)
	10	(35483, 259.633478)	(13549, 135.378938)	(7078, 100.353824)	(8260, 86.502816)
	15	(35483, 347.251763)	(13549, 164.680759)	(7212, 112.436771)	(8294, 92.507716)
	20	(35442, 437.978777)	(13549, 188.161939)	(7212, 123.091461)	(8625, 99.140762)
IO	1	(5661, 89.014214)	(7077, 84.894401)	(5199, 83.422277)	(8145, 75.072201)
	2	(5479, 121.469296)	(7999, 92.596306)	(5880, 82.015747)	(8581, 73.922073)
	5	(5502, 167.262149)	(8450, 107.182301)	(5533, 91.749191)	(8682, 78.988132)
	10	(5520, 246.015041)	(8261, 129.768289)	(5921, 98.238124)	(8921, 84.525209)
	15	(5796, 333.021418)	(8261, 154.97954)	(5878, 113.489638)	(9052, 91.156537)
	20	(5796, 413.023137)	(7483, 177.147368)	(6062, 121.723597)	(9059, 98.88832)
NT	1	(3382, 103.389162)	(5724, 79.779424)	(2916, 74.370836)	(5361, 71.278303)
	2	(3859, 151.221716)	(6139, 92.829653)	(3099, 79.956918)	(5771, 72.274644)
	5	(4147, 270.213349)	(7012, 123.380309)	(3480, 93.147245)	(5908, 79.698591)
	10	(4179, 466.206248)	(7186, 185.257056)	(4242, 127.623758)	(6223, 97.864621)
	15	(4418, 517.675057)	(7995, 189.778014)	(4095, 122.447309)	(6103, 93.907214)
	20	(4498, 597.433512)	(7995, 216.309984)	(4110, 133.193601)	(6092, 100.494656)
NE	1	(139, 63.555624)	(595, 70.558657)	(371, 69.325438)	(3312, 68.733193)
	2	(139, 79.795067)	(595, 73.237299)	(371, 71.77277)	(3312, 71.158174)
	5	(139, 127.806795)	(595, 87.703684)	(371, 78.094574)	(3312, 75.459431)
	10	(506, 208.08281)	(1191, 111.561699)	(814, 90.293125)	(4510, 81.541043)
	15	(139, 290.510849)	(595, 136.452374)	(371, 99.434331)	(3312, 86.7421)
	20	(139, 371.255455)	(595, 161.463131)	(371, 110.222559)	(3312, 96.512952)
RD	1	(0, 64.169277)	(31, 81.413712)	(11, 76.234492)	(0, 70.665266)
	2	(121, 79.942868)	(250, 85.861006)	(545, 78.40747)	(3264, 72.485616)
	5	(140, 112.099574)	(462, 95.675977)	(635, 82.484578)	(4441, 75.22764)
	10	(37, 210.442689)	(697, 126.084332)	(1648, 95.920044)	(4859, 86.439338)
	15	(208, 271.602123)	(727, 141.739601)	(1807, 103.595016)	(4414, 88.147885)
	20	(197, 367.440253)	(1038, 172.267636)	(1989, 116.029053)	(4467, 95.818715)

Table 16. The full results of the main experiments on *youtube*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).

algorithm	n_c	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
BM	1	(69841, 184.947758)	(15865, 109.131924)	(6154, 125.102625)	(1973, 116.184614)
	2	(69841, 269.715721)	(16639, 156.3468)	(6487, 148.578884)	(2187, 136.397296)
	5	(70392, 333.232194)	(17250, 188.865752)	(6246, 172.212999)	(2336, 159.929409)
	10	(70184, 447.916909)	(17482, 263.394664)	(6246, 217.438621)	(2347, 198.744257)
	15	(70184, 559.750126)	(17482, 321.388279)	(5906, 267.584617)	(2299, 226.794706)
	20	(70184, 681.211728)	(17482, 392.373696)	(4467, 312.21477)	(2357, 269.380681)
EQ	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	(69841, 270.361965)	(16639, 156.262437)	(6487, 149.014505)	(2187, 135.776025)
	5	(70289, 314.912242)	(17348, 175.188496)	(6508, 164.977351)	(2258, 150.627091)
	10	(69737, 444.372591)	(17482, 260.021884)	(6246, 215.380874)	(2342, 196.503726)
	15	(70184, 534.436413)	(17482, 310.851462)	(6246, 259.94217)	(2269, 222.622928)
	20	(70184, 670.27082)	(17482, 388.571692)	(5906, 317.5184)	(2257, 270.485292)
II	1	(69841, 179.602117)	(15865, 108.033626)	(6154, 124.044298)	(1973, 117.409596)
	2	(70289, 225.902993)	(16368, 134.849478)	(6237, 140.792145)	(1983, 132.427966)
	5	(69737, 285.287187)	(16158, 176.135094)	(6246, 169.299593)	(2217, 152.173485)
	10	(70184, 399.478906)	(16168, 246.115413)	(5906, 213.597636)	(2274, 193.611218)
	15	(70184, 526.861574)	(16216, 314.135171)	(4467, 258.704611)	(2329, 226.436015)
	20	(70184, 642.020926)	(16455, 375.499729)	(4620, 308.995176)	(2280, 262.455593)
IO	1	(2295, 115.656188)	(3453, 119.008855)	(3767, 112.720193)	(2021, 122.897098)
	2	(2208, 156.583749)	(3866, 141.172058)	(3597, 130.649717)	(2239, 140.72643)
	5	(1885, 217.510045)	(3806, 176.122573)	(3686, 156.575334)	(2248, 162.098473)
	10	(1710, 316.557355)	(3614, 232.498359)	(3711, 198.373934)	(2441, 194.604057)
	15	(818, 420.451756)	(3561, 293.285089)	(3590, 242.467404)	(2391, 232.632324)
	20	(710, 522.844322)	(3934, 349.380345)	(3640, 285.66923)	(2419, 267.734644)
NT	1	(3361, 154.290558)	(3616, 144.460126)	(2800, 137.186695)	(3539, 142.928956)
	2	(3271, 233.801483)	(3625, 188.470627)	(2784, 169.520057)	(3677, 168.023174)
	5	(3220, 439.065302)	(3811, 298.813281)	(3030, 251.15891)	(3874, 233.807214)
	10	(3494, 705.59448)	(3906, 473.593645)	(3109, 375.332806)	(3990, 342.674057)
	15	(3783, 804.524135)	(3967, 495.260585)	(3123, 389.246175)	(4078, 351.200492)
	20	(4008, 915.755914)	(4093, 554.369119)	(3147, 429.889279)	(4118, 386.540142)
NE	1	(682, 86.673368)	(648, 101.997978)	(1405, 109.180708)	(1452, 118.312682)
	2	(682, 106.525254)	(648, 118.811623)	(1405, 117.111967)	(1452, 125.247142)
	5	(682, 167.174618)	(648, 152.96458)	(1405, 142.058964)	(1452, 146.397903)
	10	(1344, 267.953063)	(947, 215.08867)	(1510, 181.730074)	(1819, 179.622152)
	15	(682, 371.214326)	(648, 279.089291)	(1405, 224.449483)	(1452, 216.560952)
	20	(682, 470.687674)	(648, 343.055558)	(1405, 265.112105)	(1452, 250.082739)
RD	1	(23, 89.965633)	(16, 102.005447)	(121, 112.442735)	(155, 122.04761)
	2	(51, 109.182972)	(366, 116.9455)	(966, 124.456227)	(779, 130.313734)
	5	(119, 150.46222)	(453, 142.383985)	(936, 139.941693)	(1387, 145.472471)
	10	(105, 275.956563)	(971, 226.873622)	(1564, 196.010391)	(1854, 196.772464)
	15	(159, 353.856702)	(996, 262.244178)	(1770, 232.126078)	(2292, 219.906269)
	20	(137, 469.818807)	(1264, 337.926391)	(2056, 290.098063)	(2632, 265.957037)

Table 17. The full results of the main experiments on *wikitalk*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, and each n_c, we report the performance (left) and the running time (right).



Fig. 1. The full results of the sampling experiments on *email*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 2. The full results of the sampling experiments on *facebook*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 3. The full results of the sampling experiments on *brightkite*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 4. The full results of the sampling experiments on *enron*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 5. The full results of the sampling experiments on *hepph*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 6. The full results of the sampling experiments on *epinions*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 7. The full results of the sampling experiments on *relato*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 8. The full results of the sampling experiments on *slashdot*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 9. The full results of the sampling experiments on *syracuse*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 10. The full results of the sampling experiments on *gowalla*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 11. The full results of the sampling experiments on *twitter*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 12. The full results of the sampling experiments on *stanford*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 13. The full results of the sampling experiments on *youtube*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.



Fig. 14. The full results of the sampling experiments on *wikitalk*. For each considered k value and each case, we report the best performance among the first x sampled mergers.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	21	150	331	255
		IN	21	150	331	255
		RD	18.7	97.0	289.3	255.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	21	150	196	255
		NN	21	27	195	0
		RD	7.0	39.3	124.0	133.0
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	46	192	385	227
		IN	47	200	381	227
		RD	27.7	127.3	320.7	227.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	30	175	255	227
		AE	18	150	291	206
		RD	14.0	78.0	181.7	129.0

Table 18. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *email*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	12	128	142	227
		IN	5	93	54	61
		RD	8.3	100.0	105.0	188.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	12	128	128	165
		NN	0	16	29	151
		RD	3.0	7.0	48.7	85.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	21	100	151	171
		IN	7	17	24	18
		RD	12.3	73.7	92.3	116.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	17	46	151	169
		AE	15	74	50	72
		RD	7.0	22.3	36.0	14.3

Table 19. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *facebook*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	79	100	204	195
		IN	79	100	126	151
		RD	34.0	77.0	181.7	150.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	79	72	204	150
		NN	62	24	76	88
		RD	38.7	34.7	36.3	72.3
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	452	161	238	181
		IN	452	161	72	37
		RD	54.0	81.7	159.3	113.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	452	161	136	71
		AE	452	161	136	58
		RD	130.3	51.3	36.3	85.0

Table 20. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *brightkite*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	104	145	461	1058
		IN	104	149	456	1058
		RD	13.3	126.0	413.0	971.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	104	122	364	806
		NN	10	82	101	666
		RD	10.7	53.3	162.7	659.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	139	315	445	1224
		IN	97	315	429	1224
		RD	10.3	131.0	348.7	992.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	139	315	330	1115
		AE	57	315	330	1115
		RD	59.0	128.7	215.0	606.3

Table 21. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *enron*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	71	441	409	430
		IN	73	441	409	430
		RD	30.0	272.0	321.3	428.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	71	441	409	430
		NN	19	61	23	0
		RD	10.7	182.0	15.7	198.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	267	531	328	407
		IN	227	556	231	115
		RD	34.0	156.7	219.7	399.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	267	531	312	108
		AE	267	531	328	115
		RD	22.3	108.0	22.3	21.0

Table 22. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *hepph*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	102	550	770	1069
		IN	102	550	770	1205
		RD	45.0	385.3	705.7	1081.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	102	550	770	1054
		NN	49	243	457	445
		RD	39.3	237.3	417.0	487.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	1177	1113	1105	1067
		IN	1177	1113	1129	914
		RD	117.7	543.3	725.7	858.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	1177	1113	1105	958
		AE	1093	1113	1105	841
		RD	333.0	585.7	590.7	778.0

Table 23. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *epinions*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	62	115	246	260
		IN	62	115	246	311
		RD	28.3	82.0	185.3	264.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	59	89	246	186
		NN	20	57	90	165
		RD	33.3	76.0	81.0	113.3
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	265	259	255	236
		IN	265	248	410	287
		RD	29.0	123.3	228.7	241.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	265	259	244	236
		AE	224	259	196	236
		RD	79.7	68.7	107.3	83.0

Table 24. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *relato*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	621	171	192	154
		IN	621	179	189	154
		RD	329.3	166.0	176.3	142.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	621	150	185	135
		NN	237	89	171	83
		RD	201.0	64.0	81.3	81.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	2737	186	233	136
		IN	2737	177	233	151
		RD	495.7	136.3	173.3	124.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	2737	186	136	124
		AE	2737	153	233	136
		RD	918.3	65.7	120.3	68.7

Table 25. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *slashdot*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	67	259	287	859
		IN	67	259	287	722
		RD	32.7	171.3	212.0	790.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	67	240	249	859
		NN	57	259	249	216
		RD	11.3	65.3	72.7	72.0
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	525	973	634	809
		IN	525	973	634	414
		RD	60.0	226.0	231.7	400.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	525	973	463	709
		AE	525	973	634	414
		RD	98.3	382.3	129.0	231.7

Table 26. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *syracuse*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	334	496	376	757
		IN	334	496	470	757
		RD	28.0	147.0	297.3	735.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	334	427	376	757
		NN	63	161	270	593
		RD	42.7	133.3	219.7	233.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	2802	853	601	779
		IN	2802	853	601	676
		RD	28.3	144.0	319.3	574.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	2802	810	601	529
		AE	2802	853	437	529
		RD	460.7	399.0	207.0	273.7

Table 27. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *gowalla*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	214	345	443	540
		IN	214	345	520	483
		RD	12.0	84.7	193.0	340.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	214	345	306	327
		NN	147	251	197	167
		RD	18.3	84.0	147.7	113.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	632	955	815	787
		IN	632	955	815	787
		RD	12.0	62.7	146.7	280.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	632	955	815	414
		AE	632	955	815	414
		RD	62.0	332.3	355.3	315.7

Table 28. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *twitter*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k=5$	$k=10$	$k=15$	$k=20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	1212	1853	4036	704
		IN	423	1853	4036	676
		RD	680.3	1363.7	2435.3	260.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	1212	1853	4036	704
		NN	0	1165	0	0
		RD	344.3	215.7	462.7	215.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	2407	4879	4054	648
		IN	1454	2868	4054	144
		RD	244.7	896.0	607.7	55.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	2407	4879	4054	59
		AE	1826	2868	4054	14
		RD	317.3	1355.0	40.7	0.0

Table 29. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *stanford*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	854	995	973	2964
		IN	854	995	887	2964
		RD	394.7	669.0	942.7	2929.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	854	995	973	2809
		NN	54	512	724	1902
		RD	185.3	395.7	430.0	2151.3
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	5363	2145	952	2853
		IN	5363	2145	821	2853
		RD	239.0	688.0	808.7	2771.0
	pair-heuristics	SE	5363	2145	952	2813
		AE	4447	2137	949	2813
		RD	923.7	814.3	458.7	1677.0

Table 30. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *youtube*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.

IOMs/IIMs	nodes/pairs	heuristic	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
IOMs	node-heuristics	IP	778	1595	930	344
		IN	778	1595	930	687
		RD	84.0	701.7	553.0	551.7
	pair-heuristics	SE	117	1595	930	317
		NN	73	118	194	287
		RD	207.3	193.0	166.3	221.7
IIMs	node-heuristics	IP	30577	2687	1025	287
		IN	30577	2121	1144	954
		RD	121.0	687.3	555.0	615.3
	pair-heuristics	SE	30577	2687	1025	214
		AE	30577	1570	1025	210
		RD	2892.0	1123.0	204.3	204.7

Table 31. The full results of the heuristics experiments on *wikitalk*. For each algorithm, each considered k value, we report the performance of each considered node-heuristic and pair-heuristic.