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What is structure?

Structure is that which...

makes data different from noise: makes a network different from a random graph, or from a null model

helps us compress the data: describe the network succinctly, giving a human-readable summary of important structures

helps us generalize from data we’ve seen from data we haven’t seen: e.g. predict missing links from the links we know about

helps us understand what multiple networks have in common: e.g. structure of food webs, from the Cambrian to today

helps us coarse-grain the dynamics, reducing the number of variables: e.g. compartmentalized models in epidemiology
The Bayesian approach

Imagine that the network is created by a *generative model*, and fit the parameters of this model to the data.

We can gracefully incorporate partial information: e.g. if

- attributes of some nodes are known, or known with some confidence
- some links are known, others not observed yet (e.g. food webs)
- some links might be false positives (e.g. gene regulatory networks, protein interactions)

Use the inferred model to generalize from what we do know to what we don’t: label unknown nodes, predict missing links, mark false positives.
Statistical inference

imagine that our graph $G$ is drawn from an ensemble, or “generative model”: some probability distribution $P(G|\theta)$ with parameters $\theta$

$\theta$ can be continuous or discrete: represents the structure of the graph, properties of nodes and edges, etc.

maximum likelihood: given $G$, find the $\theta$ that maximizes $P(G|\theta)$

Bayes: compute, or sample from, the posterior distribution $P(\theta|G)$

if $G$ is partly known, we can infer $\theta$ and use $P(G|\theta)$ to generate the rest of $G$: e.g. infer $\theta$ from known links, and predict missing links

if some parts of $\theta$ are known, can constrain the search and infer the rest of $\theta$: e.g. if we know attributes of some nodes, can guess attributes of others
The Erdős-Renyí model

every pair of vertices $i, j$ is connected independently with the same probability $p$
degree distribution is Poisson with mean $d=np$
if $d < 1$, almost all components are trees, and max component has size $O(\log n)$
if $d > 1$, a unique giant component appears
at $d = \ln n$, completely connected
ring + Erdős-Renyí = Watts-Strogatz
but still pretends all nodes are the same...
The stochastic block model

nodes have discrete attributes: \( k \) types of nodes

each node \( i \) has type \( t_i \in \{1,\ldots,k\} \), with prior distribution \( q_1,\ldots,q_k \)

\( k \times k \) matrix \( p \) of connection probabilities

if \( t_i = r \) and \( t_j = s \), there is a link \( i \rightarrow j \) with probability \( p_{rs} \)

\( p \) is not necessarily symmetric, and we don’t assume that \( p_{rr} > p_{rs} \)

given a graph \( G \), we want to simultaneously...

  label the nodes, i.e., infer the type assignment \( t : V \rightarrow \{1,\ldots,k\} \)

  learn how types affect link probabilities, i.e., infer the matrix \( p \)

how do we get off the ground?
Assortative and disassortative

- functional groups, not just clumps
- food webs: predators and prey
- economics: suppliers and customers
- word adjacencies: adjectives and nouns
- social: leaders and followers
The likelihood

the probability of $G$ given the types $t$ and parameters $\theta=(p,q)$ is a product

$$P(G \mid t, \theta) = \prod_{(i,j) \in E} p_{t_i,t_j} \prod_{(i,j) \notin E} (1 - p_{t_i,t_j})$$

so (after normalizing) the probability of $t$ given $G$ is

$$P(t \mid G, \theta) = \frac{P(t \mid \theta) P(G \mid t, \theta)}{\sum_{t' \in \{1, \ldots, k\}^n} P(G \mid t', \theta)}$$

$$\propto \prod_{i \in V} q_{t_i} \prod_{(i,j) \in E} p_{t_i,t_j} \prod_{(i,j) \notin E} (1 - p_{t_i,t_j})$$
A little statistical physics

the Boltzmann distribution: thermal equilibrium at temperature $T=1/\beta$

each state $t$ is a set of “spins”, or labels in our case

if a state $t$ has energy $E(t)$, then its probability is proportional to

$$P(t) \propto e^{-\beta E(t)}$$

so (with $\beta = 1$) the “energy” of a state in the block model is

$$E(t) = -\log P(G \mid t, \theta) = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \log p_{t_i,t_j} + \sum_{(i,j) \notin E} \log(1 - p_{t_i,t_j})$$

like an Ising or Potts model (except non-neighbors also interact, since non-edges are informative)
Ground states vs. free energy

the most likely group assignment is a ground state: it maximizes

$$P(G|t, \theta)$$

and \(-\log P(G|t, \theta)\) is the ground state energy

one approach: find the \(\theta=(p,q)\) that minimizes the ground state energy, i.e., maximize \(P(G|t, \theta)\) as a function of \(t\) and \(\theta\)

but this overfits! good ground states even when there no real communities

for instance, random 3-regular graphs have bisections with only about 15% of the edges crossing from one side to the other

there are communities in the graph but not the model

[Preview: it can be the other way around too!]
Ground states vs. free energy

better to use the total probability of $G$ given $\theta$, summed over all $k^n$ labelings of the vertices:

$$P(G | \theta) = \sum_{t \in \{1,...,k\}^n} P(G, t | \theta)$$

$$= \sum_{t \in \{1,...,k\}^n} P(G | t, \theta) P(t | \theta)$$

this is a partition function, and $-\log P(G|\theta)$ is a free energy

goal: find $\theta=(p,q)$ that minimizes the free energy, i.e., maximizes $P(G|\theta)$
Expectation-Maximization

Gradient ascent (or descent) in parameter space

(E step) given the current $\theta=(p,q)$, estimate one- and two-point marginals of the Gibbs distribution

(M step) update $\theta=(p,q)$ to their most likely values

$$
\mu_r^i = \Pr[t_i = r] \quad \mu_{rs}^{ij} = \Pr[t_i = r \text{ and } t_j = s]
$$

$$
q_r = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \mu_r^i \quad p_{rs} = \frac{\sum_{(i,j) \in E} \mu_{rs}^{ij}}{q_r q_s N^2}
$$
Classifying words with a ground state:
I record that I was born on a Friday
Classifying (softly) by Gibbs sampling: The Karate Club

instructor

president
Method #1:
Markov Chain Monte Carlo

computing $P(t|G, \theta)$ is hard, but it’s a product of local terms

can compute ratios between $P(t|G, \theta)$ and $P(t´ | G, \theta)$ if $t$ and $t´$ differ at one node

heat-bath dynamics: choose a random node $v$, fix types of all other nodes, update $v$’s type according to its marginal distribution

pretty good for finding ground states, but can get stuck in local optima

can speed up by introducing a temperature parameter:

  simulated annealing
  population annealing
  parallel tempering

but there’s no free lunch
Method #2: Belief propagation (a.k.a. the cavity method)

Each node $i$ sends a “message” to each of its neighbors $j$, giving $i$’s marginal distribution based on its other neighbors $k$

denote this message $\mu_{r \rightarrow j} = \text{estimate of Pr}[t_i = r]$ if $j$ were absent

How do we update it?
Updating the beliefs

$$\mu_{s \rightarrow j}^i = \frac{1}{Z_{i \rightarrow j}} q_s \prod_{k \neq j} \sum_{(i,k) \in E} \mu_{r}^{k \rightarrow i} p_{rs} \times \prod_{k \neq j} \sum_{(i,k) \notin E} \mu_{r}^{k \rightarrow i}(1 - p_{rs})$$

a complete graph of messages—takes $O(n^2)$ time to update

can simplify by assuming that $\mu_{r}^{k \rightarrow i} = \mu_{r}^{k}$ for all non-neighbors $i$

each node $k$ applies an “external field” $\sum_{r} \mu_{r}^{k}(1 - p_{rs})$ to all vertices of type $s$
Making belief propagation scalable

\[
\mu_{s \to j} = \frac{1}{Z_{i \to j}} q_s \prod_{k \neq j} \sum_{(i,k) \in E} \mu_{r}^{k \to i} p_{rs} \times \prod_{k \neq j} \sum_{i,k \notin E} \frac{\mu_{r}^{k}(1-p_{rs})}{\mu_{r}^{k}(1-p_{rs})}
\]

each update now takes $O(n+m)$ time: scalable!

update until the messages reach a fixed point

like Monte Carlo, can get stuck: try different initial messages
BP converges in a small number of iterations on many networks: finite correlation length

[Decelle, Krzakala, Moore, Zdeborová, PRL 2011]
Belief propagation: scalability, learning, marginals, free energy

total running time is nearly linear: can handle millions of nodes on a laptop

for each setting of the parameters $\theta$, can compute the Bethe free energy: a good approximation even for graphs with loops

can explore free energy landscape as a function of $\theta$

Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm: find $\theta$ that maximizes $P(G|\theta)$ (minimizes free energy)

returns marginals, i.e. soft clustering, and two-point correlations
A phase transition: detectable to undetectable communities

A phase transition: detectable to undetectable communities

when the rows of $p_{ij}$ are different enough, BP can recover the communities

but there is a transition where it can’t — and no algorithm can!

the ensemble of graphs “knows” the communities, but a typical graph doesn’t

[Decelle, Krzakala, Moore, Zdeborová, PRL 2011; Mossel, Neeman, Sly 2012]
What kind of community do you want?

different models give different answers for the communities

we can compare each one to “ground truth” and judge its accuracy...

...or embrace the fact that they are sensitive to different kinds of structure
The Karate Club again: Leaders vs. followers
The Karate Club again:
Two factions
Two local optima in free energy

![Graph showing two local optima in free energy with labels for left/right and high/low groups.](image)
Degree-corrected block models

the “vanilla” block model expects vertices of the same type to have roughly the same degree:

account for “intrinsic” degree, or popularity, of nodes [Karrer & Newman, 2010] each node $i$ has an expected degree $d_i$

for nodes $i, j$ of types $r, s$, number of edges $A_{ij}$ is Poisson-distributed:

$$A_{ij} \sim \text{Poi}(d_i d_j w_{rs})$$

now the degrees are parameters, not data to be explained

can again write down the BP equations, and use them in an EM algorithm
Blogs: vanilla block model

As pointed out also by other authors [11, 30], the non-degree-corrected block-model fails to split the network into the known factions (indicated by the dashed line in the figure), instead splitting it into a group composed of high-degree vertices and another of low. The degree-corrected model, on the other hand, splits the vertices according to the known communities, except for the misidentification of one vertex on the boundary of the two groups. (The same vertex is also misplaced by a number of other commonly used community detection algorithms.)

The failure of the uncorrected model in this context is precisely because it does not take the degree sequence into account. The a priori probability of an edge between two vertices varies as the product of their degrees, a variation that can be fit by the uncorrected blockmodel if we divide the network into high- and low-degree groups. Given that we have only one set of groups to assign, however, we are obliged to choose between this fit and the true community structure. In the present case it turns out that the division into high and low degrees gives the higher likelihood and so it is this division that the algorithm returns. In the degree-corrected blockmodel, by contrast, the variation of edge probability with degree is already included in the functional form of the likelihood, which frees up the block structure for fitting to the true communities.

Moreover it is apparent that this behavior is not limited to the case $K=2$. For $K=3$, the ordinary stochastic blockmodel will, for sufficiently heterogeneous degrees, be biased towards splitting into three groups by degree—high, medium, and low—and similarly for higher values of $K$. It is of course possible that the true community structure itself corresponds entirely or mainly to groups of high and low degree, but we only want our model to find this structure if it is still statistically surprising once we know about the degree sequence, and this is precisely what the corrected model does.

As a second real-world example we show in Fig. 2 an application to a network of political blogs assembled by Adamic and Glance [31]. This network is composed of blogs (i.e., personal or group web diaries) about US politics and the web links between them, as captured on a single day in 2005. The blogs have known political leanings and were labeled by Adamic and Glance as either liberal or conservative in the data set. We consider the network in undirected form and examine only the largest connected component, which has 1222 vertices. Figure 2 shows that, as with the karate club, the uncorrected stochastic blockmodel splits the vertices into high- and low-degree groups, while the degree-corrected model finds a split more aligned with the political division of the network. While not matching the known labeling exactly, the split generated by the degree-corrected model has a normalized mutual information of 0.72 with the labeling of Adamic and Glance, compared with 0.0001 for the uncorrected model.

(a) Without degree-correction
(b) With degree-correction

FIG. 2: Divisions of the political blog network found using the (a) uncorrected and (b) corrected blockmodels. The size of a vertex is proportional to its degree and vertex color reflects inferred group membership. The division in (b) corresponds roughly to the division between liberal and conservative blogs given in [31].

(To make sure that these results were not due to a failure of the heuristic optimization scheme, we also checked that the group assignments found by the heuristic have a higher objective score than the known group assignments, and that using the known assignments as the initial condition for the optimization recovers the same group assignments as found with random initial conditions.)

B. Generation of synthetic networks

We turn now to synthetic networks. The networks we use are themselves generated from the degree-corrected [Karrer & Newman, 2010]
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B. Generation of synthetic networks

We turn now to synthetic networks. The networks we use are themselves generated from the degree-corrected blockmodel [Karrer & Newman, 2010].
when the “vanilla” stochastic block model disagrees with the degree-corrected one, which one should we use?

the vanilla model is a special case of the degree-corrected model, so the degree-corrected model always gets a better fit (higher likelihood)

but is this just overfitting? are the extra parameters worth it?
Likelihood-based hypothesis testing

when the “vanilla” stochastic block model disagrees with the degree-corrected one, which one should we use?

likelihood ratio test: how large is

$$\frac{\max_{\theta} P_{DC}(G|\theta)}{\max_{\theta} P_{SBM}(G|\theta)}$$

log is difference between two free energies

Q: how large does the difference need to be to justify the fancy model?

A: larger than it would be if $G$ were actually generated by the simple model (with a small $p$-value)

only then can we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., the simple model
Beyond $\chi^2$ and the AIC

classical result: if the fancy model has $n$ more parameters, the log-likelihood ratio follows a $\chi^2$ distribution, with mean $n/2$

but this relies on a “large data limit”: assumption that the likelihood, and posterior distribution of parameters, has a Gaussian peak

holds for i.i.d. data, but network data is highly correlated

in the degree-corrected model, degree of each node $v$ is Poisson with mean $\mu_v$
and we get just one observation of this Poisson

if $G$ is dense and $\mu_v$ is large, the Poisson distribution looks Gaussian; but for sparse networks, it has a different shape

do the math!
overwhelming evidence for the blog network; for the Karate Club, less so

[Yan, Jensen, Krzakala, Moore, Shalizi, Zdeborová, Zhang, Zhu 2012]
Dealing with uncertainty #1:
predicting missing links

for many networks, links are discovered one at a time, using difficult work and limited resources in the field or laboratory

given the links observed so far, can we predict missing links?

if there are spurious edges (false positives), can we identify them?

test the algorithm by hiding a random subset of edges from it, and ask it to rank possible missing links according to probability

can use the accuracy of prediction as another method of model selection

let’s try a particular model...
Clustering: one level
Hierarchy: many levels
A probabilistic model

probability $p_i$
Likelihood

For each internal node $i$, let

$L_i$ and $R_i = \#$ of descendants

$E_i = \#$ of edges between them

Likelihood these edges exist, and not others, is

$$\mathcal{L}_i = p_i^{E_i} (1 - p_i)^{L_i R_i - E_i}$$

Overall likelihood is a product: $\mathcal{L}(T) = \prod \mathcal{L}_i$
Maximum likelihood trees

\[ \mathcal{L} = \left( \frac{1}{9} \right) \left( \frac{8}{9} \right)^8 \]

= 0.0433

\[ \mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \left( \frac{1}{3} \right) \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \left( \frac{2}{8} \right)^2 \left( \frac{6}{8} \right)^6 \end{bmatrix} \]

= 0.0016

Wednesday, April 3, 2013
A Markov chain that explores the space of trees

update the tree $T$ with rotations, like in balanced tree data structures

Metropolis Monte Carlo: move with probability 1 if $\Delta \log \mathcal{L} \geq 0$ and probability $\exp(\Delta \ln \mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{new}} / \mathcal{L}_{\text{old}}$ otherwise

Functional roles in a food web

Grassland species

herbivore

plant

parasite
Functional roles in a food web
Predicting missing links: comparison with simple heuristics

AUC: probably a random true positive is ranked above a random true negative
Dealing with uncertainty #2: active learning of hidden node attributes

suppose we can learn a node’s attributes, but at a cost

we want to make good guesses about most of the nodes, after querying just a few of them — but which ones?

query the node with the largest *mutual information* between it and the others:

\[
I(v, G - v) = H(v) - H(v | G - v) \\
= H(G - v) - H(G - v | v)
\]

average amount of information we learn about \( G - v \) we learn by querying \( v \)

high when we’re uncertain about \( v \), and when \( v \) is highly correlated with others

[Moore, Yan, Zhu, Rouquier, Lane KDD 2011]
Learning factions in the Karate Club

% vertices above thresholds

# of nodes queried

- 0.1
- 0.3
- 0.5
- 0.7
- 0.9
Which vertices do we query first?
An antarctic food web

% vertices above thresholds vs. # of nodes queried

Legend:
- 0.1
- 0.3
- 0.5
- 0.7
- 0.9

"unknown unknowns"
The story so far

Statistical inference using generative models of networks lets us detect communities, classify nodes, and predict missing links.

Functional groups of nodes, not just assortative “clumps”

Belief propagation and expectation-maximization algorithms let us identify these groups, and learn model parameters, often in linear time: scalable!

We can elaborate these models by adding discrete or continuous attributes: degree distributions, edge types, social status or niche positions, overlapping communities, hierarchy, signed edges, document content...

For instance, we can classify documents using their content and the links between them better than with content or links alone [Zhu, Yan, Getoor, Moore]

But a cautionary note...
A real cascade of line and generator failures

Sequence of outages in Western blackout, July 2 1996

from NERC 1996 blackout report
Rich dynamics of coupled, nonlinear oscillators

Sequence of Events

Measurement at BPA Dittmer Control Center
Vancouver, WA

15:42:03
Keeler-Allston line trips

0.270 Hz, 7.0% damping (noise estimate)

0.264 Hz, 3.46% damping (transient)

0.260 Hz, 3.46% damping (transient)

0.252 Hz, 1.2% damping (noise estimate)

15:47:36
Ross-Lexington line trips/McNary generation drops off

15:48:51
Out-of-Step separation

Reference time = 15:35:30 PDT

Malin-Round Mountain #1 MW 0.270 Hz, 7.0% damping (noise estimate)

0.264 Hz, 3.46% damping (transient)

0.260 Hz, 3.46% damping (transient)

0.252 Hz, 1.2% damping (noise estimate)

(see detail)

Time in Seconds since 10-Aug-1996 22:35:30.000
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Beyond topology

We need a new network theory that doesn’t focus on topology alone

Nodes and edges have rich attributes:

- power grid: generators have nonlinear dynamics at many time scales, transmission lines have capacities, users have fluctuating demands...

- cybersecurity: multiple types of links between computers (web fetches, SSH links) with timing, duration, packet size... and many links are unique

- food webs: species have populations, links have nutrient flows....

- dynamic response to climate change, species loss, invasive species

Networks are rich, dynamic data sets, not just lists of nodes and edges

Extending Bayesian inference to richer data is possible, but challenging

We need to be agnostic about what types of structure are important
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