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Interactions as networks

• Many types of interactions can be represented as large networks
  • Friendships between people, protein interactions, web pages...
  • Missing data and imprecise relationships
  • Nodes and edges are often unlabeled

• Networks have often some type of structure
  • Dense groups of nodes
  • Number of links between nodes (degree) varies
Problem setting

• How to find the underlying factors which can explain network structure for a single, unlabeled, large graph?

• Some previous approaches
  • Community detection (Newman & Girvan 2004)
  • Machine learning (Airoldi et al. 2006, Handcock et al. 2007)

• Our approach
  • A latent component model
  • Generative model for constructing edges in graphs
  • Optimized with collapsed Gibbs sampling
  • Usable on networks with millions of nodes

Example of structure

- A collaboration network of jazz musicians\textsuperscript{1} has community structure

Generative modeling

- A generative model can generate samples of the data it represents from a set of parameters
  - “Cooking recipe”
- Models are often hierarchical
- Bayesian methods can be used to infer model parameters from a sample
Latent component model

- Each node belongs to a number of latent components
  - Mixture of components

- Generative model, for each edge:
  - A component is selected based on the component probabilities
  - Edge endpoints are selected based on the probability of the endpoint in the component

- Probabilities for components and nodes in components are drawn from Dirichlet distributions
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Parameter inference
Infinite mixture

• A crucial feature in latent component models is to learn the number of components required
  • Can be achieved by using a Dirichlet process (DP)
• DP corresponds to Dirichlet distribution with infinite components
  • In practice, leads to a finite number of components
• Estimates the amount of components from data
  • However, hyperparameter ($\alpha$) remains
Generative process

• Full generative process for the infinite component model:

1. Draw $\theta$ from $DP(\alpha)$

2. For each component $z$ in $C$ components:
   (a) Draw $m_z$ from $Dir(\beta)$

3. For each of $L$ edges:
   (a) Draw a latent component $z$ from $\theta$
   (b) Draw first end point $n_i$ from $m_z$
   (c) Draw second end point $n_j$ from $m_z$
Inferring components

- From the full model and its joint distribution, latent components can be found using Bayesian inference
  - A form of unsupervised learning
- Because of the Dirichlet priors, the inference is tractable and can be easy to compute
- Components can be found with EM optimization or full MCMC inference
  - EM seems to converge to bad local minima
  - Gibbs sampling, a form of MCMC, gives better results
- An effective implementation with collapsed Gibbs sampling
  - Latent variables marginalized away, only counts remain!
Joint distribution

- The joint probability distribution for the infinite mixture model:

\[ p_{DP}(L, Z, m|\alpha, \beta) = p(L|Z, m) \times p(m|\beta) \times p(Z|\alpha) \]

\[ = \prod_{iz} m_{zi}^{k_{zi}} \times \prod_{iz} m_{zi}^{\beta - 1} \times \frac{2E!\alpha^C}{C!\alpha_{2N} \prod_z n_z} \]

\[ \alpha_{2N} = \alpha(\alpha + 1) \ldots (\alpha + 2N - 1) \]
Conditional probability

- Sampling implemented with Gibbs sampler
- Conditional probability for each edge conditioned on all the other edges
  - Unknown parameters marginalized away
- Component probabilities for the left out edge:
  \[
p(z|i,j) = \frac{k_{zi} + \beta}{2n_z + 1 + M\beta} \times \frac{k_{zj} + \beta}{2n_z + M\beta} \times \frac{C(n_z, \alpha)}{N + K\alpha}
\]

\[
C(n_z, \alpha) = n_z \text{ if } n_z \neq 0 \text{ and } C(0, \alpha) = \alpha
\]

- In every iteration, a component is sampled for each edge based on the conditional probabilities
Example 1: Football network

- The football network\(^1\) depicts American college football games during fall season 2000
  - 115 nodes (teams) and 613 edges (games)
  - A standard test data for clustering networks
  - Known community structure (clustering), teams belong to different conferences

Data at: http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/netdata/
Football result

- Colors represent clusters
- Blue background represents the correct clustering into conferences
Example 2: Last.fm

- A large friendship network of 675,681 Last.fm users
  - Crawled via Last.fm web services during March and April 2007
  - Mutual links between all users
  - Subset: 147,610 users claiming to be from the US

- For each user: demographics (age, country, sex) and music taste (artists)

- In addition, tags for over 188,565 artists were crawled
Last.fm result

- Eight components found (columns A-H)
- The music tags occur often in some specific components (rows)
- Inference took slightly less than 4 hours
Conclusion

- Algorithm performs well at clustering networks
  - Can find both local structure (clusters) and diffuse global traits (latent dimensions)
- Method is computationally efficient
  - However, suboptimal hierarchical clustering methods are even faster
  - Provides information on the confidence of the clustering results
- Choice of constant parameters for the model (hyperparameters) may be hard
Future work

1. Further validation of algorithm
   • Perform comparisons with machine learning methods and community extraction algorithms
   • More detailed analysis of the algorithm as a predictor for node traits

2. Method development
   • Include more information about network structure into the model, such as weights, user traits, directed links
   • Model architecture
   • Distributional assumptions

3. Improvement of performance
   • Parallel implementation of sampling