Metrics for Community Analysis: A Survey

Tanmoy Chakraborty, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
Ayushi Dalmia, International Institute of Information Technology, Hyderabad, India
Animesh Mukherjee, Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, India
Niloy Ganguly, Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, India

arXiv:1604.03512v1 [cs.SI] 12 Apr 2016

Detecting and analyzing dense groups or *communities* from social and information networks has attracted immense attention over last one decade due to its enormous applicability in different domains. Community detection is an *ill-defined problem*, as the nature of the communities is not known in advance. The problem has turned out to be even complicated due to the fact that communities emerge in the network in various forms – disjoint, overlapping, hierarchical etc. Various heuristics have been proposed depending upon the application in hand. All these heuristics have been materialized in the form of new *metrics*, which in most cases are used as optimization functions for detecting the community structure, or provide an indication of the goodness of detected communities during evaluation. There arises a need for an organized and detailed survey of the metrics proposed with respect to community detection and evaluation. In this survey, we present a comprehensive and structured overview of the start-of-the-art metrics used for the detection and the evaluation of community structure. We also conduct experiments on synthetic and real-world networks to present a comparative analysis of these metrics in measuring the goodness of the underlying community structure.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: I.5.3 [**Clustering**]: Algorithms

General Terms: Design, Algorithms, Performance

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Metrics, community discovery, community evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

Community structure of networks has attracted a great deal of attention of the researchers in computer science, especially in the areas of data mining and social network analysis. Although, community is an *ill-defined* concept [Fortunato 2010], a general consensus suggests that community structure is a decomposition of nodes of a network into sets such that nodes within a set are densely connected internally, and sparsely connected externally [Girvan and Newman 2002b]. Communities are formed due to the structural or functional similarities among the vertices in the network [Newman 2004b]. Therefore, analyzing the community structure of a network provides a high-level view of the formation of network structure through the interactions of nodes having identical nature.

Communities in real-world networks are of different kinds: disjoint or non-overlapping (e.g., students belonging to different disciplines in an institute) [Fortunato 2010], overlapping (e.g., person having membership in different social groups in Facebook) [Xie et al. 2013], hierarchical (e.g., cells in human body form tissues that in turn form organs and so on) [Balcan and Liang 2013] etc. The task of community analysis goes through two separate phases: first, *detection* of meaningful community structure from a network, and second, *evaluation* of the appropriateness of the detected community structure. Since there is no single definition of a community which is universally accepted, many thoughts emerged which in turn resulted in different definitions of community structure. Every definition of community is justified in terms of different metrics formulated. Therefore, analyzing such metrics is crucial to understand the development of the studies pertaining to community analysis.

Due to the lack of consensus on the definition of a community, formulating metrics for evaluating the quality of a community is also a challenging task. There has been a large number of works aimed at designing functions quantifying properties proposed by their own in order to evaluate the goodness of a community. Interestingly,

these quality functions are not only useful for evaluation purposes but can also be used in various methods to detect the communities. The evaluation of the communities detected by an algorithm from a network becomes easier if the actual (ground-truth) community structure of the network is known a priori. In this direction, attempts were made to construct artificially-generated networks with inherent community structure [Lancichinetti et al. 2008]. To make a correspondence between the detected and ground-truth community structures, few metrics were borrowed from the literature of *clustering* in data mining [Berkhin 2006] and reformulated by incorporating the network information.

Although, there have been studies surveying different approaches mostly on the *detection* of non-overlapping [Lancichinetti and Fortunato 2009; Fortunato 2010] and overlapping [Xie et al. 2013; Harenberg et al. 2014] communities separately, no attempts have been initiated to understand thoroughly *the metrics used to design the algorithms and to evaluate the quality of the algorithms*. Metrics help us in understanding the goodness of an algorithm in a quantitative manner. We believe that evaluating a community detection algorithm may be difficult because it requires selecting between several proposed quality functions that often output contradictory results. The structural properties of the network and of the communities being looked for may strongly differ from one case to the other. It is then of utmost importance to identify the right metric depending upon the purpose and properties of the given network. Moreover, most of the metrics are extensions of some old measures. Therefore, we need to understand the evolutionary route of a derived metric and its possible extensions.

In this paper, we conduct an extensive survey on the state-of-the-art metrics used for detecting and evaluating the community structure. More importantly, we bring together metrics related to all the classes of community structures (disjoint, overlapping, fuzzy, local etc.) into a single article that can help us understand the derivation of one measure into another. Specifically, in case of metrics related to community detection we study traditional metrics like Modularity and its variants as well as more recently proposed metrics including Permanence, Surprise, Significance and Flex. In case of community evaluation, we study various state-of-the-art metrics like Normalised Mutual Information, Purity, Rand Index and F-Measure etc. Finally, a comparative analysis is presented based on the experiments conducted on synthetically-generated and real-world networks.

Organization of the survey: The survey has been conducted in two broad directions. In Section 2, we shall introduce metrics used as optimization functions in different algorithms for community detection in networks. In Section 3, we shall discuss the measures used for evaluating the goodness of the detected community structure (i.e., performance of the community detection algorithms). Note that these two sets of metrics (discussed in Sections 2 and 3) are not mutually exclusive. In Section 4, we shall present a comparative analysis on the performance of the state-of-the-art metrics based on the experiments conducted on different networks. In each of these sections mentioned above, we shall present the metrics pertaining to all kinds of community structures. Finally in Section 5, we conclude the survey by addressing the shortcomings and limitations of the metrics found in the literature of community detection. To facilitate the discussion, we present in Table I the summary of the notations used in this survey.

2. METRICS FOR DISCOVERING COMMUNITY STRUCTURE

The goal of community detection is to find inherent communities in a network. However, the definition of a community is not clear. What is a good community? Given a graph $G(V, E)$ where V is the set of nodes and E is the set of edges, one can have an

Table I: Notations used in this paper.

Graph-specific	
$G(V, E)$	A graph with set of nodes V and set of edges E
A	Adjacency matrix of graph G
N	$N = \|V\|$, Number of nodes in G
m	$m = \|E\|$, Number of edges in G
Γ_u	Neighbors of node u
$d(u)$	Degree of node u
$d(u)^{in}$	In-degree of node u
$d(u)^{out}$	Out-degree of node u
$C_{in}(u)$	Internal clustering coefficient of node u
Community-specific	
Ω	Detected non-overlapping community structure, $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_K\}$
Ψ	Detected overlapping community structure, $\Psi = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, \cdots, \psi_K\}$
C	Ground-truth community structure $C = \{c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_J\}$
N_{ω_j}	Number of nodes in community ω_j
$N_{\omega_i c_j}$	$\|\omega_i \cap c_j\|$, Number of nodes present in both ω_i and c_j communities
$\|E_\omega^{in}\|$	Number of edges between the nodes within the community ω
$\|E_\omega^{out}\|$	Number of edges between the nodes in community ω to nodes outside community ω

exponentially large number of possible communities. Enumerating these communities is an NP-Complete problem [Garey et al. 1974]. Moreover, not all partitions of a graph are equally good. In order to obtain the best partition of the graph and thus significant communities, most of the community detection algorithms aim to optimize a *goodness metric* which essentially indicates the quality of the communities detected from the network. The goal of the community detection algorithm would be to obtain the best partition of the network which would optimize the metric. A wide variety of such metrics have been proposed which can detect the quality of the communities obtained for a given partition. This section presents a detailed study on the large number of goodness metrics proposed by the graph mining algorithms for community detection. Note that apart from their extensive usage for community detection in different algorithms, these metrics are widely used to evaluate the quality of a detected community structure. We shall discuss this issue in Section 3.

2.1. Metrics used for non-overlapping community detection

The non-overlapping community detection algorithms aim at partitioning the vertices of $G(V, E)$ into K number of non-empty, mutually exclusive groups, $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_K\}$ such that each vertex belongs to *one and only one* community, i.e., $|\omega_1| + |\omega_2| + \cdots + |\omega_K| = |V|$.

Various simple metrics capturing the topological properties of the network have been proposed in the past which are used to compute the quality of communities detected. Let us consider a function $f(\omega)$ that characterizes the quality of the community on the basis of the connectivity of nodes in ω. [Yang and Leskovec 2012] summarized these scoring functions and grouped them into the following three broad classes:

(A) *Scoring functions based on internal connectivity*:

— **Internal density:** $f(\omega) = \frac{|E_\omega^{in}|}{|\omega|(|\omega|-1)/2}$ is the internal edge density of the node in community ω [Radicchi et al. 2004].
— **Edge inside:** $f(\omega) = |E_\omega^{in}|$ is the number of edges between the members of community ω [Radicchi et al. 2004].
— **Average degree:** $f(\omega) = 2|E_\omega^{in}|/|\omega|$ is the average internal degree of the members of community ω [Radicchi et al. 2004].

— **Fraction over median degree (FOMD):** $f(\omega) = \frac{|u:u\in\omega,|(u,v):v\in\omega|>d_m|}{|\omega|}$ is the fraction of nodes of ω that have internal degree higher than d_m, where d_m is the median value of $d(u)$ in V.
— **Triangle Participation Ratio (TPR):** It is the fraction of nodes in ω that belong to a triad: $f(\omega) = \frac{|u:u\in\omega,\{v,w\in\omega,(u,v)\in E,(u,w)\in E,(v,w)\in E\}\neq\phi|}{|\omega|}$.

(B) *Scoring functions based on external connectivity*:

— **Expansion** measures the number of edges per node that point outside the cluster: $f(\omega) = |E_\omega^{out}|/|\omega|$ [Radicchi et al. 2004].
— **Cut Ratio** is the fraction of existing edges (out of all possible edges) leaving the cluster: $f(\omega) = |E_\omega^{out}|/|\omega|(N|\omega|)$ [Fortunato 2010].

(C) *Scoring functions that combine internal and external connectivity*:

— **Conductance**: $f(\omega) = \frac{|E_\omega^{out}|}{2|E_\omega^{in}|+|E_\omega^{out}|}$ measures the fraction of total edge volume that points outside the community [Shi and Malik 2000].
— **Normalized Cut**: $f(\omega) = \frac{|E_\omega^{out}|}{2|E_\omega^{in}|+|E_\omega^{out}|} + \frac{|E_\omega^{out}|}{2(m-|E_\omega^{in}|)+|E_\omega^{out}|}$ normalises the cut score. [Shi and Malik 2000].
— **Maximum-ODF (Out Degree Fraction)**: $f(\omega) = max_{u\in\omega}\frac{|(u,v)\in E:v\notin\omega|}{d(u)}$ is the maximum fraction of edges of a node in ω that point outside ω [Flake et al. 2000].
— **Average-ODF**: $f(\omega) = \frac{1}{|\omega|}\sum_{u\in\omega}\frac{|(u,v)\in E:v\notin\omega|}{d(u)}$ is the average fraction of edges of nodes in ω that point out of ω [Flake et al. 2000].
— **Flake-ODF**: $f(\omega) = \frac{|u:u\in\omega,|(u,v)\in E:v\in\omega|<d(u)/2|}{|\omega|}$ is the fraction of nodes in ω that have fewer edges pointing inside than to the outside of the cluster [Flake et al. 2000].

(D) *Scoring function based on a network model*:

— **Modularity**: It computes the difference between the fraction of edges for a given partition of the original graph and a null graph. The choice of the null graph is in principle arbitrary, and several possibilities exist. The usual choice of the null graph is to choose a model with the same degree distribution as of the original graph. For an unweighted and undirected network, modularity is defined as,

$$Q_{ud} = \sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{|E_\omega^{in}|}{m} - \left(\frac{|E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}|}{2m}\right)^2\right] \tag{1}$$

An alternative way of defining the modularity of a graph is given as follows [Newman 2006b]:

$$Q_{ud} = \frac{1}{2m}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij} - \frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{2}$$

where $\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$ is the Kronecker delta function, which returns 1 if $\omega_i = \omega_j$, and 0 otherwise. The value of modularity lies between -1 and 1. A higher value of modularity indicates a strong community structure.

[Yang and Leskovec 2012] further defined four goodness metrics $f(\omega)$ for a community ω which capture the network structure:

— **Separability** captures the intuition that good communities are well-separated from the rest of the network [Shi and Malik 2000; Fortunato 2010], meaning that they have relatively few edges pointing from set ω to the rest of the network. Separabil-

ity measures the ratio between the internal and the external number of edges of ω: $f(\omega) = |E_\omega^{in}|/|E_\omega^{out}|$.

— **Density** is built on the intuition that good communities are well connected [Fortunato 2010]. It measures the fraction of the edges (out of all possible edges) that appear between the nodes in ω, $f(\omega) = 2|E_\omega^{in}|/\omega(\omega-1)$.

— **Cohesiveness** characterizes the internal structure of the community. Intuitively, a good community should be internally well and evenly connected, i.e., it should be relatively hard to split a community into two sub-communities. This is characterized by the conductance of the internal cut. Formally, $f(\omega) = min_{\omega' \subset \omega}\phi(\omega')$, where $\phi(\omega')$ is the conductance of ω' measured in the induced subgraph by ω. Intuitively, conductance measures the ratio of the edges in ω' that point outside the set and the edges inside the set ω'. A good community should have high cohesiveness (high internal conductance) as it should require deleting many edges before the community would be internally split into disconnected components [Leskovec et al. 2010].

— **Clustering coefficient** is based on the premise that network communities are manifestations of locally inhomogeneous distributions of edges, because pairs of nodes with common neighbors are more likely to be connected with each other [Watts and Strogatz 1998].

In another paper, [Leskovec et al. 2010] used two other topological metrics to measure the quality of a community:

— **Volume**: $\sum_{u\in\omega} d(u)$ is the sum of degrees of nodes in ω.

— **Edges cut**: $|E_\omega^{out}|$ is the number of edges needed to be removed to disconnect nodes in ω from the rest of the network.

Among the metrics discussed above, modularity is the most widely used one to detect the strength of the communities. Introduced in the seminal paper [Newman and Girvan 2004] the principal idea behind modularity is that the number of inter-community edges for a given graph must be greater than the number of edges for a random graph having a similar degree distribution as the original graph. The definition of modularity suggested by [Newman and Girvan 2004] in Equation 1 was applicable only to *unweighted* and *undirected* graphs. Several modifications and extensions to modularity have been proposed in the literature of community detection. The proposed changes cater to the specific tasks and type of graphs one may intend to analyze.

Modularity for weighted graphs: [Newman 2004a] proposed a simple extension to the existing definition of modularity for weighted graphs. One can view a weighted graph as a multigraph with multiple edges between a pair of nodes. Mapping the weighted graph to a multi-graph, it can be easily shown that Equation 2 is a generalized formula for modularity. For a weighted network, instead of A_{ij}, we use W_{ij} representing the weight of the edge between nodes i and j, the degree $d(i)$ is now replaced with the strength $s(i)$ of node i. The strength of a node is the sum of the degree of the adjacent nodes. For proper normalization, the number of edges $m = |E|$ in Equation 2 has to be replaced by the sum W of the weights of all edges. Thus, the product $\frac{s(i)s(j)}{2W}$ is now the expected weight of the edge (i, j) in the null model of modularity, which has to be compared with the actual weight W_{ij} of that edge in the original graph. The equation of modularity for a weighted network can be written as,

$$Q_w = \frac{1}{2|W|}\sum_{ij}\left[W_{ij} - \frac{s(i)s(j)}{2|W|}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{3}$$

Modularity for directed graphs: [Arenas et al. 2007] and [Leicht and Newman 2008] proposed extensions to modularity for directed graphs. [Arenas et al. 2007] elegantly extended the definition of modularity while preserving its semantics in terms of

probability to the scenario of directed networks. If an edge is directed, the probability that it will be oriented in either of the two possible directions depends on the in- and out-degrees of the end vertices. For instance, taken two vertices i and j under consideration, where i has a high in-degree and low out-degree, while j has low in-degree and high out-degree, in the null model of modularity an edge will be much more likely to point from j to i than from i to j. Therefore, the expression of modularity for directed graphs can be defined as follows,

$$Q_d = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij} - \frac{d(i)^{out}d(j)^{in}}{m}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{4}$$

where $d(i)^{out}$ and $d(i)^{in}$ are the in-degree and out-degree of node i respectively. If a graph is both directed and weighted, Equations 3 and 4 can be combined as follows, which is the most general form of modularity,

$$Q_{gen} = \frac{1}{|W|}\sum_{ij}\left[W_{ij} - \frac{s_i^{out}s_j^{in}}{|W|}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{5}$$

Similarity-based modularity: [Feng et al. 2007] proposed similarity-based modularity which is robust to the groups of nodes in a graph which have dense interconnections. Instead of using edges within communities and between communities as the criteria of partitioning they propose a more general concept, *similarity* $S(i,j)$, to measure the graph partition quality. The notion of similarity between two vertices i and j is given by the number of shared neighbors normalized by the number of neighbors of each vertex. For a partition Ω, the similarity-based modularity (Q_s) is given as,

$$Q_s = \sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)\delta(i,\omega)\delta(j,\omega)}{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)} - \left(\frac{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)\delta(i,\omega)}{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)}\right)^2\right] \tag{6}$$

where

$$\delta(i,\omega) = \begin{cases}1, & \text{if } i\in\omega\\ 0, & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}$$

Motif modularity: [Arenas et al. 2008b] used the underlying principle of modularity and proposed motif modularity where they use motifs instead of edges. They proposed that short paths, or motifs, of a network, could be used to define and identify both communities and more general topological classes of nodes. Communities will be defined based on the principle that they "contain" more motifs than a null model representing a randomized version of the network. As a particular case, the triangle modularity of a partition Ω reads,

$$Q_{mm}^{\triangle}(\omega) = \left[\frac{\sum_{ijk}A_{ij}(\omega)A_{jk}(\omega)A_{ki}(\omega)}{\sum_{ijk}A_{ij}A_{jk}A_{ki}} - \frac{\sum_{ijk}n_{ij}(\omega)n_{jk}(\omega)n_{ki}(\omega)}{\sum_{ijk}n_{ij}n_{jk}n_{ki}}\right] \tag{7}$$

where $A_{ij}(\omega) = A_{ij}\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j)}$, $n_{ij} = d(i)d(j)$, $n_{ij}(\omega) = n_{ij}\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$, and $\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} = 1$ if both i and j are part of same community, 0 otherwise.

Max-Min modularity: [Chen et al. 2009b] presented a new measure, called max-min modularity, which considers the property of both connected Q_{Max} (same as modularity) and user-defined related node pairs in finding communities Q_{Min}. The Max-Min modularity is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{Max_Min} &= Q_{Max} - Q_{Min} \\ &= \sum_{ij}\left[\frac{1}{2m}\left(A_{ij} - \frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m}\right) - \frac{1}{2m'}\left(A'_{ij} - \frac{d(i)'d(j)'}{2m'}\right)\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The second part tries to minimize the modularity of the complement of the graph G, given by G', constructed taking into consideration the user-defined criteria U (to define whether two disconnected nodes are related or not). The higher Q_{Max_Min} is, the better community division over Q_{gen}.

Influence-based modularity: [Ghosh and Lerman 2010] proposed influence-based modularity where they claimed that "a community is composed of individuals who have a greater capacity to influence others within their community than outsiders." The influence is measured using a *influence matrix* P which captures the number of n-hop length paths between nodes i and j for all the pairs of nodes in the graph. If $\bar{P}$ indicates the expected capacity to influence, then influence based modularity is given by,

$$Q_i = \sum_{ij} \left[P_{ij} - \bar{P_{ij}} \right] \delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{9}$$

Diffusion-based modularity: [Kim et al. 2010] remarked that the directed modularity of Equation 4 may not properly account for the directedness of the edges, and proposed a modified definition of modularity based on diffusion on directed graphs, inspired by Google's PageRank algorithm. They proposed the concept of *LinkRank* which indicates the importance of links instead of nodes as in the case of PageRank algorithm. LinkRank is the probability that a random walker is moving from node i to j in the stationary state. By using LinkRank, the modified definition of modularity can be written as,

$$Q_{lr} = \sum_{ij} \left[L_{ij} - E(L_{ij}) \right] \delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{10}$$

where $E(L_{ij})$ is the expected value of L_{ij} in the null model. In Equation 10, it is easy to notice that the first term is the fraction of time spent on walking within communities by a random walker since L_{ij} is the probability of the random walker following the link from i to j, and the second term is the expected value of this fraction in a null model.

Dist-modularity: [Liu et al. 2012] extended the existing definition of modularity and proposed Dist-modularity. Dist-modularity captures the similarity attraction feature in the null model. In the new null model the expected number of edges is given by,

$$P_{ij}^{Dist} = \frac{\tilde{P_{ij}} + \tilde{P_{ji}}}{2} \tag{11}$$

where,

$$\tilde{P_{ij}} = \frac{d(i)d(j)e^{-(s_{ij}/\sigma)^2}}{\sum_{v \in V} d(v)e^{-(s_{iv}/\sigma)^2}} \tag{12}$$

where s_{ij} denotes the similarity distance between v_i and v_j – the smaller the s_{ij}, the more similar are the two nodes. σ is a parameter of the quality metric that controls how fast or slow the function $e^{-(s_{ij}/\sigma)^2}$ decreases. Using the new null model, dist-modularity is given by,

$$Q_{Dist} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{ij} \left[A_{ij} - P_{ij}^{Dist} \right] \delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{13}$$

Limits of modularity: Given a network, the knowledge of the size of the communities is not known a priori. Modularity and modularity-based definitions discussed so far are not robust in nature and would fail to capture communities of all types in a network. [Fortunato and Barthlemy 2007] discussed the limits of modularity. They found that modularity optimization may fail to identify modules smaller than a scale which

depends on the total size of the network and on the degree of interconnectedness of the modules, even in cases where modules are unambiguously defined. This is known as the *resolution limit* of modularity. [Good et al. 2010] studied modularity at a deeper level and pointed out the degeneracy problem of modularity. Modularity may not have a global minima. There are typically an exponential number of structurally diverse alternative partitions with modularities very close to the optimum, often known as the *degeneracy problem*. This problem is most severe when applied to networks with modular structure; it occurs for weighted, directed, bipartite and multi-scale generalizations of modularity; and it is likely to exist in many of the less popular partition score functions for module identification. However, several modifications of modularity have been proposed in the past to address the limits of modularity. In the following section we briefly discuss the modifications proposed which overcome the limits of the original definition.

Methods to overcome the limitations of modularity: Modifications of modularity's null model were introduced by [Massen and Doye 2005] and [Muff et al. 2005]. [Massen and Doye 2005] identified the sensitivity of modularity towards larger communities. The value of modularity tends to decrease with the increase in the large number of small communities as the expected number of edges is larger than the actual edges in the graph. This leads to a bias toward detecting large communities. In order to address this, they proposed a modified form of modularity by improving the predicted fraction of edges within communities. The method is to create an ensemble of random networks with the same degree distribution as the original and with the constraint that multiple edges and self-connections are forbidden. They first calculated the probability of an edge between any pair of nodes in a such an ensemble network. The predicted fraction of edges within each community in a random network is given by the sum of these probabilities over each pair of nodes within the community. This sum (denoted by f_ω) replaces the second element of modularity Q in Equation 1. Thus, **modified modularity** is now given by,

$$Q_{rnl} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left[\frac{|E_\omega^{in}|}{m} - f_\omega \right] \tag{14}$$

[Muff et al. 2005] addressed the limits of modularity by proposing a local version of modularity, in which the expected number of edges within a module is not calculated with respect to the full graph, but considering just a portion of it, namely the subgraph including the module and its neighboring modules. Their motivation is the fact that modularity's null model implicitly assumes that each vertex could be attached to any other, whereas in real cases a community is usually connected to few other communities. On a directed graph, their **localized modularity** LQ reads,

$$LQ = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left[\frac{|E_\omega^{in}|}{L_{\omega n}} - \frac{|E_\omega^{in}||E_\omega^{out}|}{L_{\omega n}^2} \right] \tag{15}$$

where $L_{\omega n}$ is the total number of edges in the subgraph comprising community ω and its neighbor communities. The localized modularity is not bounded by 1, but can take any value.

In order to address the resolution limit [Reichardt and Bornholdt 2006a] used parameters to tune the contribution of the null model. They scaled the topology by a factor r by adding self loops of the same magnitude r to the vertices.

[Li et al. 2008] proposed a quantitative measure for evaluating the partition of a network into communities based on the concept of average modularity degree called the **modularity density** or **D-value**. For a partition Ω the modularity density is given

by,

$$D = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} d(G_\omega) \tag{16}$$

where $d(G_\omega)$ is the average modularity degree of subgraph $G_\omega = (V_\omega, E_\omega)$ given by,

$$d(G_\omega) = d_{in}(G_\omega) - d_{out}(G_\omega) \tag{17}$$

where $d_{in}(G_\omega)$ and $d_{out}(G_\omega)$ are the average inner and outer degrees of subgraph G_ω respectively.

[Arenas et al. 2008a] viewed the resolution limit of modularity as a feature of the quality function and proposed a modification to the modularity function that allows to view the network at multiple resolutions. The modularity of the network at scale r is given by,

$$Q_r = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left[\frac{|E_\omega^{in}| + |V_\omega| r}{|E| + |V| r} - \left(\frac{|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}| + |V_\omega| r}{2|E| + |V| r} \right)^2 \right] \tag{18}$$

The resolution limit of the method is supposedly solvable with the introduction of modified versions of the measure, with tunable resolution parameters. However, [Lancichinetti and Fortunato 2011] showed that multi-resolution modularity suffers from two opposite coexisting problems: the tendency to merge small subgraphs, which dominates when the resolution is low; the tendency to split large subgraphs, which dominates when the resolution is high.

[Zhen-Qing et al. 2012] argued that simply counting the number of edges within a module is not enough to capture the topology of a network. In order to capture the topology of the network they proposed a new parameter, called minimal diameter D_ω which is defined as the average minimal path for all pairs of vertices in a given module. The new definition of modularity metric is then given as:

$$Q_d = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left[\frac{|E_\omega^{in}|}{D_\omega} - \left(\frac{|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}|}{2|E|} \right)^2 * \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_\omega} \right] \tag{19}$$

where D_ω is the observed diameter for the community ω and can be computed easily. $\tilde{D}_\omega$ is the expected diameter for a randomised graph and is computed by the methods discussed by [Fronczak et al. 2004].

[Sun et al. 2013] addressed the resolution limit of modularity by proposing the quality metric **modularity intensity**. Maximizing modularity intensity can resolve the resolution limit problem, and the model effectively captures the community evolutionary process. It evaluates the cohesiveness of a community, which not only considers links between vertices, but also link weights. A community with a higher modularity intensity indicates that it is hard to split or die out.

[Chen et al. 2013] addressed the multi-resolution problem of modularity where in some cases it tends to favor small communities over large ones while in others, large communities over small ones. They first proposed modularity with **split penalty** given by,

$$Q_s = Q_{ud} - SP \tag{20}$$

The split penalty addresses the problem of favoring small communities by measuring the negative effect of edges joining members of different communities and is given by,

$$SP = \sum_{\omega_i \in \Omega} \left[\sum_{\substack{\omega_j \in \Omega \\ \omega_j \neq \omega_i}} \frac{|E_{\omega_i, \omega_j}|}{2m} \right] \tag{21}$$

where $|E_{\omega_i, \omega_j}|$ is the number of edges (sum of weights of edges) from community ω_i to community ω_j for unweighted (weighted) networks. We can use Equation 1 and Equation 21 in Equation 20 to obtain the modified modularity with split penalty. Using

split penalty alone may lead to large communities which may not be desirable. In order to address this they introduced **community density**. For undirected networks, the proposed metric **modularity density** is given by,

$$Q_{uds} = \sum_{\omega_i \in \Omega} \left[\frac{|E^{in}_{\omega_i}|}{m} d_{\omega_i} - \left(\frac{|E^{in}_{\omega_i} + E^{out}_{\omega_i}|}{2m} d_{\omega_i} \right)^2 - \sum_{\substack{\omega_j \in \Omega \\ \omega_j \neq \omega_i}} \frac{|E_{\omega_i,\omega_j}|}{2m} d_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \right] \tag{22}$$

where d_{ω_i} is the internal density of community ω_i and d_{ω_i,ω_j} is the pair-wise density between communities ω_i and ω_j.

[Zhang and Zhao 2012] proposed a new community metric given as follows,

$$\Phi(\Omega) = \Phi_1(\Omega) - \Phi_2(\Omega) \tag{23}$$

where,

$$\Phi_1(\Omega) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \frac{|E^{in}_{\omega} + E^{out}_{\omega}|}{N_{\omega}}, \Phi_2(\Omega) = \sum_{\omega_i \in \Omega} \sum i \neq j \frac{|E_{\omega_i,\omega_j}|}{N_{\omega_i,\omega_j}} \tag{24}$$

The function $\Phi_1(\Omega)$ defines the sum of the average degrees in each subnetwork and $\Phi_2(\Omega)$defines the sum of the average number of connections between one subnetwork and other subnetworks. It is easy to see that for community identification, our goal is to both maximize $\Phi_1(\Omega)$ and minimize $\Phi_2(\Omega)$.

[Miyauchi and Kawase 2015b] addressed the resolution limit of modularity by proposing a new quality metric called **Z-Modularity**. For a division Ω they quantified the statistical rarity of division Ω in terms of the fraction of the number of edges within communities. To this end, they considered the following edge generation process over V. First N edges are placed over V at random with the same distribution of vertex degree. Then, the probability that the edge is placed within communities is given by,

$$p = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(\frac{D_{\omega}}{2m} \right)^2 \tag{25}$$

where D_{ω} is the sum of degrees of all the nodes in ω. Note that this edge generation process is the same as the null-model used in the definition of modularity, with the exception of the sample size. Unlike the null-model, the sample size N is not necessarily equal to the number of edges m. Let X be a random variable denoting the number of edges generated by the process within communities. Then, X follows the binomial distribution $B(N, p)$. By the central limit theorem, when the sample size N is sufficiently large, the distribution of X/N can be approximated by the normal distribution $N(p, p(1-p)/N)$. Thus, we can quantify the statistical rarity of division Ω in terms of the fraction of the number of edges within communities using the Z-score as follows,

$$Z(\Omega) = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \frac{|m_{\omega}|}{m} - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(\frac{|D_{\omega}|}{2m} \right)^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(\frac{|D_{\omega}|}{2m} \right)^2 \left(1 - \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left(\frac{|D_{\omega}|}{2m} \right)^2 \right)^2}} \tag{26}$$

The sample size N never depends on a given division; thus, it is omitted in the denominator.

Recently, [Xiang et al. 2015] proposed multi-resolution methods by using the generalized self-loop rescaling strategy to address the resolution limit of modularity.

Adaptive scale modularity: [van Laarhoven and Marchiori 2014] proposed six properties (see Section 1 of SI Text for details) as axioms for community-based quality functions viz. permutation invariance, scale invariance, richness, monotonicity, locality

and continuity. They analyzed these six properties and found that modularity is permutation invariant, scale invariant and continuous. In order to adapt modularity to obey the remaining two properties, they proposed adaptive scale modularity. Instead of normalizing the edge-weights with the sum of the edge weights, they proposed to normalize it using a constant M. However, if one only keeps the factor M, the fixed scale modularity does not obey monotonicity. The parameter $\gamma \geq 2$ ensures that the adaptive scale modularity obeys all six axioms. The proposed metric is give by,

$$Q_{asm} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \left[\frac{|E_\omega^{in}|}{M + \gamma(|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}|)} - \left(\frac{|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}|}{M + \gamma(|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}|)} \right)^2 \right] \tag{27}$$

Until now, we have discussed modularity and various adaptations of the metric to incorporate different properties of the network and the community. The metrics discussed so far follow the underlying principle of modularity; for a good community, the number of edges within the community should be larger than the number of edges in a random graph which follows the same degree distribution as the original graph. We now pay attention to other community detection metrics.

Community Score: [Pizzuti 2008] proposed a simple but effective goodness function that maximizes the in-degree of the nodes belonging to the community and that implicitly minimizes their out-degree. Consider a community ω where μ_i denote the fraction of edges connecting node i to the other nodes in ω. The power mean of ω of order r, denoted as $M(\omega)$ is defined as,

$$M(\omega) = \frac{\sum_{i \in \omega} (\mu_i)^r}{N_\omega} \tag{28}$$

The volume $v(\omega)$ of a community ω is given by $|E_\omega|$. The score of a community ω is given by $score(\omega) = M(\omega) v_\omega$. The community score of the graph corresponding to a partition Ω is given by,

$$CS = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} score(\omega) \tag{29}$$

SPart: [Chira et al. 2012] proposed a new fitness function, SPart. The quality of a network partition in communities is evaluated by looking at the contribution of each node and its neighbors to the strength of its community via the internal and external degrees. Given a node v belonging to a community ω, a node score evaluating the contribution of the node to the strength of its community is computed using the following measure,

$$SNode(v) = \frac{d(v)^{in} - d(v)^{out}}{|\omega|} \tag{30}$$

A high positive value of $SNode(v)$ indicates an important contribution of node to the strength of its community. The fitness or goodness of a community ω is evaluated by considering the contribution $SNode(x)$ of each node $x \in \omega$ (first level nodes) and furthermore the contribution of all nodes $w \in \omega$ (second level nodes) which are linked with v. The measure used to compute the fitness of each community is defined as follows,

$$SComm(\omega) = \sum_{v \in \omega} \left[SNode(v) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{w \in \omega \\ A_{vw}=1}} SNode(w) \right] \tag{31}$$

The overall fitness of a particular partition Ω is given as follows,

$$SPart(\Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{i \in \Omega} SComm(\omega_i) \frac{\nu(\omega_i)}{|\omega_i|} \tag{32}$$

where $\nu(\omega_i)$ is the ratio of the number of edges within the community ω to the total number of edges.

Significance: [Traag et al. 2013] highlighted the fact that we do not want to know the probability a 'fixed' partition containing at least E internal edges, but whether a partition with at least E internal edges can be found in a random graph. The probability for finding a certain partition can be reduced to finding some dense subgraphs in a random graph. The probability that a subgraph S of size n_ω and density q appears in a random graph $\mathcal{G}$ of size n and density p is asymptotically,

$$Pr(S(n_\omega, q) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(n,p)) = e^{\Theta(-\binom{n_\omega}{k} D(q||p))} \tag{33}$$

where $D(q||p)$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence. For a partition Ω we can compute the probability for the partition to be contained in a random graph as follows:

$$Pr(\Omega) = \prod_\omega exp(-\binom{n_\omega}{2} D(p_c||p)) \tag{34}$$

Significance is then given by,

$$S(\Omega) = -\log Pr(\Omega) = \sum_c \binom{n_\omega}{2} D(p_\omega||p) \tag{35}$$

Permanence: [Chakraborty et al. 2014] proposed permanence, a vertex based community quality metric to quantify the propensity of a vertex to remain in its assigned community and the extent to which it is "pulled" by the neighboring communities. The permanence of a vertex v compares the internal connection of a vertex $I(v)$ with the maximum connections to a single external community, i.e., $E_{max}(v)$. This is normalized by the degree of the vertex $d(v)$. Alongside, permanence also captures how well the vertex is connected within the community via internal clustering coefficient $c_{in}(v)$. This criterion emphasizes that a vertex is likely to be within a community if it is a part of a near-clique substructure. Mathematically, the permanence of a vertex v is given by,

$$Perm(v) = \left[\frac{I(v)}{E_{max}(v)} \times \frac{1}{d(v)}\right] - \left[1 - c_{in}(v)\right] \tag{36}$$

The sum of the permanence of all vertices, normalized by the number of vertices, provides the permanence of the network. It indicates to what extent, on an average, the vertices of a network are bound to their communities. The value of permanence ranges from $+1$ to -1. Permanence has been proved to ameliorate the limitations of modularity.

Surprise: Another community quality metric, Surprise proposed by [Aldecoa et al. 2011] compares the distribution of the nodes and links in communities in a given network with respect to a null model. Surprise assumes as a null model that links between nodes emerge randomly. It then evaluates the departure of the observed partition from the expected distribution of nodes and links into communities given the null model via KL-divergence. To do so, it uses the following cumulative hypergeometric distribution,

$$S = \sum_{j=p}^{Min(M,|E|)} \frac{\binom{M}{j}\binom{F-M}{|E|-j}}{\binom{F}{|E|}} \tag{37}$$

where F is the maximum possible number of links in a network, E is the observed set of links, M is the maximum possible number of intra-community links for a given partition, and p is the total number of intra-community links observed in that partition. Using a cumulative hypergeometric distribution allows to calculate the exact probability of the distribution of links and nodes in the communities defined for the network by a given partition. Thus, Surprise measures how unlikely ("surprising") is that distribution. Unlike modularity, Surprise also considers the role of number of units within each community along with the number of links. Qualitatively, Surprise performed better than modularity. However, this claim was later confirmed by [Aldecoa and Marín

2013; Aldecoa and Marn 2014; Fleck et al. 2014]. In practice, it is not straightforward to work with, nor is it simple to implement in an optimization procedure, mainly due to numerical computational problems.

[Traag et al. 2015] proposed an asymptotic approximation of Surprise by allowing the links to be withdrawn with replacement. Thus, **asymptotical Surprise** is given by,

$$S = \sum_{j=p}^{Min(M,|E|)} \binom{M}{j} \langle q \rangle^j (1 - \langle q \rangle)^{M-j} \tag{38}$$

where $q = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} |E_\omega^{in}|}{|E|}$ and $\langle q \rangle$ indicates the expected value of q.

Expected nodes: [Gaumont et al. 2015] proposed a novel quality metric, called expected nodes where they studied the link partitions as oppose to the node partitions in modularity. Intuitively, a group of links ω is a relevant community if it consists of a large number of links adjacent to a few nodes (V_{in}). A node is an internal node of ω if one of its stubs (half-links) is in ω. Therefore, to compute the expected number of internal nodes in the configuration model, one can choose randomly $2|\omega|$ stubs among a total of $2|E|$ stubs. A node u has therefore $b(u)$ ways to be picked.The expected number of internal nodes for a given link group ω, denoted by $\mu_G(|\omega|)$, is then,

$$\mu_G(|\omega|) = \sum_{u \in V} 1 - \frac{\binom{2|E|-b(u)}{2|\omega|}}{\binom{2|E|}{2|\omega|}} \tag{39}$$

A group ω has a good internal quality if it has less internal nodes than expected. The internal quality Q_{in} for a given group ω is given as the variation between the actual number of internal nodes $V_{in}(\omega)$ and its expectation $\mu_G(|\omega|)$,

$$Q_{in}(\omega) = \frac{\mu_G(|\omega|) - V_{in}(\omega)}{\mu_G(|\omega|)} \tag{40}$$

Using similar arguments, one can write the external quality of a group ω as,

$$Q_{ext}(\omega) = \min\left(0, \frac{|V_{out}(\omega)| - \mu_{G\setminus\omega}(\bar{d}(\omega)/2)}{\mu_{G\setminus\omega}(\bar{d}(\omega)/2)}\right) \tag{41}$$

where $\bar{d}(\omega) = \sum_{u \in V_{in}(\omega)} \bar{d}(\omega, u)$; $\bar{d}(\omega, u)$ be the degree of u restricted to links not in ω. Thus, the expected nodes for a group ω is defined as,

$$Q_\omega = 2\frac{|\omega| Q_{in}(\omega) + |\omega_{out}| Q_{ext}(\omega)}{|\omega| + |\omega_{out}|} \tag{42}$$

The formulation for expected nodes for a given partition Ω is given as the weighted sum of the quality of each group,

$$Q_G(\Omega) = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} |\omega| Q(\omega)}{|E|} \tag{43}$$

Communitude: [Miyauchi and Kawase 2015a] quantified the community degree of ω in terms of the fraction of the number of edges within the subgraph induced by ω. Inspired by the metric, Z-score, proposed in Equation 26, a similar probability distribution of the fraction of the number of edges within the subgraph generated using the nodes in ω is estimated. Next, they quantified the community degree of ω in terms of the fraction of the number of edges within the subgraph using the Z-score as follows,

$$com(\omega) = \frac{\frac{|E_\omega^{in}|}{m} - (\frac{|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}|}{2m})^2}{(\frac{|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}|}{2m})^2 (1 - (\frac{|E_\omega^{in} + E_\omega^{out}|}{2m})^2)} \tag{44}$$

If $\omega = \phi$, $com(\omega) = 0$. The upper bound for the metric is 1. Note, this quality function can be viewed as a modified version of the function given by Z-score, which is nor-

malized by the standard deviation of the fraction of the number of edges within the subgraph.

[Creusefond et al. 2014] used **compactness** which measures the potential speed of a diffusion process in a community. Starting from the most eccentric node, the function captures the number of edges reached per time step by a perfect transmission of information. The underlying model defines community as a group of people within which communication quickly reaches everyone. They recently used it as a community-level quality function to measure the goodness of the detected community [Creusefond et al. 2015].

The **local internal clustering coefficient** [Watts and Strogatz 1998] is also used as a quality metric in [Creusefond et al. 2015]. It is defined by the probability that two neighbors of a vertex that are in the same community are also neighbors. The clustering property of communities is actually one of the most well-known in this field, and is explained by the construction of social networks by *homophily* [McPherson et al. 2001].

A summary of the metrics discussed in this subsection can be found in the SI Text (Table I).

2.2. Metrics for overlapping community detection

In real world networks, it is well-understood that a node can be naturally characterized by multiple community memberships. For instance, a person in social network can have connections to several groups, such as friends, family and colleagues; a researcher may be active in several areas. Moreover, in social networks the number of communities a vertex can belong to is unlimited because there is no restriction on the number of communities a person can be a part of. This phenomenon also happens in other networks, such as biological networks [Thai and Pardalos 2011] where a node might have multiple functions. Therefore, overlapping community structure is a natural phenomenon in real networks, and thus there has been an increasing interest to discover communities that are not necessarily disjoint.

More formally, given a graph $G(V, E)$, the task of overlapping community detection is to partition the vertices V into non-empty sets $\Psi = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_{|\Psi|}\}$, where a vertex can belong to more than one set, i.e., $|\psi_1| + |\psi_2| + \cdots + |\psi_{|\Psi|}| \geq |V|$.

Note that in this case, the relationship between a node and a community is binary, i.e., a node either *completely* belongs to a community or does not, resulting *crisp overlapping community*. While on the other hand, several attempts have been conducted with the assumption that each node is associated with communities in proportion to a belongingness factor. This is called *fuzzy overlapping community* structure. In this section, we discuss the metrics associated with both these notions of overlapping community detection.

Although initial attempt for overlapping community detection was done by [Palla et al. 2005], [Zhang et al. 2007] introduced the original notion of overlapping community structure. Given a set of overlapping communities $\Psi = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_{|\Psi|}\}$ in which a node may belong to more than one of them, a vector of belonging coefficients $(\alpha_{i\psi_1}, \alpha_{i\psi_2}, ..., \alpha_{i\psi_{|\Psi|}})$ can be assigned to each node i in the network. A belonging coefficient $\alpha_{i\psi}$ measures the strength of association between node i and community ψ. Without loss of generality, the following constraints are assumed to hold,

$$0 \leq \alpha_{i\psi} \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in V, \forall \psi \in \Psi \qquad and \qquad \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \alpha_{i\psi} = 1 \tag{45}$$

Modularity: Using the notion of fuzzy overlap [Zhang et al. 2007] defined the membership of each community as $\bar{V_\psi} = \{i | \alpha_{i\psi} > \lambda, i \in V\}$, where λ is a threshold that can convert a soft assignment into final clustering. They proposed a generalized notion of

modularity as follows,

$$Q_{ov}^{z} = \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \left[\frac{|E_{\psi}^{in}|}{m} - \left(\frac{2|E_{\psi}^{in}| + |E_{\psi}^{out}|}{2m} \right)^2 \right] \tag{46}$$

where $|E_{\psi}^{in}| = \sum_{i,j \in \psi}((\alpha_{i\psi}+\alpha_{j\psi})/2)W_{ij}$ and $|E_{\psi}^{out}| = \sum_{i \in \psi j \in N-N_{\psi}}(\alpha_{i\psi}+(1-\alpha_{j\psi})/2)W_{ij}$. This modified modularity was used to give a relative membership of the nodes.

[Nepusz et al. 2008] extended modularity for computing the goodness of an overlapping partition Ψ by replacing the Kronecker delta function in Equation 2 and proposed a fuzzy variant of modularity as follows,

$$Q_{ov}^{F} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{ij} \left[A_{ij} - \frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m} \right] s_{ij} \tag{47}$$

where,

$$s_{ij} = \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \alpha_{i\psi}\alpha_{j\psi} \tag{48}$$

The goal is thus to find a fuzzy partition such that the difference between the actual similarity among the vertices given by the adjacency matrix and the fuzzy similarity given by the belongingness vector is minimized.

A similar goodness metric was proposed by [Shen et al. 2009a] where they extended modularity as follows:

$$Q_{ov}^{S} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{ij} \left[A_{ij} - \frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m} \right] \alpha_{i\psi}\alpha_{j\psi} \tag{49}$$

[Shen et al. 2009b] proposed to optimize Equation 50, to detect both the overlapping and hierarchical properties of complex community structure together by introducing a belonging coefficient. The belonging coefficient $\alpha_{i\psi}$ of a node i for a given community is redefined as the number of communities O_i to which it belongs. The extended modularity of the overlapping community structure is given by,

$$Q_{ov}^{E} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \sum_{ij} \left[A_{ij} - \frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m} \right] \frac{1}{O_i O_j} \tag{50}$$

[Nicosia et al. 2009] proposed the following measure expressed in terms of a function F,

$$Q_{ov}^{N} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \sum_{ij} \left[A_{ij} F\Big(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi}\Big) - \frac{d(i)d(j) \left(\sum_{v \in V} F\Big(\alpha_{v\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi}\Big) \right) \left(\sum_{v \in V} F\Big(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{v\psi}\Big) \right)}{2mN^2} \right] \tag{51}$$

where $F(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi})$ could be defined as a product $\alpha_{i\psi}\alpha_{j\psi}$, an average $(\alpha_{i\psi} + \alpha_{j\psi})/2$, a maximum $max(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi})$, or any other suitable function.

[Lancichinetti et al. 2009] maximized the following local fitness function in their proposed algorithm LFM to obtain natural communities,

$$f(\psi) = \frac{|E_{in}|^{\psi}}{(|E_{in}|^{\psi} + |E_{out}|^{\psi})^{\alpha}} \tag{52}$$

where α is the resolution parameter controlling the size of the communities.

[Pizzuti 2009] used the definition of community score (Equation 29) introduced in [Pizzuti 2008] on the line graph of the given network G.

[Lázár et al. 2010] defined a crisp overlapping goodness measure as follows for a partition Ψ:

$$Q_{ov}^{crisp} = \frac{1}{|\Psi|} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} Q_\psi \tag{53}$$

The modularity Q_ψ for a given community ψ is given by,

$$Q_\psi = \frac{|E_\psi^{in}| + |E_\psi^{out}|}{N_\psi(N_\psi - 1)/2} \frac{1}{N_\psi} \sum_{i \in N_\psi} \frac{\sum_{j \in N_\psi i \neq j} A_{ij} - \sum_{j \notin N_\psi} A_{ij}}{d(i)s_i} \tag{54}$$

Here s_i is the number of communities in which node i belongs to.

[Chen et al. 2010] proposed using the modified modularity Q_{ov}^{Ψ} for weighted networks defined as,

$$Q_{ov}^{\Psi} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \sum_{ij} \left[A_{ij} - \frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m} \right] \alpha_{i\psi} \alpha_{j\psi} \tag{55}$$

where $\alpha_{i\psi} = \frac{k_{i\psi}}{\sum_{\psi \in \Psi} k_{i\psi}}$ is the strength with which node i belongs to community ψ, and $k_{i\psi} = \sum_{j \in \psi} w_{ij}$ is the total weight of links from i into community ψ.

[Havemann et al. 2011] proposed the following modification to the fitness function given by Equation 52,

$$f(\psi) = \frac{|E_{in}|^\psi + 1}{(|E_{in}|^\psi + |E_{out}|^\psi)^\alpha} \tag{56}$$

which allows a single node to be considered a community by itself. This avoids violation of the principle of locality.

[Chen et al. 2014] extended the existing definition of modularity density introduced in [Chen et al. 2013]. They proposed the following goodness function,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ov}^{MD} &= \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \left[\frac{|E_\psi^{in}|}{m} d_\psi - \left(\frac{2|E_\psi^{in}| + |E_\psi^{out}|}{2m} d_\psi \right)^2 - \sum_{\psi' \in \Psi, \psi \neq \psi'} \frac{|E_{\psi,\psi'}|}{2m} d_{\psi,\psi'} \right], \\ d_\psi &= \frac{2|E_\psi^{in}|}{\sum_{i,j \in \psi, i \neq j} f(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi})}, \\ d_{\psi,\psi'} &= \frac{|E_{\psi,\psi'}|}{\sum_{i \in \psi, j \in \psi'} f(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi})} \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where $|E_\psi^{in}| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in \psi} f(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi}) A_{ij}, |E_\psi^{out}| = \sum_{i \in \psi} \sum_{\substack{\psi' \in \Psi \\ \psi \neq \psi' \\ j \in \psi'}} f(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi'}) A_{ij}$, and $|E_{\psi,\psi'}| = \sum_{i \in \psi, j \in \psi'} f(\alpha_{i\psi}, \alpha_{j\psi'}) A_{ij}$.

Flex: [de Frana and Coelho 2015] introduced a novel quality metric, called flex which tries to balance two objectives at the same time: maximize both the number of links inside a community and the local clustering coefficient of each community. The first step to calculate flex for a given partition of the network is to define the *Local Contribution* of a node i to a given community ψ,

$$LC(i, \psi) = \lambda * \triangle(i, \psi) + (1 - \lambda) * N(i, \psi) - \kappa * \wedge(i, \psi), \tag{58}$$

where $\triangle(i, \psi)$ is the ratio between the transitivity of node i (number of triangles that i forms) inside community ψ and the total transitivity of this node in the full network, $N(i, \psi)$ is the ratio between the number of neighbors node i has inside community ψ and its total number of neighbors, and $\wedge(i, \psi)$ is the ratio between the number of open triangles in community ψ that contain node i and the total participation of i in the whole network. Variables λ and κ are weights that balance the importance of each term.

Given the local contribution of all nodes to each community, the *Community Contribution* (CC) of a community ψ in a given partition is defined as,

$$CC(\psi) = \sum_{i \in \psi} LC(i, \psi) - \frac{{N_\psi}^\gamma}{N}, \tag{59}$$

where γ is the penalization weight devised to avoid the generation of a trivial solution in which the entire network forms a single community. The *Flex* value of a given partition Ψ is given by,

$$Flex(\Psi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} CC(\psi) \tag{60}$$

[Baumes et al. 2005] proposed a two-step process which maximizes the following local density function,

$$f(\psi) = \frac{|W_{in}|^\psi}{|W_{in}|^\psi + |W_{out}|^\psi} \tag{61}$$

A modified version was introduced by [Kelley 2009] after incorporating the edge probability e_p, where the parameter λ controls how the algorithm behaves in sparse areas of the network.

$$f(\psi) = \frac{|W_{in}|^\psi}{|W_{in}|^\psi + |W_{out}|^\psi} + \lambda e_p \tag{62}$$

A summary of the metrics discussed in this subsection can be found in the SI Text (Table II).

2.3. Other metrics for community detection

The majority of the community quality detection metrics which have been proposed in the literature pertain to overlapping and non-overlapping communities only. However, attempts have been made to propose community quality metrics depending upon the application in hand or the network properties. Table VIII summarizes the different metrics proposed so far. A detailed explanation of all the metrics mentioned in Table VIII can be found in the SI text (Section 2).

3. METRICS FOR COMMUNITY EVALUATION

Once the communities from a network are detected using a community detection algorithm, the next task is to evaluate the detected community structure. The evaluation becomes easier, if the actual community structure of the network is given to us (we call the actual community structure of a network as "ground-truth" community structure). In such cases, various metrics can be used to make a correspondence between the detected and the ground-truth communities. We refer to these metrics as ground-truth based validation metrics. If the algorithm is able to detect a community structure which has high resemblance with the ground-truth, the algorithm is well-accepted and can be used further for other networks where the underlying ground-truth communities might not be available.

3.1. Ground-truth based validation metrics for non-overlapping community structure

In this section, we discuss the metrics used to measure the similarity between the detected and the ground-truth community structures for non-overlapping community structure. Note that most of these metrics are borrowed from the literature of "clustering" in data mining.

Let us recall the notations to be used in this section again: given a graph $G(V, E)$, $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_K\}$ is the set of detected communities, and $C = \{c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_J\}$ is the

Table II: Other metrics for community detection.

Task	Metrics
Local Community Detection	Local Modularity ([Clauset 2005]) Subgraph Modularity ([Luo et al. 2006]) Density Isolation ([Lang and Andersen 2007]) Community Internal Relation ([Chen et al. 2009a]) Community External Relation ([Chen et al. 2009a]) Local-Global Fitness Function ([Lancichinetti et al. 2008]) Internal Density ([Saha et al. 2010]) Conductance ([Andersen et al. 2006; Kloster and Gleich 2014]) Edge-Surplus ([Tsourakakis et al. 2013])
n-partitie networks	Bipartite Modularity ([Barber 2007; Guimerà et al. 2007]) Modified Bipartite Modularity ([Murata 2009]) Tripartite Modularity ([Neubauer and Obermayer 2009]) Tripartite Modularity ([Murata 2010; 2011]) Mutli-faceted Bipartite Modularity ([Suzuki and Wakita 2009]) Density-Based Bipartite Modularity ([Xu et al. 2015]) Intensity Score ([Yu et al. 2015])
Multiplex Networks	Modularity for Multiplex Networks ([Tang et al. 2009]) Redundancy ([Berlingerio et al. 2011]) Cross-Layer Edge Clustering Coefficient ([Brdka et al. 2012])
Signed Networks	Map Equation for Signed Networks ([Esmailian and Jalili 2015])
Anti-Community Detection	Anti-Modularity ([Chen et al. 2014])

set of ground-truth communities. $N = |V| = \sum_{k \in K} |\omega_k| = \sum_{j \in J} |c_j|$ is the total number of nodes, $N_{c_j} = |c_j|$ and $N_{\omega_i c_j} = |\omega_i \cap c_j|$.

[Lin et al. 2006; Manning et al. 2008] introduced **purity** where each detected community is assigned to the ground-truth label which is most frequent in the community. Formally, it is defined as,

$$Purity(\Omega, C) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k} \max_{j} |\omega_k, c_j| \tag{63}$$

The upper bound is 1; it corresponds to a perfect match between the partitions. The lower bound is 0 and indicates the opposite. Note that purity is not a symmetric measure: processing the purity of Ω relatively to C amounts to considering the parts of Ω majority in each part of C. Therefore, in general, there is no reason to consider that $Purity(\Omega, C)$ and $Purity(C, \Omega)$ are equal. In cluster analysis, the former version is generally used, and called simply *purity*, whereas the second version is the *inverse purity* [Artiles et al. 2007]. [Danon et al. 2005] made a comment, explaining how it can be biased by the number and sizes of communities. However, their remark is actually valid only for the purity, and not for the inverse version.

High purity is easy to achieve when the number of communities is large; in particular, purity is 1 if each node gets its own community. In contrast, the inverse purity favors algorithms detecting few large communities. The most extreme case occurs when the algorithm puts all the nodes in the same community. Thus, we cannot use purity to trade off the quality of the community against the number of communities. To solve this problem, Newman introduced an additional constraint [Newman 2004c]: when an estimated community is majority in several actual communities, all the concerned nodes are considered as misclassified. The solution generally adopted in cluster analysis rather consists in processing the **F-Measure**, which is the harmonic mean of both the versions of the purity [Artiles et al. 2007].

$$F - Measure = \frac{2 \cdot Purity(\Omega, C) \cdot Purity(C, \Omega)}{Purity(\Omega, C) + Purity(C, \Omega)} \tag{64}$$

Another interpretation of community is to view it as a series of decisions, one for each of the pairs of nodes in the network [Hubert and Arabie 1985]. Two nodes will be as-

signed to the same community if and only if they both have same label in ground-truth. A true positive (TP) decision assigns two same-labeled nodes to the same community; a true negative (TN) decision assigns two different labeled nodes to different communities. There are two types of errors we can commit. A (FP) decision assigns two different labeled nodes to the same community. A (FN) decision assigns two same labeled nodes to different communities. The **Rand index** (RI) measures the percentage of decisions that are correct and is given by,

$$RI = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + FP + FN + TN} \tag{65}$$

RI gives equal weight to FPs and FNs. We can use the F_β to penalize FNs more strongly than FPs by selecting a value $\beta > 1$, thus giving more weight to recall (R) as follows,

$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP};\ R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN};\ F_\beta = \frac{(\beta^2 + 1)PR}{\beta^2 P + R} \tag{66}$$

Although RI is more stringent and reliable, it has some shortcomings. In brief, RI can be shown to have biases that may make its results misleading in certain application scenarios. There is a family of other external indexes that can be used in order to get more accurate results, such as the Jaccard coefficient [Halkidi et al. 2001], the Minkowski measure [Jiang et al. 2004], the FowlkesMallows index [Fowlkes and Mallows 1983], and the τ statistics [Jain and Dubes 1988].

In the domain of community detection, the chance-corrected version of RI, called **Adjusted Rand Index** (ARI) [Hubert and Arabie 1985], is often preferred. It seems to be less sensitive to the number of communities [Vinh et al. 2009]. The chance correction is based on the general formula defined for any measure M,

$$M_c = \frac{M - E(M)}{M_{max} - E(M)} \tag{67}$$

where M_c is the chance-corrected measure, M_{max} is the maximal value that M can reach, and $E(M)$ is the value expected for some null model. According to [Hubert and Arabie 1985], under this assumption that the partitions are generated randomly with the constraint of having fixed number of communities and part sizes, the expected value for the number of pairs in a community intersection $\omega_i \cap c_j$ is given by,

$$E\binom{N_{\omega_i c_j}}{2} = \binom{N_{\omega_i}}{2}\binom{N_{c_j}}{2}\Big/\binom{N}{2} \tag{68}$$

By replacing in Equation 67 and after some simplifications, we get the final ARI

$$ARI(\Omega, C) = \frac{\sum_{ij}\binom{N_{\omega_i c_j}}{2} - \sum_i \binom{N_{\omega_i}}{2}\sum_j \binom{N_{c_j}}{2}\Big/\binom{N}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_i \binom{N_{\omega_i}}{2} + \sum_j \binom{N_{c_j}}{2}\right) - \sum_i \binom{N_{\omega_i}}{2}\sum_j \binom{N_{c_j}}{2}\Big/\binom{N}{2}} \tag{69}$$

Like RI, this metric is symmetric. Its upper bound is 1, meaning both partitions are exactly similar. Because it is chance-corrected, a value equal or below 0 represents the fact that the similarity between Ω and C is equal or less than what is expected from two random partitions.

Normalized Mutual Information (NMI) [Manning et al. 2008; Strehl and Ghosh 2003; Fortunato and Lancichinetti 2009], another alternative information-theoretic metric is defined as follows:

$$NMI(\Omega, C) = \frac{I(\sigma, C)}{[H(\sigma) + H(C)]/2} \tag{70}$$

where I is mutual information,

$$I(\Omega, C) = \sum_k \sum_j \frac{|\omega_k \cap c_j|}{N}\ log\frac{N|\omega_k \cap c_j|}{|\omega_k||c_j|} \tag{71}$$

H is entropy as defined below,

$$H(\Omega) = -\sum_k \frac{|\omega_k|}{N} \, log \frac{\omega_k}{N} \tag{72}$$

NMI is always a number between 0 and 1. A major problem of NMI is that it is not a *true metric*, i.e., it does not follow triangle-inequality (see Section 3.2 of SI Text).

In contrast, **Variation of Information** (VI) [Meilă 2007; Kraskov et al. 2003] or shared information distance obeys the triangle inequality. It is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} VI(\Omega, C) &= -\sum_{i,j} r_{ij}[\log(r_{ij}/p_i) + \log(r_{ij}/q_j)] \\ &= H(\Omega) + H(C) - 2I(\Omega, C) \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where $p_i = |\omega_i|/N$, $q_j = |c_j|/N$ and $r_{ij} = |\omega_j \cap c_j|/N$. A perfect agreement with a known structure will provide a value of VI = 0.

However, [Orman et al. 2012] argued (see Section 3.1 of SI Text) that the traditional metrics consider a community structure as simply a partition, and therefore ignore a part of the available information: the network topology. In order to make a more reliable evaluation, [Orman et al. 2012] proposed to jointly use traditional metrics and various topological properties. However, they also acknowledged that this makes the evaluation process more complicated, due to the multiplicity of values to take into account. Recently, [Labatut 2013] proposed the solution which consists in retaining a single value, by modifying traditional measures so that they take the network topology into account. The proposed metrics are: modified purity, modified ARI and modified NMI.

To begin with, a notion of purity of *a node* is defined for a partition Ω relatively to another partition C:

$$Purity(u, \Omega, C) = \delta(C_j | \underset{\forall j}{\text{s.t.}} \; N_{\omega_i c_j} \; is \; maximum) \tag{74}$$

where $u \in \omega_i$ and $u \in c_j$; and δ is the Kronecker delta function. The function is therefore binary: 1 if the community of C containing u is majority in that of Ω also containing u, and otherwise. The purity of a part ω_i relatively to a partition C can then be calculated by averaging the purity of its nodes: $Purity(\omega_i, C) = \frac{1}{|\omega_i|} \sum_{u \in \omega_i} Purity(u, \Omega, C)$. So, for all the partitions in Ω relative to C, we get $Purity(\Omega, C) = \sum_i \sum_{u \in \omega_i} \frac{1}{N} Purity(u, \Omega, C)$. Here, one can notice the purity of each node is weighted by a value N. In order to take into account the topological information, [Labatut 2013] proposed to replace this uniform weight by a value w_u. Its role is to penalize more strongly misclassification concerning topologically important nodes. Therefore, the **modified purity** can be defined as follows:

$$Purity_M(\Omega, C) = \sum_i \sum_{u \in \omega_i} \frac{w_u}{w} Purity(u, \Omega, C) \tag{75}$$

where $W = \sum_v w_v$, i.e., sum of all the weights of the nodes. This normalization allows keeping the measure between 0 and 1. Similarly, using the modified definition of purity, we can obtain modified F-measure using Equation 64.

However, since Rand Index is based on pairwise comparisons, it is not possible to isolate the individual effect of each node, as we have seen above. Therefore, [Labatut 2013] used similarly for pairs of nodes, and proposed to use the product of the two corresponding nodal weights: $w_u w_v$. Then for any subset of nodes S, it can be translated as: $W(S) = \sum_{u,v \in S} w_u w_v$. Therefore, from Equation 69 the **modified ARI** can be obtained as follows:

$$ARI_M(\Omega, C) = \frac{\sum_{ij} W(\omega_i \cap W(c_j) - \sum_j W(\omega_i) W(c_j)/W(V)}{\frac{1}{2}\big(\sum_i W(\omega_i) + \sum_j W(c_j)\big) - \sum_i W(\omega_i) \sum_j W(c_j)/W(s)} \tag{76}$$

Similarly, the assumption that all nodes have the same probability $1/N$ to be selected in the NMI, [Labatut 2013] is replaced it by the node-specific weight w_u. We can consequently define a modified joint probability distribution $p_{ij}^{'} = \sum_{u \in \omega_i \cap c_j} w_u / W$. Therefore, Equations 71 and 72 can be replaced as follows:

$$I(\Omega, C) = \sum_k \sum_j \frac{W(\omega_k \cap c_j)}{W} \; log \frac{W \cdot W(\omega_k \cap c_j)}{W(\omega_k) W(c_j)} \tag{77}$$

$$H(\Omega) = -\sum_k \frac{W(\omega_k)}{W} \; log \frac{W(\omega_k)}{W} \tag{78}$$

By replacing the above two equations in Equation 70, one can get the **modified NMI**.

All the modified metrics discussed above require the definition of an individual weight w_u for node u. [Labatut 2013] considered three types of weights: (i) degree measure, $w_u = d_u / \underset{v}{max}\ (d_v)$, where d_u is the degree of u, (ii) embeddedness measure [Lancichinetti et al. 2010], $w_u = e_u / d_u$, where e_u is the internal degree of u in its own community, and (iii) weighted embeddedness measure, $w_u = e_u / \underset{v}{max}\ (d_v)$.

[Aynaud and Guillaume 2010] proposed **edit distance** between pair of communities to measure the similarity. This distance counts the number of transformations needed to move from a partition A to a partition B. This distance has two advantages and one disadvantage: it gives the matching and it is more intelligible but its matching is a one to one association. There are no merge, split or appearance of new communities, and thus the association is only reliable when such one to one association exists, i.e., only when the communities are really stable (see Section 3.3 in SI Text).

A summary of the metrics discussed in this subsection can be found in the SI Text (Table III).

3.2. Ground-truth based validation measures for overlapping community structure

Let us again assume that for a network $G(V, E)$, $\Psi = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, \cdots, \psi_K\}$ is the set of detected communities, and $C = \{c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_J\}$ is the set of ground-truth communities. $N = |V| = |\cup_{k \in K} \psi_k| = |\cup_{j \in J} c_j|$ is the total number of nodes, $N_{c_j} = |c_j|$ and $N_{\omega_i c_j} = |\omega_i \cap c_j|$.

NMI was further extended for overlapping community structure [Lancichinetti et al. 2008; McDaid et al. 2011]. For each node i in the detected community structure Ψ, its community membership can be expressed as a binary vector of length $|\Psi|$, where $(x_i)_k$ is 1 if node i belongs to the k^{th} cluster ψ_k, otherwise 0. The k^{th} entry of this vector can be viewed as a random variable X_k, whose probability distribution is given by $P(X_k = k) = N_k/N$, $P(X_k = 0) = 1 - P(X_k = 1)$, where $N_k = |\psi|$, and N is the number of nodes in the graph. The same holds for the random variable Y_l associated with the l^{th} cluster in community structure C. Both the empirical marginal probability distribution $P(X_k)$ and the joint probability distribution $P(X_k, Y_l)$ are used to further define entropy $H(X)$ and $H(X_k, Y_l)$. The conditional entropy of a cluster X_k given Y_l is defined as $H(X_k|Y_l) = H(X_k, Y_l) - H(Y_l)$. The entropy of X_k with respect to the entire vector Y is based on the best matching between X_k and any component of Y given by

$$H(X_k|Y) = min_{l \in 1,2,\ldots,|C|} \; H(X_k|Y_l) \tag{79}$$

The normalized conditional entropy of a community X with respect to Y is

$$H(X|Y) = \frac{1}{C} \sum_k \frac{H(X_k|y)}{H(X_k)} \tag{80}$$

Similarly, we can define $H(Y|X)$. Finally the NMI for overlapping community, **Overlapping Normalized Mutual Information** (ONMI) for two community structures Ω and C is given by $ONMI(X|Y) = 1 - [H(X|Y) + H(Y|X)]/2$. ONMI can be easily reduced to NMI when there is no overlap in the network.

The overlapping version of the Adjusted Rand Index is **Omega index** [Collins and Dent 1988; Murray et al. 2012]. It is based on pairs of nodes in agreement in two community structures. Here, a pair of nodes is considered to be in agreement if they are clustered in exactly the same number of communities (possibly none). That is, the Omega index considers how many pairs of nodes belong together in no communities, how many are placed together in exactly one community, how many are placed in exactly two communities, and so on. Omega index is defined in the following way [Gregory 2011; Havemann et al. 2011],

$$Omega(\Psi, C) = \frac{Omega_u(\Psi, C) - Omega_e(\Psi, C)}{1 - Omega_e(\Psi, C)} \tag{81}$$

The unadjusted Omega index $Omega_u$ is defined as,

$$Omega_u(\Psi, C) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1} max(|\Psi|, |C|)|t_j(\psi_i) \cap t_j(c_j)| \tag{82}$$

where $M = N(N-1)/2$, i.e., all possible edges, $t_j(C)$ is the set of pairs that appear exactly j times in a community C. The expected Omega index in the null model $Omega_e$ is given by,

$$Omega_e(\Psi, C) = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{j=1} max(|\Psi|, |C|)|t_j(\psi_i)| \cdot |t_j(c_j)| \tag{83}$$

The larger the Omega index, the better the matching between two community structures. A value of 1 indicates perfect matching. When there is no overlap, the Omega index reduces to the ARI.

[Campello 2007] extended the concept of RI by making it able to evaluate an overlapping partition of a data set. Further, [Campello 2010] proposed another effective solution, named **Generalized external index** (GEI) to the problem of comparing two overlapping partitions by deriving first the concepts of agreements and disagreements for each individual pair of nodes (i,j). To do so, the following auxiliary definitions are needed:

— $\alpha_\Psi(i, j)$: Number of communities shared by nodes i and j in partition Ψ
— $\alpha_C(i, j)$: Number of communities shared by nodes i and j in partition C.
— $\beta_\Psi(i)$: Number of communities to which node i belongs in Ψ, minus 1.
— $\beta_C(i)$: Number of communities to which node i belongs in C, minus 1.

Based on the definitions above, the agreements a_G and disagreements d_G associated to pair (i, j) are defined as:

$$a_G(i, j) = min\{\alpha_\Psi(i, j), \alpha_C(i, j)\} + min\{\beta_\Psi(i), \beta_C(i)\} + min\{\beta_\Psi(j), \beta_C(j)\} \tag{84}$$
$$d_G(i, j) = abs[\alpha_\Psi(i, j) - \alpha_C(i, j)] + abs[\beta_\Psi(i) - \beta_C(i)] + abs[\beta_\Psi(j) - \beta_C(j)] \tag{85}$$

These measures, in their turn, can be used to define the generalized external index for comparing overlapping partitions:

$$GEI(\Psi, C) = \frac{a_G}{a_G + d_G} \tag{86}$$

[Hullermeier and Rifqi 2009] proposed another extension of RI, named as **Fuzzy Rand Index**. They considered RI as a distance measure. Given a fuzzy partition $P = \{P_1, P_2, ...P_k\}$ of V, each element $v \in V$ can be characterized by its membership vector $P(v) = \{P_1(v), P_2(v), ..., P_k(v)\} \in [0, 1]^k$, where $P_i(v)$ is the degree of membership of v in the i^{th} community P_i. A fuzzy equivalence relation on V can be defined in terms of a similarity measure on the associated membership vectors: $E_p(u, v) = 1 - ||P(u) - P^{'}(v)||$. Now, given two fuzzy partitions Ψ and C, the idea is to generalize the concept of concordance as follows. We consider a pair (u, v) as being concordant in so far as Ψ and C agree on their degree of equivalence. This suggests to define the degree of

concordance as $1 - |E_\Psi(u,v) - E_C(u,v)| \in [0,1]$. Analogously, the degree of discordance is $|E_\Psi(u,v) - E_C(u,v)|$. Therefore, the distance measure on fuzzy partitions is then defined by the normalized sum of degrees of discordance:

$$d(\Psi, C) = \frac{\sum_{u,v \in V} |E_\Psi(u,v) - E_C(u,v)|}{n(n-1)/2} \tag{87}$$

Likewise, $1 - d(\Psi, C)$ corresponds to the normalized degree of concordance and, therefore, is another generalization of the original Rand index.

[Yang and Leskovec 2013a] used average **F1-score** to measure the equivalence of two overlapping partitions. It is defined to be the average of the F1-score of the best-matching ground-truth community to each detected community, and the F1-score of the best-matching detected community to each ground-truth community:

$$F1 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{|\Psi|}\sum_{\psi_i \in \Psi} F1(\psi_i, C_{g(i)}) + \frac{1}{|C|}\sum_{c_i \in C} F1(\Psi_{g'(i)}, c_i)\right) \tag{88}$$

where the best matching g and $g^{'}$ is defined as follows: $g(i) = \underset{j}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, F1(\Omega_i, C_j)$, $g^{'}(i) = \underset{j}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, F1(\psi_j, C_i)$.

[Yang and Leskovec 2013a] also used **accuracy in the number of communities** to be the relative accuracy between the detected and the true number of communities as follows: $1 - \frac{|\Psi| - |C|}{2|C|}$.

Precision, Recall and F-measure (see Equation 64) are also used to compare two overlapping partitions [Whang et al. 2013]. [Wang and Fleury 2012] used **sensitivity**, **specificity** and **accuracy** for community evaluation. Sensitivity relates to the ability to identify the actual overlapping nodes, and is given by ratio of actual overlapping nodes to the detected overlapping nodes. Specificity relates to the ability to identify non-overlapping nodes, and is given by the ratio of actual non-overlapping nodes to all detected non-overlapping nodes. Accuracy is a "balanced accuracy", which is the sum of sensitivity and specificity with equal importance.

Note that for all the metrics discussed above, higher values mean more "accurately" detected communities, i.e., the detected node community memberships better correspond to ground-truth node community memberships. Maximum value of 1 is obtained when the detected communities perfectly correspond to the ground-truth communities.

A summary of the metrics discussed in this subsection can be found in the SI Text (Table IV).

4. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of the state-of-the-art community scoring functions as an indicator to measure the goodness of the community structure. In particular, we concentrate on the metrics used for evaluating non-overlapping and overlapping community structures. First, we discuss the benchmark datasets used in this experiment. Following this, we elaborate the experimental setup and the results for non-overlapping and overlapping community structures.

4.1. Benchmark datasets

We take both the synthetic and the real-world networks whose ground-truth community structure is known a priori.

4.1.1. Datasets with non-overlapping community structure. We examine a set of artificially generated networks and three real-world complex networks used in [Chakraborty et al. 2014].

Synthetic networks: We select the LFR benchmark model [Lancichinetti et al. 2008] to generate artificial networks with a community structure. The model allows to control directly the following properties: number of nodes n, desired average degree k and maximal degree k_{max}, exponent γ for the degree distribution, exponent β for the community size distribution, and mixing coefficient μ. The parameter μ represents the desired average proportion of links between a node and the nodes located outside its community, called *inter-community links*. In this experiment, we vary the number of nodes (n) and mixing coefficient (μ) to get different network structures. For the rest of the parameters, we use the default value of the parameters mentioned in the implementation[1] designed by [Lancichinetti et al. 2008]. Note that for each parameter configuration, we generate 100 LFR networks, and the values in all the experiments are reported by averaging the results.

Real-world networks: We use three real-world networks whose properties are summarized in Table III.

Football network, proposed by [Girvan and Newman 2002a] contains the network of American football games between Division IA colleges during the regular season of Fall 2000. The vertices in the graph represent teams (identified by their college names) and edges represent regular-season games between the two teams they connect. The teams are divided into conferences (indicating communities) containing around 8-12 teams each. Games are more frequent between members of the same conference than between members of different conferences. Inter-conference play is not uniformly distributed; teams that are geographically close to one another but belong to different conferences are more likely to play one another than teams separated by large geographic distances.

Railway network, proposed by [Ghosh et al. 2011] consists of nodes representing railway stations in India, where two stations s_i and s_j are connected by an edge if there exists at least one train-route such that both s_i and s_j are scheduled halts on that route. Here the communities are states/provinces of India since the number of trains within each state is much higher than the trains in-between two states.

Coauthorship network is derived from the citation dataset[2] proposed by [Chakraborty et al. 2013; Chakraborty et al. 2014]. Here each node represents an author and an undirected edge between authors is drawn if the two authors collaborate at least once via publishing a paper. The communities are marked by the research fields since authors have a tendency to collaborate with other authors within the same field.

Table III: Properties of real-world networks. n and e are the number of nodes and edges, c is the number of communities, $< k >$ and k_{max} its average and maximum degree, n_c^{min} and n_c^{max} the sizes of its smallest and largest communities.

Network	n	e	$< k >$	k_{max}	c	n_c^{max}	n_c^{min}
Football	115	613	10.57	12	12	13	5
Railway	301	1,224	6.36	48	21	46	1
Coauthorship	103,677	352,183	5.53	1,230	24	14,404	34

[1] https://sites.google.com/site/santofortunato/inthepress2
[2] http://cnerg.org/

Table IV: Properties of the real-world networks. n: number of nodes, e: number of edges, C: number of communities, ρ: average edge-density per community, S: average size of a community, $\bar{O}_m$: average number of community memberships per node.

Network	n	e	C	ρ	S	$\bar{O}_m$
LiveJournal	3,997,962	34,681,189	310,092	0.536	40.02	3.09
Amazon	334,863	925,872	151,037	0.769	99.86	14.83
Youtube	1,134,890	2,987,624	8,385	0.732	43.88	2.27

4.1.2. Datasets with overlapping community structure. We also examine various synthetic and real-world networks whose ground-truth communities are overlapping in nature.

Synthetic networks: We use the same LFR benchmark networks proposed by [Lancichinetti et al. 2008]. Along with the other parameters mentioned earlier, we can control two other parameters, namely the percentage of overlapping nodes O_n, and the number of communities to which a node belongs O_m. We vary the following parameters depending upon the experimental need: n, μ, O_n and O_m.

Real-world networks: We use three real networks with known overlapping ground-truth community structures[3] [Yang and Leskovec 2012]. The properties of these networks are summarized in Table IV.

LiveJournal network contains nodes which are users in the LiveJournal[4] blogging community and edges are friendship relationships. This site also allows users form a group which other members can then join. These user-defined groups are considered as ground-truth communities.

Amazon network is based on "Customers Who Bought This Item Also Bought" feature of the Amazon website[5]. If a product i is frequently co-purchased with product j, the graph contains an undirected edge from i to j. Each product category provided by Amazon defines each ground-truth community.

Youtube network contains nodes corresponding to the users in Youtube[6], and edges are formed due to the friendship with each other. Users can create groups which other users can join and these groups form the ground-truth communities.

4.2. Experimental setup

Here we discuss the experiment conducted to evaluate the quality of the scoring metrics discussed in Section 2. Since the validation metrics discussed in Section 3 compare the detected community structure directly with the ground-truth results, this evaluation is considered to be more perfect and thus preferred widely. However, as mentioned earlier for most of the real-world networks, the underlying ground-truth community structure is unknown. Therefore, the scoring metrics are used for the evaluation. Here, we intend to show to what extent a particular scoring function is able to reproduce the results obtained from the validation metrics.

In particular, we use the framework discussed in [Steinhaeuser and Chawla 2010]. Let us assume that $SM = \{SM_i\}$ and $VM = \{VM_j\}$ are sets of scoring and validation metrics respectively. $CD = \{CD_1, CD_2, ..., CD_k\}$ is the set of k community detection algorithms. We perform the following steps:
(i) For each network, we execute k algorithms present in CD and obtain k different community structures;

[3]The datasets are taken from http://snap.stanford.edu/
[4]http://www.livejournal.com/
[5]www.amazon.com
[6]https://www.youtube.com




Fig. 1: (Color online) Spearman's rank correlation among the results obtained from seven scoring metrics and five validation measures for LFR networks with non-overlapping community structure ((upper panel) varying the number of nodes, (lower) varying the value of μ).

(ii) For each of these community structures, we compute all the scoring metrics in SM separately;
(iii) The algorithms in CD are then ranked based on the value of each of these SM metrics separately, with the highest rank given to the highest value;
(iv) The community structures are further compared with the ground-truth labels of the network in terms of each of the validation metrics in VM separately;
(v) The algorithms are again ranked based on the values of each of the validation metrics (highest value/best match has the best rank);
(vi) Finally, we obtain Spearman's rank correlation between the rankings obtained for each of the scoring metrics SM_i (step (iii)) and each of the ground-truth validation metric VM_j (step (v)).

We posit that since these two types of metrics are orthogonal, and because the validation metrics generally provide a stronger measure of correctness due to direct correspondence with the ground-truth structure, the ranking of a good scoring metric should "match" with those of the validation metrics. We compare the relative ranks instead of the absolute values, because the range of the values is not commensurate across the quantities and therefore the rank order is a more intrinsic measure.

4.3. Comparison of non-overlapping community scoring metrics

We compare the performance of seven state-of-the-art community scoring metrics used as goodness measures for non-overlapping community structure: modularity (Mod), modularity density (MD), conductance (Con), communitude (Com), asymptotic surprise (Sur), significance (Sig) and permanence (Perm). These metrics form the set SM as mentioned in Section 4.2. For detecting communities from the synthetic and real-world networks, we use six algorithms (representing CD in Section 4.2): FastGreedy [Newman 2004d], Louvain [Blondel et al. 2008], CNM [Clauset et al. 2004], WalkTrap [Pons and Latapy 2006], InfoMod, [Rosvall and Bergstrom 2007] and InfoMap [Rosvall and Bergstrom 2008]. To compare the output of the community detection algorithms with the ground-truth community structure, we consider five validation measures (rep-




Fig. 2: (Color online) Heatmap depicting the spearman's rank correlation among the results obtained from seven scoring metrics and five validation measures for real-world networks with non-overlapping community structure.

resenting VM in Section 4.2): variation of information (VI), normalized mutual information (NMI), adjusted rand index (ARI), F-measure (F) and purity (Pu).

Figure 1 presents a comparative result of the seven scoring metrics for different LFR networks with non-overlapping community structure. In most of the cases, a general trend is observed: permanence turns out to be superior among all, which is followed by modularity; although there are few exceptions where modularity outperforms others. In most cases, communitude stands as third ranked metric, followed by modularity density and surprise. Conductance consistently performs worst among all the metrics. In few cases, we notice that while all the metrics show a decline, permanence tends to increase (Figures 1(d) and (e)) or remain consistent (Figure 1(b)).

Figure 2 presents a heatmap depicting the rank correlation for real-world networks. We notice that for football network, modularity density outperforms others with the average rank correlation of 0.37 (over all the validation measures, followed by permanence (0.13), significance (0.08), communitude (0.07), conductance (0.04), modularity (-0.11) and surprise (-0.11). For railway network, the result is slightly different where permanence (0.37) outperforms others. For coauthorship network which is reasonably sparse and constitutes weaker community structure, permanence (0.37) turns out to be the best, followed by significance (0.27), communitude (0.27) and conductance (0.27). In short, on average permanence performs better than others state-of-the-art metrics irrespective of the underlying network structure and validation measures.

4.4. Comparison of overlapping community scoring metrics

We further compare the performance of the five overlapping community scoring metrics: Q_{ov}^{Z} (Equation 46), Q_{ov}^{N} (Equation 51), Q_{ov}^{S} (Equation 49), Q_{ov}^{MD} (Equation 57) and flex (Equation 60). These metrics form the set SM, mentioned in Section 4.2. For the purpose of evaluation, we take four ground-truth based measures (representing VM): ONMI, Omega index, Generalized external index (GEI) and F1-score. We detect the overlapping community structure using six algorithms separately: OSLOM[7] [Lancichinetti et al. 2011], EAGLE[8] [Shen et al. 2009b], COPRA[9] [Gregory 2010], SLPA[10] [Xie and Szymanski 2012], MOSES[11] [McDaid and Hurley 2010] and BIGCLAM[12] [Yang and Leskovec 2013b]. These algorithms form the set CD. The experiment dis-

[7] http://www.oslom.org.
[8] http://code.google.com/p/eaglepp/
[9] http://www.cs.bris.ac.uk/~steve/networks/software/copra.html.
[10] https://sites.google.com/site/communitydetectionslpa.
[11] http://sites.google.com/site/aaronmcdaid/moses.
[12] http://snap.stanford.edu




Fig. 3: (Color online) Spearman's rank correlation among the results obtained from five overlapping community scoring metrics and four validation measures for LFR networks with overlapping community structure: varying the number of nodes n ($\mu = 0.3$, $O_m = 5$, $O_n = 10\%$); mixing parameter μ ($n = 10,000$, $O_m = 5$, $O_n = 10\%$).

cussed in Section 4.2 is repeated to check which one among SM highly corresponds to the results obtained from VM.

Figure 7 shows the results for the LFR networks by varying different parameters, i.e., n and μ. We also vary the parameters O_m and O_n (see Figure 3 in SI Text). For most of the cases, Q_{ov}^{MD} seems to be the best, which is followed by flex, Q_{ov}^{S}, Q_{ov}^{N} and Q_{ov}^{Z}. Most surprisingly, if we look at the trends carefully in Figure 7, we notice that the pattern obtained by comparing with GEI is significantly different from the others. This indicates that GEI based validation measure may not be a good performance indicator for community evaluation.

The heatmaps in Figure 4 show the performance of the scoring metrics for real-world networks. We compute the correlation of the rank of the algorithms as discussed in Section 4.2. For LiveJournal, Amazon and Youtube networks, the average correlations (over all validation measures) are reported sequentially (delimited by comma): flex (0.16, 0.26, 0.08), Q_{ov}^{Z} (-0.27, -0.09, -0.43), Q_{ov}^{MD} (0.16, 0.46, 0.19), Q_{ov}^{S} (0.05, 0.39, -0.29) and Q_{ov}^{N} (0.16. -0.37, -0.15). While the correlation seems to be positive (almost neutral) for flex and Q_{ov}^{MD}, Q_{ov}^{Z} and Q_{ov}^{N} seem to be negatively correlated with the validation metrics. In short, although Q_{ov}^{MD} seems to have higher correlation with the validation metrics, there is no metric which performs well on all kinds of networks.

5. CONCLUSION

Despite such a vast extent of research in the detection and analysis of community structure, researchers are often in doubt while selecting an appropriate measurement metric. In this review, we attempted to understand the quality metrics pertaining to the detection of all sorts of communities. Most of these metrics are also used to evaluate




Fig. 4: (Color online) Heatmap depicting the spearman's rank correlation among the results obtained from five overlapping community scoring metrics and four validation measures for real-world networks with overlapping community structure.

the community structure. We hope that presenting all kinds of metrics together would enable the readers to understand the evolution chain of these metrics and provide them with the opportunity to select the right metric in the right context.

We observed that the most popular and widely accepted metric in the literature of community analysis is Newman-Grivan's modularity, which also lays the foundation for other metrics. Although the drawbacks of modualrity have been addressed several times, there are rare occasions where a completely new understanding of a community structure has been presented; exceptions include surprise, significance and permanence etc. Empirical results indicated that permanence and extended modularity density (Q^{MD}_{ov}) are most appropriate in measuring the quality of a community structure compared to the other competing metrics for disjoint and overlapping community detection respectively.

An interesting question is yet to be addressed – given a network, do we apply disjoint or overlapping community detection algorithm? There is no such metric/algorithm which is able to detect disjoint as well as overlapping community structure depending upon the network topology without knowing the type of the underlying community strcuture. Moreover, there is very limited literature addressing the effect of various network noises on the behavior of the metric [Chakraborty et al. 2014]. [Reichardt and Bornholdt 2006b; Guimera et al. 2004] explored the significance of community structures only for the case of disjoint community detection which is based on the notion of modularity; although the same is yet to be explored for overlapping community structure and for other goodness metrics. Last but not the least, we believe that metrics are the core component of the community detection algorithms, and this review would have a huge implication in understanding the plethora of research in the area of community analysis.

Supplementary Materials

6. METRICS FOR NON-OVERLAPPING COMMUNITIES

Adaptive scale modularity: [van Laarhoven and Marchiori 2014] proposed six properties as axioms for community-based quality functions as follows:

— *Permutation invariance:* This property expects that the quality of a community depends only on the weight of edges between nodes, not on the identity of nodes. Formally, a graph community quality function Q is permutation invariant if for all graphs $G = (V, E)$ and all isomorphisms $f : V \rightarrow V'$, it is the case that $Q(G, \Omega) = Q(f(G), f(\Omega))$; where f is extended to graphs and communities by $f(\Omega) = \{\{f(i)|i \in \omega\}|\omega \in \Omega\}$ and $f(V, E) = (V', < i, j > \rightarrow E(f^{-1}(i), f^{-1}(j)))$.

— *Scale invariance:* This property requires that the quality doesn't change when edge weights are scaled uniformly. Formally, a graph community quality function Q is scale invariant if for all graphs $G = (V, E)$, all communities ω_i, ω_j of G and all constants $\alpha > 0$, $Q(G, \omega_i) \leq Q(G, \omega_j)$ if and only if $Q(\alpha G, \omega_i) \leq Q(\alpha G, \omega_j)$ where $\alpha G = (V, < i, j > \rightarrow \alpha E(i, j))$ is a graph with edge weights scaled by a factor α.

— *Richness:* A graph community quality function Q is rich if for all sets V and all non-trivial partitions Ω^* of V, there is a graph $G = (V, E)$ such that Ω^* is the $Q - optimal$ communities of V, that is, $\Omega^* = argmax_\Omega\ Q(G, \Omega)$.

— *Monotonicity:* A graph community quality function Q is monotonic if for all graphs G, all communities Ω of $G(V, E)$ and all $C - consistent$ improvements G' of G it is the case that $Q(G', \Omega) \geq Q(G, \Omega)$. A graph $G' = (V, E')$ is a C-consistent improvement of G if for all nodes i and j, $E'(i, j) \geq E(i, j)$ whenever $i \sim_\Omega j$ and $E'(i, j) \leq E(i, j)$ whenever $i \nsim_\Omega j$.

— *Locality:* This property demands that the contribution of a single community to the total quality should only depend on nodes in the neighborhood of that community. Formally, a quality function Q is local if for all graphs $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ that agree on a set V_a and its neighborhood, and for all communities Ω_a , Ω'_a of V_a , Ω_i of $V_1 \setminus V_a$ and Ω_j of $V_2 \setminus V_a$, if $Q(G_1, \Omega_a \cup \Omega_i) \geq Q(G_2, \Omega'_a \cup \Omega_i)$ then $Q(G_1, \Omega_a \cup \Omega_j) \geq Q(G_2, \Omega'_a \cup \Omega_j)$.

— *Continuity:* A quality function Q is continuous if a small change in the graph leads to a small change in the quality. Formally, Q is continuous if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every graph $G = (V, E)$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all graphs $G' = (V, E')$, if $E(i, j) - \delta < E'(i, j) < E(i, j) + \delta$ for all nodes i and j, then $Q(G', \Omega) - \epsilon < Q(G, \Omega) < Q(G', \Omega) + \epsilon$ for all communities Ω of G.

7. OTHER METRICS FOR COMMUNITY DETECTION

7.1. Metrics for local community detection

Most of the algorithms developed for detecting global community require that the graph be completely known. However, in real-world scenario, it might not be possible to collect the entire network due to several reasons, such as privacy of the data, inefficient crawling, noise during data curation. In such cases, instead of discovering global community structure of a network, people might be interested to explore the community around a particular node, i.e., the other nodes who belong to the same

community/communities which the given node is a part of. This is called the local community structure.

Although [Bagrow and Bollt 2005] were the first who addressed the issue of incomplete network for community detection, they proposed a global community finding algorithm. Later, [Clauset 2005] proposed **local modularity** for local community detection. Suppose that in the graph G, we have perfect knowledge of the connectivity of some set of vertices, denoted as C. This implies the existence of a set of vertices U about which we know only their adjacencies to C. The adjacency matrix of such partially known graph is given by,

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if vertices } i \text{ and } j \text{ are connected, and either vertex is in } C \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We restrict our consideration to those vertices in the subset of C that have at least one neighbor in U, i.e., the vertices which make up the *boundary* of C. Let us denote those vertices that comprise the boundary as B, and the boundary-adjacency matrix as

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if vertices } i \text{ and } j \text{ are connected, and either vertex is in } B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then the local modularity R is defined as follows:

$$R = \frac{\sum_{ij} B_{ij}\delta_{ij}}{\sum_{ij} B_{ij}} = \frac{I}{T} \tag{89}$$

where δ_{ij} is 1 when either $v_i \in B$ and $v_j \in C$ or vice versa, and is 0 otherwise. Here, T is the number of edges with one or more endpoints in B, while I is the number of those edges with neither endpoint in U.

[Luo et al. 2006] further replaced R by a new local modularity, called **subgraph modularity** M, as shown in the following:

$$M = \frac{M_{in}}{M_{out}} = \frac{1/2\sum_{ij} A_{ij}\theta_{ij}}{\sum_{ij} A_{ij}\lambda_{ij}} \tag{90}$$

where $\theta_{ij} = 1$ if both node v_i and node v_j exist in community C; 0 otherwise. And $\lambda_{ij} = 1$ means that only one, either node v_i or node v_j, exists in community C.
[Lang and Andersen 2007] proposed **density-isolation** as $f_{\alpha,\beta}(S) = m_S - \alpha c_S - \beta n_S$, where α and β are the two parameters.

[Chen et al. 2009a] experimented with the earlier two measures and noticed that the results usually include many outliers, i.e., the discovered communities have high recall but low accuracy, which reduces the overall community quality. They proposed to measure the **community internal relation** L_{in} by the average internal degree of nodes in C, $L_{in} = \frac{\sum_{i\in C} IK_i}{|C|}$, where IK_i is the number of edges between node i and nodes in C. Similarly, they measured the **community external relation** L_{ex} by the average external degree of nodes in B: $L_{ex} = \frac{\sum_{j\in B} EK_j}{|B|}$, where EK_j is the number of connections between node j and nodes outside C. Then they tried to maximize L_{in} and minimize L_{ex} at the same time, i.e., maximize $L = \frac{L_{in}}{L_{ex}}$.

[Lancichinetti et al. 2008] proposed local-global community detection algorithm, which proposes a fitness function, as shown in the following:

$$F = \frac{d_{in}^C}{(d_{in}^C + d_{ex}^C)^\alpha} \tag{91}$$

where d_{in}^C and d_{ex}^C refer to the sums of degree of the internal nodes and external nodes of community C, respectively, and α is a resolution parameter used for controlling the size of local community.

[Saha et al. 2010] proposed **internal density** $\frac{m_S}{n_S}$ of a set S for the local community detection. [Andersen et al. 2006; Kloster and Gleich 2014] used **conductance** as

an objective function. [Tsourakakis et al. 2013] defined **edge-surplus** of a set S as $f_\alpha(S) = m_S - \alpha\binom{n_S}{2}$, where α is the probability of existence of an edge.

[Wu et al. 2015] criticized that most existing metrics tend to include irrelevant subgraphs in the detected local community; they referred to such irrelevant subgraphs as free riders. They systematically studied the existing goodness metrics and provided theoretical explanations on why they may cause the free rider effect. [Bagrow 2008] proposed new benchmark networks and evaluation measures to compare the local community detection algorithms.

7.2. Metrics for n-partite networks

A significant class of networks constitute the n-partite networks. The vertices of an n-partite network can be partitioned into n disjoint sets such that no two vertices within the same set are adjacent. There are thus n distinct kinds of vertices, providing a natural representation for many affiliation or interaction networks. Several variants of modularity and community quality metrics have been proposed specially for bipartite and tripartite networks. We shall review each of them in this section.

[Barber 2007] defined a null model appropriate for bipartite networks, and used it to define bipartite modularity. The null model $P_{i,j}$ for a pair of communities is given by:

$$P_{i,j} = Ck(i)d(j) \tag{92}$$

where $k(i)$ is the degree of vertices of one type and $d(j)$ is the degree of the vertices of the other type. On applying constraints we can obtain $C = 1/m$. Thus, the new null model is given by,

$$P_{i,j} = \frac{k(i)d(j)}{m} \tag{93}$$

This can be now used in the usual equation of modularity to obtain modularity for bipartite graphs as follows,

$$Q_b = \frac{1}{2m}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij} - P_{ij}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j} \tag{94}$$

[Guimerà et al. 2007] proposed a new metric for bipartite network. They also showed that unipartite directed networks can be viewed as bipartite networks. Thus, the same quality metric can be used. In order to define modularity for bipartite networks, certain terms are introduced as follows. Consider the expected number of times that actor i belongs to a team comprised of m_a actors is given by $m_a\frac{t_i}{\sum_k t_k}$, where t_i is the total number of teams to which actor i belongs. Similarly, the expected number of times that two actors i and j belong to team a is $m_a(m_a-1)\frac{t_i t_j}{(\sum_k t_k)^2}$. Therefore, the average number of teams in which i and j are expected to be together is $\frac{\sum_a m_a(m_a-1)}{(\sum_a m_a)^2}t_i t_j$.

Using the above equation the modularity of bipartite network is given as,

$$Q_b = \sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{\sum_{i\neq j\in\omega} c_{i,j}}{\sum_a m_a(m_a-1)} - \frac{\sum_{i\neq j\in\omega} t_i t_j}{(\sum_a m_a)^2}\right] \tag{95}$$

where $c_{i,j}$ is the actual number of groups in which i and j are together.

[Murata 2009] pointed out the weaknesses of the bipartite modularities given by [Barber 2007] and [Guimerà et al. 2007] in Equation 94 and Equation 95 respectively. Using the bipartite modularity given by Equation 95 two vertex types are not treated symmetrically in the definition above. The bipartite modularity focuses on the connectivities of only one vertex type (via the vertices of the other type). It is therefore not sufficient for representing the connectivities of the other vertex type. The weaknesses

of bipartite modularity given by Equation 94 are two-fold: (i) the number of communities has to be searched in advance; and (ii) the numbers of communities of both vertex types have to be equal. Both weaknesses come from the bipartitioning method employed. The first weakness is fatal for practical community detection since the search for the number of communities is computationally expensive. The second weakness is also fatal for dividing real-world networks since the numbers of communities of both vertex types are often imbalanced. In order to overcome the weaknesses of the bipartite modularities, the constraint of one-to-one correspondence between communities of both types is removed in the proposed definition of bipartite modularity. One X-vertex community may corresponds to many Y-vertex communities and vice versa.

Consider a particular division of the bipartite network into X-vertex communities and Y-vertex communities, and the numbers of the communities are L^X and L^Y, respectively. V^X and V^Y are the sets of the communities of X-vertices and Y-vertices, and V_l^X and V_m^Y are the individual X communities that belong to the sets $(V^X = V_1^X, ..., V_{L^X}^X)$ and $(V^Y = V_1^Y, ..., V_{L^Y}^Y)$. Now, we can define, e_{lm} (the fraction of all edges that connect vertices in V_l to vertices in V_m) and a_l as follows,

$$e_{lm} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i \in V_l} \sum_{j \in V_m} A(i,j) \tag{96}$$

$$a_l = \sum_m e_{lm} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i \in V_l} \sum_{j \in V} A(i,j) \tag{97}$$

The new modularity is now defined as,

$$Q_B = \sum_l Q_{B_l} = \sum_l (e_{lm} - a_l a_m), m = \arg\max_k (e_{lk}) \tag{98}$$

Q_{B_l} means the deviation of the number of edges that connect the l-th X-vertex community and the corresponding (m-th) Y-vertex community, from the expected number of randomly-connected edges. A larger Q_{B_l} value means stronger correspondence between the l-th community and the m-th community.

[Neubauer and Obermayer 2009] used the bipartite modularity given by Equation 98 by projecting the tripartite network to bipartite networks.

[Murata 2010; 2011] proposed modularity for tripartite networks by extending the bipartite modularity given by Equation 98. Consider a tripartite network G where V is composed of three types of vertices, V^X, V^Y, and V^Z. A hyperedge connects the triples of the vertices (i, j, k), where $i \in V^X$, $j \in V^Y$, and $k \in V^Z$, respectively. Suppose that $deg(i)$ is the number of hyperedges that connect to vertex i. Under the condition that the vertices of V_l^*, V_m^* and V_n^* are of different types (where * is either X, Y, or Z) and it sums over two dimensions, such as a_l^X, a_m^Y, and a_n^Z.

$$e_{lmm} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in V_l} \sum_{j \in V_m} \sum_{k \in V_n} A(i,j,k) \tag{99}$$

$$a_l^X = \sum_{l \in V_l^X} \sum_m \sum_n e_{lmn} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in V_l^X} \sum_{j \in V^Y} \sum_{k \in V^Z} A(i,j,k) \tag{100}$$

The sum over all the communities of V^X is as follows,

$$Q^X = \sum_l Q_l^X = \sum_l \sum_m \sum_n (e_{lmn} - a_l^X a_m^Y a_n^Z) \quad m, n = \arg\max_{j,k} (e_{ljk}) \tag{101}$$

Similarly, we can define Q^Y and Q^Z. The new tripartite modularity Q_t is defined as the average of Q^X, Q^Y and Q^Z

$$Q = \frac{1}{3}(Q^X + Q^Y + Q^Z) \tag{102}$$

[Suzuki and Wakita 2009] proposed a new measure which is used to extract multi-faceted community structures from bipartite networks. They extended the bipartite modularity given by Equation 98. The modified modularity is given as follows,

$$Q = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{V_k, V_l \in V} \frac{e_{kl}}{a_k} \left(\frac{e_{kl}}{|E|/2} - \frac{a_k a_l}{(|E|/2)^2} \right) \tag{103}$$

where e_{ij} and a_i are given by Equation 96 and Equation 97 respectively.

[Xu et al. 2015] proposed **density-based bipartite modularity** for evaluating community structure in bipartite networks. They demonstrated that the existing modularity measurements for bipartite network community partitioning, suffer from resolution limits. To overcome this limit, they proposed a quantitative measurement for evaluating community partitioning in bipartite networks based on the concept of the average bipartite modularity degree. For a bipartite community $G_i(V_i^X, V_i^Y, E_i)$, they defined $D(V_i^X, V_i^Y) = \sum_{j \in V_i^X} \sum_{k \in V_i^Y} A(j,k)$, $D(V_i^X, \bar{V_i^Y}) = \sum_{j \in V_i^X} \sum_{k \in \bar{V_i^Y}} A(j,k)$ and $D(\bar{V_i^X}, V_i^Y) = \sum_{j \in \bar{V_i^X}} \sum_{k \in V_i^Y} A(j,k)$ where $\bar{V_i^X} = V^X - V_i^X$ and $V_i^X \cap \bar{V_i^X} = \phi$. The bipartite density $Q_D(G_i)$ of bipartite community G_i is defined as,

$$Q_D(G_i) = D_{in}(G_i) - D_{out}(G_i) \tag{104}$$

where $D_{in}(G_i)$ and $D_{out}(G_i)$ are the average inner and outer degree of the community G_i respectively. Therefore, the bipartite density of community $G_i(V_i^X, V_i^Y, E_i)$ can be formulated as follows:

$$Q_D(G_i) = \frac{D(V_i^X, V_i^Y) - D(V_i^X, \bar{V_i^Y}) - D(\bar{V_i^X}, V_i^Y)}{|V_i^X| \times |V_i^X|} \tag{105}$$

Here, the intuitive idea is that $Q_D(G_i)$ should be as large as possible for a valid community in bipartite networks. Next, the bipartite density-based modularity of a partitioning scheme P is defined as the summation of bipartite densities overall communities G_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, |P|$. Let $Q_D(P)$ denote the bipartite density-based modularity of a partition scheme P, which divides the bipartite network G into communities $G_i, \cdots, G_{|P|}$; therefore, $Q_D(P)$ can be calculated as follows:

$$Q_D(P) = \sum_{i=1}^{c} Q(G_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{c} \frac{D(V_i^X, V_i^Y) - D(V_i^X, \bar{V_i^Y}) - D(\bar{V_i^X}, V_i^Y)}{|V_i^X| \times |V_i^X|} \tag{106}$$

The larger the value $Q_D(P)$ is, the more accurate the partitioning scheme P becomes.

[Yu et al. 2015] proposed a vertex metric **intensity score** to measure the quality of communities in a advertiser-keyword network modeled as a bipartite graph. Given a weighted bipartite advertiser-keyword graph $G = (A, K, E)$, where A is the set of advertisers, K is the set of keywords and E is the weighted edge such that $A \cap K = \phi$ and $E \subseteq V \times K$. Let w_{ij} denote the weight of an edge between vertex $i \in A$ and vertex $j \in K$. Let $C(A_C, K_C, E_C)$ be one community in the advertiser-keyword graph G. They defined the *homogeneous neighborhood* of a vertex u as a set $N(u) = \{v | (u,t) \in E_C \wedge (t,v) \in E_C, t \neq \phi, u \neq v\}$. The competition coefficient of a vertex $i \in A_C$ is defined as follows:

$$cc_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_j \sum_k w_{jk}}{|N(i)|}, & \text{if} \quad N(i) \neq \phi \\ 0, & \text{if} \quad N(i) = \phi \end{cases}$$

The intensity score I_i of a vertex i in community $C(A_C, K_C, E_C)$ is given by

$$I_i = cc_i + \lambda \left(\sum_{i \in A_C \wedge j \in K_C} w_{ij} - \max_{c'} \sum_{i \in A_C \wedge j' \in K_{C'}} w_{ij'} \right) \tag{107}$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter. The objective is to partition the vertices of G into subsets so as to maximize the intensity score in each detected community. The goal

function is,

$$f_{obj} = \max \sum_{A_C \subseteq G} \sum_{i \in A_C} I_i \tag{108}$$

7.3. Community quality metrics for anti-community detection

So far we discussed about metrics to find assortative communities. However, there has been an interest to find anti-communities. In an anti-community, vertices have most of their connections outside their group and have no or fewer connections with the members within the same group. [Estrada and Rodríguez-Velázquez 2005; Newman 2006a; Newman and Leicht 2007] did some of the initial works to propose "disassortative" communities or communities with networks possessing bipartite structure. However most of these methods either modify the existing definition of modularity or propose a new algorithm for anti-community detection.

Recently, [Chen et al. 2014] proposed a measure, **anti-modularity** to find anti-communities. Consider $B = [b_{ij}] = A^T A$. If v_1 and v_2 are the vertices in the same anti-community, then $b_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik} a_{kj}$ is the number of paths between v_i and v_j passing through a third vertex. The expected number of paths between v_i and v_j passing through a third vertex is next estimated. For a vertex $v_k \in V$ the probability that it appears in the immediate neighbor of v_i and v_j is $\frac{d(i)d(j)}{N^2}$. Thus, for all N vertices the expectation of the number of vertices is $N.\frac{d(i)d(j)}{N^2} = \frac{d(i)d(j)}{N}$. Thus, for an anti-modularity partition $\Omega^{prime} = \omega'_1, \omega'_2, \cdots, \omega'_{|\Omega|}$, the anti-modularity is defined as:

$$Q_{anti} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\omega' \in \Omega'} \sum_{v_i, v_j \in V_{\omega'}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik} a_{jk} - \frac{d(i)d(j)}{N} \right) \tag{109}$$

They demonstrated via experiments that optimizing anti-modularity is reasonable and reliable measure of anti-community partitioning.

7.4. Community quality metrics for multiplex networks

A multiplex is a finite set of m graphs, $G = \{G_1, \cdots, G_m\}$, where every graph $G_i = (V, E_i)$ has a distinct edge set $E_i \subseteq V \times V$. Multiplex networks have recently caught attention in the field of community detection. The existing quality metrics discussed so far for monoplex networks may not give the desired communities in case of multiplex networks. In this section, we discuss the different community detection quality measures designed to measure the quality of a community in a multiplex network.

[Tang et al. 2009] built along the lines of the community measure developed by Newman and Girvan. The modularity function by Newman and Girvan measures how different a monoplex-communities are from a random graph. Given a fixed partition on the vertex set, the modularity on each of the m graphs in the multiplex differs. Therefore a good multiplex-communities suggests that all the monoplex-communities in the graphs have high modularity.

To quantify this concept, [Tang et al. 2009] claimed that if there exists latent communities in the multiplex, a subset of the graphs in the multiplex, $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}$ has sufficient information to find these communities. If the hypothesis is true, then the communities detected from $\mathcal{G}'$ should reflect high modularity on the rest of the graphs in the multiplex.

In the language of machine learning, let us pick a random graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ as the test data and let $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G} \in G$ be the training data. The multiplex-partition P yielded from a community detection algorithm on $\mathcal{G}'$ is evaluated with the modularity function on

the test data G. P is a good multiplex-partition if the modularity of partition P on the graph G is maximized. This extends the modularity metric for multiplex.

[Berlingerio et al. 2011] proposed a local metric, **redundancy** as a measure to compute the quality of a multiplex community. Consider each graph in a multiplex as an independent mode of communication between the members, e.g., email, telephone, postal, etc. A high quality community should resume high information flow amongst its members when one of the communication modes fails.

Let $W \subseteq V$ be the set of vertices in a multiplex-community and $P \subseteq W \times W$ be the set of vertex pairs in W that are adjacent in ≥ 1 relationship. The set of redundant vertex pairs are $P' \subseteq P$ where vertex pairs in W that are adjacent in ≥ 2 relationships. The redundancy of W is determined by:

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}| \times |\mathcal{P}|} \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{\{u,v\} \in P'} \delta(u, v, E_i) \tag{110}$$

where $\delta(u, v, E_i) = 1 \quad if \quad \{u, v\} \in E_i \quad (0, \quad otherwise)$. The metric essentially counts the number of edges in the multiplex-community where their corresponding vertex pairs are adjacent in two or more graphs. The sum is normalized by the theoretical maximum number of edges between all adjacent vertex pairs, i.e., $(|\mathcal{G}| \times |\mathcal{P}|)$. The quality of a multiplex-community is determined by how identical the subgraphs (induced by the vertices of the multiplex-community) are across the graphs in the multiplex. Thus the redundancy does not depend on the number of edges in the multiplex-community, i.e., not a necessary condition to its quality. This can lead to an unusual idea that a community can be low in density. For instance a cycle of overlapping edges form a "community" of equal quality as a complete clique of overlapping edges.

[Brdka et al. 2012] proposed a vertex based community quality measure, **Cross-Layer Edge Clustering Coefficient (CLECC)**. A high edge clustering coefficient implies that there are many common neighbors between the vertex pair, thus suggesting that the two vertices should belong to the same community. Given a parameter α, the MIN-Neighbors of vertex v, $N(v, \alpha)$ are the set of vertices that are adjacent to v in at least α graphs. The Cross-Layer Edge Clustering Coefficient of two vertices $u, v \in V$ measures the ratio of their common neighbors to all their neighbors.

$$CLECC(u, v, \alpha) = \frac{|N(u, \alpha) \cap N(v, \alpha)|}{|N(u, \alpha) \cup N(v, \alpha) \setminus \{u, v\}|} \tag{111}$$

A pair of vertices in a multiplex of social networks with low CLECC suggests that the individuals do not share a common clique of friends through at least α social networks. Therefore it is unlikely that they form a community together.

[Loe and Jensen 2015] studied the different methods proposed to detect communities in *multiplex networks* and performed a comparative analysis of the same.

7.5. Community detection in signed networks

Community Detection has been significantly under-explored for networks with positive and negative links as compared to unsigned ones. Trying to fill this gap, [Esmailian and Jalili 2015] measured the quality of partitions by introducing a Map Equation for signed networks. It is based on the assumption that negative relations weaken positive flow from a node towards a community, and thus, external (internal) negative ties increase the probability of staying inside (escaping from) a community.

8. METRICS FOR COMMUNITY EVALUATION

8.1. Issues with traditional measures

[Orman et al. 2012] argued that the traditional measures consider a community structure to be simply a partition, and therefore ignore a part of the available information:




Fig. 5: Example illustrating the limitation of purely partition-based measures. Colors correspond to the actual communities, whereas lines labeled and represent two different (incorrect) estimations of this community structure as presented in [Labatut 2013].

the network topology. For instance, let us take an example in Figure 5 where 10 nodes are partitioned into two communities (represented by two colors, and referred to as R). Let us also assume two detected community structures: (A) node 2 is misclassified and assigned with nodes, 7, 8, 9 and 10, (B) node 6 is misclassified and assigned with nodes, 7, 8, 9 and 10. If we apply the existing measures, in order to compare R and A, we obtain the score for both the purity and inverse purity. Consequently, the F-Measure reaches the same value. For ARI and NMI, we get 0.6 and 0.62, respectively. Now, if we process the same measures between R and B, we get exactly the same values. Indeed, from a partition perspective, nothing allows to distinguish node 2 from node 6, so misclassifying the former or the latter leads to the same evaluation. However, intuitively, these errors do not seem to be equivalent at all. Indeed, node 2 is much more integrated in its actual community than node 6. Its misclassification in partition A is therefore a more serious error than that of node in partition B.

8.2. Issues with NMI

A major problem of NMI is that it is not a *true metric*, i.e., it does not follow triangle-inequality. Imagine that a putative optimal partition is estimated according to a given criterion. Let us now consider the following triangle inequality:

$$\frac{NMI_{IE} + NMI_{EF}}{2} \leq \frac{1 + NMI_{IF}}{2} \tag{112}$$

where NMI_{IE} is the normalized mutual information calculated for the initial structure (I) and the estimated partition (E), NMI_{EF} is the normalized mutual information for the final structure (F) versus the estimated partition and NMI_{IF} is the normalized mutual information for the comparison between the initial and final structures. Inequality 112 holds true if the structures of I, F and E are identical (i.e., both the number and sizes of the communities are the same, but not necessarily are the same the nodes within each community).

8.3. Example of Edit Distance

For example, Figue 6 presents two partitions with two possible matchings. In the first one, nodes C, D, E, F, G and H must be moved whereas, only C and F have to move with the second matching. The matching which minimizes the number of transforma-



Fig. 6: Example of the matching between parts of different partitions [Aynaud and Guillaume 2010]




Fig. 7: (Color online) Spearman's rank correlation among the results obtained from five overlapping community scoring metrics and four validation measures for LFR networks with overlapping community structure: varying the number of communities to which a node belongs O_m ($n = 10,000$, $\mu = 0.3$, $O_n = 10\%$), and percentage of overlapping nodes O_n ($n = 10,000$, $\mu = 0.3$, $O_m = 5$).

tions can be computed in $O(n^3)$ with n the number of parts using the Kuhn-Munkres algorithm [Kuhn 1955].

9. EXPERIMENTS

We use the LFR benchmark networks proposed by [Lancichinetti et al. 2008]. We vary the following parameters depending upon the experimental need: the number of nodes (n), mixing coefficient (μ), the percentage of overlapping nodes O_n, and the number of communities to which a node belongs O_m. Figure 7 shows the results for the LFR networks by varying different parameters O_m and O_n.

10. SUMMARY

In this section we summarize the various metrics for both community detection and evaluation. The notations used are borrowed from Table I in the main paper. Table I and Table II summarize the community detection metrics for non-overlapping and overlapping community structures respectively. Table III and Table IV describe the

community evaluation metrics for non-overlapping and overlapping community structures respectively.

REFERENCES

Rodrigo Aldecoa and Ignacio Marín. 2013. Surprise maximization reveals the community structure of complex networks. *Scientific reports* 3 (2013).

Rodrigo Aldecoa, Ignacio Marín, and others. 2011. Deciphering network community structure by surprise. *PloS one* 6, 9 (2011), e24195.

Rodrigo Aldecoa and Ignacio Marn. 2014. SurpriseMe: an integrated tool for network community structure characterization using Surprise maximization. *Bioinformatics* 30, 7 (2014), 1041–1042.

Reid Andersen, Fan Chung, and Kevin Lang. 2006. Local Graph Partitioning Using PageRank Vectors. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '06)*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 475–486.

A Arenas, J Duch, A Fernndez, and S Gmez. 2007. Size reduction of complex networks preserving modularity. *New Journal of Physics* 9, 6 (2007), 176.

A Arenas, A Fernndez, S Fortunato, and S Gmez. 2008b. Motif-based communities in complex networks. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 41, 22 (2008), 224001.

A Arenas, A Fernndez, and S Gmez. 2008a. Analysis of the structure of complex networks at different resolution levels. *New Journal of Physics* 10, 5 (2008), 053039.

Javier Artiles, Julio Gonzalo, and Satoshi Sekine. 2007. The SemEval-2007 WePS Evaluation: Establishing a Benchmark for the Web People Search Task. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluations (SemEval '07)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 64–69.

T. Aynaud and J.-L. Guillaume. 2010. Static community detection algorithms for evolving networks. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc and Wireless Networks (WiOpt)*. Avignon, France, 513–519.

James P Bagrow. 2008. Evaluating local community methods in networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2008, 05 (2008), P05001.

James P. Bagrow and Erik M. Bollt. 2005. Local method for detecting communities. *Phys. Rev. E* 72 (Oct 2005), 046108. Issue 4.

Maria Florina Balcan and Yingyu Liang. 2013. Modeling and Detecting Community Hierarchies. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Similarity-Based Pattern Recognition (SIMBAD'13)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 160–175.

Michael J. Barber. 2007. Modularity and community detection in bipartite networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 76 (Dec 2007), 066102. Issue 6.

Jeffrey Baumes, Mark K Goldberg, Mukkai S Krishnamoorthy, Malik Magdon-Ismail, and Nathan Preston. 2005. Finding communities by clustering a graph into overlapping subgraphs. *IADIS AC* 5 (2005), 97–104.

Pavel Berkhin. 2006. A Survey of Clustering Data Mining Techniques. In *Grouping Multidimensional Data - Recent Advances in Clustering*. 25–71.

M. Berlingerio, M. Coscia, and F. Giannotti. 2011. Finding and Characterizing Communities in Multidimensional Networks. In *Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM), 2011 International Conference on*. 490–494.

V.D. Blondel, J.L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E.L.J.S. Mech. 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *J. Stat. Mech* (2008), P10008.

Piotr Brdka, Przemysaw Kazienko, and Bartosz Kooszczyk. 2012. Predicting Group Evolution in the Social Network. In *Social Informatics*, Karl Aberer, Andreas Flache, Wander Jager, Ling Liu, Jie Tang, and Christophe Guret (Eds.). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 7710. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 54–67.

R.J.G.B. Campello. 2007. A fuzzy extension of the Rand index and other related indexes for clustering and classification assessment. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 28, 7 (2007), 833 – 841.

R.J.G.B. Campello. 2010. Generalized external indexes for comparing data partitions with overlapping categories. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 31, 9 (2010), 966 – 975.

Tanmoy Chakraborty, Sandipan Sikdar, Niloy Ganguly, and Animesh Mukherjee. 2014. Citation interactions among computer science fields: a quantitative route to the rise and fall of scientific research. *Social Netw. Analys. Mining* 4, 1 (2014), 187.

Tanmoy Chakraborty, Sandipan Sikdar, Vihar Tammana, Niloy Ganguly, and Animesh Mukherjee. 2013. Computer science fields as ground-truth communities: their impact, rise and fall. In *Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining 2013, ASONAM '13, Niagara, ON, Canada - August 25 - 29, 2013*. 426–433.

Tanmoy Chakraborty, Sriram Srinivasan, Niloy Ganguly, Animesh Mukherjee, and Sanjukta Bhowmick. 2014. On the Permanence of Vertices in Network Communities. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '14)*. ACM, New York, New York, USA, 1396–1405.

Duanbing Chen, Mingsheng Shang, Zehua Lv, and Yan Fu. 2010. Detecting overlapping communities of weighted networks via a local algorithm. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 389, 19 (2010), 4177 – 4187.

Jiyang Chen, O. Zaiane, and R. Goebel. 2009a. Local Community Identification in Social Networks. In *International Conference on Advances in Social Network Analysis and Mining*. 237–242.

Jiyang Chen, Osmar R. Zaane, and Randy Goebel. 2009b. Detecting Communities in Social Networks Using Max-Min Modularity. In *SDM*. SIAM, 978–989.

Ling Chen, Qiang Yu, and Bolun Chen. 2014. Anti-modularity and anti-community detecting in complex networks. *Information Sciences* 275 (2014), 293 – 313.

Mingming Chen, K. Kuzmin, and B.K. Szymanski. 2014. Extension of Modularity Density for overlapping community structure. In *2014 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*. Beijing, China, 856–863.

Mingming Chen, T. Nguyen, and B.K. Szymanski. 2013. On Measuring the Quality of a Network Community Structure. In *2013 International Conference on Social Computing (SocialCom)*. Washington, USA, 122–127.

C. Chira, A. Gog, and D. Iclanzan. 2012. Evolutionary detection of community structures in complex networks: A new fitness function. In *IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*. Brisbane, Australia, 1–8.

Aaron Clauset. 2005. Finding local community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 72 (Aug. 2005), 026132.

Aaron Clauset, M. E. J. Newman, , and Cristopher Moore. 2004. Finding community structure in very large networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 70, 6 (2004), 066111.

L. M. Collins and C. W. Dent. 1988. Omega: A general formulation of the rand index of cluster recovery suitable for non-disjoint solutions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 23, 2 (1988), 231–242.

J. Creusefond, Thomas Largillier, and Sylvain Peyronnet. 2014. Finding compact communities in large graphs. *CoRR* abs/1410.2105 (2014).

J. Creusefond, Thomas Largillier, and Sylvain Peyronnet. 2015. On the evaluation potential of quality functions in community detection for different contexts. *CoRR* arXiv:1510.01714 (2015).

Leon Danon, Albert Daz-Guilera, Jordi Duch, and Alex Arenas. 2005. Comparing community structure identification. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2005, 09 (2005), P09008.

FabrcioOlivetti de Frana and GuilhermePalermo Coelho. 2015. A Flexible Fitness Function for Community Detection in Complex Networks. In *Complex Networks VI*, Giuseppe Mangioni, Filippo Simini, Stephen Miles Uzzo, and Dashun Wang (Eds.). Studies in Computational Intelligence, Vol. 597. Springer International Publishing, 1–12.

Pouya Esmailian and Mahdi Jalili. 2015. Community Detection in Signed Networks: the Role of Negative ties in Different Scales. *Scientific reports* 5 (2015).

Ernesto Estrada and Juan A. Rodríguez-Velázquez. 2005. Spectral measures of bipartivity in complex networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 72 (Oct 2005), 046105. Issue 4.

Zhidan Feng, Xiaowei Xu, Nurcan Yuruk, and ThomasA.J. Schweiger. 2007. A Novel Similarity-Based Modularity Function for Graph Partitioning. In *Data Warehousing and Knowledge Discovery*, IlYeal Song, Johann Eder, and ThoManh Nguyen (Eds.). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 4654. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 385–396.

Gary William Flake, Steve Lawrence, and C. Lee Giles. 2000. Efficient Identification of Web Communities. In *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '00)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 150–160.

Tobias Fleck, Andrea Kappes, and Dorothea Wagner. 2014. Graph Clustering with Surprise: Complexity and Exact Solutions. In *SOFSEM 2014: Theory and Practice of Computer Science*, Viliam Geffert, Bart Preneel, Branislav Rovan, Jlius tuller, and AMin Tjoa (Eds.). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8327. Springer International Publishing, 223–234.

Santo Fortunato. 2010. Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports* 486, 3-5 (2010), 75 – 174.

Santo Fortunato and Marc Barthlemy. 2007. Resolution limit in community detection. *PNAS* 104, 1 (2007), 36–41.

Santo Fortunato and Andrea Lancichinetti. 2009. Community detection algorithms: a comparative analysis: invited presentation, extended abstract. In *4th International Conference on Performance Evaluation Methodologies and Tools, VALUETOOLS '09, Pisa, Italy, October 20-22, 2009*. 27.

E. B. Fowlkes and C. L. Mallows. 1983. A Method for Comparing Two Hierarchical Clusterings. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 78, 383 (1983), 553–569.

Agata Fronczak, Piotr Fronczak, and Janusz A. Hołyst. 2004. Average path length in random networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 70 (Nov 2004), 056110. Issue 5.

M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and L. Stockmeyer. 1974. Some Simplified NP-complete Problems. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC '74)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 47–63.

No Gaumont, Franois Queyroi, Clmence Magnien, and Matthieu Latapy. 2015. Expected Nodes: A Quality Function for the Detection of Link Communities. In *Complex Networks VI*, Giuseppe Mangioni, Filippo Simini, Stephen Miles Uzzo, and Dashun Wang (Eds.). Studies in Computational Intelligence, Vol. 597. Springer International Publishing, 57–64.

Rumi Ghosh and Kristina Lerman. 2010. Community Detection Using a Measure of Global Influence. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Advances in Social Network Mining and Analysis (SNAKDD'08)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 20–35.

Saptarshi Ghosh, Avishek Banerjee, Naveen Sharma, Sanket Agarwal, and Niloy Ganguly. 2011. Statistical Analysis of The Indian Railway Network: a Complex Network Approach. *Acta Physica Polonica B Proceedings Supplement* 4 (March 2011), 123–137.

M. Girvan and M. E. Newman. 2002a. Community structure in social and biological networks. *PNAS* 99, 12 (June 2002), 7821–7826.

M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman. 2002b. Community structure in social and biological networks. *PNAS* 99, 12 (2002), 7821–7826.

Benjamin H. Good, Yves-Alexandre de Montjoye, and Aaron Clauset. 2010. Performance of modularity maximization in practical contexts. *Phys. Rev. E* 81 (Apr 2010), 046106. Issue 4.

Steve Gregory. 2010. Finding overlapping communities in networks by label propagation. *New J. Phys.* 12, 10 (2010), 103018.

Steve Gregory. 2011. Fuzzy overlapping communities in networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2011, 02 (2011), P02017.

R. Guimera, M. Sales-Pardo, and L.A.N. Amaral. 2004. Modularity from fluctuations in random graphs and complex networks. *Physical Review E* 70, 2 (2004), 025101.

Roger Guimerà, Marta Sales-Pardo, and Luís A. Nunes Amaral. 2007. Module identification in bipartite and directed networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 76 (Sep 2007), 036102. Issue 3.

Maria Halkidi, Yannis Batistakis, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2001. On Clustering Validation Techniques. *J. Intell. Inf. Syst.* 17, 2-3 (Dec. 2001), 107–145.

S. Harenberg, G. Bello, L. Gjeltema, S. Ranshous, J. Harlalka, R. Seay, K. Padmanabhan, and N. Samatova. 2014. Community detection in large-scale networks: A survey and empirical evaluation. *WIREs Comput Stat* 6 (2014), 426–439.

Frank Havemann, Michael Heinz, Alexander Struck, and Jochen Glser. 2011. Identification of overlapping communities and their hierarchy by locally calculating community-changing resolution levels. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2011, 01 (2011), P01023.

L. Hubert and P. Arabie. 1985. Comparing partitions. *Journal of classification* 2, 1 (1985), 193–218.

Eyke Hullermeier and Maria Rifqi. 2009. A Fuzzy Variant of the Rand Index for Comparing Clustering Structures. In *IFSA/EUSFLAT Conf.* (2009-12-16), Joo Paulo Carvalho, Didier Dubois, Uzay Kaymak, and Joo Miguel da Costa Sousa (Eds.). 1294–1298.

Anil K. Jain and Richard C. Dubes. 1988. *Algorithms for Clustering Data*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.

Daxin Jiang, Chun Tang, and Aidong Zhang. 2004. Cluster Analysis for Gene Expression Data: A Survey. *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.* 16, 11 (Nov. 2004), 1370–1386.

Stephen Kelley. 2009. *The existence and discovery of overlapping communities in large-scale networks*. RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE.

Youngdo Kim, Seung-Woo Son, and Hawoong Jeong. 2010. Finding communities in directed networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 81 (Jan 2010), 016103. Issue 1.

Kyle Kloster and David F. Gleich. 2014. Heat Kernel Based Community Detection. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '14)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1386–1395.

Alexander Kraskov, Harald Stgbauer, Ralph G. Andrzejak, and Peter Grassberger. 2003. Hierarchical Clustering Based on Mutual Information. *CoRR* q-bio.QM/0311039 (2003).

Harold W. Kuhn. 1955. The Hungarian Method for the Assignment Problem. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 2, 1–2 (March 1955), 83–97.

Vincent Labatut. 2013. Generalized Measures for the Evaluation of Community Detection Methods. *CoRR* abs/1303.5441 (2013).

Andrea Lancichinetti and Santo Fortunato. 2009. Community detection algorithms: A comparative analysis. *Phys. Rev. E* 80 (Nov 2009), 056117. Issue 5.

Andrea Lancichinetti and Santo Fortunato. 2011. Limits of modularity maximization in community detection. *Phys. Rev. E* 84 (Dec 2011), 066122. Issue 6.

Andrea Lancichinetti, Santo Fortunato, and Janos Kertesz. 2008. Detecting the overlapping and hierarchical community structure of complex networks. *ArXiv E-prints* (Feb. 2008).

Andrea Lancichinetti, Santo Fortunato, and Jnos Kertsz. 2009. Detecting the overlapping and hierarchical community structure in complex networks. *New Journal of Physics* 11, 3 (2009), 033015.

Andrea Lancichinetti, Mikko Kivel, Jari Saramki, and Santo Fortunato. 2010. Characterizing the Community Structure of Complex Networks. *PLoS ONE* 5, 8 (08 2010), e11976.

A. Lancichinetti, F. Radicchi, J. J. Ramasco, and S. Fortunato. 2011. Finding statistically significant communities in networks. *PLoS ONE* 6, 4 (2011), e18961.

Kevin J. Lang and Reid Andersen. 2007. Finding Dense and Isolated Submarkets in a Sponsored Search Spending Graph. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '07)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 613–622.

Anna Lázár, Dániel Ábel, and Tamás Vicsek. 2010. Modularity measure of networks with overlapping communities. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* 90, 1 (2010), 18001.

E. A. Leicht and M. E. J. Newman. 2008. Community Structure in Directed Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100 (Mar 2008), 118703. Issue 11.

Jure Leskovec, Kevin J. Lang, and Michael Mahoney. 2010. Empirical Comparison of Algorithms for Network Community Detection. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW '10)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 631–640.

Zhenping Li, Shihua Zhang, Rui-Sheng Wang, Xiang-Sun Zhang, and Luonan Chen. 2008. Quantitative function for community detection. *Phys. Rev. E* 77 (Mar 2008), 036109. Issue 3.

Tsau Young Lin, Setsuo Ohsuga, Churn-Jung Liau, and Xiaohua Hu (Eds.). 2006. *Foundations and Novel Approaches in Data Mining*. Studies in Computational Intelligence, Vol. 9. Springer.

Xin Liu, Tsuyoshi Murata, and Ken Wakita. 2012. Extending modularity by capturing the similarity attraction feature in the null model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.4007* (2012).

Chuan Wen Loe and Henrik Jeldtoft Jensen. 2015. Comparison of communities detection algorithms for multiplex. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 431 (2015), 29 – 45.

Feng Luo, James Z. Wang, and Eric Promislow. 2006. Exploring Local Community Structures in Large Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI '06)*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 233–239.

Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. 2008. *Introduction to Information Retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA.

Claire P. Massen and Jonathan P. K. Doye. 2005. Identifying communities within energy landscapes. *Phys. Rev. E* 71 (Apr 2005), 046101. Issue 4.

Aaron McDaid and Neil Hurley. 2010. Detecting Highly Overlapping Communities with Model-Based Overlapping Seed Expansion. In *ASONAM*. Washington, DC, USA, 112–119.

Aaron F. McDaid, Derek Greene, and Neil J. Hurley. 2011. Normalized Mutual Information to evaluate overlapping community finding algorithms. *CoRR* abs/1110.2515 (2011).

Miller McPherson, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27 (2001), pp. 415–444.

Marina Meilă. 2007. Comparing Clusterings—an Information Based Distance. *J. Multivar. Anal.* 98, 5 (May 2007), 873–895.

Atsushi Miyauchi and Yasushi Kawase. 2015a. What Is a Network Community?: A Novel Quality Function and Detection Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '15)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1471–1480.

Atsushi Miyauchi and Yasushi Kawase. 2015b. Z-score-based modularity for community detection in networks. *CoRR* abs/1501.01909 (2015).

Stefanie Muff, Francesco Rao, and Amedeo Caflisch. 2005. Local modularity measure for network clusterizations. *Phys. Rev. E* 72 (Nov 2005), 056107. Issue 5.

T. Murata. 2009. Detecting Communities from Bipartite Networks Based on Bipartite Modularities. In *Computational Science and Engineering, 2009. CSE '09. International Conference on*, Vol. 4. 50–57.

Tsuyoshi Murata. 2010. Detecting communities from tripartite networks. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*. ACM, Raleigh, North Carolina USA, 1159–1160.

Tsuyoshi Murata. 2011. A New Tripartite Modularity for Detecting Communities. *Information and Media Technologies* 6, 2 (2011), 572–579.

Gabriel Murray, Giuseppe Carenini, and Raymond Ng. 2012. Using the Omega Index for Evaluating Abstractive Community Detection. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Evaluation Metrics and System Comparison for Automatic Summarization*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 10–18.

Tamás Nepusz, Andrea Petróczi, László Négyessy, and Fülöp Bazsó. 2008. Fuzzy communities and the concept of bridgeness in complex networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 77 (Jan 2008), 016107. Issue 1.

Nicolas Neubauer and Klaus Obermayer. 2009. Towards community detection in k-partite k-uniform hypergraphs. In *Proceedings of the NIPS 2009 Workshop on Analyzing Networks and Learning with Graphs*. 1–9.

M. E. J. Newman. 2004a. Analysis of weighted networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 70 (Nov 2004), 056131. Issue 5.

M. E. J. Newman. 2004b. Detecting community structure in networks. *EPJB* 38, 2 (25 March 2004), 321–330.

M. E. J. Newman. 2004c. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 69 (Jun 2004), 066133. Issue 6.

M. E. J. Newman. 2004d. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 69, 6 (June 2004), 066133.

M. E. J. Newman. 2006a. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Phys. Rev. E* 74 (Sep 2006), 036104. Issue 3.

M. E. J. Newman. 2006b. Modularity and community structure in networks. *PNAS* 103, 23 (2006), 8577–8582.

M. E. J. Newman and M. Girvan. 2004. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 69 (Feb 2004), 026113. Issue 2.

M. E. J. Newman and E. A. Leicht. 2007. Mixture models and exploratory analysis in networks. *PNAS* 104, 23 (2007), 9564–9569.

V. Nicosia, G. Mangioni, V. Carchiolo, and M. Malgeri. 2009. Extending the definition of modularity of directed graphs with overlapping communities. (2009).

Gnce Keziban Orman, Vincent Labatut, and Hocine Cherifi. 2012. Comparative Evaluation of Community Detection Algorithms: A Topological Approach. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics* 8 (2012), p08001.

Gergely Palla, Imre Derényi, Illés Farkas, and Tamás Vicsek. 2005. Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society. *Nature* 435, 7043 (2005), 814–818.

Clara Pizzuti. 2008. GA-Net: A Genetic Algorithm for Community Detection in Social Networks. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature PPSN X*, Gnter Rudolph, Thomas Jansen, Nicola Beume, Simon Lucas, and Carlo Poloni (Eds.). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 5199. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1081–1090.

Clara Pizzuti. 2009. Overlapped Community Detection in Complex Networks. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO '09)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 859–866.

Pascal Pons and Matthieu Latapy. 2006. Computing Communities in Large Networks Using Random Walks. *Journal of Graph Algortihms and Applications* 10, 2 (2006), 191–218.

F. Radicchi, C. Castellano, F. Cecconi, V. Loreto, and D. Parisi. 2004. Defining and identifying communities in networks. *PNAS* 101, 9 (2004), 2658.

Jörg Reichardt and Stefan Bornholdt. 2006a. Statistical mechanics of community detection. *Phys. Rev. E* 74 (Jul 2006), 016110. Issue 1.

Joerg Reichardt and Stefan Bornholdt. 2006b. When are networks truly modular? *Physica D Nonlinear Phenomena* 224 (December 2006), 20–26.

M. Rosvall and C.T. Bergstrom. 2007. An information-theoretic framework for resolving community structure in complex networks. *PNAS* 104, 18 (2007), 7327.

Martin Rosvall and Carl T. Bergstrom. 2008. Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *PNAS* 105, 4 (2008), 1118–1123.

Barna Saha, Allison Hoch, Samir Khuller, Louiqa Raschid, and Xiao-Ning Zhang. 2010. Dense Subgraphs with Restrictions and Applications to Gene Annotation Graphs. In *RECOMB* (2010-05-11) *(Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Bonnie Berger (Ed.), Vol. 6044. Springer, 456–472.

Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, Kai Cai, and Mao-Bin Hu. 2009b. Detect overlapping and hierarchical community structure in networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 388, 8 (2009), 1706 – 1712.

Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, and Jia-Feng Guo. 2009a. Quantifying and identifying the overlapping community structure in networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2009, 07 (2009), P07042.

Jianbo Shi and Jitendra Malik. 2000. Normalized Cuts and Image Segmentation. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 22, 8 (Aug. 2000), 888–905.

Karsten Steinhaeuser and Nitesh V. Chawla. 2010. Identifying and Evaluating Community Structure in Complex Networks. *Pattern Recogn. Lett.* 31, 5 (April 2010), 413–421.

Alexander Strehl and Joydeep Ghosh. 2003. Cluster Ensembles — a Knowledge Reuse Framework for Combining Multiple Partitions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 3 (March 2003), 583–617.

Peng Gang Sun, Lin Gao, and Yang Yang. 2013. Maximizing Modularity Intensity for Community Partition and Evolution. *Inf. Sci.* 236 (July 2013), 83–92.

Kenta Suzuki and Ken Wakita. 2009. Extracting Multi-facet Community Structure from Bipartite Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2009 International Conference on Computational Science and Engineering - Volume 04 (CSE '09)*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 312–319.

Lei Tang, Xufei Wang, and Huan Liu. 2009. Uncoverning Groups via Heterogeneous Interaction Analysis. In *Ninth IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*. Miami, Florida, USA, 503–512.

My T Thai and Panos M Pardalos. 2011. *Handbook of optimization in complex networks: theory and applications*. Vol. 57. Springer Science & Business Media.

V. A. Traag, R. Aldecoa, and J.-C. Delvenne. 2015. Detecting communities using asymptotical surprise. *Phys. Rev. E* 92 (Aug 2015), 022816. Issue 2.

Vincent A Traag, Gautier Krings, and Paul Van Dooren. 2013. Significant scales in community structure. *Scientific reports* 3 (2013).

Charalampos Tsourakakis, Francesco Bonchi, Aristides Gionis, Francesco Gullo, and Maria Tsiarli. 2013. Denser Than the Densest Subgraph: Extracting Optimal Quasi-cliques with Quality Guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '13)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 104–112.

Twan van Laarhoven and Elena Marchiori. 2014. Axioms for Graph Clustering Quality Functions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15 (2014), 193–215.

Nguyen Xuan Vinh, Julien Epps, and James Bailey. 2009. Information Theoretic Measures for Clusterings Comparison: Is a Correction for Chance Necessary?. In *ICML*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1073–1080.

Qinna Wang and Eric Fleury. 2012. Fuzziness and Overlapping Communities in Large-Scale Networks. 18, 4 (2012), 457–486.

D.J. Watts and S.H. Strogatz. 1998. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature* 393 (1998), 440–442.

Joyce Jiyoung Whang, David F. Gleich, and Inderjit S. Dhillon. 2013. Overlapping community detection using seed set expansion. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Conference on information and knowledge management (CIKM '13)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2099–2108.

Yubao Wu, Ruoming Jin, Jing Li, and Xiang Zhang. 2015. Robust Local Community Detection: On Free Rider Effect and Its Elimination. *PVLDB* 8, 7 (2015), 798–809.

Ju Xiang, Yan-Ni Tang, Yuan-Yuan Gao, Yan Zhang, Ke Deng, Xiao-Ke Xu, and Ke Hu. 2015. Multi-resolution community detection based on generalized self-loop rescaling strategy. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 432 (2015), 127–139.

Jierui Xie, Stephen Kelley, and Boleslaw K. Szymanski. 2013. Overlapping Community Detection in Networks: The State-of-the-art and Comparative Study. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 45, 4, Article 43 (Aug. 2013), 35 pages.

Jierui Xie and Boleslaw K. Szymanski. 2012. Towards Linear Time Overlapping Community Detection in Social Networks. In *PAKDD*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 25–36.

Yongcheng Xu, Ling Chen, Bin Li, and Wei liu. 2015. Density-based modularity for evaluating community structure in bipartite networks. *Information Sciences* 317 (2015), 278 – 294.

Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. 2012. Defining and Evaluating Network Communities Based on Ground-truth. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Workshop on Mining Data Semantics (MDS '12)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3:1–3:8.

Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. 2013a. Overlapping Community Detection at Scale: A Nonnegative Matrix Factorization Approach. In *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '13)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 587–596.

Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. 2013b. Overlapping Community Detection at Scale: A Nonnegative Matrix Factorization Approach. In *WSDM*. ACM, New York, USA, 587–596.

Wenchao Yu, Ariyam Das, Justin Wood, Wei Wang, Carlo Zaniolo, and Ping Luo. 2015. Max-Intensity: Detecting Competitive Advertiser Communities in Sponsored Search Market. In *ICDM*. IEEE, 569–578.

Shihua Zhang, Rui-Sheng Wang, and Xiang-Sun Zhang. 2007. Identification of overlapping community structure in complex networks using fuzzy c-means clustering. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 374, 1 (2007), 483–490.

Shuqin Zhang and Hongyu Zhao. 2012. Community identification in networks with unbalanced structure. *Phys. Rev. E* 85 (Jun 2012), 066114. Issue 6.

Ye Zhen-Qing, Zhang Ke, Hu Song-Nian, and Yu Jun. 2012. A New Definition of Modularity for Community Detection in Complex Networks. *Chinese Physics Letters* 29, 9 (2012), 098901.

Table V: Metrics for non-overlapping community detection.

Metric	Expression
Internal density	$\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert}{\lvert\omega\rvert(\omega-1)/2}$
Edge inside	$\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert$
Average degree	$2\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert/\lvert\omega\rvert$
Fraction over median degree (FOMD)	$\frac{\lvert u:u\in\omega,\lvert(u,v):v\in\omega\rvert>d_m\rvert}{\lvert\omega\rvert}$
Triangle Participation Ratio (TPR)	$\frac{\lvert u:u\in\omega,\{v,w\in\omega,(u,v)\in E,(u,w)\in E,(v,w)\in E\}\neq\phi\rvert}{\lvert\omega\rvert}$
Expansion	$\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert/\lvert\omega\rvert$
Cut Ratio	$\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert/\lvert\omega\rvert(N\lvert\omega\rvert)$
Conductance	$\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert+\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert}$
Normalized Cut	$\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert+\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert}+\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2(m-\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert)+\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert}$
Maximum-ODF (Out Degree Fraction)	$max_{u\in\omega}\frac{\lvert(u,v)\in E:v\notin\omega\rvert}{d(u)}$
Average-ODF	$\frac{1}{\lvert\omega\rvert}\sum_{u\in\omega}\frac{\lvert(u,v)\in E:v\notin\omega\rvert}{d(u)}$
Flake-ODF	$\frac{\lvert u:u\in\omega,\lvert(u,v)\in E:v\in\omega\rvert<d(u)/2\rvert}{\lvert\omega\rvert}$
Modularity	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert}{m}-\left(\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2m}\right)^2\right]$
Separability	$\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert/\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert$
Density	$2\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert/\omega(\omega-1)$
Cohesiveness	$min_{\omega^{'}\subset\omega}\phi(\omega^{'})$, where $\phi(\omega^{'})$ is the conductance of $\omega^{'}$ measured in the induced subgraph by ω.
Volume	$\sum_{u\in\omega}d(u)$
Edges cut	$\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert$
Weighted Modularity	$\frac{1}{2\lvert W\rvert}\sum_{ij}\left[W_{ij}-\frac{s(i)s(j)}{2\lvert W\rvert}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$
Modularity for Directed Graphs	$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij}-\frac{d(i)^{out}d(j)^{in}}{m}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$
Generalized Modularity	$\frac{1}{\lvert W\rvert}\sum_{ij}\left[W_{ij}-\frac{s_i^{out}s_j^{in}}{\lvert W\rvert}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$
Coverage-based modularity	$\frac{\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert}{m}}{\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2m}}$
Similarity-based modularity	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)\delta(i,\omega)\delta(j,\omega)}{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)}-\left(\frac{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)\delta(i,\omega)}{\sum_i\sum_j S(i,j)}\right)^2\right]$
Motif modularity	$\left[\frac{\sum_{ijk}A_{ij}(\omega)A_{jk}(\omega)A_{ki}(\omega)}{\sum_{ijk}A_{ij}A_{jk}A_{ki}}-\frac{\sum_{ijk}n_{ij}(\omega)n_{jk}(\omega)n_{ki}(\omega)}{\sum_{ijk}n_{ij}n_{jk}n_{ki}}\right]$
Max-Min modularity	$\sum_{ij}\left[\frac{1}{2m}\left(A_{ij}-\frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m}\right)-\frac{1}{2m'}\left(A'_{ij}-\frac{d(i)'d(j)'}{2m'}\right)\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$
Influence-based modularity	$\sum_{ij}\left[P_{ij}-\bar{P_{ij}}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$
Diffusion-based modularity	$\sum_{ij}\left[L_{ij}-E(L_{ij})\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$
Dist-modularity	$\frac{1}{2m}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij}-P_{ij}^{Dist}\right]\delta_{\omega_i,\omega_j}$
Local modularity	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert}{L_{\omega n}}-\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert\lvert E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{L_{\omega n}^2}\right]$
Modularity Density	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}d(G_\omega)$
Modularity with Resolution Parameter	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert+\lvert V_\omega\rvert r}{\lvert E\rvert+\lvert V\rvert r}-\left(\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}\rvert+\lvert V_\omega\rvert r}{2\lvert E\rvert+\lvert V\rvert r}\right)^2\right]$
Modularity with Diameter	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left[\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert}{D_\omega}-\left(\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2\lvert E\rvert}\right)^2*\frac{1}{D_\omega}\right]$
Modularity Density	$Q_{ud}-SP$ where $SP=\sum_{\omega_i\in\Omega}\left[\sum_{\omega_j\in\Omega\atop\omega_j\neq\omega_i}\frac{\lvert E_{\omega_i,\omega_j}\rvert}{2m}\right]$
Z-Modularity	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\left(\frac{D_\omega}{2m}\right)^2$
Community Score	$\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}score(\omega)$, $score(\omega)=M(\omega)v_\omega$, $M(\omega)=\frac{\sum_{i\in\omega}(\mu_i)'}{N_\omega}$
SPart	$\frac{1}{\lvert\Omega\rvert}\sum_{i\in\Omega}SComm(\omega_i)\frac{\nu(\omega_i)}{\lvert\omega_i\rvert}$ $SNode(v)=\frac{d(v)^{in}-d(v)^{out}}{\lvert\omega\rvert}$ $SComm(\omega)=\sum_{v\in\omega}\left[SNode(v)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{A_{vw}=1\atop w\in\omega}SNode(w)\right]$
Significance	$-\log Pr(\Omega)=\sum_c\binom{n_\omega}{2}D(p_\omega\lvert\lvert p)$ $Pr(\Omega)=\prod_\omega exp(-\binom{n_\omega}{2}D(p_c\lvert\lvert p))$
Permanence	$\left[\frac{I(v)}{E_{max}(v)}\times\frac{1}{d(v)}\right]-\left[1-c_{in}(v)\right]$
Surprise	$\sum_{j=p}^{Min(M,\lvert E\rvert)}\frac{\binom{M}{j}\binom{E-M}{\lvert E\rvert-j}}{\binom{E}{\lvert E\rvert}}$
Expected nodes	$\mu_G(\lvert\omega\rvert)=\sum_{u\in V}1-\frac{\binom{2\lvert E\rvert-b(u)}{2\lvert\omega\rvert}}{\binom{2\lvert E\rvert}{2\lvert\omega\rvert}}$ $Q_{in}(\omega)=\frac{\mu_G(\lvert\omega\rvert)-V_{in}(\omega)}{\mu_G(\lvert\omega\rvert)}$ $Q_{ext}(\omega)=\min\left(0,\frac{\lvert V_{out}(\omega)\rvert-\mu_{G\setminus\omega}(\bar{d}(\omega)/2)}{\mu_{G\setminus\omega}(d(\omega)/2)}\right)$ $Q_\omega=2\frac{\lvert\omega\rvert Q_{in}(\omega)+\lvert\omega_{out}\rvert Q_{ext}(\omega)}{\lvert\omega\rvert+\lvert\omega_{out}\rvert}$ $\frac{\sum_{\omega\in\Omega}\lvert\omega\rvert Q(\omega)}{\lvert E\rvert}$
Communitude	$\frac{\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}\rvert}{m}-(\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2m})^2}{(\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2m})^2(1-(\frac{\lvert E_\omega^{in}+E_\omega^{out}\rvert}{2m})^2)}$

Table VI: Metrics for Overlapping Community Detection.

Metric	Expression
Modularity	$\sum_{\psi\in\Psi}\left[\frac{\lvert E_{\psi}^{in}\rvert}{m}-\left(\frac{2\lvert E_{\psi}^{in}\rvert+\lvert E_{\psi}^{out}\rvert}{2m}\right)^{2}\right]$
Fuzzy Modularity	$\frac{1}{2m}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij}-\frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m}\right]s_{ij}$
Modularity [Shen et al. 2009a]	$\frac{1}{2m}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij}-\frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m}\right]\alpha_{i\psi}\alpha_{j\psi}$
Modularity [Shen et al. 2009b]	$\frac{1}{2m}\sum_{\psi\in\Psi}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij}-\frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m}\right]\frac{1}{O_iO_j}$
Modularity [Nicosia et al. 2009]	$\frac{1}{2m}\sum_{\psi\in\Psi}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij}F\left(\alpha_{i\psi},\alpha_{j\psi}\right)-\frac{d(i)d(j)\left(\sum_{v\in V}F\left(\alpha_{v\psi},\alpha_{j\psi}\right)\right)\left(\sum_{v\in V}F\left(\alpha_{i\psi},\alpha_{v\psi}\right)\right)}{2mN^{2}}\right]$
Fitness Function	$\frac{\lvert E_{in}\rvert^{\psi}}{(\lvert E_{in}\rvert^{\psi}+\lvert E_{out}\rvert^{\psi})^{\alpha}}$
Modularity [Lázár et al. 2010]	$\frac{\lvert E_{\psi}^{in}\rvert+\lvert E_{\psi}^{out}\rvert}{N_{\psi}(N_{\psi}-1)/2}\frac{1}{N_{\psi}}\sum_{i\in N_{\psi}}\frac{\sum_{j\in N_{\psi}i\neq j}A_{ij}-\sum_{j\notin N_{\psi}}A_{ij}}{d(i)s_i}$
Modularity [Chen et al. 2010]	$\frac{1}{2m}\sum_{\psi\in\Psi}\sum_{ij}\left[A_{ij}-\frac{d(i)d(j)}{2m}\right]\alpha_{i\psi}\alpha_{j\psi}$
Modified Fitness Function	$\lvert E_{in}\rvert^{\psi}+\lvert E_{out}\rvert^{\psi})^{\alpha}$
Overlapping Modularity Density	$\sum_{\psi\in\Psi}\left[\frac{\lvert E_{\psi}^{in}\rvert}{m}d_{\psi}-\left(\frac{2\lvert E_{\psi}^{in}\rvert+\lvert E_{\psi}^{out}\rvert}{2m}d_{\psi}\right)^{2}-\sum_{\psi'\in\Psi,\psi\neq\psi'}\frac{\lvert E_{\psi,\psi'}\rvert}{2m}d_{\psi,\psi'}\right]$,
Flex	$LC(i,\psi)=\lambda*\triangle(i,\psi)+(1-\lambda)*N(i,\psi)-\kappa*\wedge(i,\psi)$ $CC(\psi)=\sum_{i\in\psi}LC(i,\psi)-\frac{N_{\psi}}{N}^{\gamma}$ $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{\psi\in\Psi}CC(\psi)$

Table VII: Metrics for Non-Overlapping Community Evaluation.

Metric	Expression
Purity	$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k}\max_{j}\lvert\omega_k,c_j\rvert$
F-Measure	$\frac{2\cdot Purity(\Omega,C)\cdot Purity(C,\Omega)}{Purity(\Omega,C)+Purity(C,\Omega)}$
Rand Index	$\frac{TP+TN}{TP+FP+FN+TN}$
F_{β}	$\frac{(\beta^2+1)PR}{\beta^2P+R};P=\frac{TP}{TP+FP};R=\frac{TP}{TP+FN};$
Adjusted Rand Index	$\frac{\sum_{ij}\binom{N_{\omega_i c_j}}{2}-\sum_i\binom{N_{\omega_i}}{2}\sum_j\binom{N_{c_j}}{2}/\binom{N}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_i\binom{N_{\omega_i}}{2}+\sum_j\binom{N_{c_j}}{2}\right)-\sum_i\binom{N_{\omega_i}}{2}\sum_j\binom{N_{c_j}}{2}/\binom{N}{2}}$
Normalized Mutual Information	$\frac{I(\sigma,C)}{[H(\sigma)+H(C)]/2}$ $I(\Omega,C)=\sum_k\sum_j\frac{\lvert\omega_k\cap c_j\rvert}{N}\ log\frac{N\lvert\omega_k\cap c_j\rvert}{\lvert\omega_k\rvert\lvert c_j\rvert}$
Entropy	$H(\Omega)=-\sum_k\frac{\lvert\omega_k\rvert}{N}\ log\frac{\omega_k}{N}$
Variation of Information	$\sum_{i,j}r_{ij}[\log(r_{ij}/p_i)+\log(r_{ij}/q_j)]$ $H(\Omega)+H(C)-2I(\Omega,C)$
Modified Purity	$\sum_i\sum_{u\in\omega_i}\frac{w_u}{w}Purity(u,\Omega,C)$
Modified ARI	$\frac{\sum_{ij}W(\omega_i\cap W(c_j)-\sum_jW(\omega_i)W(c_j)/W(V)}{\frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_iW(\omega_i)+\sum_jW(c_j)\right)-\sum_iW(\omega_i)\sum_jW(c_j)/W(s)}$

Table VIII: Metrics for overlapping community evaluation.

Metric	Expression
Overlapping Normalized Mutual Information	$ONMI(X\lvert Y)=1-[H(X\lvert Y)+H(Y\lvert X)]/2$
Omega Index	$\frac{Omega_u(\Psi,C)-Omega_e(\Psi,C)}{1-Omega_e(\Psi,C)}$ $\frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}max(\lvert\Psi\rvert,\lvert C\rvert)\lvert t_j(\psi_i)\cap t_j(c_j)\rvert$ $\frac{1}{M^2}\sum_{j=1}max(\lvert\Psi\rvert,\lvert C\rvert)\lvert t_j(\psi_i)\rvert\cdot\lvert t_j(c_j)\rvert$
Generalized External Index	$a_G(i,j)=min\{\alpha_\Psi(i,j),\alpha_C(i,j)\}+min\{\beta_\Psi(i),\beta_C(i)\}+min\{\beta_\Psi(j),\beta_C(j)\}$ $d_G(i,j)=abs[\alpha_\Psi(i,j)-\alpha_C(i,j)]+abs[\beta_\Psi(i)-\beta_C(i)]+abs[\beta_\Psi(j)-\beta_C(j)]$ $GEI(\Psi,C)=\frac{a_G}{a_G+d_G}$
F1-Score	$\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{\lvert\Psi\rvert}\sum_{\psi_i\in\Psi}F1(\psi_i,C_{g(i)})+\frac{1}{\lvert C\rvert}\sum_{c_i\in C}F1(\Psi_{g'(i)},c_i))$