

Bayesian Nonparametrics for Sparse Dynamic Networks

Cian Naik¹, François Caron¹, Judith Rousseau¹, Yee Whye Teh^{1,3}, and
Konstantina Palla²

¹ Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

² Microsoft Research, Cambridge, United Kingdom

³ Google Deepmind, London, United Kingdom

Abstract. In this paper we propose a Bayesian nonparametric approach to modelling sparse time-varying networks. A positive parameter is associated to each node of a network, which models the sociability of that node. Sociabilities are assumed to evolve over time, and are modelled via a dynamic point process model. The model is able to capture long term evolution of the sociabilities. Moreover, it yields sparse graphs, where the number of edges grows subquadratically with the number of nodes. The evolution of the sociabilities is described by a tractable time-varying generalised gamma process. We provide some theoretical insights into the model and apply it to three datasets: a simulated network, a network of hyperlinks between communities on Reddit, and a network of co-occurrences of words in Reuters news articles after the September 11th attacks.

Keywords: Bayesian nonparametrics · Poisson random measures · networks · random graphs · sparsity · point processes

1 Introduction

This article is concerned with the analysis of dynamic networks, where one observes the evolution of links among a set of objects over time. As an example, links may represent social interactions between individuals over time or the co-occurrence of words in a newspaper over time. Probabilistic approaches treat the dynamic networks of interest as random graphs, where the vertices (nodes) and edges correspond to objects and links respectively. In the graph setting, sparsity is defined in terms of the rate in which the numbers of edges grows as the number of nodes increases. In a *sparse* graph the number of edges grows sub-quadratically in the number of nodes. Hence, in a large graphs, two nodes chosen at random are very unlikely to be linked.

While sparsity is a property found in many real-world network datasets [33], most of the popular Bayesian models used in network analysis account for dense graphs, i.e. where the number of edges grows quadratically in the number of nodes, see [35] for a review. A recent Bayesian nonparametric approach, proposed by [6] and later developed in a number of articles [39, 18, 3, 38, 31] represents the

graph as an infinite point process on $\mathbb{R}_+^2$, giving rise to a class of sparse random graphs. This class of sparse models is projective and admits a representation theorem due to [24].

In this paper, we are interested in the dynamic domain and aim to probabilistically model the evolution of sparse graphs over time, where edges may appear and disappear, and the node popularity may change over time. We build on the sparse graph model of [6] and extend it to deal with time series of network data. We describe a fully generative and projective approach for the construction of sparse dynamic graphs. It is challenging to perform exact inference using the framework we introduce, and thus we consider an approximate inference method, using a finite-dimensional approximation introduced by [28].

The rest of the article is structured as follows. In Section 2 we give some background on the sparse network model of [6]. Section 3 describes the novel statistical dynamic network model we introduce in detail. In Section 4, we describe the sparsity properties of the proposed model. The approximate inference method, based on a truncation of the infinite-dimensional model is described in Section 5. In Section 6 we present illustrations of our approach to three different dynamic networks with thousands of nodes and edges.

2 Background: model of Caron and Fox for sparse static networks

We recall in this section the model of [6] for sparse multigraphs. Let $\alpha > 0$ be a positive real tuning the size of the network. A finite multigraph of size $\alpha > 0$ is represented by a point process on $[0, \alpha]^2$

$$N = \sum_{i,j} n_{ij} \delta_{(\theta_i, \theta_j)}$$

where $n_{ij} = n_{ji} \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, $i \leq j$, represents the number of interactions between individuals i and j , and the $\theta_i \in [0, \alpha]$ can be interpreted as node labels. Those node labels are introduced for the model's construction, but are not observed nor inferred. Each node i is assigned a sociability parameter $w_i > 0$. Let $W = \sum_i w_i \delta_{\theta_i}$ be the corresponding random measure on $[0, \alpha]$. We assume that W is a generalised gamma completely random measure [26, 21, 4, 29]. That is, $\{(w_i, \theta_i)_{i \geq 1}\}$ are the points of a Poisson point process with mean measure $\nu(w)dw \mathbb{1}_{\theta \leq \alpha} d\theta$ where $\mathbb{1}_A = 1$ if the statement A is true and 0 otherwise, and ν is a Lévy intensity on $(0, \infty)$ defined as

$$\nu(w) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} w^{-1-\sigma} e^{-\tau w} \quad (1)$$

with hyperparameters $\sigma < 1$ and $\tau > 0$. We write simply $W \sim \text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau)$.

To each pair of nodes i, j , we assign a number of latent interactions n_{ij} , where

$$n_{ij} \mid w_i, w_j \sim \begin{cases} \text{Poisson}(2w_i w_j) & i < j, \\ \text{Poisson}(w_i w_j) & i = j \end{cases} \quad n_{ji} = n_{ij} \quad (2)$$

Finally, two nodes are said to be connected if they have at least one interaction; let $z_{ij} = \mathbb{1}_{n_{ij} > 0}$ be the binary variable indicating if two nodes are connected. When $\sigma > 0$, such model yields sparse graphs with power-law degree distributions [6, 7].




Fig. 1: Graphical representation of the model. The counts n_t are derived from the sociabilities W_t , whose time-evolution depends on the counts C_t and hyper-parameters α, σ, τ and ϕ .

3 Dynamic statistical network model

In order to study dynamically evolving networks, we assume that at each time $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, we observe a set of interactions between a number of nodes. This set of interaction is represented by a point process N_t over $[0, \alpha]^2$ as in Equation (3), where α tunes the size of the graphs.

$$N_t = \sum_{i,j} n_{tij} \delta_{(\theta_i, \theta_j)}. \quad (3)$$

Here, n_{tij} is the number of interactions between i and j at time t , and the θ_i are unique node labels.

The dynamic point process N_t is obtained as follows. We assume that each node i at time t has a *sociability* parameter $w_{ti} \in \mathbb{R}_+$, that can be thought of as a measure of the node's willingness to interact with other nodes at time t . We consider the associated collection of random measures on $\mathbb{R}_+$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$

$$W_t = \sum_i w_{ti} \delta_{\theta_i}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T.$$

We first describe in Section 3.1 the model for the latent interactions. Then we describe in Section 3.2 the model for the time-varying sociability parameters $(W_t)_{t \geq 1}$. The overall probabilistic model is summarised in Figure 1.




Fig. 2: Degree distributions over time, for a network simulated from the GG model with $T = 4$, $\alpha = 200$, $\tau = 1$, $\phi = 1$ and varying values of σ .

3.1 Dynamic network model based on observed interactions

In the dynamic setting, what we observe in practice is often counts of interactions between nodes, e.g. hyperlinks, emails or co-occurrences, rather than a binary indicator of whether there is a connection between them. So for each pair of nodes $i \leq j$, we let $(n_{tij})_{t=1,2,\dots,T,j \geq i}$ be the interaction count between them at time t . We assume that n_{tij} can be modelled as

$$n_{tij} \mid w_{ti}, w_{tj} \sim \begin{cases} \text{Poisson}(2w_{ti}w_{tj}) & i < j, \\ \text{Poisson}(w_{ti}w_{tj}) & i = j \end{cases} \quad n_{tji} = n_{tij} \quad (4)$$

This model can be easily adapted to graphs with directed edges, by modifying the Equation (4) to

$$n_{tij} \sim \text{Poisson}(w_{ti}w_{tj})$$

for all $i \neq j$, where n_{tij} now represents the number of interactions from i to j . The resulting inference algorithm essentially remains the same, and from now on we assume we are in the undirected edge setting. As in the static case, we can reconstruct the binary graph by letting $z_{tij} = \mathbb{1}_{(n_{tij} > 0)}$ be the binary variable indicating if nodes i and j are connected at time t , i.e. two nodes are connected at time t if and only if $n_{tij} > 0$. To avoid ambiguity, we say that the number of edges in the graph at time t is $\sum_{i > j} z_{tij}$, rather than counting the number of interactions between pairs of nodes. Marginalizing out the interaction counts n_{tij} , we have for $i \neq j$:

$$\Pr(z_{tij} = 1 \mid (w_{t-k,i}, w_{t-k,j})_{k=0,\dots,t-1}) = 1 - e^{-2w_{ti}w_{tj}}. \quad (5)$$

3.2 A dependent generalised gamma process for the sociability parameters

We consider here that the sequence of random measures $(W_t)_{t=1,2,\dots}$ follows a Markov model, such that W_t is marginally distributed as $\text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau)$. To this aim, we build on the generic construction of [36]. A similar model has been derived by [8] for dependent gamma processes (corresponding to the case $\sigma = 0$ here). As in [6], we use the generalised gamma process here because of the




Fig. 3: Evolution of weights over time, for a network simulated from the GG model with $T = 100$, $\alpha = 1$, $\sigma = 0.01$, $\tau = 1$ and (a) $\phi = 20$ (b) $\phi = 2000$.

flexibility the sparsity parameter σ gives us. In particular, this setup allows us to capture power-law degree distributions, unlike with the gamma process.

For a sequence of additional latent variables $(C_t)_{t=1,2,\dots}$, we consider a Markov chain $W_t \rightarrow C_t \rightarrow W_{t+1}$ starting with $W_1 \sim \text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau)$ that leaves W_t marginally $\text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau)$. For $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$, define

$$C_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_{ti} \delta_{\theta_i} \quad c_{ti} | W_t \sim \text{Poisson}(\phi w_{ti}) \quad (6)$$

where $\phi > 0$ is a parameter tuning the correlation. Given C_t , the measure W_{t+1} is then constructed as a combination of masses defined by C_t and GG innovation:

$$W_{t+1} = W_{t+1}^* + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} w_{t+1,i}^* \delta_{\theta_i} \quad (7)$$

with

$$W_{t+1}^* \sim \text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau + \phi) \quad (8)$$

$$w_{t+1,i}^* | C_t \sim \text{Gamma}(\max(c_{ti} - \sigma, 0), \tau + \phi). \quad (9)$$

By convention, $\text{Gamma}(0, \tau) = \delta_0$, hence $w_{t+1,i}^* = 0$ if $c_{ti} = 0$ else $w_{t+1,i}^* > 0$. Because the conditional laws of $W_{t+1} | C_t$ coincide with that of $W_t | C_t$ [37, 22, 23], the construction guarantees that W_{t+1} has the same marginal distribution as W_t , i.e., they are both distributed as $\text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau)$. Moreover, as proved in Section A of the Appendix, the conditional mean of W_{t+1} given $W_t = \sum_i w_{ti} \delta_{\theta_i}$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} E[W_{t+1} | W_t] &= \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau + \phi} \right)^{1-\sigma} E[W_t] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\tau + \phi} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} [\phi w_{ti} - \sigma(1 - e^{-\phi w_{ti}})] \delta_{\theta_i} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In the gamma process case ($\sigma = 0$), the above expression reduces to

$$E[W_{t+1}|W_t] = \frac{\tau}{\tau + \phi} E[W_t] + \frac{\phi}{\tau + \phi} W_t.$$

3.3 Summary of the model's hyperparameters

The model is parameterised by $(\alpha, \sigma, \tau, \phi)$, where:

- α tunes the overall size of the networks, with a larger value of α corresponding to larger networks.
- σ controls the sparsity and power-law properties of the graph, as will be shown in Section 4. In Figure 2 we see that different values of σ give rise to different power-law degree distributions.
- τ induces an exponential tilting of large degrees in the degree distribution.
- ϕ tunes the correlation of the sociabilities of each node over time. As we see in Figure 3, larger values correspond to higher correlation and smoother evolution of the weights.

4 Sparsity and power-law properties of the model

By construction, the interactions at time t , n_{tij} , are drawn from the same (static) model as in [6], using a generalised gamma process for the Lévy intensity, and so applying Proposition 18 in [7] we obtain the following asymptotic properties

Proposition 1. *Let $N_{t,\alpha}$ be the number of active nodes at time t , $N_{t,\alpha}^{(e)} = \sum_{i \leq j} z_{tij}$ be the number of edges and $N_{t,\alpha,j}$ the number of nodes of degree j in the graph at time t , then as α tends to infinity, almost surely, we have for any t : if $\sigma > 0$, $N_{t,\alpha}^{(e)} \asymp N_{t,\alpha}^{2/(1+\sigma)}$, if $\sigma = 0$, $N_{t,\alpha}^{(e)} \asymp N_{t,\alpha}^2 / \log^2(N_{t,\alpha})$ and if $\sigma < 0$, $N_{t,\alpha}^{(e)} \asymp N_{t,\alpha}^2$. Also, almost surely, for any $t \geq 1$ and $j \geq 1$, if $\sigma \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\frac{N_{t,\alpha,j}}{N_{t,\alpha}} \rightarrow p_j, \quad p_j = \frac{\sigma \Gamma(j - \sigma)}{j! \Gamma(1 - \sigma)},$$

while if $\sigma \leq 0$, $N_{t,\alpha,j}/N_{t,\alpha} \rightarrow 0$ for all $j \geq 1$.

Hence the graphs are sparse if $\sigma \geq 0$ and dense if $\sigma < 0$.

5 Approximate inference

5.1 Finite-dimensional approximation

Performing exact inference using this model is quite challenging, and we consider instead an approximate inference method, using a finite-dimensional approximation to the GG prior, introduced by [28]. This approximation gives rise

to a particularly simple conjugate construction, enabling posterior inference to be performed.

Let $\text{BFRY}(\eta, \tau, \sigma)$ denote a (scaled and exponentially tilted) BFRY random variable⁴ on $(0, \infty)$ with probability density function

$$g_{\eta, \tau, \sigma}(w) = \frac{\sigma w^{-1-\sigma} e^{-\tau w} \left(1 - e^{-(\sigma/\eta)^{1/\sigma} w}\right)}{\Gamma(1-\sigma) \left\{(\tau + (\sigma/\eta)^{1/\sigma})^\sigma - \tau^\sigma\right\}}$$

with parameters $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $\tau > 0$ and $\eta > 0$.

At time 1, consider the finite-dimensional measure

$$W_1 = \sum_{i=1}^K w_{1i} \delta_{\theta_i}$$

where $w_{1i} \sim \text{BFRY}(\alpha/K, \tau, \sigma)$ and $K < \infty$ is the truncation level. As shown by [28], for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$

$$W_1 \xrightarrow{d} \text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau)$$

as the truncation level K tends to infinity. By this we mean that, if $W \sim \text{GG}(\alpha, \sigma, \tau)$, then

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_f(W') = \mathcal{L}_f(W)$$

for an arbitrary measurable and positive f , where $\mathcal{L}_f(W) := \mathbb{E}[e^{-W(f)}]$ is the Laplace functional of W as defined by [28].

To use this finite approximation with our dynamic model, we consider Poisson latent variables as in Equation (6). The measure W_{t+1} is then constructed as:

$$W_{t+1} = \sum_{i=1}^K w_{t+1,i} \delta_{\theta_i}$$

$$w_{t+1,i} | C_t \sim \text{BFRY}(\alpha'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - c_{ti}).$$

where

$$\alpha'_t = K(\sigma - c_{ti})(\sigma K/\alpha)^{\frac{c_{ti}-\sigma}{\sigma}}.$$

This construction mirrors that of Section 3.2, with the key difference being that we now obtain a stationary $\text{BFRY}(\alpha/K, \tau, \sigma)$ distribution for the w_{ti} . We can easily see this by noting that if

$$w_{ti} \sim \text{BFRY}(\alpha/K, \tau, \sigma)$$

$$c_{ti} | w_{ti} \sim \text{Poisson}(\phi w_{ti})$$

then

$$p(w_{ti} | c_{ti}) \propto w_{ti}^{-1-\sigma+c_{ti}} e^{-(\tau+\phi)w_{ti}} \left(1 - e^{-(\sigma K/\alpha)^{1/\sigma} w_{ti}}\right) \quad (11)$$

⁴ The name was coined by [11] after [2].




Fig. 4: (Top row) Posterior Predictive Degree Distribution and (bottom row) 95% credible intervals for sociabilities of the nodes with the highest degrees, for a network simulated from the GG model. True weights are represented by a green cross.

which we then recognise as a BFRY $(\alpha'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - c_{ti})$ with α'_t as above.

Thus, the use of a finite-dimensional approximation BFRY random variables gives us the simple conjugate construction that we desired. The reason that we introduce this non-standard distribution is that, as far as we know, it is not possible to approximate the generalised gamma process using a finite measure with i.i.d. gamma random weights. In the specific case $\sigma = 0$, we could use the simpler finite approximation using $\text{Gamma}(\alpha/K, \tau)$ random variables. However, this would preclude us from modelling networks with power-law degree distributions, as discussed previously.

5.2 Posterior Inference Algorithm

In order to perform posterior inference with the approximate method, we use a Gibbs sampler. We introduce auxiliary variables $\{u_{ti}\}_{i=1}^K, t = 1, \dots, T$ following a truncated exponential distribution. The overall sampler is as follows (see details in Section B of the Appendix):

1. Update the weights w_{ti} given the rest using Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC).
2. Update the latent c_{ti} given the rest using Metropolis Hastings (MH).
3. Update the hyperparameters α, σ, ϕ and τ and the latent variables u_{ti} given the rest

For the hyperparameters, we place gamma priors on α, τ and ϕ , and a Beta prior on σ .




Fig. 5: Evolution of weights of high degree nodes for the network simulated from the GG model. The dotted line shows the true value of the weights in each case.

6 Experiments

6.1 Simulated Data

In order to assess the approximate inference scheme, we first consider a synthetic dataset. We simulate a network with $T = 4$, $\alpha = 100$, $\sigma = 0.2$, $\tau = 1$, $\phi = 10$ from the exact model (see Section 3), and then estimate it using our approximate inference scheme described in Section 5. The generated network has 3,096 nodes and 101,571 edges. We run an MCMC chain of length 600,000, with the first 300,000 samples discarded as burn-in. We set the truncation threshold to $K = 15,000$.

The approximate inference scheme estimates the model’s parameters well. This can be seen in terms of the fit of the posterior predictive degree distribution to the empirical as seen in Figures 4a-4d, and the coverage of the credible intervals for the weights, as we see in Figures 4e-4h for the 50 nodes with the highest degree, and in Figure 5 for the evolution over time of some high degree nodes.

To see the influence of the truncation level K , we rerun the algorithm for different truncation levels $K = 5,000$ and $K = 10,000$. Trace plots of the hyperparameters are shown in Figure 6. The approximate posterior distributions are quantitatively similar, but we see that increasing the value of K leads to a more correlated Markov chain. However, we note that ϕ is slightly under-estimated in our model, and this problem is more severe the lower the truncation level is taken to be. Further comparison is given in Section C of the Appendix.




Fig. 6: Trace plots for (a) σ , (b) ϕ , (c) τ and (d) α for different truncation levels, when fitting to a network simulated from the GG model

6.2 Real Data

We illustrate the use of our model on two more dynamic network datasets: the Reddit Hyperlink Network [27]⁵ and the Reuters Terror dataset⁶.

Reddit Hyperlink Network The Reddit hyperlink network represents hyperlink connections between subreddits (communities on Reddit) over a period of $T = 12$ consecutive months in 2016. Nodes are subreddits (communities) and the symmetric edges represent hyperlinks originating in a post in one community and linking to a post in another community. The network has $N = 28,810$ nodes and 388,574 interactions. The observations here are hyperlinks between the pair of subreddits i, j at time t . The dataset has been made symmetric by placing an edge between nodes i and j if there is a hyperlink between them in either direction. We also assume that there are no loops in the network, that is $n_{t,ij} = 0$ for $i = j$. We run the Gibbs sampler 400,000 samples, with the first 200,000 discarded as burn in. In this case, we choose a truncation level of $K = 40,000$.

⁵ <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/soc-RedditHyperlinks.html>

⁶ <http://vlado.fmf.uni-lj.si/pub/networks/data/CRA/terror.htm>




Fig. 7: Posterior Predictive Degree Distribution over time for the Reddit hyper-link network




Fig. 8: Evolution of (a) degrees and (b) weights of high degree nodes for the Reddit hyperlink network

From Figure 7 we see that our model is capturing the empirical degree distribution well. Furthermore, in Figure 8 we see that the model is able to capture the evolution of weights associated with each subreddit in a fashion that agrees with the observed frequency of interactions. The high degree nodes here are interpretable as either communities with a very large number of followers - such as “askreddit” or “bestof”, or communities which frequently link to others - such as “drama” or “subredditdrama”.

In particular, we see in Figure 9a that the weights of the controversial but popular political subreddit “The Donald” increases to a peak in November, corresponding to the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Conversely, the weights of the subreddit “Sandersforpresident” decrease as the year goes on, corresponding to the end of Senator Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign, a trend that again agrees with the evolution of the corresponding observed degrees.

Reuters Terror Dataset The final dataset we consider is the Reuters terror news network dataset. It is based on all stories released during $T = 7$ consecutive weeks (the original data was day-by-day, but was shortened and collated for our purposes) by the Reuters news agency concerning the 09/11/01 attack on the




Fig. 9: Evolution of the weights, for the Reddit hyperlink network.




Fig. 10: Posterior Predictive Degree Distribution for the Reuters terror dataset

U.S.. Nodes are words and edges represent co-occurrence of words in a sentence, in news. The network has $N = 13,332$ nodes (different words) and 473,382 interactions. The observations here are the frequency of co-occurrence between the pair of words i, j at time t . We assume that there are no loops in the network, that is $n_{tij} = 0$ for $i = j$. We run the Gibbs sampler with 200,000 samples, with the first 100,000 discarded as burn in. In this case, we choose a truncation level of $K = 20,000$.

Figure 10 suggests that the empirical degree distribution does not follow a power law distribution, and our model therefore provides a moderate fit to the empirical degree distribution. The model is however able to capture the evolution of the popularity of the different words, as shown in Figure 11a. For example, the weights of the words “plane” and “attack” decrease over time after 9/11, while the words “letter” and “anthrax” show a peak a few weeks after the attack. These correspond to the anthrax attacks that occurred over several weeks starting a week after 9/11.

Due to the empirical degree distribution not following a power-law, the estimated value of σ is very close to 0, which causes a slow convergence of the MCMC algorithm.




Fig. 11: Evolution of the weights, for the Reuters terror dataset

7 Discussion and Extensions

A lot of work has been done on modelling dynamic networks; we restrict ourselves to focussing on Bayesian approaches. Much of this work has centred around extending static models. For example, [43] and [12] extend the stochastic block model to the dynamic setting by allowing for parameters that evolve over time. There has also been work on extending the mixed membership stochastic block-model [14, 19, 42], the infinite relational model [34] and the latent feature relational model [13, 17, 25]. The problem inherent in these models is that they lead to networks which are dense almost surely [1, 20], a property considered unrealistic for many real-world networks [35] such as social and internet networks.

In order to build models for sparse dynamic networks, [15] build on the framework of edge-exchangeable networks [5, 9, 41], in which graphs are constructed based on an infinitely exchangeable sequence of edges. As in our case, this framework allows for sparse networks with power-law degree distributions. This work, along with others in this framework [34, 16], utilises the mixture of Dirichlet network distributions (MDND) to introduce structure in the networks.

Conversely, our work builds on a different notion of exchangeability [24, 6]. Within this framework, [30] use mutually-exciting Hawkes processes to model temporal interaction data. The difference between our work and theirs is that the sociabilities of the nodes are constant throughout time, with the time evolving element driven by previous interactions via the Hawkes process. Their work also builds on that of [38], incorporating community structure to the network. Exploring how communities appear, evolve and merge could have many practical uses. Thus, expanding our model to capture both evolving node popularity and dynamically changing community structure could be a useful extension.

Furthermore, our model assumes that the time between observations of the network is constant. If this is not the case, it may be helpful to use a continuous-time version of our model. This could be done by considering a birth-death process for the interactions between nodes, where each interaction has a certain lifetime distribution. The continuously evolving node sociabilities could then be described by the Dawson-Watanabe superprocess [40, 10].

Acknowledgements

C. Naik was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council and Medical Research Council [award reference 1930478]. F. Caron was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Council under grant EP/P026753/1. J. Rousseau was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 834175). K. Palla was supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) ERC grant agreement no. 617411.

Bibliography

- [1] Aldous, D.J.: Representations for partially exchangeable arrays of random variables. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **11**(4), 581–598 (1981)
- [2] Bertoin, J., Fujita, T., Roynette, B., Yor, M.: On a particular class of self-decomposable random variables : the durations of Bessel excursions straddling independent exponential times. *Probability and Mathematical Statistics* **26**(2), 315–366 (2006)
- [3] Borgs, C., Chayes, J., Cohn, H., Holden, N.: Sparse exchangeable graphs and their limits via graphon processes. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **18**(1), 1–71 (2018)
- [4] Brix, A.: Generalized gamma measures and shot-noise Cox processes. *Advances in Applied Probability* **31**(4), 929–953 (1999)
- [5] Cai, D., Campbell, T., Broderick, T.: Edge-exchangeable graphs and sparsity. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. pp. 4249–4257 (2016)
- [6] Caron, F., Fox, E.: Sparse graphs using exchangeable random measures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* **79**, 1–44 (2017), part 5
- [7] Caron, F., Panero, F., Rousseau, J.: On sparsity, power-law and clustering properties of graphex processes. *arXiv pp. arXiv-1708* (2017)
- [8] Caron, F., Teh, Y.W.: Bayesian nonparametric models for ranked data. In: *NIPS* (2012)
- [9] Crane, H., Dempsey, W.: Edge exchangeable models for interaction networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**(523), 1311–1326 (2018)
- [10] Dawson, D.A.: Stochastic evolution equations and related measure processes. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **5**(1), 1–52 (1975)
- [11] Devroye, L., James, L.F.: On simulation and properties of the stable law. *Statistical Methods and Applications* **23**(3), 307–343 (2014)
- [12] Durante, D., Dunson, D.: Bayesian logistic gaussian process models for dynamic networks. In: *AISTATS*. pp. 194–201 (2014)
- [13] Foulds, J., DuBois, C., Asuncion, A., Butts, C., Smyth, P.: A dynamic relational infinite feature model for longitudinal social networks. In: *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*. pp. 287–295 (2011)
- [14] Fu, W., Song, L., Xing, E.P.: Dynamic mixed membership blockmodel for evolving networks. In: *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*. pp. 329–336 (2009)
- [15] Ghaleb, E., Mahyar, H., Grosu, R., Taylor, G.W., Williamson, S.A.: A non-parametric bayesian model for sparse temporal multigraphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05098* (2019)
- [16] Ghaleb, E., Mirzasoleiman, B., Grosu, R., Leskovec, J.: Dynamic network model from partial observations. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. pp. 9862–9872 (2018)

- [17] Heaukulani, C., Ghahramani, Z.: Dynamic probabilistic models for latent feature propagation in social networks. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 275–283 (2013)
- [18] Herlau, T.: Completely random measures for modelling block-structured sparse networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.02925 (2015)
- [19] Ho, Q., Song, L., Xing, E.: Evolving cluster mixed-membership blockmodel for time-evolving networks. In: Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics. pp. 342–350 (2011)
- [20] Hoover, D.N.: Relations on probability spaces and arrays of random variables. Preprint, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ (1979)
- [21] Hougaard, P.: Survival models for heterogeneous populations derived from stable distributions. *Biometrika* **73**(2), 387–396 (1986)
- [22] James, L.F.: Poisson process partition calculus with applications to exchangeable models and bayesian nonparametrics. arXiv preprint math/0205093 (2002)
- [23] James, L.F., Lijoi, A., Prünster, I.: Posterior analysis for normalized random measures with independent increments. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **36**(1), 76–97 (2009)
- [24] Kallenberg, O.: Exchangeable random measures in the plane. *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **3**(1), 81–136 (1990)
- [25] Kim, M., Leskovec, J.: Nonparametric multi-group membership model for dynamic networks. In: Advances in neural information processing systems. pp. 1385–1393 (2013)
- [26] Kingman, J.: Completely random measures. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **21**(1), 59–78 (1967)
- [27] Kumar, S., Hamilton, W.L., Leskovec, J., Jurafsky, D.: Community interaction and conflict on the web. In: Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference on World Wide Web. pp. 933–943. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee (2018)
- [28] Lee, J., James, L.F., Choi, S.: Finite-dimensional bfry priors and variational bayesian inference for power law models. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 3162–3170 (2016)
- [29] Lijoi, A., Mena, R.H., Prünster, I.: Controlling the reinforcement in Bayesian non-parametric mixture models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **69**(4), 715–740 (2007)
- [30] Miscoiridou, X., Caron, F., Teh, Y.W.: Modelling sparsity, heterogeneity, reciprocity and community structure in temporal interaction data. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. pp. 2343–2352 (2018)
- [31] Naik, C., Caron, F., Rousseau, J.: Sparse networks with core-periphery structure. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **15**(1), 1814–1868 (2021)
- [32] Neal, R.: Markov chain sampling methods for Dirichlet process mixture models. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics* pp. 249–265 (2000)
- [33] Newman, M.: Networks: an introduction. OUP Oxford (2009)
- [34] Ng, Y.C., Silva, R.: A dynamic edge exchangeable model for sparse temporal networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.04008 (2017)

- [35] Orbanz, P., Roy, D.M.: Bayesian models of graphs, arrays and other exchangeable random structures. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intelligence (PAMI)* **37**(2), 437–461 (2015)
- [36] Pitt, M.K., Walker, S.G.: Constructing stationary time series models using auxiliary variables with applications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **100**(470), 554–564 (2005)
- [37] Prünster, I.: Random probability measures derived from increasing additive processes and their application to Bayesian statistics. Ph.D. thesis, University of Pavia (2002)
- [38] Todeschini, A., X., M., Caron, F.: Exchangeable random measures for sparse and modular graphs with overlapping communities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* (2020)
- [39] Veitch, V., Roy, D.M.: The class of random graphs arising from exchangeable random measures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03099* (2015)
- [40] Watanabe, S.: A limit theorem of branching processes and continuous state branching processes. *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University* **8**(1), 141–167 (1968)
- [41] Williamson, S.A.: Nonparametric network models for link prediction. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17**(1), 7102–7121 (2016)
- [42] Xing, E.P., Fu, W., Song, L., et al.: A state-space mixed membership block-model for dynamic network tomography. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **4**(2), 535–566 (2010)
- [43] Xu, K., Hero, A.O.: Dynamic stochastic blockmodels for time-evolving social networks. *Selected Topics in Signal Processing, IEEE Journal of* **8**(4), 552–562 (2014)

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Equation (10)

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[W_{t+1}|W_t] \\
&= E[E[W_{t+1}|C_t]|W_t] \\
&= E[W_{t+1}^*] + \frac{1}{\tau + \phi} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E[\max(c_{ti} - \sigma, 0)|W_t] \delta_{\theta_i} \\
&= E[W_{t+1}^*] + \frac{1}{\tau + \phi} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} [\phi w_{ti} - \sigma(1 - e^{-\phi w_{ti}})] \delta_{\theta_i}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that, for any measurable set $A \subseteq [0, \alpha]$, using Campbell's theorem,

$$E[W_{t+1}(A)] = \lambda(A) \int_0^{\infty} w \rho(w) dw = \lambda(A) \tau^{\sigma-1}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
E[W_{t+1}^*(A)] &= \lambda(A) (\tau + \phi)^{\sigma-1} \\
&= \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau + \phi} \right)^{1-\sigma} E[W_{t+1}(A)]
\end{aligned}$$

where λ denotes the Lebesgue measure. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[W_{t+1}|W_t] &= \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau + \phi} \right)^{1-\sigma} E[W_t] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\tau + \phi} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} [\phi w_{ti} - \sigma(1 - e^{-\phi w_{ti}})] \delta_{\theta_i}
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

B MCMC algorithm details

For $t = 1, \dots, T$, let $\mathbf{n}_t = (n_{tij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq K}$, $\mathbf{w}_t = (w_{ti})_{i=1, \dots, K}$, $\mathbf{u}_t = (u_{ti})_{i=1, \dots, K}$ and $\mathbf{c}_t = (c_{ti})_{i=1, \dots, K}$.

B.1 Conditional distribution for the interactions n_{tij}

The conditional distribution of $(\mathbf{n}_t)_{t=1, \dots, T}$ given the other variables can be found by recalling Equation (4) in the main article. We have

$$p((\mathbf{n}_t)_{t=1, \dots, T} \mid \text{rest}) = \prod_{t=1}^T p(\mathbf{n}_t \mid \mathbf{w}_t)$$

where

$$p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{w}_t) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} \frac{(2w_{ti}w_{tj})^{n_{tij}} e^{-2w_{ti}w_{tj}}}{n_{tij}!} \prod_{i=1}^K \frac{(w_{ti}^2)^{n_{tii}} e^{-w_{ti}^2}}{n_{tii}!}$$

$$\propto \left[\prod_{i=1}^K w_{ti}^{m_{ti}} \right] e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^K w_{ti})^2}$$

where $m_{ti} = n_{tii} + \sum_{j=1}^K n_{tij}$.

B.2 Update of u_{ti} and w_{ti}

The auxiliary variables u_{ti} are introduced in order to help with numerical instability problems with the update of the weights w_{ti} . These generally stem from the $(1 - e^{-(\sigma K/\alpha)^{1/\sigma} w_{ti}})$ term in the BFRY distribution, which can be unstable when $(\sigma K/\alpha)^{1/\sigma}$ is large. Noting that the truncation level K is a fixed value that we choose, we denote this term by

$$t_{\alpha,\sigma} = (\sigma K/\alpha)^{1/\sigma} \quad (13)$$

in everything that follows.

When defining u_{ti} , we want to cancel this problematic term out from the distribution of w_{ti} , and thus we sample u_{ti} :

$$u_{ti} | w_{ti} \sim \text{tExp}(w_{ti}, t_{\alpha,\sigma}) \quad (14)$$

where $\text{tExp}(\lambda, a)$ denotes an Exponential distribution with rate parameter λ , truncated on $[0, a]$. The density function of $u_{ti}|w_{ti}$ is thus given by:

$$p(u_{ti}|w_{ti}) = \frac{w_{ti} e^{-u_{ti}w_{ti}}}{(1 - e^{-t_{\alpha,\sigma}w_{ti}})}, \quad 0 \leq u_{ti} \leq t_{\alpha,\sigma} \quad (15)$$

We can sample u_{ti} directly using inverse transform sampling. However, due to non-conjugacy we cannot sample directly from the posterior of w_{ti} . For that reason we use Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) [32]. For a given value of t , the posterior of $\mathbf{w}_t$ is given by:

$$p(\mathbf{w}_t | \mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{c}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t)$$

$$\propto p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{w}_t) p(\mathbf{w}_t | \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{c}_{t-1}) p(\mathbf{u}_t | \mathbf{w}_t)$$

$$\propto \left[\prod_{i=1}^K w_{ti}^{m_{ti}} \right] e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^K w_{ti})^2} \left[\prod_{i=1}^K w_{ti}^{c_{ti} + \mathbb{1}_{t>1} c_{t-1i} - 1 - \sigma} e^{-(\phi + \mathbb{1}_{t>1} \phi + \tau) w_{ti}} (1 - e^{-t_{\alpha,\sigma} w_{ti}}) \right]$$

$$\times \left[\prod_{i=1}^K \frac{w_{ti} e^{-u_{ti} w_{ti}}}{(1 - e^{-t_{\alpha,\sigma} w_{ti}})} \right]$$

$$\propto \left[\prod_{i=1}^K w_{ti}^{c_{ti} + \mathbb{1}_{t>1} c_{t-1i} + 1 + m_{ti} - 1 - \sigma} e^{-(\phi + \mathbb{1}_{t>1} \phi + \tau + u_{ti}) w_{ti}} \right] e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^K w_{ti})^2}$$

where some of the terms only appear for $\mathbb{1}_{t>1}$ because $\mathbf{c}_0$ does not exist, and thus $p(w_{1i}|c_{1i}, c_{0,i}) = p(w_{1i}|c_{1i})$. Here, we used that

$$p(\mathbf{w}_t|\mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{c}_{t-1}) \propto \prod_{i=1}^K \left[\text{BFRY}(\alpha_t''/K, \tau + 2\phi, \sigma - c_{ti} - c_{t-1i}) \right] \quad (16)$$

while noting that the form of α_t'' is defined such that

$$t_{\alpha, \sigma} = (\sigma K / \alpha)^{1/\sigma} = \left(\frac{(\sigma - c_{ti} - c_{t-1i})K}{\alpha_t''} \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma - c_{ti} - c_{t-1i}}}$$

We use change of variables $y_{ti} = \log w_{ti}$. The HMC algorithm requires computing the gradient of the log-posterior which is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \log p(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{c}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t)}{dy_{ti}} &= (c_{ti} + \mathbb{1}_{t>1}c_{t-1i} + 1 + m_{ti} - \sigma) \\ &\quad - w_{ti} \left(\phi + \mathbb{1}_{t>1}\phi + \tau + u_{ti} + 2 \sum_{j=1}^K w_{tj} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The algorithm then proceeds as follows, for each $t = 1, \dots, T$:

1. Sample momentum variables $\mathbf{p}_t = (p_{ti})_{i=1, \dots, K}$ as:

$$p_{ti} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad i = 1, \dots, K$$

2. Simulate L steps of the discretized Hamiltonian via

$$\begin{aligned} \log \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t^{(0)} &= \log \mathbf{w}_t \\ \tilde{p}_{ti} &= p_{ti} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{\partial \log p(\log \mathbf{w}_t|\mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{c}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t)}{d(\log w_{ti})} \quad i = 1, \dots, K \end{aligned}$$

and for $l = 1, \dots, L-1$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t^{(l)} &= \log \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t^{(l-1)} + \varepsilon \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t^{(l-1)} \\ \tilde{p}_{ti}^{(l)} &= \tilde{p}_{ti}^{(l-1)} + \varepsilon \frac{\partial \log p(\log \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t^{(l)}|\mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{c}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t)}{d(\log \tilde{w}_{ti}^{(l)})} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t = (\tilde{p}_{ti})_{i=1, \dots, K}$. Finally, set

$$\begin{aligned} \log \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t &= \log \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t^{(L-1)} + \varepsilon \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t^{(L-1)} \\ \tilde{p}_{ti} &= - \left[\tilde{p}_{ti}^{(L-1)} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{\partial \log p(\log \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t|\mathbf{n}_t, \mathbf{c}_t, \mathbf{c}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_t)}{d(\log \tilde{w}_{ti})} \right] \quad i = 1, \dots, K \end{aligned}$$

3. Accept $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_t$, with probability $a = \min(1, r)$, where r is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} r &= \left[\prod_{i=1}^K \left(\frac{\tilde{w}_{ti}}{w_{ti}} \right)^{c_{ti} + \mathbb{1}_{t>1}c_{t-1i} + 1 + m_{ti} - \sigma} \right] \\ &\quad \times e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^K \tilde{w}_{ti})^2 + (\sum_{i=1}^K w_{ti})^2 - (\phi + \mathbb{1}_{t>1}\phi + \tau)(\sum_{i=1}^K \tilde{w}_{ti} - \sum_{i=1}^K w_{ti})} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\sum_{i=1}^K u_{ti} \tilde{w}_{ti} - \sum_{i=1}^K u_{ti} w_{ti}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \tilde{p}_{ti}^2 - p_{ti}^2} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In our case, we take $L = 10$, and tune ε on the first 10,000 samples in order to achieve an acceptance rate of 0.65.

B.3 Update of c_{ti}

We update $c_t | \mathbf{w}_t, \mathbf{w}_{t+1}$ for each t . The conditional distribution is:

$$p(c_{tk} | w_{tk}, w_{t+1k}) \propto p(c_{tk} | w_{tk}) p(w_{t+1k} | c_{tk}) \quad (19)$$

where

$$p(c_{tk} | w_{tk}) = \text{Poisson}(c_{tk}; \phi w_{tk}) \quad (20)$$

$$p(w_{t+1,k} | c_{tk}, w_{tk}) = \text{BFRY}(w_{t+1,k}; \alpha'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - c_{ti}) \quad (21)$$

For each $t = 1, \dots, T$ and $k = 1, \dots, K$. We use Metropolis-Hastings to sample c_{tk} with a Poisson as the proposal distribution, i.e. $\tilde{c}_{tk} \sim \text{Poisson}(\phi w_k)$. Accept with probability $\min(1, r)$ where

$$r = \frac{p(w_{t+1,k} | \tilde{c}_{tk})}{p(w_{t+1,k} | c_{tk})} = \frac{\text{BFRY}(w_{t+1,k}; \tilde{\alpha}'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - \tilde{c}_{ti})}{\text{BFRY}(w_{t+1,k}; \alpha'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - c_{ti})} \quad (22)$$

where we remember that α'_t depends on c_t .

B.4 Update of $\alpha, \sigma, \tau, \phi$

The joint posterior is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p(\alpha, \sigma, \tau, \phi | C, W) &\propto \prod_{k=1}^K \left(p(w_{1k}) p(c_{1k} | \phi, w_{1k}) \right) \prod_{t=2}^T \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \left(p(w_{tk} | c_{t-1k}) p(c_{tk} | \phi, w_{tk}) \right) \right] \\ &\quad \times p(\alpha) p(\sigma) p(\tau) p(\phi) \\ &\propto \prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{1k}; \alpha/K, \tau, \sigma) \frac{(w_{1k}\phi)^{c_{1k}} e^{-\phi w_{1k}}}{c_{1k}!} \right) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{t=2}^T \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{tk}; \alpha'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - c_{t-1,k}) \frac{(w_{tk}\phi)^{c_{tk}} e^{-\phi w_{tk}}}{c_{tk}!} \right) \right] \\ &\quad \times p(\alpha) p(\sigma) p(\tau) p(\phi) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

We place Gamma priors on α, τ and ϕ , and a Beta prior on σ :

$$p(\alpha) = \text{Gamma}(\alpha; a_1, a_2) \quad (24)$$

$$p(\sigma) = \text{Beta}(\sigma; s_1, s_2) = \frac{\sigma^{s_1-1} (1-\sigma)^{s_2-1}}{B(s_1, s_2)} \quad (25)$$

$$p(\tau) = \text{Gamma}(\tau; t_1, t_2) \quad (26)$$

$$p(\phi) = \text{Gamma}(\phi; f_1, f_2) \quad (27)$$

We then use a Metropolis Hastings sampler, with proposals given by:

$$q(\tilde{\alpha}|\alpha) = \text{lognormal}(\tilde{\alpha}; \log(\alpha), \sigma_\alpha) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\alpha \sqrt{2\pi\tilde{\alpha}}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log \tilde{\alpha} - \log \alpha)^2}{2\sigma_\alpha^2}\right) \quad (28)$$

$$q(\tilde{\tau}|\tau) = \text{lognormal}(\tilde{\tau}; \log(\tau), \sigma_\tau) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\tau \sqrt{2\pi\tilde{\tau}}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log \tilde{\tau} - \log \tau)^2}{2\sigma_\tau^2}\right) \quad (29)$$

$$q(\tilde{\phi}|\phi) = \text{lognormal}(\tilde{\phi}; \log(\phi), \sigma_\phi) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\phi \sqrt{2\pi\tilde{\phi}}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log \tilde{\phi} - \log \phi)^2}{2\sigma_\phi^2}\right) \quad (30)$$

$$q(\tilde{\sigma}|\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\sigma \sqrt{2\pi\tilde{\sigma}(1-\tilde{\sigma})}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{1-\tilde{\sigma}} - \log \frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma})^2}{2\sigma_\sigma^2}\right) \quad (31)$$

The parts of the MH ratio involving the priors and proposals of the hyperparameters are given by:

$$\frac{p(\tilde{\alpha})q(\alpha|\tilde{\alpha})}{p(\alpha)q(\tilde{\alpha}|\alpha)} = e^{-a_2(\tilde{\alpha}-\alpha)} \left(\frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{\alpha}\right)^{a_1} \quad (32)$$

$$\frac{p(\tilde{\tau})q(\tau|\tilde{\tau})}{p(\tau)q(\tilde{\tau}|\tau)} = e^{-t_2(\tilde{\tau}-\tau)} \left(\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{\tau}\right)^{t_1} \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{p(\tilde{\phi})q(\phi|\tilde{\phi})}{p(\phi)q(\tilde{\phi}|\phi)} = e^{-f_2(\tilde{\phi}-\phi)} \left(\frac{\tilde{\phi}}{\phi}\right)^{f_1} \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{p(\tilde{\sigma})q(\sigma|\tilde{\sigma})}{p(\sigma)q(\tilde{\sigma}|\sigma)} = \left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sigma}\right)^{s_1} \left(\frac{1-\tilde{\sigma}}{1-\sigma}\right)^{s_2} \quad (35)$$

The MH ratio without the priors and proposals on α, σ, τ and ϕ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{1k}; \tilde{\alpha}/K, \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\sigma}) \frac{(w_{1k}\tilde{\phi})^{c_{1k}} e^{-\tilde{\phi}w_{1k}}}{c_{1k}!} \right) \\ & \times \prod_{t=2}^T \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{tk}; \tilde{\alpha}'_t/K, \tilde{\tau} + \tilde{\phi}, \tilde{\sigma} - c_{t-1,k}) \frac{(w_{tk}\tilde{\phi})^{c_{tk}} e^{-\tilde{\phi}w_{tk}}}{c_{tk}!} \right) \right] \\ & \frac{}{\prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{1k}; \alpha/K, \tau, \sigma) \frac{(w_{1k}\phi)^{c_{1k}} e^{-\phi w_{1k}}}{c_{1k}!} \right)} \\ & \times \prod_{t=2}^T \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{tk}; \alpha'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - c_{t-1,k}) \frac{(w_{tk}\phi)^{c_{tk}} e^{-\phi w_{tk}}}{c_{tk}!} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The logarithm of the ratio is then given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & K [\log(\tilde{\sigma}) - \log(\sigma)] + K [\log(\Gamma(1 - \sigma)) - \log(\Gamma(1 - \tilde{\sigma}))] + [-(\tilde{\tau} + \tilde{\phi}) + (\tau + \phi)] \sum_{k=1}^K w_{1k} \\
 & + K \left[\log(\{(\tau + t_{\alpha, \sigma})^\sigma - \tau^\sigma\}) - \log(\{(\tilde{\tau} + t_{\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\sigma}})^{\tilde{\sigma}} - \tilde{\tau}^{\tilde{\sigma}}\}) \right] \\
 & + (\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}) \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K \log(w_{tk}) + [\log(\tilde{\phi}) - \log(\phi)] \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K c_{tk} \\
 & + \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K [\log(1 - e^{-t_{\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\sigma}} w_{tk}}) - \log(1 - e^{-t_{\alpha, \sigma} w_{tk}})] \\
 & + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{k=1}^K \log\left(\frac{\Gamma(1 - \sigma + c_{t-1k})}{\Gamma(1 - \tilde{\sigma} + c_{t-1k})}\right) + [-(\tilde{\tau} + 2\tilde{\phi}) + (\tau + 2\phi)] \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{k=1}^K w_{tk} \\
 & + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{k=1}^K \log\left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma} - c_{t-1k}}{\sigma - c_{t-1k}}\right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{k=1}^K \log\left(\frac{\{(\tau + \phi + t_{\alpha, \sigma})^{\sigma - c_{t-1k}} - (\tau + \phi)^{\sigma - c_{t-1k}}\}}{\{(\tilde{\tau} + \tilde{\phi} + t_{\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\sigma}})^{\tilde{\sigma} - c_{t-1k}} - (\tilde{\tau} + \tilde{\phi})^{\tilde{\sigma} - c_{t-1k}}\}}\right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

B.5 Log-posterior density

The posterior probability density function, given the latent variables and up to a normalizing constant, thus takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & p\left((w_{tk}, c_{tk})_{k=1, \dots, K, t=1, \dots, T}, \sigma, \tau, \phi, \alpha, \rho \mid (n_{tij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq K, t=1, \dots, T}\right) \\
 & \propto \prod_{t=1}^T \left[p(\mathbf{n}_t | \mathbf{w}_t) \right] \prod_{k=1}^K \left(p(w_{1k}) p(c_{1k} | \phi, w_{1k}) \right) \prod_{t=2}^T \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \left(p(w_{tk} | c_{t-1k}) p(c_{tk} | \phi, w_{tk}) \right) \right] \\
 & \quad \times p(\alpha) p(\sigma) p(\tau) p(\phi) \\
 & \propto \prod_{t=1}^T \left[\left[\prod_{k=1}^K w_{tk}^{m_{tk}} \right] e^{-(\sum_{k=1}^K w_{tk})^2} \right] \prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{1k}; \alpha/K, \tau, \sigma) \frac{(w_{1k}\phi)^{c_{1k}} e^{-\phi w_{1k}}}{c_{1k}!} \right) \\
 & \quad \times \prod_{t=2}^T \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \left(\text{BFRY}(w_{tk}; \alpha'_t/K, \tau + \phi, \sigma - c_{t-1, k}) \frac{(w_{tk}\phi)^{c_{tk}} e^{-\phi w_{tk}}}{c_{tk}!} \right) \right] \\
 & \quad \times p(\alpha) p(\sigma) p(\tau) p(\phi).
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

C MCMC plots

In this section we give the MCMC trace plots for the simulated and real data experiments. In each case, the samples are thinned so that we have 100 samples from the posterior.

C.1 Simulated Data

In Figure 12 we see the trace plots for the hyperparameters α, σ, τ and ϕ , as well as the logposterior (up to a constant), for the network simulated from the GG model. We can see that the parameters other than ϕ converge well to their true values, and that in each case the mixing of the three chains is good. Furthermore, we can see that the logposterior has converged to a stable value.




Fig. 12: MCMC trace plots of hyperparameters and logposterior for the network simulated from the GG model, with $\alpha = 100$, $\sigma = 0.2$, $\tau = 1$ and $\phi = 10$. The true values in each case are denoted by the dotted green line.

C.2 Real Data

Reddit Hyperlink Network In Figure 13 we see the trace plots for the hyperparameters α, σ, τ and ϕ , as well as the logposterior, for the Reddit hyperlink network. We can see that the parameters and the logposterior have converged to a stable value.

Reuters Terror Dataset In Figure 14 we see the trace plots for the hyperparameters α, σ, τ and ϕ , as well as the logposterior, for the Reuters terror network. As before, we see that the hyperparameters have not yet converged. However, we found that running a longer chain provided similar credible intervals for the weights and degree distribution.




Fig. 13: MCMC trace plots of hyperparameters and logposterior for the Reddit hyperlink network.




Fig. 14: MCMC trace plots of hyperparameters and logposterior for the Reuters terror network.