

Distributed Representations of Signed Networks

Mohammad Raihanul Islam, B. Aditya Prakash, Naren Ramakrishnan

Discovery Analytics Center, Department of Computer Science, Virginia Tech

Email: {raihaan8, badityap, naren}@cs.vt.edu

Abstract

Recent successes in word embedding and document embedding have motivated researchers to explore similar representations for networks and to use such representations for tasks such as edge prediction, node label prediction, and community detection. Existing methods are largely focused on finding distributed representations for unsigned networks and are unable to discover embeddings that respect polarities inherent in edges. We propose sign2vec, a fast scalable embedding method suitable for signed networks. Our proposed objective function aims to carefully model the social structure implicit in signed networks by reinforcing the principles of social balance theory. Our method builds upon the traditional word2vec family of embedding approaches but we propose a new targeted node sampling strategy to maintain structural balance in higher-order neighborhoods. We demonstrate the superiority of sign2vec over state-of-the-art methods proposed for both signed and unsigned networks on several real world datasets from different domains. In particular, sign2vec offers an approach to generate a richer vocabulary of features of signed networks to support representation and reasoning.

1 Introduction

Social and information networks are ubiquitous today across a variety of domains; as a result, a large body of research has been developed to help construct discriminative and informative features for network analysis tasks such as classification (Bhagat, Cormode, and Muthukrishnan 2011), prediction (Liben-Nowell and Kleinberg 2003), visualization (van der Maaten and Hinton 2008), and entity recommendation (Yu et al. 2014).

Classical approaches to find features and embeddings are motivated by dimensionality reduction research and extensions, e.g., approaches such as Laplacian eigenmaps (Belkin and Niyogi 2001), non-linear dimension reduction (Tenenbaum, Silva, and Langford 2000; Roweis and Saul 2000), and spectral embedding (Kunegis et al. 2010; Zheng and Skillicorn 2015). More recent research has focused on developing network analogies to distributed vector representations such as word2vec (Mikolov et al. 2013a; Mikolov, Le, and Sutskever 2013). In particular, by viewing sequences of nodes encountered on random walks as documents, methods such as DeepWalk (Perozzi, Al-Rfou, and Skiena 2014), node2vec (Grover and Leskovec 2016), and LINE (Tang et

al. 2015) learn similar representations for nodes (viewing them as words).

Although these approaches are scalable to large networks, they are primarily applicable to only unsigned networks. Signed networks are becoming increasingly important in online media, trust management, and in law/criminal applications. As we will show, applying the above methods to signed networks results in key information loss in the resulting embedding. For instance, if the sign between two nodes is negative, the resulting embeddings could place the nodes in close proximity, which is undesirable.

A recent attempt to fill this gap is the work of Wang et al. wherein the authors learn node representations by optimizing an objective function through a multi-layer neural network based on structural balance theory. This work, however, models only local connectivity information through 2-hop paths and fails to capture global balance structures prevalent in a network. Our contributions are:

1. We propose sign2vec, a scalable node embedding method for feature learning in signed networks that maintains structural balance in higher order neighborhoods. sign2vec is very generic by design, and can handle both directed and undirected networks, including weighted or unweighted (binary) edges.
2. We propose a novel node sampling method as an improvement over traditional negative sampling. The idea is to keep a cache of nodes during optimization integral for maintaining the principles of structural balance in the network. This targeted node sampling can be treated as an extension of the negative sampling used in word2vec models.
3. Through extensive experimentation, we demonstrate that sign2vec generates better features suitable for a range of prediction tasks such as edge and node label prediction. sign2vec is able to scalably generate embeddings for networks with millions of nodes.

2 Problem Formulation

Definition 1. *Signed Network:* A signed network can be defined as $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of vertices and E is the set of edges between the vertices. Each element v_i of V represents an entity in the network and each edge $e_{ij} \in E$ is a tuple (v_i, v_j) associated with a weight $w_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$. The absolute value of w_{ij} represents the strength of the relationship between v_i and v_j , whereas the sign represents

the nature of relationship (e.g., friendship or antagonism). A signed network can be either directed or undirected. If G is undirected then the order of vertices is not relevant (i.e. $(v_i, v_j) \equiv (v_j, v_i)$). On the other hand, if G is directed then order becomes relevant (i.e. $(v_i, v_j) \not\equiv (v_j, v_i)$ and $w_{ij} \neq w_{ji}$).




Figure 1: Given a signed network (a), a conventional network embedding (b) does not take signs into account and can result in faulty representations. (c) *sign2vec* learns embeddings that respect sign information between edges. Of the possible signed triangles, (d) and (e) are considered balanced but (f) and (g) are not.

Because the weights in a signed network carry a combined interpretation (sign denotes polarity and magnitude denotes strength), conventional proximity assumptions used in unsigned network representations (e.g., in (Grover and Leskovec 2016)) cannot be applied for signed networks. Consider a network wherein the nodes v_i and v_j are positively connected and the nodes v_k and v_i are negatively connected (see Fig. 1(a)). Suppose the weights of the edges e_{ij} and e_{ik} are $+w_{ij}$ and $-w_{ik}$ respectively. Now if $|+w_{ij}| < |-w_{ik}|$, conventional embedding methods will place v_i and v_k closer than v_i and v_j owing to the stronger influence of the weight (Fig. 1(b)). Even if considering the weight of negative edge as zero does not resolve it, because even though it may put node v_i and v_j closer, node v_k may be relatively closer to v_i because of ignoring the adverse relation between node v_i and v_k . This may comprise the quality of embedding space. Ideally, we would like a representation wherein nodes v_i and v_j are closer than nodes v_i and v_k , as shown in Fig. 1(c). This example shows that modeling the polarity is as important as modeling the strength of the relationship.

To accurately model the interplay between the vertices in signed networks we use the theory of *structural balance* proposed by Heider. Structural balance theory posits that triangles with an odd number of positive edges are more plausible than an even positive edges (see Fig. 1). Although different adaptation and alternative of balance theory exist in the literature, here we focus primarily on the original notion of structural balance to create the embedding space because it is useful in many scenarios like signed networks constructed from adjectives (described in Section 4).

Problem Statement: *Scalable Embedding of Signed Net-*

works (sign2vec): Given a signed network G , compute a low-dimensional vector $\mathbf{d}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K, \forall v_i \in V$, where positively related vertices reside in close proximity and negatively related vertices are distant.

3 Scalable Embedding of Signed Networks (*sign2vec*)

sign2vec for undirected networks

Consider a weighted signed network defined as in section 2. Now suppose each v_i is represented by a vector $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Then a natural way to compute the proximity between v_i and v_j is by the following function (ignoring the sign for now):

$$p_u(v_i, v_j) = \sigma(\mathbf{x}_j^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\mathbf{x}_j^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i)} \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma(a) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-a)}$. Now let us breakdown the weight of edge w_{ij} into two components: r_{ij} and s_{ij} . $r_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}$ represents the absolute value of w_{ij} (i.e. $r_{ij} = |w_{ij}|$) and $s_{ij} \in \{-1, 1\}$ represents the sign of w_{ij} . Given this breakdown of w_{ij} , $p_u(v_i, v_j) = \sigma(s_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_j^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i))$. Now incorporating the weight information, the objective function for undirected signed network can be written as:

$$\mathcal{O}_{un} = \sum_{e_{ij} \in E} r_{ij} \sigma(s_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_j^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i)) = \sum_{e_{ij} \in E} r_{ij} p_u(v_i, v_j) \quad (2)$$

By maximizing Eqn. 2 we obtain a vector \mathbf{x}_i of dimension K for each node $v_i \in V$ (we also use \mathbf{d}_i to refer this embedding, for reasons that will become clear in the next section).

sign2vec for directed networks

Computing embeddings for directed networks is trickier due to the asymmetric nature of neighborhoods (and thus, contexts). For instance, if the edge e_{ij} is positive, but e_{ji} is negative, it is not clear if the respective representations for nodes v_i and v_j should be proximal or not. We solve this problem by treating each vertex as itself plus a specific context; for instance, a positive edge e_{ij} is interpreted to mean that given the context of node v_j , node v_i wants to be closer. This enables us to treat all nodes consistently without worrying about reciprocity relationships. To this end, we introduce another vector $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ besides $\mathbf{x}_i, \forall v_i \in V$. For a directed edge e_{ij} the probability of context v_j given v_i is:

$$p_d(v_j|v_i) = \frac{\exp(s_{ij}(\mathbf{y}_j^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i))}{\sum_{k=1}^{|V|} \exp(s_{ik}(\mathbf{y}_k^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i))} \quad (3)$$

Treating the same entity as itself and as a specific context is very popular in the text representation literature (Mikolov et al. 2013a). The above equation defines a probability distribution over all context space w.r.t. node v_i . Now our goal is to optimize the above objective function for all the edges in the network. However we also need to consider the weight of each edge in the optimization. Incorporating the absolute weight of each edge we obtain the objective function for a directed network as:

$$\mathcal{O}_{dir} = \sum_{e_{ij} \in E} r_{ij} p_d(v_j|v_i) \quad (4)$$




Figure 2: (a) depicts a small network to illustrate why conventional negative sampling does not work. v_i and v_y might be considered too distant for their representations to be placed close to each other. Targeted node sampling solves this problem by constructing a cache of nodes which can be used as sampling. (b) shows how we resolve conflict. Although there are two ways to proceed from node v_i to v_l the shortest path is v_i, v_j, v_k, v_l , which estimates a net positive relation between v_i and v_l . As a result v_l will be added to η_i^+ . However for node v_m there are two shortest paths from v_i , with the path v_i, v_p, v_o, v_n, v_m having more positive edges but with a net negative relation, so v_m will be added to η_i^- in case of a conflict.

By maximizing Eqn. 4 we will obtain two vectors \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{y}_i for each $v_i \in V$. The vector \mathbf{x}_i models the outward connection of a node whereas \mathbf{y}_i models the inward connection of the node. Therefore the concatenation of \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{y}_i represents the final embedding for each node. We denote the final embedding of node v_i as \mathbf{d}_i . It should be noted that for undirected network $\mathbf{d}_i = \mathbf{x}_i$ whereas for a directed network \mathbf{d}_i is the concatenation of \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{y}_i . This means $|\mathbf{x}_i| = |\mathbf{y}_i| = \frac{K}{2}$ in the case of directed graph (for the same representational length).

Efficient Optimization by Targeted Node Sampling

The denominator of Eqn. 3 is very hard to compute as we have to marginalize the conditional probability over the entire vertex set V . We adopt the classical negative sampling approach (Mikolov et al. 2013b) wherein negative examples are selected from some distribution for each edge e_{ij} . However, for signed network conventional negative sampling does not work. For example consider the network from Fig. 2(a). Viewing this example as an unsigned network, while optimizing for edge e_{ij} , we will consider v_i and v_y as negative examples and thus they will be placed distant from each other. However, in a signed network context, v_i and v_y have a friendlier relationship (than with, say, v_x) and thus should be placed closer to each other. We propose a new sampling approach, referred to as simply *targeted node sampling* wherein we first create a cache of nodes for each node with their estimated relationship according to structural balance theory and then sample nodes accordingly.

Constructing the cache for each node: We aim to construct a cache of positive and negative examples for each node v_i where the positive (negative) example cache η_i^+

(η_i^-) contains nodes which should have a positive (negative) relationship with v_i according to structural balance theory. To construct these caches for each node v_i , we apply random walks of length l starting with v_i to obtain a sequence of nodes. Suppose the sequence is $\Omega = \langle v_i, v_{n_0}, \dots, v_{n_{l-1}} \rangle$. Now we add each node v_{n_p} to either η_i^+ or η_i^- by observing the estimated sign between v_i and v_{n_p} . The estimated sign is computed using the following recursive formula:

$$\tilde{s}_{in_p} = \tilde{s}_{in_{p-1}} \times s_{n_{p-1}n_p} \quad (5)$$

Here $\tilde{s}_{in_{p-1}}$ is the estimated sign between node v_i and node $v_{n_{p-1}}$, which can be computed recursively. The base case for this formula is $\tilde{s}_{in_1} = s_{in_0} \times s_{n_0n_1}$. If node v_{n_p} is not a neighbor of node v_i and \tilde{s}_{in_p} is positive then we add v_{n_p} to η_i^+ . On the other hand if \tilde{s}_{in_p} is negative and v_{n_p} is not a neighbor of v_i then we add it to η_i^- . For example for the graph shown in Fig. 2(a), suppose a random walk starting with node v_i is $\langle v_i, v_j, v_k, v_z \rangle$. Here node v_k will be added to η_i^+ because $\tilde{s}_{ik} = s_{ij} \times s_{jk} > 0$ (base case) and v_k is not a neighbor of v_i . However, v_z will be added to node η_i^- since $\tilde{s}_{iz} = \tilde{s}_{ik} \times s_{kz} < 0$ and v_z is not a neighbor of v_i . The one problem with this approach is that a node v_j may be added to both η_i^+ and η_i^- . We denote this phenomena as *conflict* and define the reason for this *conflict* in Theorem 1. We resolve this situation by computing the shortest path between v_i and v_j and compute \tilde{s}_{ij} between them using the shortest path, then add to either η_i^+ or η_i^- based on \tilde{s}_{ij} . To compute the shortest path we have to consider the network as unsigned since negative weight has a different interpretation for shortest path algorithms. We also prove that if there are multiple shortest paths with equal length in case of a *conflict*, then only one path has the highest number of positive edges. We pick this path to compute \tilde{s}_{ij} . Both proofs are described in the supplementary section. A scenario is shown in Fig. 2(b).

Theorem 1. (Reason of conflict): Node v_j will be added to both η_i^+ and η_i^- if there are multiple paths from v_i to v_j and the union of these paths has at least one unbalanced cycle.

Proof. (By contradiction.) Suppose there is a *conflict* for node v_i where η_i^+ and η_i^- both contain node v_j . Since there are at least two distinct v_i - v_j paths because of the conflict, the network contains a cycle c (ignoring the direction for directed networks). Now it is evident that the common edges of both paths are not responsible for the conflict since they occur in both paths. Suppose the cycle has two distinct x - y paths. Now if cycle c is balanced there will be an even number of negative edges which will be distributed between the distinct v_x - v_y paths in c . The distribution can occur in two ways: either both paths will have an odd number of negative edges or an even number of negative edges. In both cases the estimated sign between the v_x - v_y paths will be the same. However, this is a contradiction because the final estimated sign of two v_i - v_j paths are different and the signs between the common path are same, so the signs between the v_x - v_y paths must be different. Therefore, cycle c cannot be balanced and hence contains an odd number of negative edges. Thus we have identified at least one unbalanced cycle. \square




Figure 3: A comparative scenario depicting the optimization process inherent in both SiNE (a) and sign2vec (b). The shaded vertices represent the nodes both methods will consider while optimizing the edge e_{ij} . We can see the SiNE only considers the immediate neighbors because it optimizes edges in 2-hop paths having opposite signs. On the other hand, sign2vec considers higher order neighbors ($v_a, v_b, v_c, v_x, v_y, v_z$) for targeted node sampling.

Targeted edge sampling during optimization: Now after constructing the cache $\eta_i = \eta_i^+ \cup \eta_i^-$ for each node v_i , we can apply the targeted sampling approach for each node. Here our goal is to extend the objective of negative sampling from classical word2vec approaches (Mikolov et al. 2013b). In traditional negative sampling, a random word-context pair is negatively sampled for each observed word-context pair. In a signed network both positive and negative edges are present, and thus we aim to conduct both types of sampling while sampling an edge observing its sign. Therefore when sampling a positive (negative) edge e_{ij} , we aim to sample multiple negative (positive) nodes from η_i^- (η_i^+). Therefore the objective function for each edge becomes (taking log):

$$\mathcal{O}_{ij} = \log[\sigma(s_{ij}(\mathbf{y}_j^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i))] + \sum_{c=1}^{\mathcal{N}} E_{v_n \sim \tau(s_{ij})} \log[\sigma(\tilde{s}_{in}(\mathbf{y}_n^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_i))] \quad (6)$$

Here \mathcal{N} is the number of targeted node examples per edge and τ is a function which selects from η_i^+ or η_i^- based on the sign s_{ij} . τ selects from η_i^+ (η_i^-) if $s_{ij} < 0$ ($s_{ij} > 0$).

The benefit of targeted node sampling in terms of global balance considerations across the entire network is shown in Fig. 3. Here we compare how our proposed approach sign2vec and SiNE (Wang et al. 2017) maintain structural balance. For simplicity suppose only edge e_{ij} has a negative sign. Now SiNE only optimizes w.r.t. pairs of edges in 2-hop paths each having different signs. Therefore optimizing the edge e_{ij} involves only the immediate neighbors of node v_i and v_j , i.e. v_l, v_m, v_n, v_o (Fig. 3 (a)). However sign2vec skips the immediate neighbors while it uses higher order neighbors (i.e., $v_a, v_b, v_c, v_x, v_y, v_z$). Note that sign2vec actually uses immediate neighbors as separate examples (i.e edge e_{il}, e_{im} etc.). In this manner sign2vec covers more nodes to optimize the embedding space than SiNE.

Algorithm 1 The sign2vec algorithm

Input: (Graph $G = (V, E)$, embedding size K , walks per node r , walk length l , total number of samples s , initial learning rate γ)
Output: $\mathbf{d}_k \in \mathbb{R}^K, \forall v_k \in V$

1. **for all** $v_n \in V$ **do**
2. **for** $i = 1$ to r **do**
3. $\omega_{ni} = \text{RandomWalk}(G, v_n, l)$
4. **for all** $v_n \in V$ **do**
5. **for** $i = 1$ to r **do**
6. **for each** $v_k \in \omega_{ni}$ **do**
7. Estimate relation between v_k and v_n using Eqn. 5
8. Add v_k to either η_n^+ or η_n^- based on the relation
9. resolve *conflict* for node v_n
10. **repeat**
11. **for each** mini-batch of edges **do**
12. Sample an edge using edge sampling method
13. Optimize the objective function in Eqn. 6.
14. Update learning rate γ
15. **until** in total s samples are processed

Discussion

We now discuss several computational aspects of the sign2vec model.

Optimization: We adopt the asynchronous stochastic gradient method (ASGD) (Recht et al. 2011) to optimize the objective function \mathcal{O}_{ij} for each edge e_{ij} . The ASGD method randomly selects a mini batch of randomly selected edges and update embeddings at each step. Now for each edge e_{ij} the gradient of the objective function will have a constant coefficient r_{ij} (i.e. $|w_{ij}|$). Now if the absolute weights of the edges have a high variance, it is hard to find a good learning rate. For example if we set the learning rate very small it would work well for large weighted edge but for small weighted edge the overall learning will be very inadequate resulting in poor performance. On the other hand, a large learning rate will work well for edges with smaller weights but for edges with large weight the gradient will be out of limits. To remedy this we adopt the *edge sampling* used in (Tang et al. 2015). In edge sampling all the weighted edges treated as binary edges with non-negative weights (i.e. absolute value of edges r_{ij}). Now the edges are sampled during optimization according to the multinomial distribution constructed from the absolute value of the edge weights. For example suppose all the absolute values of the edges are stored in the set $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{|E|}\}$. Now during the optimization each edge is sampled according to the multinomial distribution constructed from R . However, each sampling from R would take $O(E)$ time, which is computationally expensive for large network. To remedy this we use the alias table approach proposed in (Li et al. 2014a). An alias table takes $O(1)$ time while continuously drawing samples from a constant discrete multinomial distribution.

Threshold value for η_i : Theoretically there should not be any bound on the size of η_i^+ and η_i^- . However empirical

analysis shows limiting the size of η_i^+ to very small values (i.e 5 – 7) actually gives better results.

η_i for low degree nodes: Nodes with a low degree may not have an adequate number of samples for η_i^+ and η_i^- from the random walks. This is why it is possible to exchange the nodes within η_i^+ and η_i^- . For example if node $v_x \in \eta_i^+$, one can add node v_i to η_x^+ .

Embedding for new vertices: sign2vec can learn embedding for newly arriving vertices. Since this is a network model, we can assume that advent of new vertices means we know its connection with existing nodes (i.e., neighbors). Suppose the new vertex is v_n and its set of neighbors is N_n . We just have to construct η_n and optimize the newly formed edges using the same optimization function stated in Eqn. 6 to obtain the embedding of node n .

Complexity: Constructing η_i for node v_i takes $O(rl)$ time where l is the length of random walk and r is the number of walk for each node. Since $rl \ll |V|$, the total cache construction actually takes very little time w.r.t. vertex size. Moreover conflict resolution only takes place for very rare instances where the length of the shortest path is at most l . This cost is thus negligible compared to random walk and cache construction time. Now, for optimizing each edge along with the node sampling take $O(K(\mathcal{N} + 1))$, where K is the size of embedding space and \mathcal{N} is the size of node sampling. The total complexity of optimization then become $O(K(\mathcal{N} + 1)|E|)$, where E is the set of edges. Therefore the overall complexity becomes $O(rl|V| + K(\mathcal{N} + 1)|E|)$. A pseudocode of sign2vec is shown in Algorithm 1. sign2vec is available at: <https://github.com/raihan2108/signet>.

4 Experiments

Experimental Setup: We compare our algorithm against both the state-of-the-art method proposed for signed and unsigned network embedding. The description of the methods are below:

- node2vec (Grover and Leskovec 2016): This method, not specific to signed networks, computes embeddings by optimizing the neighborhood structure using informed random walks.
- SNE (Yuan, Wu, and Xiang 2017): This method computes the embedding using a log bilinear model; however it does not exploit any specific theory of signed networks.
- SiNE (Wang et al. 2017): This method uses a multi-layer neural network to learn the embedding by optimizing an objective function satisfying structural balance theory. SiNE only concentrates on the immediate neighborhood of vertices rather than on the global balance structure.
- sign2vec-NS: This method is similar to our proposed method sign2vec except it uses conventional negative sampling instead of our proposed targeted node sampling.
- sign2vec: This is our proposed sign2vec method which uses random walks to construct a cache of positive and negative examples for targeted node sampling.

We skip hand crafted feature generation method for link prediction like (Leskovec, Huttenlocher, and Kleinberg 2010) because they can not be applied in node label prediction and already shows inferior performance compared to SiNE.

In the discussion below, we focus on five real world signed network datasets (see Table 1). Out of these five, two datasets are from social network platforms—Epinions and Slashdot—courtesy the Stanford Network Analysis Project (SNAP). The details on how the signed edges are defined are available at the project website ¹. The third dataset is a voting records of Wikipedia adminship election (Wiki), also from SNAP. The fourth dataset we study is an adjective network (ADJNet) constructed from the synonyms and antonyms collected from Wordnet database. Label information about whether the adjective is positive or negative comes from SentiWordNet ². The last dataset is a citation network we constructed from written case opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS). We expand the notion of SCOTUS citation network (Fowler and Jeon 2008) into a signed network.

To understand this network, it is important to note that there are typically two main parts to a SCOTUS case opinion. The first part contains the majority and any optional concurring opinions where justices cite previously argued cases to defend their position. The second part (optional, does not exist in a unanimous decision) consists of dissenting opinions containing arguments opposing the decision of the majority opinion. In our modeling, nodes denote cases (not opinions). The citation of one case’s majority opinion to another case will form a positive relationship, and citations from dissenting opinions will form a negative relationship. We collected all written opinions from the inception of SCOTUS to construct the citation network. Moreover, we also collected the decision direction of supreme court cases from The Supreme Court Database ³. This decision direction denotes whether the decision is conservative or liberal, information that we will use for validation. We also use 3 synthetic datasets in 4, details are in the corresponding section.

Unless otherwise stated, for directed networks we set $|\mathbf{x}_i| = |\mathbf{y}_i| = \frac{K}{2} = 20$ for both sign2vec-NS and sign2vec; therefore $|\mathbf{d}_i| = 40$. For a fair comparison, the final embedding dimension for others methods is set to 40. For undirected network (ADJNet) $|\mathbf{d}_i| = 40$ for all the methods. We also set the total number of samples (examples) to 100 million, $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $l = 50$ and $r = 1$ for sign2vec-NS and sign2vec. For all the other parameters for node2vec, SNE and SiNE we use the settings recommended in their respective papers.

Are Embeddings Interpretable? For visual depiction of embeddings, we first utilize a small dataset denoting relations between sixteen tribes in Central Highlands of New Guinea (Read 1954). This is a signed network showing the alliance and hostility between the tribes. We learned the embeddings in two dimensional space as an undirected network as shown in Fig. 4. We can see that in general solid blue edges (alliance) are shorter than the dashed red edges (hostility) confirming that allied tribes are closer than the hostile tribes. One notable point is tribe *MASIL* has no enemies and often works as a peace negotiator between the tribes. We can see that *MASIL* positions nicely between two

¹<http://snap.stanford.edu/>

²<http://sentiwordnet.isti.cnr.it/>

³<http://scdb.wustl.edu/>

Table 1: Statistics of the datasets used for performance evaluation. In social network datasets negative edges are under-represented, however in ADJNet and SCOTUS they are well represented. ADJNet and SCOTUS also contain binary labels.

Statistics	Epinions	Slashdot	Wiki	ADJNet	SCOTUS
total nodes	131828	82144	7220	4579	28305
positive edges	717667	425072	83717	10708	43781
negative edges	123705	124130	28422	7044	42102
total edges	841372	549202	112139	17752	85883
% negative edges	14.703	22.602	25.345	39.680	49.023
direction	directed	directed	directed	undirected	directed




Figure 4: 2-dimensional embedding of alliances among sixteen tribes of New Guinea. Alliance (hostility) between the tribes is shown in solid blue (dashed red) edges. We can see that edges representing alliance are comparatively shorter than the edges represents hostility.

groups of tribes $\{OVE, GAHUK, ASARO, UKUDZ, ALIKA, GEHAM\}$ and $\{UHETO, SEUVE, NAGAM, KOHIK, NOTOH\}$. The tribes within these two groups are only allied to each other and MASIL but they are hostile to other tribes belonging to different groups. This actually justifies the position of MASIL. As reported in (Hage and Harary 1983) there is another such group which consists of the tribes NAGAD, KOTUN, GAMA, GAVEV; notice that they position themselves in the lower left corner far away from other two groups. Therefore the embedding space learned by sign2vec clearly depicts alliances and relationships among the tribes.

Does the embedding space learned by sign2vec support structural balance theory? Here we present our analysis on whether the embedding space learned by sign2vec follows the principles of structural balance theory. We calculate the mean Euclidean distance between representations of nodes connected by positive versus negative edges, as well as their standard deviations (see Table 2). The lower value of positive edges suggests positively connected nodes stay closer together than the negatively connected nodes indicating that sign2vec has successfully learned the embedding using the principles of structural balance theory. Moreover,

Table 2: Average Euclidean distance between node representations connected by positive edges versus negative edges with std. deviation. We can see that the avg. distance between positive edge is significantly lower than negative edges indicating that sign2vec preserves the conditions of structural balance theory.

Type of edges	Epinions	Slashdot	Wiki	SCOTUS	ADJNet
positive	0.86 (0.37)	0.98 (0.31)	1.06 (0.27)	0.84 (0.25)	0.71 (0.16)
negative	1.64 (0.23)	1.60 (0.19)	1.56 (0.19)	1.64 (0.21)	1.77 (0.08)
ratio	0.524	0.613	0.679	0.512	0.401

the ratio of average distance between the positive and negative edges is at most 67% over all the datasets suggesting that sign2vec grasps the principles very effectively.

Are representations learned by sign2vec effective at edge label prediction? We now explore the utility of sign2vec for edge label prediction. For all the datasets we sample 50% of the edges as a training set to learn the node embedding. Then we train a logistic regression classifier using the embedding as features and the sign of the edges as label. This classifier is used to predict the sign of the remaining 50% of the edges. Since edges involve two nodes we explore several scores to compute the features for edges from the node embedding. They are described below:

1. **Concatenation** (concat): $\mathbf{f}_{ij} = \mathbf{d}_i \oplus \mathbf{d}_j$
2. **Average** (avg): $\mathbf{f}_{ij} = \frac{\mathbf{d}_i + \mathbf{d}_j}{2}$
3. **Hadamard** (had): $\mathbf{f}_{ij} = \mathbf{d}_i * \mathbf{d}_j$
4. \mathcal{L}_1 : $\mathbf{f}_{ij} = |\mathbf{d}_i - \mathbf{d}_j|$
5. \mathcal{L}_2 : $\mathbf{f}_{ij} = |\mathbf{d}_i - \mathbf{d}_j|^2$

Here \mathbf{f}_{ij} is the feature vector of edge e_{ij} and \mathbf{d}_i is the embedding of node v_i . Except for the method of concatenation (which has a feature vector dimension of 80) other methods use 40-dimensional vectors. Since the datasets are typically imbalanced we use the macro-F1 scores to evaluate our method. We repeat this process five times and report the average results (see Table 3). Some key observations from this table are as follows:

1. sign2vec, not surprisingly, outperforms node2vec across all datasets. For datasets that contain relatively fewer negative edges (e.g., 14% for Epinions and 22% for Slashdot), the improvements are modest (around 34–40%). For ADJNet and SCOTUS where the sign distribution is less skewed, sign2vec outperforms node2vec by a huge margin (64% for ADJNet and 63% for SCOTUS). Also for Wiki the gains are huge (around 66%) where 25% of edges are negative.
2. sign2vec demonstrates a consistent advantage over SiNE and SNE, with gains ranging from 64–75% (for the social network datasets) to 82–115% (for ADJNet and SCOTUS).
3. sign2vec also outperforms sign2vec-NS in almost all scenarios demonstrating the effectiveness of targeted node sampling over negative sampling.
4. Performance measures (across all scores and across all algorithms) are comparatively better for Epinions over other datasets because almost 83% of the nodes in Epinions sat-

Table 3: Comparison of edge label prediction in all datasets. We show the macro F1 score for each feature scoring method. The best score across all the scoring method is shown in boldface. sign2vec outperforms node2vec, SNE, and SiNE in every case. The results are statistically significant with $p < 0.01$.

Eval.	Dataset	Epinions	Slashdot	Wiki	ADJNet	SCOTUS
concat	node2vec	0.601	0.508	0.45	0.478	0.500
	SNE	0.461	0.436	0.428	0.376	0.447
	SiNE	0.460	0.436	0.427	0.401	0.378
	sign2vec-NS	0.792	0.654	0.719	0.379	0.547
	sign2vec	0.807	0.716	0.750	0.412	0.550
avg	node2vec	0.485	0.495	0.428	0.477	0.495
	SNE	0.461	0.436	0.428	0.376	0.363
	SiNE	0.460	0.436	0.427	0.388	0.378
	sign2vec-NS	0.626	0.589	0.614	0.374	0.509
	sign2vec	0.694	0.668	0.667	0.400	0.523
had	node2vec	0.469	0.455	0.428	0.43	0.492
	SNE	0.461	0.436	0.428	0.376	0.336
	SiNE	0.460	0.436	0.427	0.393	0.378
	sign2vec-NS	0.666	0.554	0.508	0.795	0.671
	sign2vec	0.726	0.582	0.523	0.785	0.815
\mathcal{L}_1	node2vec	0.461	0.437	0.431	0.401	0.492
	SNE	0.461	0.436	0.428	0.376	0.378
	SiNE	0.460	0.436	0.427	0.378	0.378
	sign2vec-NS	0.661	0.552	0.457	0.792	0.598
	sign2vec	0.753	0.627	0.487	0.788	0.782
\mathcal{L}_2	node2vec	0.464	0.439	0.432	0.451	0.483
	SNE	0.461	0.436	0.428	0.376	0.336
	SiNE	0.460	0.436	0.427	0.378	0.378
	sign2vec-NS	0.665	0.560	0.463	0.795	0.630
	sign2vec	0.760	0.641	0.508	0.786	0.792
gain over node2vec (%)		34.28	40.94	66.67	64.85	63.00
gain over SNE (%)		75.05	64.22	75.23	109.57	82.33
gain over SiNE (%)		75.43	64.22	75.64	96.51	115.61
gain over sign2vec-NS (%)		1.89	9.48	4.31	-0.88	21.46

isfy the structural balance condition (Facchetti, Iacono, and Altafini 2011). As a result edge label prediction is comparatively easier than in other datasets.

5. The feature scoring method has a noticeable impact w.r.t. different datasets. The Average and Concatenation methods subsidize differences whereas the Hadamard, \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 methods promote differences. To understand why this makes a difference, consider networks like ADJNet and SCOTUS where connected components denote strong polarities (e.g., denoting synonyms or justice leanings, respectively). In such networks, the Hadamard, \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 methods provide more discriminatory features. However, Epinions and Slashdot are relatively large datasets with diversified communities and so all these methods perform nearly comparably.

Are representations learned by sign2vec effective at node label prediction? For datasets like SCOTUS and ADJNet (where nodes are annotated with labels), we learn a logistic regression classifier to map from node representations to corresponding labels (with a 50-50 training-test split). We also repeat this five times and report the average. See Table 4 for results. As can be seen, sign2vec consistently outperforms all the other approaches. In particular, in the case

Table 4: Comparison of methods for node label prediction on real world datasets. sign2vec outperforms other methods in all datasets.

Dataset Name		ADJNet	SCOTUS
micro f1	node2vec	0.5284	0.5392
	SNE	0.5480	0.5432
	SiNE	0.6257	0.6131
	sign2vec-NS	0.7292	0.8004
	sign2vec	0.8380	0.8419
gain over node2vec (%)		58.5920	56.1387
gain over SNE (%)		52.9197	54.9890
gain over SiNE (%)		33.9300	37.3185
gain over sign2vec-NS (%)		14.9205	5.1849
macro f1	node2vec	0.4605	0.4922
	SNE	0.4540	0.4435
	SiNE	0.5847	0.5696
	sign2vec-NS	0.7261	0.7997
	sign2vec	0.8374	0.8415
gain over node2vec (%)		45.0084	41.5092
gain over SNE (%)		84.4493	89.7407
gain over SiNE (%)		43.2187	47.7353
gain over sign2vec-NS (%)		15.3285	5.2270

of SCOTUS which is a citation network, some cases have a huge number of citations (i.e. landmark cases) in both ideologies. Targeted node sampling, by adding such cases to either η_i^+ or η_i^- , situates the embedding space close to the landmark cases if they are in η_i^+ or away from them if they are in η_i^- , thus supporting accurate node prediction.

The case of Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission (FEC), one of the most controversial cases in recent times, is instructive. In this case, Citizens United seeks an injunction against the FEC to prevent the application of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) so that a film on Hillary Clinton can be broadcasted. In a 5-4 vote, the court decides in favor of Citizens United. In Fig. 7, we depict the BCRA related cases that cite Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission in a 2D projection. The cases whose decisions support a conservative view are shown in red and the cases which support a liberal point of view are shown in blue. Another two cases disputing the application of BCRA cite this case (shown in filled circles), viz. Williams-Yulee vs The Florida Bar and McCutcheon vs FEC. In the first case the court supports the liberal point-of-view (shown in blue) and cites the case negatively (shown in dashed line). Therefore, its embedding resides far away from the Citizens United case. In McCutcheon vs FEC, the court supports a conservative point-of-view and decides in favor of McCutcheon. This case positively cites Citizens United case and its embedding is therefore positioned closer to it.

Multiclass Node Classification In section 4, we show the results of node classification on real world dataset. One limitation of ADJNet and SCOTUS is nodes are tagged with binary data. Although binary labeling seems plausible in perfectly balanced signed network, it is possible to find the extension of this behavior in many social media analysis. For example, in an election media campaign, there could be multiple candidates, where supporters of one candidate speaks




Figure 5: Macro F1 of ADJNet (a) and SCOTUS (b) datasets varying the percent of nodes used for training. sign2vec outperforms sign2vec-NS in all cases. (c) and (d) show execution time of sign2vec varying the number of nodes and threads.

favorably for her candidate while speaks against other candidates. It is interesting to investigate how sign2vec performs in this circumstance.

Unfortunately, to the best of our knowledge there is no publicly available dataset to for this evaluation. That is why we use synthetic dataset to compare the performance. We generate the networks based on the method proposed in (Chiang, Whang, and Dhillon 2012). Given a total number of nodes NV , number of node labels NG and sparsity score α , we first create NG subgraphs from NV nodes having only positive edges within the subgraphs. The nodes of i^{th} subgraphs are labeled as class i . Then we connect the subgraphs by only by negative edges. We also add random positive and negative edges as noise to make the networks more realistic. α controls the total number of edges. We create 3 synthetic datasets each with $NV = 50000$ nodes where NG is set to 10 (Syn 10), 20 (Syn 20), 50 (Syn 50).

We train a one-vs-rest logistic regression classifier for the prediction with a 50-50 training-test split. The result is shown in Table 5. We can see that, sign2vec not surpris-

Table 5: Comparison of multiclass prediction on Synthetic Datasets. We apply one-vs-rest logistic regression classifier for the prediction. sign2vec outperforms all the other methods in all datasets.

Performance measure	Algorithms	Syn 10	Syn 20	Syn 50
micro f1	node2vec	0.1112	0.0527	0.0195
	SiNE	0.1105	0.0545	0.0197
	sign2vec-NS	0.1483	0.0848	0.0519
	sign2vec	0.1723	0.1104	0.0716
gain (%) of sign2vec		16.1834	30.1887	37.9576
macro f1	node2vec	0.0967	0.0283	0.0032
	SiNE	0.1083	0.0535	0.0187
	sign2vec-NS	0.1344	0.0747	0.0486
	sign2vec	0.1695	0.1084	0.0704
gain (%) of sign2vec		26.1161	45.1138	44.8560

ingly outperforms other methods with considerable margin. One of the interesting points is since in this dataset multiple opposite groups are present, considering this densely group behavior can provide better node sampling than random walk. This intend to explore this idea in the future.

How much more effective is our sampling strategy in the presence of partial information? To evaluate the effectiveness of our targeted node sampling versus negative sampling, we remove all outgoing edges of a certain percent of randomly selected nodes (test nodes), learn an embedding, and then aim to predict the labels of the test nodes. We show the macro F1 scores for ADJNet (treating it as directed) and SCOTUS in Fig. 5 (a) and Fig. 5 (b). As seen here, sign2vec consistently outperforms sign2vec-NS. Withholding the outgoing edges of test nodes implies that both methods will miss the same edge information in learning the embedding. However due to targeted node sampling many of these test nodes will be added to η_i^+ or η_i^- in sign2vec (recall only the outgoing edges are removed, but not incoming edges). Because of this property, sign2vec will be able to make an informed choice while optimizing the embedding space.



Figure 6: Predicting the polarity of adjectives in a subset of the ADJNet dataset. Here red labeled/boldface words are negative while the blue labeled/slanted words are positive. (Many adjectives have been removed to reduce clutter.) We use t-SNE to map the data into a 2D space.

How scalable is sign2vec for large networks? To assess the scalability of sign2vec, we learn embeddings for an Erdos-Renyi random network for upto one million nodes. The average degree for each node is set to 10 and the total number of samples is set to 100 times the number of edges in the network. The size of the dimension is also set to 100 for this experiment. We make the network signed by randomly changing the sign of 20% edges to negative. The optimization time and the total execution time (targeted node sampling + optimization) is compared in Fig. 5 (c) for different vertex sizes. On a regular desktop, an unparallelized version of sign2vec requires less than 3 hours to learn the embedding space for over 1 million nodes. Moreover, the sampling times is negligible compared to the optimization time (less than 15 minutes for 1 million nodes). This actually shows sign2vec is very scalable for real world networks. Additionally, sign2vec uses an asynchronous stochastic gradient approach, so it is trivially parallelizable and as Fig. 5(d) shows, we can obtain a 3.5 fold improvement with just 5 threads, with diminishing returns beyond that point.

5 Other Related Work

Work related to unsupervised feature learning for networks have been discussed in the introduction. These ideas follow the trend opened up originally by unsupervised feature learning in text. Skip-gram models proposed in (Mikolov et al. 2013a; Mikolov, Le, and Sutskever 2013; Mikolov et al. 2013b) learn a vector representation of words by optimizing a likelihood function. Skip-gram models are based on the principle that words in similar contexts generally have similar meanings (Harris 1981) and can be extended to learn feature representations for documents (Le and Mikolov 2014), parts of speech (Trask, Michalak, and Liu 2015), items in collaborative filtering (Barkan and Koenigstein 2016). Recently deep learning based models have been proposed




Figure 7: Several conservatively and liberally disputed cases including Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) related cases that cite *Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission*. Conservatively (liberally) disputed cases are shown in red (blue). Our discussed cases are shown in filled circles while other cases are shown in unfilled circles. Solid (dashed) edges represent positively (negatively) oriented relationships.

for representation learning on graphs to perform the above mentioned prediction tasks in unsigned networks (Li et al. 2014b; Li et al. 2016; Li et al. 2014c; Wang, Cui, and Zhu 2016). Although these models provide high accuracy by optimizing several layers of non-linear transformations, they are computationally expensive, requires a significant amount of training time and are only applicable to unsigned networks as opposed to our proposed method sign2vec.

6 Conclusion

We have presented a scalable feature learning framework suitable for signed networks. Using a targeted node sampling for random walks, and leveraging structural balance theory, we have shown how the embedding space learned by sign2vec yields interpretable as well as effective representations. Future work is aimed at experimenting with other theories of signed networks and extensions to networks with a heterogeneity of node and edge tables.

References

- [Barkan and Koenigstein 2016] Barkan, O., and Koenigstein, N. 2016. ITEM2VEC: Neural item embedding for collaborative filtering. In *Workshop on MLSP*, 1–6.
- [Belkin and Niyogi 2001] Belkin, M., and Niyogi, P. 2001. Laplacian Eigenmaps and Spectral Techniques for Embedding and Clustering. In *NIPS*, 585–591.
- [Bhagat, Cormode, and Muthukrishnan 2011] Bhagat, S.; Cormode, G.; and Muthukrishnan, S. 2011. *Node Classification in Social Networks*. Springer US. 115–148.
- [Chiang, Whang, and Dhillon 2012] Chiang, K.-Y.; Whang, J.; and Dhillon, I. 2012. Scalable clustering of signed networks using balance normalized cut. In *CIKM*, 615–624.
- [Facchetti, Iacono, and Altafini 2011] Facchetti, G.; Iacono, G.; and Altafini, C. 2011. Computing global structural balance in large-scale signed social networks. *PNAS* 108(52):20953–20958.
- [Fowler and Jeon 2008] Fowler, J., and Jeon, S. 2008. The authority of supreme court precedent. *Social Networks* 30(1):16–30.
- [Grover and Leskovec 2016] Grover, A., and Leskovec, J. 2016. node2vec: Scalable Feature Learning for Networks. In *KDD*, 855–864.
- [Hage and Harary 1983] Hage, P., and Harary, F. 1983. *Structural models in anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- [Harris 1981] Harris, Z. 1981. *Distributional Structure*. Springer Netherlands.
- [Heider 1946] Heider, F. 1946. Attitudes and Cognitive Organization. *Journal of Psychology* 21:107–112.
- [Kunegis et al. 2010] Kunegis, J.; Stephan, S.; Lommatzsch, A.; Lerner, J.; Luca, E. D.; and Albayrak, S. 2010. Spectral Analysis of Signed Graphs for Clustering, Prediction and Visualization. In *SDM*, 559–570.
- [Le and Mikolov 2014] Le, Q., and Mikolov, T. 2014. Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *ICML*, 1188–1196.

- [Leskovec, Huttenlocher, and Kleinberg 2010] Leskovec, J.; Huttenlocher, D.; and Kleinberg, J. 2010. Predicting Positive and Negative Links in Online Social Networks. In *WWW*, 641–650.
- [Li et al. 2014a] Li, A.; Ahmed, A.; Ravi, S.; and Smola, A. 2014a. Reducing the sampling complexity of topic models. In *KDD*, 891–900.
- [Li et al. 2014b] Li, K.; Gao, J.; Guo, S.; Du, N.; Li, X.; and Zhang, A. 2014b. LRBM: A restricted boltzmann machine based approach for representation learning on linked data. In *ICDM*, 300–309.
- [Li et al. 2014c] Li, X.; Du, N.; Li, H.; Li, K.; Gao, J.; and Zhang, A. 2014c. A deep learning approach to link prediction in dynamic networks. In *SDM*, 289–297.
- [Li et al. 2016] Li, Y.; Tarlow, D.; Brockschmidt, M.; and Zemel, R. 2016. Gated graph sequence neural networks. In *ICLR*.
- [Liben-Nowell and Kleinberg 2003] Liben-Nowell, D., and Kleinberg, J. 2003. The Link Prediction Problem for Social Networks. In *CIKM*, 556–559.
- [Mikolov et al. 2013a] Mikolov, T.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G.; and Dean, J. 2013a. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. *CoRR* abs/1301.3781.
- [Mikolov et al. 2013b] Mikolov, T.; Sutskever, I.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G.; and Dean, J. 2013b. Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and their Compositionality. In *NIPS*. 3111–3119.
- [Mikolov, Le, and Sutskever 2013] Mikolov, T.; Le, Q.; and Sutskever, I. 2013. Exploiting Similarities among Languages for Machine Translation. *CoRR* abs/1309.4168.
- [Perozzi, Al-Rfou, and Skiena 2014] Perozzi, B.; Al-Rfou, R.; and Skiena, S. 2014. DeepWalk: Online Learning of Social Representations. In *KDD*, 701–710.
- [Read 1954] Read, K. 1954. Cultures of the central highlands, new guinea. *Southwest J Anthropol* 10(1):1–43.
- [Recht et al. 2011] Recht, B.; Re, C.; Wright, S.; and Niu, F. 2011. Hogwild: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent. In *NIPS*, 693–701.
- [Roweis and Saul 2000] Roweis, S., and Saul, L. 2000. Non-linear Dimensionality Reduction by Locally Linear Embedding. *Science* 290(5500):2323–2326.
- [Tang et al. 2015] Tang, J.; Qu, M.; Wang, M.; Zhang, M.; Yan, J.; and Mei, Q. 2015. LINE: Large-scale Information Network Embedding. In *WWW*, 1067–1077.
- [Tenenbaum, Silva, and Langford 2000] Tenenbaum, J.; Silva, V.; and Langford, J. 2000. A Global Geometric Framework for Nonlinear Dimensionality Reduction. *Science* 290(5500):2319–2323.
- [Trask, Michalak, and Liu 2015] Trask, A.; Michalak, P.; and Liu, J. 2015. sense2vec-A fast and accurate method for word sense disambiguation in neural word embeddings. *arXiv:1511.06388*.
- [van der Maaten and Hinton 2008] van der Maaten, L., and Hinton, G. 2008. Visualizing High-Dimensional Data Using t-SNE. *JMLR* 9:2579–2605.
- [Wang et al. 2017] Wang, S.; Tang, J.; Aggarwal, C.; Chang, Y.; and Liu, H. 2017. Signed network embedding in social media. In *SDM*.
- [Wang, Cui, and Zhu 2016] Wang, D.; Cui, P.; and Zhu, W. 2016. Structural deep network embedding. In *KDD*, 1225–1234.
- [Yu et al. 2014] Yu, X.; Ren, X.; Sun, Y.; Gu, Q.; Sturt, B.; Khandelwal, U.; Norick, B.; and Han, J. 2014. Personalized Entity Recommendation: A Heterogeneous Information Network Approach. In *WSDM*, 283–292.
- [Yuan, Wu, and Xiang 2017] Yuan, S.; Wu, X.; and Xiang, Y. 2017. SNE: Signed network embedding. In *arXiv:1703.04837*.
- [Zheng and Skillicorn 2015] Zheng, Q., and Skillicorn, D. 2015. Spectral Embedding of Signed Networks. In *SDM*, 55–63.