Hidden Community Detection in Social Networks

Kun He*
Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Wuhan, China
brooklet60@hust.edu.cn

Yingru Li†
Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Wuhan, China
szrlee@hust.edu.cn

Sucheta Soundarajan
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY, USA
susounda@syr.edu

John E. Hopcroft
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY, USA
jeh@cs.cornell.edu

arXiv:1702.07462v1 [cs.SI] 24 Feb 2017

ABSTRACT

We introduce a new paradigm that is important for community detection in the realm of network analysis. Networks contain a set of strong, dominant communities, which interfere with the detection of weak, natural community structure. When most of the members of the weak communities also belong to stronger communities, they are extremely hard to be uncovered. We call the weak communities the *hidden community structure*.

We present a novel approach called *HICODE* (HIdden COmmunity DEtection) that identifies the hidden community structure as well as the dominant community structure. By weakening the strength of the dominant structure, one can uncover the hidden structure beneath. Likewise, by reducing the strength of the hidden structure, one can more accurately identify the dominant structure. In this way, *HICODE* tackles both tasks simultaneously.

Extensive experiments on real-world networks demonstrate that *HICODE* outperforms several state-of-the-art community detection methods in uncovering both the dominant and the hidden structure. For example in the Facebook university social networks, we find multiple non-redundant sets of communities that are strongly associated with residential hall, year of registration or career position of the faculties or students, while the state-of-the-art algorithms mainly locate the dominant ground truth category. Due to the difficulty of labeling all ground truth communities in real-world datasets, *HICODE* provides a promising approach to pinpoint the existing latent communities and uncover communities for which there is no ground truth. Finding this unknown structure is an extremely important community detection problem.

CCS CONCEPTS

•Information systems →Social networks; •Human-centered computing →Social network analysis;

KEYWORDS

Community detection; hidden structure; structure mining; social networks

ACM Reference format:
Kun He, Yingru Li, Sucheta Soundarajan, and John E. Hopcroft. 2017. Hidden Community Detection in Social Networks. In *Proceedings of a Confenrence , Canada, 2017 (Submitted to a confenrence),* 10 pages.
DOI: 10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn

1 INTRODUCTION


Over the past decades, community detection has emerged as an essential task in the realm of network analysis, and provides insight into the underlying structure and potential functions of the networks [14, 23]. Early work focused primarily on identifying disjoint communities that partition the set of nodes within a network [7, 29, 30]. More recently, researchers have observed the multiplicity of interwoven memberships of communities and have developed algorithms for finding overlapping communities [3, 10, 22, 37]. Some partitioning techniques are also extended to tackle the overlapping case [15, 17, 41]. Within these two categories, one can further build a hierarchical dendrogram based on the granularity of the detected communities.

Although much progress has been made, there is a type of community structure, which we call the **hidden community structure**, that has attracted little attention in the literature. Real-world networks contain sparse community structure, such as secret organizations or temporary groups, which is considerably weaker than the dense community structure like families, colleagues or close friends, as evaluated by popular community scoring metrics. If most of the members in the less modular community also belong to other denser communities, the community is usually overlooked.

For instance, in a social network, individuals may belong to multiple strong social communities, corresponding to groups such as families, colleagues and friends. Though overlapping, the connections inside these communities are strong and numerous enough that existing overlapping community detection algorithms can perceive and uncover these latent but dominant modular structures. However, in addition to these strong communities, individuals may also belong to weaker communities, such as a group of medical patients that see each other at the doctor's office and communicate infrequently, or high school alumni whom have infrequent contact.

*This work was done while the first author was a visiting professor at Cornell University.
†Corresponding author.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).
Submitted to a confenrence, Canada
© 2017 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM…$15.00
DOI: 10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn



(a) Dominant communities (b) Hidden communities

Figure 1: The illustration of the dominant communities and the hidden communities in a social network. (a) The three cliques correspond to communities of students working closely as teams in projects. (b) The three groups of different colors correspond to sports communities with sparser connections.

As illustrated in Figure 1 for a small network, the hidden community structure is sparser and as it is tangled with the structure of the dominant communities, it is also harder for detection.

For applications in a large variety of scientific disciplines, the weak, hidden structure is of great interest and deserves to be explored. For example, in Protein-Protein Interaction (PPI) networks [28], biologists wish to identify gene groups serving similar functions. However, the current annotation is far from complete [12], and the dominant, clearest groupings are more likely to be annotated. In such a scenario, a way to help the biologists identify the hidden, less obvious groups is of great value. As another example, consider a government that wishes to identify communities of a criminal or terrorist organization in a social network. This community structure may be expressed within the network, but is likely to be much weaker than communities corresponding to family or location. Identifying this hidden structure in the presence of the stronger community structure is even more important but faces a major challenge.

This paper aims to provide insight into the hidden structure. We will address the following questions:

- Do real-world networks contain hidden community structure?
- How can we formally characterize "hidden" structure?
- How can one find hidden structure in the presence of stronger, dominant structure?

To address the above issues, we define the **hiddenness value** of a community as the portion of nodes in stronger communities, and present a meta-approach called Hidden Community Detection (*HICODE*) to identify the dominant structure as well as the hidden structure in networks. *HICODE* begins by first applying an existing algorithm as a base algorithm to a network, and then weakening the structure of the detected communities in the network. In this way, the weaker, hidden community structure becomes visible. This step is repeated iteratively until no further significant structure is detected. Next, *HICODE* weakens the structure of the hidden communities, and thus obtains a more accurate version of the dominant community structure.

Through experiments on real social networks, we demonstrate the existence of multiple sets of non-redundant communities. The weaker set of communities, though possessing significant community structure, is rarely detected by state-of-the-art community detection algorithms. On real-world networks containing a hidden ground-truth community structure, *HICODE* uncovers this structure much preciser than the baseline algorithms.

Hidden community structure can be regarded as a special type of overlapping communities. However, existing overlapping community detection methods mainly focus on communities in which a considerably portion of the members are not "hidden", that is, they could also belong to other weaker communities but this community is clearly the strongest for these members. We believe the insights we obtained on hidden community structure will provide valuable guidance for future investigations. The main contributions of this paper include:

- **Conception on Hidden Community.** We introduce the concept of hidden community structure that exists widely in social networks, and we formally define the hiddenness value of a community.
- **Methods on Hidden Community Detection.** We present *HICODE* for identifying both the dominant and the hidden structure. We implement *HICODE* with several community detection algorithms as the base algorithm, and provide several structure weakening methods: RemoveEdge, ReduceEdge and ReduceWeight.
- **Validation on real world datasets.** Through experiments on a variety of real-world networks, we demonstrate that the higher the hiddenness value a community is, the harder for an algorithm to locate such community; *HICODE* outperforms several state-of-the-art community detection methods on uncovering the hidden communities.
- **Scalability.** As a meta-approach, *HICODE* is scalable by applying any conventional community detection algorithm as the base algorithm. One can use *HICODE* as a tool to find overlapping communities by using any disjoint community algorithm as the base. In addition, by applying overlapping community detection algorithms as the base, *HICODE* can

improve the accuracy on the set of communities the base algorithm found, at the same time it can uncover more weak communities hidden underneath the dominant set.

2 PRELIMINARIES

Let graph $G = (V, E)$ represent a network with n nodes and e edges. Let A be the adjacency matrix of G, the ij-entry $A_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether there is an edge connecting nodes i, j.[1] Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, ..., C_K\}$ be all the overlapping communities, where $C_k = (V_k, E_k)$ is a comparatively dense subgraph of G. The cardinality of a community is defined as the number of nodes in this community, i.e. $|C_k| = |V_k|$. We first introduce some necessary metrics, then provide formal definitions on the hidden structure.

2.1 Metrics

Modularity. To measure the strength of a set of communities that partition the network, we adopt the popular *modularity* metric. Modularity is defined by Newman as the ratio of the number of intra-community edges to the expected number of edges in the same set of communities if the edges had been distributed randomly while preserving degree distribution [25].

The modularity score Q of a partition is calculated by:

$$Q = \sum_{k=1}^{K} Q_k = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left[\frac{e_{kk}}{e} - \left(\frac{d_k}{2e} \right)^2 \right], \tag{1}$$

where K is the number of communities in the partitioning, e is the number of edges in the graph, e_{kk} is the number of edges within community C_k, and d_k is the total degree of the nodes in community C_k. Q lies in the range $[-0.5, 1)$, with larger values indicating a stronger community set.

Definition 2.1. **Modularity of a Community**. We call Q_k the sum modularity contribution of C_k, and the modularity of a single community is defined as the sum modularity contribution of that community divided by the number of nodes in the community, i.e. $Q_k/|C_k|$.

Zhang et al. extend Newman's definition to a set of overlapping communities by considering the belonging coefficient w_{ik} for node i to community C_k [41]. Briefly, $w_{ik} = 1/m$ if community C_k is one of the m communities containing node i. Then in Eq. (1), e_{kk} is weighted by

$$e_{kk} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in C_k} \frac{w_{ik} + w_{jk}}{2} A_{ij}, \tag{2}$$

where A_{ij} is the ij-entry of the adjacency matrix. We know $d_k = 2e_{kk} + e_{k_out}$, then e_{k_out} is weighted by

$$e_{k_out} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in C_k, j \notin C_k} \frac{w_{ik} + (1 - w_{jk})}{2} A_{ij}. \tag{3}$$

The extended definition degenerates exactly to Eq. (1) for disjoint communities.

Normalized Mutual Information (NMI). We use *normalized mutual information (NMI)* to capture the similarity of two partitions X and Y [11].

$$NMI(X, Y) = \frac{2I(X, Y)}{H(X) + H(Y)}, \tag{4}$$

where $H(X)$ is the Shannon entropy of partition X, and $I(X, Y)$ is the *mutual information* that captures the similarity between two partitions X and Y. For a set of communities that partition a network, $p(x) = |x|$, and $p(x, y) = |x \cap y|$. The NMI score lies in the range [0,1], where 1 represents a perfect matching and 0 indicates total independence. For overlapping communities, we use the extended NMI [1]. See [1] for details.

$$I(X, Y) = \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in Y} p(x, y) \log \frac{p(x, y)}{p(x)p(y)} \tag{5}$$

$$H(X) = -\sum_{x \in X} p(x) \log p(x) \tag{6}$$

2.2 Definitions

Assume we have some metric function $\mathcal{F}$:$(G, C_k) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ (*e.g., modularity [25] or conductance [32]*) that assigns a quality score to a community. For simplicity, let $\mathcal{F}_k$ denote the quality of C_k in G. Here, we assume that higher scores indicate stronger communities, but the definition below can be trivially modified for the case when lower scores indicate higher community quality.

Definition 2.2. **Hiddenness Value of a Community**. The hiddenness value $H(C_k)$ of community C_k is the fraction of nodes of C_k belonging to various communities with a higher $\mathcal{F}$ score.

Let $\mathbb{S}_k$ be the set of all strong communities for community C_k.

$$\mathbb{S}_k = \{C_i | \mathcal{F}_i > \mathcal{F}_k, C_i \in \mathcal{C}\} \tag{7}$$

The hiddenness value of C_k can be calculated as:

$$H(C_k) = \frac{1}{|C_k|} \cdot \left| \bigcup_{C_i \in \mathbb{S}_k} C_i \cap C_k \right| \tag{8}$$

$H(C_k) \in [0, 1]$. Intuitively, the higher a community's hiddenness value is, the more difficult for the community to be uncovered.

The goal of the hidden community detection problem is to locate overlapping communities in the network such that communities having high hiddenness values can be found. Note that there is no single threshold for a 'high' hiddenness value, these values depend on the network under study, the metric being used, and the set of communities. For two communities $C_i, C_j \in \mathcal{C}$, if $H(C_i) > H(C_j)$, then C_i is comparatively hidden as compared with C_j, and C_j is comparatively dominant as compared with C_i.

For convenience, we separate the communities into layers.

Definition 2.3. **Layer**. A layer is a set of communities that partitions or covers the nodes of the network.[2]

Intuitively, in a social network, a partitioning layer may correspond to a grouping of individuals by their locations, and colleague circles could form an overlapping layer where some colleagues are in interdisciplinary areas.

Definition 2.4. **Hiddenness Value of a Layer**. The hiddenness value $H(\mathcal{L}_i)$ of a layer $\mathcal{L}_i$ is the weighted average hiddenness values of the communities in this layer.

$$H(\mathcal{L}_i) = \frac{\sum_{C_k \in \mathcal{L}_i} |C_k| \cdot H(C_k)}{\left| \sum_{C_k \in \mathcal{L}_i} C_k \right|}. \tag{9}$$

[1] For simplicity, we discuss unweighted graph, but all discussions in this paper are easily extended to weighted graph by letting $A_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ to indicate the weight of each edge. In the weighted graph, the number of edges then corresponds to the sum of the edge weights.

[2] Here we allow trivial communities of size less than 3.

$H(\mathcal{L}_i) \in [0, 1]$. The dominant layer is the layer with lowest hiddenness value. It is usually the set of communities found by a standard community detection algorithm that optimizes metric $\mathcal{F}$. A layer is called hidden if it has a comparatively high hiddenness value. Figure 1 illustrates a small social network with two layers of communities, the dominant layer corresponds to project teams and the hidden layer corresponds to sports groups.

2.3 Case Study

To illustrate the concept of hidden community structure, we choose modularity as the community metric, and show an example on the Caltech Facebook network dataset (*described in detail in Section 4.3*). For simplicity, here we only consider two annotations for each individual: the residence hall ('Dorm') and year of matriculation ('Year'). A ground truth community contains all individuals living in the same dormitory, or are in the same year of matriculation. 'Dorm' communities partition the nodes and form a layer. Similarly, 'Year' communities form another layer.

On average, 79% of the nodes in each 'Year' community belong to a stronger 'Dorm' community, i.e., the 'Year' layer has a hiddenness value of 0.79. In contrast, the 'Dorm' layer only has a hiddenness value of 0.08. The 'Year' layer have substantially higher hiddenness values than the 'Dorm' layer. Note that 'Year' is still the hidden layer as compared with 'Dorm' when we use the conductance metric.

We thus conjecture that standard community detection algorithms have difficulty detecting the 'Year' layer. As we will see in the experiments, the state-of-the-art community detection algorithms that we consider can effectively find the 'Dorm' layer but rarely detect the 'Year' layer, while *HICODE* can effectively uncover both layers.

3 HIDDEN COMMUNITY DETECTION

3.1 Algorithm Overview

In this section, we propose a meta-approach called *HICODE* to find layers of community structure in a network. *HICODE* uses an existing community detection algorithm as the 'base' method, and iteratively weakens the structure of detected layers to reveal hidden structure. *HICODE* then applies a refinement procedure to increase the quality of the layers.

HICODE contains two stages: **Identification** and **Refinement**.

Stage 1. Identification:

The Identification stage determines the initial layers of communities as follows:

(1) Identify a layer of communities via the base method;
(2) Weaken the structure of the detected layer;
(3) Repeat until the appropriate number of layers are found.

In this stage, we iteratively identify a set of initial layers by weakening the structure of the previous, stronger layers.

Section 3.2 presents methods for weakening the detected community structure in order to reveal the hidden structure beneath.

A crucial aspect of the Identification stage is to automatically determine the number of layers n_L in a network. This is accomplished by increasing n_L until a stopping condition is met. We describe this process in Section 3.3.

Stage 2. Refinement:

It is reasonable that stronger community structure can obscure weaker community structure, but critically, we observe that weaker structure can also hinder the accurate or complete detection of the stronger structures. After the Identification stage, one has only a rough approximation of the various community layers, and the purpose of the Refinement stage is to further improve the quality of these detected layers.

Refinement is an iterative process. In each iteration, we consider each layer, and improve the current layer as follows:

(1) Weaken the structures of *all other* layers from the original network to obtain a *reduced network*;
(2) Apply the base algorithm to the resulting network.

In contrast to the Identification stage, where only the layers found so far (i.e., the stronger layers) are reduced, during the Refinement stage, we weaken the effects of both the stronger and weaker layers. This is necessary because the weaker layers can impair detection of the layer currently under consideration, even though they have a smaller impact on the network structure than the stronger layers. Through this process, a more accurate version of the current layer is produced.

We use NMI [1, 11] to capture the similarity of two partitions or two sets of overlapping communities. For the synthetic data that we consider, the Refinement stage quickly converges within 30 iterations, meaning that the NMI of the corresponding layers at adjacent iterations is almost 1. For real-world datasets, 100 iterations is generally enough.

Although the trend over these iterations is to see higher quality community layers (i.e., higher modularity partitions or coverings), there are fluctuations in this trend. In each Refinement iteration, we calculate the modularity of the detected layers, and the final output corresponds to the iteration with the highest average modularity score.

3.2 Reducing Methods

We present the following methods to reduce a single layer of community structure: RemoveEdge, ReduceEdge, and ReduceWeight. RemoveEdge works reasonably well when there are only a small number of layers, and communities in different layers have comparatively small overlaps. ReduceEdge generally performs better, but it typically does not perform as well as ReduceWeight; however, one major advantage that ReduceEdge has over ReduceWeight is that it does not require a base algorithm that supports weighted networks. As we will see in experiments, ReduceWeight is the best-performing method of the three.

For all cases, if one has a layer of overlapping communities, then in order to avoid duplicate weakening on the overlapping portions, we sort the communities according to their sizes, weaken larger communities first and do not weaken the overlapping portion again for subsequent communities in the same layer.

3.2.1 RemoveEdge. RemoveEdge weakens a detected community by removing all intra-community edges. This method is inspired by algorithms that find communities by removing edges, such as the classic Girvan-Newman algorithm, which, removes edges with high betweenness [14]. RemoveEdge works reasonably well when there are few layers and communities in different layers have comparatively small overlaps.

3.2.2 ReduceEdge. ReduceEdge approximates each layer as a single stochastic blockmodel, where other edges are regarded as background noise. This method randomly removes some edges within each community block so that the edge probability in the block matches the background edge probability of this block.

For each community C_k in a single layer that we want to reduce, we calculate the observed edge probability p_k in C_k, and the background block probability q_k, as illustrated in the reordered adjacency matrix in Figure 2. Let n_k and e_{kk} be the number of nodes and edges inside C_k, and d_k the sum of degrees of nodes in C_k. p_k equals the actual number of edges in C_k divided by the maximum possible number of edges:

$$p_k = \frac{e_{kk}}{0.5n_k(n_k - 1)}, \tag{10}$$

and q_k is the average outgoing edge density of block C_k:

$$q_k = \frac{d_k - 2e_{kk}}{n_k(n - n_k)}. \tag{11}$$




Figure 2: p_k and q_k of a community block C_k.

If we treat the observed edge probability p_k in community C_k as the superposition of the underlying edge probability p'_k of C_k and the background block probability q_k, then $p_k = 1 - (1 - p'_k)(1 - q_k)$. For an edge in C_k, the probability that it is generated by the background noise is

$$q'_k = 1 - p'_k = \frac{1 - p_k}{1 - q_k} = \frac{q_k}{p_k}. \tag{12}$$

ReduceEdge removes each edge within community C_k with probability $1 - q'_k$ (i.e., it keeps each internal edge with probability q'_k). In this way, edges are randomly removed from C_k such that the edge probability within C_k matches q_k.[3]

3.2.3 ReduceWeight. This method reduces the weight of each edge within community C_k by a factor of q'_k, defined in Eq. (12). Like with ReduceEdge, we wish to set the weighted probability within C_k equal to the average weighted background block probability q_k.

Note that to use ReduceWeight, one's base algorithm must support weighted networks. However, the original network itself need not be weighted, as one can simply set the original weight of every edge to 1. We let ReduceWeight degenerate to ReduceEdge if the base algorithm does not support weighted graphs. Unlike ReduceEdge, ReduceWeight is deterministic.

3.3 Selecting the Number of Layers

A major challenge for *HICODE* is determining n_L, the appropriate number of community layers. On synthetic networks (*details of the data model are described Section 4.2*) where all communities are labeled, we observe that if n_L is chosen correctly, then during the Refinement stage, the average modularity of the detected layers increases. If n_L is either over or under-estimated, then this trend declines. Our rule for determining the number of layers n_L is motivated by this observation: if one selects the appropriate number of layers, the output will generally be of a higher quality.

We begin by setting the number of layers $n_L = 2$, and increase the number of layers until a stopping condition is met. For each candidate number of layers n_L, *HICODE* first calculates the modularity of the weakest layer obtained at the Identification stage. If the value is very low, then there are no more significant layers, so we set $n_L = n_L - 1$ and return; otherwise, let Q_t be the average modularity of all the detected layers at step t:

(1) Calculate Q_0 for $t = 0$, i.e. after identification, before any refinement is conducted;
(2) Perform $T = 10$ tentative iterations of refinement, and calculate Q_t for each $t \in \{1, ..., T\}$;
(3) Calculate the average improvement ratio of modularity per iteration[4]: $R_T = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} Q_t}{T \cdot Q_0}$.

R_T represents how much refinement improves the detected layers. If n_L is too high, then when we remove the structure of the extra layers, we will be removing structure that actually belongs to some earlier layer. This will result in a lower quality partition, such that the refinement stage actually *lowers* the quality of the detected layers. Thus, we choose n_L corresponding to the peak R_T.

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

4.1 Evaluation Metric

Besides *NMI*, we also define a Jaccard score-based metric to evaluate how well the detected layers resemble the ground truth communities. Given a set of detected communities $\mathcal{D}$ and a set of ground truth communities $\mathcal{G}$, the Jaccard similarity-based precision, recall, and F_1 score are defined as follows:

Each detected community D_i has its individual Jaccard Precision

$$P(D_i) = \max_{G_j \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{|G_j \cap D_i|}{|G_j \cup D_i|}.$$

The *Jaccard Precision* P of the set $\mathcal{D}$ is defined as the weighted average of $P(D_i)$ over all detected communities, weighted by the size of the communities.

Each ground truth community G_j has its individual Jaccard Recall

$$R(G_j) = \max_{D_i \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{|G_j \cap D_i|}{|G_j \cup D_i|}.$$

The *Jaccard Recall* R of the set $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as the weighted average of $R(G_j)$ over all ground truth communities, weighted by the size of these communities.

We use weighted P and R to give a higher priority to bigger communities. The *Jaccard* F_1 *Score* is defined as the harmonic mean of P and R, i.e.

$$F_1 = 2PR/(P + R).$$

4.2 Synthetic Stochastic Blockmodel

We define a synthetic stochastic blockmodel containing multiple layers of planted communities. Each layer in a network corresponds to a single stochastic blockmodel that partitions the nodes into roughly equally-sized sets. In each layer, we first create the

[3]Note that ReduceEdge is also suitable for weighted graph where e_{kk} corresponds to the sum of edge weights inside C_k, and d_k corresponds to the sum of degrees of nodes in C_k, weighted by the edge weight.

[4]Instead of only considering how much improvement we get at step T, we use the average modularity of the T steps to balance the fluctuation on real-world networks.

appropriate number of community IDs and randomly assign each node to a community, then we produce a $G(n, p)$ Erdos-Renyi random graph over each block. We select suitable p-values for the different layers so that they are of different densities, but roughly equal strengths as measured by modularity. By randomly assigning nodes to communities, we ensure that the communities in different layers are independent (i.e., a node's membership in different layers is unrelated).

We then generate a small synthetic network SynL2 that will be used to illustrate the details of our algorithm. There are two layers of communities, containing 5 communities of roughly size 40, and 4 communities of roughly size 50. The p values that govern the number of intra-community links for these two layers are 0.12 and 0.10. Their modularity scores are 0.40 and 0.39, with hiddenness values of 0.43 and 0.56. We observe a very low NMI of 0.05 between the two layers, and the F_1 score is also low at 0.02.

4.3 Real-world Datasets

We do thorough testing on two groups of real-world networks, as summarized in Table 1.

(1) **Facebook networks**: These networks are portions of the Facebook social network for different universities in the United States [33], which comes from a single-day snapshot in September 2005 when one needed a '.edu' email address to become a member of Facebook. For each university network, the data have categorical attributes encompassing the gender, major, year of matriculation, high school, dormitory, status (faculty, student, staff, etc.) and residence (house, dormitory, fraternity, etc.) of the users. We choose eight representative university networks which express comparatively high modularity scores when grouping the nodes by at least one of the attributes: Caltech, Smith, Rice, Vassar, Wellesley, Bucknell, Carnegie and UIllinois.

(2) **SNAP networks**: We choose three networks with ground-truth communities collected by SNAP[5] [38]: Youtube, Amazon and DBLP. Youtube indicates friendships among users and the ground truth communities are user-defined groups. Amazon is a product co-purchasing network where co-purchased products are connected by edges, and the ground truth corresponds to product categories. DBLP is a co-authorship network where nodes represent authors, edges represent the co-authorship, and the ground truth communities correspond to conferences. For each network, we extract a subnetwork (*For convenience, we still use the same name*) containing all nodes in the top 5000 ground-truth. For further analysis, we partition the ground-truth communities into several community sets (*CommSet*) based on their hiddenness values.

More statistics for their ground truth communities are as shown in Table 2 (left column): the modularity and average hiddenness value for each ground truth community layer, as well as the maximum NMI (NMI_{max}), maximum and average F_1 scores (F_{max} and F_{avg}) for pairwise layers.

For Facebook networks, each layer gives rise to a set of communities grouped by a common attribute (i.e., nodes with a common annotation are in the same community), and we call each such set of communities an annotated layer (e.g., the 'Dorm' annotation gives rise to one annotated layer). These annotated layers cover all nodes ($coverage = 100\%$) in the corresponding networks.

[5]http://snap.stanford.edu

Source	Domain	Dataset	$\|V\|$	$\|E\|$
Facebook	**Social**	Caltech	769	16,656
		Smith	2,970	97,133
		Rice	4,087	184,828
		Vassar	3,068	119,161
		Wellesley	2,970	94,899
		Bucknell	3,826	158,864
		Carnegie	6,637	249,967
		UIllinois	30,809	1,264,428
SNAP	**Social**	YouTube	31,150	202,130
	Products	Amazon	13,288	41,730
	Collaboration	DBLP	49,097	170,284

Table 1: The real-world network datasets.

For SNAP networks, we manually divide the ground-truth communities into two sets, namely $CommSet_A$ or $CommSet_B$, depending on whether the hiddenness value is less than 0.5 or not. The coverage ratio (*ratio of nodes covered by the communities*) of $CommSet_A$ in Amazon, DBLP and Youtube are 100%, 100% and 80%. So $CommSet_A$ forms a layer for Amazon and DBLP respectively, but it only covers 80% of the nodes in Youtube. The coverage ratio of $CommSet_B$ on the three networks are 46%, 4% and 46% respectively. $CommSet_A$ and $CommSet_B$ contain very different communities for DBLP and Youtube. But on Amazon, $CommSet_A$ and $CommSet_B$ contain very similar communities since their pairwise NMI and F_1 are very high, indicating that if an algorithm accurately detects most communities in $CommSet_A$, then this algorithm also has a high detection accuracy on $CommSet_B$.

4.4 Base Algorithms and Baselines

We compare *HICODE* to four popular algorithms in two categories:

(1) **Overlapping detection methods**: OSLOM (OS) [22] and Link Communities (LC) [3]. OS uses a fitness function and joins together small clusters into statistically significant larger clusters. LC is a landmark algorithm that finds communities by performing hierarchical clustering on the links, which results in overlapping communities of nodes.

(2) **Disjoint detection methods**: Infomap (IM) [30] and Louvain method (Mod) [7]. IM is based on the random walk technique and minimizes the expected length of a description of information. Mod is a fast method popular for greedy modularity optimization.

We also implement *HICODE* using the four algorithms as the base, denoted as HC:Mod, HC:IM, HC:OS, and HC:LC.[6]


5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We first evaluate different reducing methods of *HICODE* and illustrate the necessity of the Refinement stage. Then we show the statistics of the multiple layers detected by *HICODE* and compare the detection accuracy with state-of-the-art baselines on real-world networks.

5.1 Analysis on HICODE

5.1.1 Comparison of the Reduction Methods. We first evaluate different reducing methods on each of the versions of *HICODE* (corresponding to different base algorithms). Figure 3 shows the Recall for all layers of communities detected by HC:Mod, HC:IM, HC:OS and HC:LC on several examples of the Facebook networks: Caltech, Smith, Rice and Vassar.

[6]Code and synthetic data: https://github.com/KunHe2015/HiCode/



(a) Caltech (b) Smith (c) Rice (d) Vassar

Figure 3: Stacked Recall of all Layers for the reducing methods (left to right: RemoveEdge, ReduceEdge, ReduceWeight).

In general, ReduceWeight reaches the highest detection accuracy, followed by ReduceEdge and RemoveEdge. ReduceWeight and ReduceEdge provide a more accurate estimation on the background density, while RemoveEdge removes all intra-community edges and impairs more structure of other layers, especially when communities in different layers overlap considerably. ReduceWeight deterministically reduces the weight of intra-community edges and outperforms ReduceEdge, which randomly removes intra-community edges. To save space, we will present results using ReduceWeight.

For the different versions of *HICODE*, HC:Mod and HC:IM perform consistently better than HC:OS and HC:LC. We will use HC:Mod to show the property of *HICODE*, and then compare our results on the four *HICODE* implementations with other algorithms.

5.1.2 Necessity of the Refinement Stage. To show the necessity of the Refinement stage, which gradually separates the community structures mixed together and strengthens the structure of each layer, we run HC:Mod on the small network SynL2 and illustrate its results.[7]


There are two planted layers on SynL2, with hiddenness values of 0.45 and 0.56. Communities in layer 2 is comparatively more hidden with respect to communities in layer 1. On average, 20% of the nodes in a community of layer 1 overlap with each community in layer 2, and 25% of the nodes in a community of layer 2 overlap with each community in layer 1. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate several snapshots of the detected two layers during the execution (shown by the adjacency matrix but the node IDs are reordered for the two layers respectively). In the Identification stage ($t = 0$), *HICODE* only roughly identifies the stronger layer 1, and only roughly identifies the less stronger layer 2 after the initial detected layer 1 is weakened. Then during the Refinement stage, by iteratively weakening the other community layers, we get a more accurate current layer, which forms a positive feedback cycle. The refinement process converges within 20 steps and the two detected layers remain stable in further iterations.

In addition, we also observe that the average modularity scores of the detected layers on the original network are improved by the Refinement stage. As an example, Figure 6 shows the increasing trend during the iteration when we detect 2, 3, 4 or 5 community layers on four real-world networks.

5.2 Evaluation on Real Networks


For real-world networks from various domains, *HICODE* uncovers multiple layers of high modularity community structure. Table 2 (right column) shows the statistics of the layers found by HC:Mod

[7]The other base algorithms produce similar results.



(a) $t = 0$ (b) $t = 5$ (c) $t = 10$ (d) $t = 20$

Figure 4: Refinement of layer 1 on SynL2.



(a) $t = 0$ (b) $t = 5$ (c) $t = 10$ (d) $t = 20$

Figure 5: Refinement of layer 2 on SynL2.

in each network. When comparing these layers to one another, their maximum pairwise NMI, maximum and average pairwise F_1 scores are low, indicating that these layers of communities are distinct. One exception is Amazon, which seems only to contain one layer of very strong community structure.

When comparing the ground truth layers on the Facebook networks, we see the layers found by *HICODE* are strongly associated with the community categories. Tables 3 show the F_1 and NMI scores of *HICODE* and the baseline algorithms evaluated against different annotation categories on several examples: Caltech, Smith, Rice and Vassar. We see that:

(1) All baseline algorithms primarily locate the dominant structure, and rarely detect the hidden, weaker structures. Interestingly, different to other algorithms, LC regards Status and Year as the dominant on Vassar and Smith respectively. This occurs as LC may have a different notion of community structure.

(2) All *HICODE* implementations return community layers that are strongly associated with each ground truth category. *HICODE* not only uncovers the hidden layers that the baseline algorithms rarely detect, but also improves the detection accuracy on the dominant layer.

For each *CommSet* of the SNAP networks, we calculate the Recall of *AllLayers* (the union of all layers found by *HICODE*) and the Recall of the communities detected by each of the baselines. In Table 4, we see that the comparatively hidden $CommSet_B$ is consistently harder to be located than the dominant $CommSet_A$. When compared with the baselines, *HICODE* not only has higher detection accuracy on the comparatively hidden $CommSet_B$, but also boost the detection accuracy on the comparatively dominant communities in $CommSet_A$. Again, on Amazon, all algorithms detect both




Figure 6: Improvement on Modularity of the detected layers.

Datasets	Annotated communities				Community layers found by HC:Mod				
	Annotations (modularity, hiddenness value)	NMI_{max}	F_{max}	F_{avg}	#Layers	Modularity	NMI_{max}	F_{max}	F_{avg}
Facebook									
Caltech	Dorm(0.30, 0.08) Year(0.19, 0.84) Status(0.08, 0.85)	0.13	0.32	0.18	2	0.40, 0.25	0.00	0.18	0.18
Smith	Dorm(0.23, 0.42) Year(0.23, 0.49)	0.00	0.04	0.04	2	0.51, 0.34	0.03	0.11	0.11
Rice	Dorm(0.37, 0.02) Year(0.23, 0.94) Status(0.13, 0.91)	0.11	0.26	0.14	3	0.50, 0.36, 0.34	0.02	0.20	0.13
Vassar	Year(0.34, 0.06) Dorm(0.15, 0.98) Status(0.13, 0.89)	0.18	0.30	0.18	3	0.45, 0.32, 0.31	0.04	0.21	0.15
Bucknell	Year(0.40, 0.05) Status(0.12, 0.91) Dorm(0.11, 0.98)	0.15	0.31	0.17	3	0.51, 0.37, 0.31	0.05	0.30	0.22
Carnegie	Year(0.28, 0.29) Major(0.12, 0.84) Status(0.11, 0.78) Dorm(0.08, 0.92)	0.07	0.24	0.09	4	0.40, 0.42, 0.34, 0.32	0.06	0.23	0.17
Wellesley	Year(0.30, 0.10) Status(0.15, 0.79)	0.15	0.28	0.28	2	0.37, 0.26	0.00	0.15	0.15
UIllinois	Year(0.27, 0.24) High_school(0.15, 0.82) Dorm(0.14, 0.76)	0.00	0.07	0.03	2	0.45, 0.34	0.04	0.16	0.14
SNAP									
YouTube	Co-liked $CommSet_A$(0.23, 0.24) $CommSet_B$(0.10, 0.73)	0.03	0.15	0.15	3	0.59, 0.48, 0.33	0.04	0.33	0.23
Amazon	Co-purchased $CommSet_A$(0.99, 0.29) $CommSet_B$(0.47, 0.92)	0.69	0.72	0.72	2	0.99, 0.14	0.55	0.71	0.70
DBLP	Co-authorship $CommSet_A$(0.79, 0.13) $CommSet_B$(0.03, 0.59)	0.53	0.10	0.10	3	0.90, 0.72, 0.56	0.01	0.10	0.09

Table 2: Statistics of the detected layers found by HC:Mod as compared with the annotated communities.

$CommSet_A$ and $CommSet_B$ fairly well due to the highly similarity of the two sets of ground truth communities.

6 RELATED WORK

In the past decades, a plethora of community detection algorithms have been presented for uncovering such latent modular structure based on different metrics (*e.g., modularity [18, 24, 25], conductivity [6, 32, 38], etc.*) and techniques (*e.g., random walk [5, 30], heat kernel [20], spectral clustering [35], seed set expansion [21, 27, 34], distance dynamics [31], mixed membership stochastic blockmodels [2, 4, 19], etc.*). Still, there are many new technologies and directions emerging, such as the local community detection [17, 20, 21].

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to formally propose and address the hidden community detection problem. Due to space limit, here we only highlight several related works in the area of clustering and community detection. For comprehensive reviews to various community detection algorithms and techniques, please refer to survey papers such as [9, 36].

Outside the realm of community detection, researchers have studied the problem of clustering data into multiple alternative groupings. By adopting orthogonal clustering and clustering in orthogonal subspaces, Cui et al. [39] cluster the data points in different views, where data points of one cluster can belong to different clusters in other views. By augmenting a spectral clustering objective function to incorporate dimensionality reduction and multiple views, and to penalize for redundancy between the views, Niu et al. proposed approaches to learn non-redundant subspaces that provide multiple views simultaneously [13] and iteratively [26]. In contrast to our work, note that their work is not about finding *hidden* structure, but rather high-quality orthogonal clusterings (possibly in a projected space), which may or may not be hidden by stronger clusterings.

In the realm of community detection, there are several pioneer and embryonic works. Yang and Leskovec [37] found that community overlaps are more densely connected than the non-overlapping parts, which coincide with our assumption that the overlapping part are the superposition of the layers. And they propose a Community-Affiliation Graph model to maximize the affiliation likelihood. Then, there are three pieces of related work that are proposed independently and almost simultaneously [8, 16, 40].

Chen et al. [8] remove nodes or edges based on the local Fiedler vector centrality (LFVC) which is associated with the sensitivity of algebraic connectivity to node or edge removals. Most importantly, they define a concept of deep community as a connected component that can only be seen after removal of all nodes or edges from the rest of the network. They prove that their method works on small

		HC:MOD		HC:IM			HC:OS		HC:LC		Partitioning		Overlapping	
Caltech		L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	Mod	IM	OS	LC
Dorm	F_1	**0.58**	0.11	**0.65**	0.11	0.11	**0.48**	0.11	**0.21**	0.10	0.51	0.51	0.49	0.18
HV = 0.08	NMI	**0.39**	0.00	**0.48**	0.01	0.01	**0.32**	0.01	**0.16**	0.02	0.36	0.42	0.28	0.14
Year	F_1	0.11	**0.60**	0.12	**0.40**	0.20	0.14	**0.45**	0.07	**0.15**	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.07
HV = 0.84	NMI	0.00	**0.38**	0.03	**0.19**	0.09	0.00	**0.29**	0.02	**0.10**	0.05	0.13	0.00	0.03
Status	F_1	0.17	**0.37**	0.12	0.38	**0.64**	0.02	**0.36**	0.23	**0.51**	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.03
HV = 0.85	NMI	**0.16**	**0.11**	0.15	0.14	**0.32**	0.00	**0.22**	0.12	**0.25**	0.06	0.30	0.19	0.13
Smith		L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	–	L_1	L_2	L_1	L_2	Mod	IM	OS	LC
Dorm	F_1	**0.45**	0.04	**0.50**	0.04	–	**0.40**	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.25	0.43	0.38	0.04
HV = 0.42	NMI	**0.26**	0.00	**0.36**	0.00	–	**0.25**	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.14	0.31	0.23	0.00
Year	F_1	0.12	**0.56**	0.10	**0.35**	–	0.15	**0.24**	0.01	**0.20**	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.18
HV = 0.49	NMI	0.00	**0.37**	0.03	**0.16**	–	0.05	**0.11**	0.00	**0.03**	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.00

		HC:MOD			HC:IM			HC:OS			HC:LC			Partitioning		Overlapping	
Vassar		L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	–	Mod	IM	OS	LC
Year	F_1	**0.67**	0.16	0.10	**0.54**	0.17	0.15	0.14	**0.44**	0.22	**0.17**	0.08	–	0.68	0.47	0.37	0.16
HV = 0.06	NMI	**0.47**	0.01	0.00	**0.31**	0.07	0.02	0.06	**0.19**	0.06	**0.04**	0.02	–	0.38	0.27	0.14	0.04
Dorm	F_1	0.13	**0.41**	0.08	0.11	0.09	**0.25**	0.11	**0.15**	0.11	0.07	**0.08**	–	0.12	0.12	0.16	0.08
HV = 0.98	NMI	0.03	**0.24**	0.02	0.02	0.01	**0.08**	0.01	**0.07**	0.02	0.02	**0.03**	–	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
Status	F_1	**0.34**	0.23	0.12	0.34	**0.57**	0.19	0.52	0.23	**0.61**	**0.63**	0.27	–	0.33	0.33	0.23	0.61
HV = 0.89	NMI	**0.15**	0.06	0.01	0.10	**0.21**	0.06	0.20	0.09	**0.27**	**0.04**	**0.08**	–	0.15	0.10	0.07	0.04
Rice		L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	L_3	Mod	IM	OS	LC
Dorm	F_1	**0.79**	0.11	0.07	**0.74**	0.08	0.08	**0.61**	0.22	0.22	**0.20**	0.10	0.07	0.70	0.55	0.54	0.10
HV = 0.02	NMI	**0.71**	0.00	0.00	**0.45**	0.00	0.00	**0.50**	0.10	0.11	**0.10**	0.01	0.00	0.59	0.32	0.29	0.04
Year	F_1	0.08	0.22	**0.55**	0.08	0.20	**0.34**	0.09	**0.22**	0.20	0.07	0.14	**0.15**	0.07	0.08	0.14	0.05
HV = 0.94	NMI	0.00	0.07	**0.29**	0.00	0.06	**0.16**	0.00	**0.13**	0.10	0.01	0.01	**0.07**	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00
Status	F_1	0.11	**0.42**	0.23	0.10	**0.61**	0.23	0.13	0.32	**0.58**	0.05	**0.61**	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.14	0.03
HV = 0.91	NMI	0.00	**0.20**	0.11	0.01	**0.25**	0.09	0.01	0.16	**0.42**	0.00	**0.05**	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.01

Table 3: Jaccard F_1 and NMI scores of all algorithms on Caltech, Smith, Vassar, Rice community categories.

synthetic networks under stochastic block model framework and do experiments on small networks of size hundreds.

Young's work [40] is most similar in spirit to our work, and they also reference our first version of the work [16]. They observe that smaller or sparser communities can be 'overshadowed' by the larger or denser communities, and communities may appear at different resolutions. They use two existing algorithms as base algorithms (LC [3] and CFinder [27]), find the first set of communities, remove all internal edges for the current detected communities, find a second set and repeated the process until no significant communities could be found. Note that communities are fixed once extracted, and they did not really uncover the weak, hidden communities that actually are incoherent with the dominant communities. Their method corresponds to the Identification stage of HC:LC using RemoveEdge. The detailed comparison is in the early version of our paper uploaded to arXiv [16].

Youtube	**HC:MOD**	**HC:IM**	**HC:OS**	**HC:LC**	Mod	IM	OS	LC
$CommSet_A$	**0.16**	**0.27**	**0.30**	**0.28**	0.13	0.04	0.27	0.28
$CommSet_B$	**0.10**	**0.12**	**0.13**	**0.13**	0.05	0.03	0.08	0.12
Amazon	**HC:MOD**	**HC:IM**	**HC:OS**	**HC:LC**	Mod	IM	OS	LC
$CommSet_A$	**0.93**	**0.90**	**0.90**	**0.91**	0.89	0.88	0.78	0.83
$CommSet_B$	**0.90**	**0.86**	**0.89**	**0.88**	0.86	0.83	0.82	0.79
DBLP	**HC:MOD**	**HC:IM**	**HC:OS**	**HC:LC**	Mod	IM	OS	LC
$CommSet_A$	**0.23**	**0.21**	**0.29**	**0.22**	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.15
$CommSet_B$	**0.11**	**0.15**	**0.20**	**0.24**	0.09	0.09	0.14	0.18

Table 4: Jaccard Recall R of all algorithms on SNAP data.

7 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we propose a new paradigm of hidden community structure for network analysis and communuty detection. We present a formal definition on 'hidden structure', and propose a systematic method called *HICODE* to uncover these hidden communities. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate that hidden communities exist in real-world networks of various domains, and the proposed method significantly outperforms several comparative methods, including overlapping community detection algorithms, in accurately locating these hidden structure. Our work sheds light on the organization of complex networks and provides new directions for research on community detection.

In the future, we plan to explore the hidden communities on directed or weighted networks, apply other community detection algorithm as the base, as well as design new reduction method for weakening the detected communities. It is also possible that our new ideas can be applied to other network mining tasks such as link-prediction or maxmimum influence propagation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is supported by US Army Research Office (No. W911NF-14-1-0477), National Science Foundation of China (No. 61472147), Microsoft Research Asia Collaborative Research (No. 97354136), and National Science Foundation of Hubei Province (No. 2015CFB566).

REFERENCES

[1] Derek Greene Aaron F. McDaid and Neil Hurley. 2013. Normalized Mutual Information to evaluate overlapping community finding algorithm. *arXiv:1110.2515v2* (2013).

[2] Emmanuel Abbe and Colin Sandon. 2015. Recovering communities in the general stochastic block model without knowing the parameters. In *NIPS 28*. 676–684.

[3] Yong-Yeol Ahn, James P. Bagrow, and Sune Lehmann. 2010. Link communities reveal multiscale complexity in networks. *Nature* 466, 7307 (2010), 761–764.

[4] Edoardo M. Airoldi, David M. Blei, Stephen E. Fienberg, and Eric P. Xing. 2008. Mixed membership stochastic blockmodels. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9 (2008), 1981–2014.

[5] Reid Andersen, Fan Chung, and Kevin Lang. 2006. Local graph partitioning using PageRank vectors. In *FOCS*. 475–486.

[6] R. Andersen and K. J. Lang. 2006. Communities from seed sets. In *WWW*. ACM, 223–232.

[7] Vincent D. Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 10 (2008), P10008.

[8] Pin-Yu Chen and Alfred O. Hero III. 2014. Deep Community Detection. *CoRR* abs/1407.6071 (2014).

[9] Michele Coscia, Fosca Giannotti, and Dino Pedreschi. 2011. A classification for community discovery methods in complex networks. *Stastical Analysis and Data Mining* 4, 5 (2011), 512–546.

[10] Michele Coscia, Giulio Rossetti, Fosca Giannotti, and Dino Pedreschi. 2012. DEMON: a local-first discovery method for overlapping communities. In *KDD*. ACM, 615–623.

[11] Leon Danon, Albert Diaz-Guilera, Jordi Duch, and Alex Arenas. 2005. Comparing community structure identification. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 9 (2005), P09008.

[12] Jishnu Das and Haiyuan Yu. 2012. HINT: High-quality protein interactomes and their applications in understanding human disease. *BMC Systems Biology* 6) (2012), 92.

[13] Michael I. Jordan Donglin Niu, Jennifer G. Dy. 2010. Multiple Non-Redundant Spectral Clustering Views. In *ICML*. 831–838.

[14] Michelle Girvan and Mark E. Newman. 2002. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99, 12 (2002), 7821–7826.

[15] Steve Gregory. 2009. Finding overlapping communities using disjoint community detection algorithms. In *CompleNet*. 47–61.

[16] Kun He, Sucheta Soundarajan, Xuezhi Cao, John E. Hopcroft, and Menglong Huang. 2015. Revealing multiple layers of hidden community structure in networks. *CoRR* abs/1501.05700 (2015).

[17] Kun He, Yiwei Sun, David Bindel, John Hopcroft, and Yixuan Li. 2015. Detecting overlapping communities from local spectral subspaces. In *ICDM 2015*. 769–774.

[18] Lifang He, Chun-Ta Lu, Jiaqi Ma, Jianping Cao, Linlin Shen, and Philip S. Yu. 2016. Joint Community and Structural Hole Spanner Detection via Harmonic Modularity. In *KDD*. 875–884.

[19] Brian Karrer and Mark E. Newman. 2011. Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Physical review E* 83 (2011), 016107.

[20] Kyle Kloster and David F Gleich. 2014. Heat kernel based community detection. In *KDD*. 24–27.

[21] Isabel M. Kloumann and Jon M. Kleinberg. 2014. Community membership identification from small seed sets. In *KDD*. 1366–1375.

[22] Andrea Lancichinetti, Filippo Radicchi, Jose J. Ramasco, and Santo Fortunato. 2011. Finding statistically significant communities in networks. *PLoS ONE* 6, 4 (2011), e18961.

[23] Mark EJ Newman. 2003. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Rev.* 45, 2 (2003), 167–256.

[24] Mark EJ Newman. 2006. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103, 23 (2006), 8577–8582.

[25] Mark EJ Newman and Michelle Girvan. 2004. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical review E* 69, 2 (2004), 026113.

[26] Donglin Niu, Jennifer G. Dy, and Michael I. Jordan. 2014. Iterative Discovery of Multiple Alternative Clustering Views. *IEEE Trans Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 36, 7 (2014), 1340–1353.

[27] Gergely Palla, Imre Derenyi, Illes Farkas, and Tamas Vicsek. 2005. Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society. *Nature* 435, 7043 (2005), 814–818.

[28] Daniel Park, Rohit Singh, Michael Baym, Chung-Shou Liao, and Bonnie Berger. 2011. IsoBase: A database of functionally related proteins across PPI networks. *Nucleic Acids Research* 39 (2011), D295–D300.

[29] Pascal Pons and Matthieu Latapy. 2006. Computing communities in large networks using random walks. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications* 10, 2 (2006), 191–218.

[30] Martin Rosvall and Carl T. Bergstrom. 2008. Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105, 4 (2008), 1118–1123.

[31] Junming Shao, Zhichao Han, Qinli Yang, and Tao Zhou. 2015. Community Detection based on Distance Dynamics. In *KDD*. 1075–1084.

[32] J. Shi and J. Malik. 2000. Normalized cuts and image segmentation. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 22, 8 (2000), 888–905.

[33] Amanda L. Traud, Peter J. Mucha, and Mason A. Porter. 2012. Social Structure of Facebook Networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 391(16) (2012), 4165–4180.

[34] Joyce J. Whang, David F. Gleich, and Inderjit S. Dhillon. 2013. Overlapping community detection using seed set expansion. In *CIKM*. 2099–2108.

[35] Scott White and Padhraic Smyth. 2005. A spectral clustering approach to finding communities in graph. In *SDM*. 274–285.

[36] Jierui Xie, Stephen Kelley, and Boleslaw K. Szymanski. 2013. Overlapping community detection in networks: The state-of-the-art and comparative study. *Comput. Surveys* 45, 4 (2013), 43.

[37] Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. 2012. Community-affiliation graph model for overlapping network community detection. In *ICDM*. 1170–1175.

[38] Jaewon Yang and Jure Leskovec. 2012. Defining and evaluating network communities based on ground-truth. In *ICDM*. 10–13.

[39] Jennifer G. Dy Ying Cui, Xiaoli Z. Fern. 2007. Non-Redundant Multi-View Clustering Via Orthogonalization. In *ICDM*. 133–142.

[40] Jean-Gabriel Young, Antoine Allard, Laurent Hebert-Dufresne, and Louis J. Dube. 2015. A shadowing problem in the detection of overlapping communities: Lifting the resolution limit through a cascading procedure. *PLoS ONE* 10(10) (2015), e0140133.

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