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Abstract—Community detection is one of the most popular research topics in the field of online social network analysis. The volume, variety and velocity of data generated by today's online social networks are advancing the way researchers analyze those networks. For instance, nowadays, the real world networks (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter) are inherently evolving rapidly and expanding aggressively over time. However, most of the studies so far have been focusing on detecting communities on the static networks. It is computationally expensive to directly employ a well-studied static algorithm repeatedly on the network snapshots of the evolving networks. We propose DynaMo, a novel dynamic modularity-based community detection algorithm, aiming to detect communities in evolving social networks. DynaMo is an adaptive and incremental algorithm, which is designed for maximizing the modularity gain while updating the community structure of evolving networks. In the experimental evaluation, a comprehensive comparison has been made among our algorithm, Louvain algorithm (static) and 5 other dynamic algorithms. Extensive experiments have been conducted on 6 real world social networks. The experimental results show that DynaMo outperforms all the other 5 dynamic algorithms in terms of effectiveness, and achieves (on average) 2 to 5 times faster than Louvain algorithm.
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1 INTRODUCTION

As the advent and advance of the notion of social network analysis in the last decade, more and more real world systems, such as online social network platforms [1], collaboration relationships [2], recommendation systems [3] and intrusion detection system [4], [5], are represented and analyzed as networks, where the vertices represent certain objects and the edges represent the relationships or connections between the objects. Most social networks have been shown to present certain community structures [6], where vertices are densely connected within communities and sparsely connected between communities. Community detection is one of the most important and fundamental problem in the field of graph mining, network science and social network analysis.

Detecting community structure is of great challenge, and most of the recent studies are proposed to detect communities in the static networks, such as spectral clustering [7], label propagation [8], modularity optimization [9], and k-clique communities [10]. However, real world networks, especially most of the online social networks, are not static. Most popular online social networks (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter) are de facto evolving rapidly and expanding aggressively in terms of either size or complexity over time. For instance, in Facebook network, the evolving of its community structure could be simply caused by new users joining in, old users leaving, or certain users connecting (i.e., friend) or disconnecting (i.e., unfriend) with the other users. Facebook announced that it had 1.52 billion daily active users (i.e., Facebook DAUs) in the fourth quarter of 2018 [11], which is a 9% increase over the same period of the previous year, and 4 million likes generated every minute as of January 2019 [12]. Thus, it is rather importance and impending to enable community detection in such evolving networks.

Designing an effective and efficient algorithm to detect communities in evolving networks is highly difficult. First, an efficient algorithm should update the communities adaptively and incrementally depending on the changes of the evolving networks, and avoid redundant and repetitive computations so far as possible. Second, it is hard to design a dynamic algorithm that performs as effective as certain static algorithms by only observing the historical community structures and the incremental changes of the evolving networks. Third, it is still quite open about how to categorize the incremental changes of evolving networks, and how to assess the influence of different types of the incremental changes on the community structure evolutions, which shall have an important impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of the designed algorithms.

To date, a few algorithms have been proposed to accommodate the need of detecting communities in evolving networks [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21]. An intuitive way to detect communities in evolving networks is to slice the network into small snapshots based on the timestamps, and directly employ well-studied static algorithms repeatedly on the network snapshots. However, these algorithms [13], [14] usually are computational expensive, since they compute the current community structures independent from the historical information (i.e., the previous community structures), especially when the network evolves rapidly and the time interval between network snapshots are extremely small. Another way to update the communities is using not only the current evolving information but also the historical community structure information. These algorithms [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21] adaptively and incrementally detect communities in...
evolving networks, without rerunning any static algorithms on the whole network snapshots from the scratch, which are commonly more efficient than simply employing static algorithms on network snapshots. However, most of those algorithms are still not practical to be utilized to analyze the real world evolving networks. For instance, [15], [18] only considers vertices/edges additions, while vertices/edges deletions happen quite often in the online social networks, such as the "unfriend" in Facebook. [15], [16], [18], [20] only consider unweighted networks, which are not applicable for many weighted evolving networks. Furthermore, some algorithms [21], [22], [23] need to know certain prior information about the community structures (e.g., the number of communities, the ratio of vertices in overlapped communities) or need certain predefined parameters which may not be available or very hard to set in practice.

In this work, we present DynaMo, a novel dynamic modularity-based community detection algorithm, aiming to detect non-overlapped communities in evolving social networks. DynaMo is an adaptive and incremental algorithm, which is designed for maximizing the modularity gain while updating the community structure of evolving networks. In order to maintain a low computing complexity in updating the community structures, we model the network evolution as a sequence of incremental network changes. We categorize the incremental network changes as six types: a) intra-community edge addition/weight increase, b) cross-community edge addition/weight increase, c) intra-community edge deletion/weight decrease, d) cross-community edge deletion/weight decrease, e) vertex addition, and f) vertex deletion. For each incremental network change, we design an operation to maximize the modularity.

In the experimental evaluation, a comprehensive comparison has been made among our algorithm, Louvain algorithm [24] and 5 dynamic algorithms (i.e., QCA [15], Batch [20], GreMod [16], LBTR-LR [18] and LBTR-SVM [18]). Extensive experiments have been conducted on 6 large-scale real world networks. The experimental results show that DynaMo outperforms all the other 5 dynamic algorithms in terms of effectiveness, and achieves (on average) 2 to 5 times faster than Louvain algorithm. To summarize, our work has the following contributions:

- We present a novel, effective and efficient dynamic modularity-based community detection algorithm, DynaMo, capable of detecting non-overlapped communities in real world evolving social networks.
- We also present the theoretical guarantees to show why/how DynaMo could maximize the modularity, while avoiding certain redundant and repetitive computations.
- A comprehensive experimental comparison among our algorithm and the state-of-the-art algorithms has been conducted (Section 3). For the sake of reproducibility and convenience of future studies about dynamic community detection, we have also released our Java prototype implementation of DynaMo, our experimental datasets and a collection of the implementations of the other state-of-the-art algorithms.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the related work. Section 3 presents the notations, the concept of evolving social networks and the definition of modularity, and introduce a static community detection algorithm (i.e., Louvain algorithm). Section 4 describes our algorithm design and theoretical propositions. Section 5 presents the experimental evaluation. Section 6 concludes.

2 Related Work

To date, a few approaches attempting to detect communities in evolving networks were proposed [13], [14], [15], [16], [18], [20], [21], [22], [23], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30]. Most of those approaches can be divided into three categories [31]: non-evolutionary, evolutionary and incremental approaches. The non-evolutionary approaches [13], [14], [25] are usually composed of two steps: (i) static algorithms are applied on each network snapshot independently to detect static communities, and then (ii) the communities detected on each network snapshot are matched with the communities detected on the previous one. For instance, [25] proposed a general model for tracking communities in dynamic networks via solving a classic cluster matching problem on the communities independently detected on consecutive network snapshots. Those approaches can take advantage of existing static community detection algorithms and conventional set matching algorithms. However, since the non-evolutionary approaches do not take the historical community structures into account while extracting the current community structures, the community detection results would be unstable. For instance, given two similar network snapshots with barely variations, the non-evolutionary approaches might produce very distinct outcomes.

On the other hand, the evolutionary approaches [21], [22], [23], [26], [27], [28], [29] incorporate the communities detection and evolution tracking via considering the community structures of the current and historical network snapshots at the same time. Those approaches aim to maintain the evolution of the community structures of the evolving networks, where the community structure (e.g., the number of communities, the size of communities) of the current network snapshot should be similar to the community structure of the previous one, and should precisely reflect the network evolution (i.e., the connections between two consecutive community structures) during that time period. For instance, [29] propose a temporally regularized clustering algorithm to identify evolving groups in dynamic networks, where they use a metric that attempts to optimize (i.e., maximize) two objectives: the quality of the current community structure and the similarity between the current and the previous community structures. However, since most of the evolutionary approaches are required to considering two or several consecutive network snapshots simultaneously, the computation cost can be pretty high. Furthermore, most of the evolutionary approaches, such as [22], [23], [29], require to determine the number of communities to be detected in advance, which is rather impractical to deal with the real world evolving networks where the number of communities evolves over time.

The incremental approaches [15], [16], [18], [20], [30] adaptively update the community structures totally based on the network changes happened during the current network snapshot and the community structure of the previous
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network snapshot. For instance, GreMod [16] is a rule-based incremental algorithm that performs the predetermined operations on different types of the edge addition changes of the evolving network. QCA [15] is another rule-based adaptive algorithm that updates the community structures according to the predefined rules of different types of the incremental changes (i.e., vertices/edges addition/deletion) on the evolving network. QCA is also one of the most efficient dynamic community detection algorithms in the field. However, since the rule-based algorithms, such as GreMod [16] and QCA [15], considers each network change as an independent event, it would be less efficient for them to deal with the case where abundant (i.e., a batch of) network changes happened in the same network snapshot. To cope with this issue, in [20], the authors proposed a batch-based incremental modularity optimization algorithm that updates the community structures by initializing all of the new and changed vertices of the current network snapshot (i.e., the batch) as singleton communities and using Louvain method to further update the community structures. However, since their initialization approach of a batch of network changes is rather coarse to generate the intermediate community structure, it would be less efficient to use the Louvain method to further update the community structure. LBTR [18] is a learning-based framework that uses machine learning classifiers and historical community structure information to predict certain vertices’ new community assignments after each round of network evolution. In those learning-based algorithms, once the models are being trained, the testing phase could be very efficient. However, since the supervised nature of the learning-based algorithms, it would be extremely hard to generalize the trained models. For instance, the models trained on one type of evolving networks (e.g., social network) might be less effective to another type of evolving networks (e.g., collaboration network). Furthermore, even for the same evolving network, the network patterns evolve over time. Thus, the models have to be updated periodically, which would be rather illogical, since the network usually evolves rapidly and training new models is a time consuming task. Our proposed approach DynaMo is an adaptive and incremental algorithm. Compared with rule-based algorithms [15, 16] our approach is capable of processing a set of network changes as a batch, and redesigned the “rules” via considering extreme cases (Section 4.3). Compared with batch-based algorithms [20], our approach has a more fine-grained initialization phase (Section 4.3), which could reduce the computation time dramatically. Compared with learning-based algorithms [18], our approach is more generalized to different patterns of the same network or different networks. In Section 5 we compared DynaMo with Louvain algorithm and 5 other dynamic algorithms on 6 real world social datasets, and showed that DynaMo outperforms all the other 5 dynamic algorithms in terms of accuracy, and much more efficient than Louvain algorithm.

3 Preliminaries

In this section, we present 1) the notations; 2) the model of evolving social networks; 3) the definition of modularity, to quantify the goodness of a network community structure; and 4) Louvain Method, a modularity-based greedy optimization method for detecting community structure in static social networks, which is an important building block of our algorithm.

3.1 Notations

Let \( G = (V, E) \) be an undirected weighted graph representing a network, where \( V \) is the set of vertices \((n = |V|)\), \( E \) is the set of undirected weighted edges \((m = |E|)\), and there could be more than one edge between a pair of vertices. Let \( C \) denote a set of disjoint communities associated with \( G \), \( A_{ij} \) denote the sum of the weights of all the edges between vertex \( i \) and vertex \( j \), \( k_i \) denote the sum of the weights of all the edges linked to vertex \( i \), and \( c_i \) denote the assigned community of vertex \( i \).

3.2 Evolving Social Networks

Let \( G^{(t)} \) denote the social network at time \( t \), and \( \Delta G^{(t)} = (\Delta V^{(t)}, \Delta E^{(t)}) \) denote the incremental change between \( G^{(t)} \) and \( G^{(t+1)} \) (i.e., \( G^{(t+1)} = G^{(t)} \cup \Delta G^{(t)} \)), where \( \Delta V^{(t)} \) and \( \Delta E^{(t)} \) are the sets of vertices and edges being changed in time range \((t, t+1)\). An evolving social network \( G \) is a sequence of network snapshots evolving over time: \( G = \{ G^{(0)}, G^{(1)}, \ldots, G^{(t)} \} \).

3.3 Modularity

Modularity [32] is one of the most widely utilized criteria to evaluate the quality of a community structure for a given network. Modularity is designed to measure the strength of dividing a network into communities. Community structures with high modularity have denser connections among vertices in the same communities but sparser connections among vertices from different communities. Given network \( G = (V, E) \), its modularity is defined as follows:

\[
Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i,j \in V} [A_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2m}] \delta(c_i, c_j)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{c \in C} (\alpha_c - \frac{\beta_c^2}{2m})
\]

where \( \alpha_c = \sum_{i,j \in c} A_{ij}, \beta_c = \sum_{i \in c} k_i \) and \( \delta(c_i, c_j) \) is a function that equals to 1, when vertices \( i, j \) are in the same community, otherwise equals to 0.

3.4 Louvain Method for Community Detection

Since the modularity optimization problem is known to be NP-hard, various heuristic approaches have been proposed to optimize modularity [9, 33, 34]. However, most of those algorithms have been superseded by the Louvain algorithm [24], which is a greedy optimization method that attempts to optimize the modularity of a community structure of the network. The optimization is performed in three steps:

- **Initialization**: Each vertex \( i \) forms a singleton community.
- **Local Modularity Optimization**: For each vertex \( i \), move it out of its own community to its neighbor’s community
where the local modularity gain is positive and maximized. If there is no positive modularity gain while moving vertex $i$, keep vertex $i$ within its own (original) community. Repeat this step over all vertices multiple times until there is no non-negligible modularity gains.

- **Network Compression**: Aggregate vertices belonging to the same community as super vertices and builds a new network whose vertices are those super vertices.

Louvain method keeps repeating the last two steps, until there is no possible modularity improvements through moving vertices/super vertices. Although the actual computational complexity of the method depends on the input network data, the method runs in an average-case time complexity of $O(m)$ with most of the computational effort spending on the optimization at the first level.

### 4. DynaMo: Dynamic Modularity-based Community Detection

#### 4.1 Problem Statement

Given an evolving social network (i.e., a list of network snapshots) $G = \{G(0), G(1), \ldots, G(\ell)\}$, where $G(0)$ is the initial network, let $C = \{C(0), C(1), \ldots, C(\ell)\}$ denote the list of community structures of the corresponding network snapshots. As illustrated in Fig. 1, we aim to design an adaptive algorithm to detect community structure $C(t-1)$, given $G(0), C(0)$ and $\Delta G(t)$.

#### 4.2 Methodology Overview

As shown in Fig.1 our approach has three components:

- **Initialization**: Start from an initial network snapshot $G(0)$, and obtain its community structure $C(0)$ through well-studied static community detection algorithms (i.e., Louvain method [24]). Utilizing well-studied static algorithms provides our algorithm a comparatively accurate initial community structure.

- **Adaptive Modularity Maximization (DynaMo)**: Given $G(t)$, $C(t)$ and $\Delta G(t)$, update the community structure of $G(t+1)$ from $C(t)$ to $C(t+1)$ while maximizing the modularity gain, using predesigned strategies that totally depend on the incremental network changes $\Delta G(t)$ and the previous network community structure $C(t)$. DynaMo is the core component of our framework that relies on fine-grained and theoretical-verified strategies (Section 4.3) to maximize the modularity gain while reducing the unnecessary computations.

- **Refinement**: Once the modularity of an output community structure $C(t+\lambda)$ is smaller than a predefined threshold, use $C(t+\lambda)$ as the new initial network snapshot, and restart our algorithm from the initialization.

The refinement component prevent our frame from constantly falling into the suboptimal solutions.

### 4.3 The DynaMo Algorithm

DynaMo is an adaptive and incremental algorithm, which is designed for maximizing the modularity gain of the community structure, after certain incremental changes happened in an evolving social network. In this case, we propose a two-step approach: (i) initialize an intermediate community structure, depending on the incremental network changes and the previous network community structure, and (ii) repeat the last two steps of Louvain method (i.e., Local Modularity Optimization and Network Compression) on the intermediate community structure until no modularity gain improvement is possible.

Our algorithm benefits community detection in evolving networks in three folds. First, in the initialization step, we categorize the incremental changes into different types. For each type of the incremental change, we design a particular strategy to initialize the corresponding intermediate community structure. All the strategies have been theoretically verified to help maximize the modularity gain during each community structure update, while avoiding redundant and repetitive computations as far as possible. Second, compared with the original initialization step of Louvain method, our initialization step takes advantage of the historical community structure information, thus reduces most of the unnecessary computations happened at Louvain method’s first level optimization. Since Louvain method spends most of the computational effort on its first level optimization (as described in Section 3.4), and our algorithm does not need to process the same optimization from the scratch, DynaMo would be much more efficient than Louvain method while detecting communities in evolving networks. Third, in the initialization, our algorithm could process a set of incremental changes as a batch. In this way, the computation of our algorithm is less sensitive to the amount of incremental changes and the frequency of network evolution, thus is capable of detecting communities even though the network evolves rapidly.

In the rest of this section, several different types of the incremental changes have been defined. For each type of the incremental change, the corresponding initialization strategy have also been designed. Eight propositions have been proposed and proved to provide the theoretical guarantees of our strategies towards maximizing the modularity gains.

#### 4.3.1 Edge Addition/Weight Increase (EA/WI)

In this scenario, an edge $(i, j, w_{ij})$ between two existing vertices $i$ and $j$ has been changed to $(i, j, w_{ij} + \Delta w)$, where $w_{ij} \geq 0$ and $\Delta w > 0$. Edge addition is a special case of edge weight increase. If $w_{ij} = 0$, the operation is edge addition. If $w_{ij} > 0$, the operation is edge weight increase. Depending on the edge property, there are two sub-scenarios:

- **Intra-Community EA/WI (ICEA/WI)**: Vertices $i$ and $j$ belong to the same community (i.e., $c_i = c_j$). According to Proposition 1, ICEA/WI will not split $i$ and $j$ into different communities. And according to Remark 4, sometimes ICEA/WI of a community can lead to it splitting into multiple communities. Proposition 2 also provides us
a convenient tool to decide if community $c_i$ should be bi-split into two smaller communities (i.e., $c_p$ and $c_p'$), while $c_i$ IEC/A/WI. However, this approach requires to check all the bi-split combinations of $c_i$, which is time consuming, especially when $c_i$ is huge. In this case, we propose to initialize $i$ and $j$ as a two-vertices community, and all the other vertices in $c_i$ as singleton communities.

**Proposition 1.** Adding an edge or increasing the edge weight between vertices $i$ and $j$, that belong to the same community ($c_i = c_j$), will not split $i$ and $j$ into different communities.

**Proof.** Let $Q_1^{(t+1)}$ denote the new modularity value if the community structure keeps unchanged (i.e., $c_i = c_j$), and $Q_2^{(t+1)}$ the new modularity value if $i$ and $j$ are split into different communities (i.e., $c_i' \subseteq c_i$ and $c_j' = c_i \setminus c_i'$).

$$Q_1^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_i} + 2\Delta w - \frac{(\alpha_{c_i} + 2\Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right) + \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_c - \frac{\beta_c^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right)$$

$$Q_2^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_i'} - \frac{(\beta_{c_i'} + \Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} + \alpha_{c_j'} \right) - \frac{(\beta_{c_i'} + \Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} + \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_c - \frac{\beta_c^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right)$$

where $\beta_{c_i} = \beta_{c_i'} + \beta_{c_j'}$.

Let $Q_1^{(t)}$ denote the modularity value of the “optimal” community structure of network snapshot $G^{(t)}$, and $Q_2^{(t)}$ denote its modularity value while $i$ and $j$ were split into different communities as in the calculation of $Q_2^{(t+1)}$.

$$Q_1^{(t)} = \frac{1}{2m} \left( \alpha_e - \frac{\beta_e^2}{2m} + \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_c - \frac{\beta_c^2}{2m} \right) \right)$$

$$Q_2^{(t)} = \frac{1}{2m} \left( \alpha_{c_i} - \frac{\beta_e^2}{2m} + \alpha_{c_j} - \frac{\beta_{c_i'}^2}{2m} + \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_c - \frac{\beta_c^2}{2m} \right) \right)$$

Since $c_i = c_j$ is the “optimal” community structure of $G^{(t)}$,

$$Q_1^{(t)} - Q_2^{(t)} \geq 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{2m} \left( \alpha_{c_i} - \alpha_{c_i'} - \alpha_{c_j'} - \frac{\beta_{c_i'} \beta_{c_j'}}{m} \right) \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \alpha_{c_i} - \alpha_{c_i'} - \alpha_{c_j'} - \frac{\beta_{c_i'} \beta_{c_j'}}{m} \geq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \alpha_{c_i} - \alpha_{c_i'} - \alpha_{c_j'} - \frac{\beta_{c_i'} \beta_{c_j'}}{m + \Delta w} \geq 0$$

By comparing $Q_1^{(t+1)}$ and $Q_2^{(t+1)}$, we get the modularity gain difference between “unchanged” and “split” as follows:

$$\left( Q_1^{(t+1)} - Q_1^{(t)} \right) - \left( Q_2^{(t+1)} - Q_1^{(t)} \right) = Q_1^{(t+1)} - Q_2^{(t+1)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_i} - \alpha_{c_i'} - \alpha_{c_j'} - \frac{\beta_{c_i'} \beta_{c_j'}}{m + \Delta w} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \Delta w(2m - \beta_{c_i'} - \beta_{c_j'}) + (\Delta w)^2 \right)$$

Since $\beta_{c_i'} + \beta_{c_j'} = \beta_{c_i} \leq 2m$, $\Delta w > 0$ and equation (6), $Q_1^{(t+1)} - Q_2^{(t+1)} > 0$, and thus the conclusion follows.

**Remark 1.** Although our Proposition 1 shows that IEC/A/WI between $i$ and $j$, where $c_i = c_j$, will not split them into different communities, however, sometimes splitting $c_i$ into smaller communities in different ways (i.e., $i$ and $j$ are in the same community after the splitting) might maximize the modularity gain. For instance, as shown in Fig. 2a, assume all the edge weights are 1.0, and the red dash line between $i$ and $j$ is a newly added intra-community edge. Before adding the new edge, the modularity of community structure as in Fig. 2a (unchanged, i.e., 0.561) is higher than that as in Fig. 2b (split, i.e., 0.558). However, after adding the new edge, the modularity of community structure as in Fig. 2b (unchanged, i.e., 0.564) becomes lower than that as in Fig. 2b (split, i.e., 0.568). In this case, although an intra-community edge has been added, splitting community $c_i$ into $c_p$ and $c_p'$ provides better modularity gain. Our algorithm carefully considers these “counterintuitive” cases, which is different from QCA [15, 35], thus, leading our algorithms to a better performance in terms of effectiveness (Section 5.2).

**Proposition 2.** (IEC/A/WI Community Bi-split) After IEC/A/WI between $i$ and $j$, where $c_i = c_j$, if there do not exist a bi-split of $c_i$ (i.e., $c_p \subseteq c_i$ and $c_q = c_i \setminus c_p$) such that $\Delta w > \frac{m \alpha_{c_p} - \beta_{c_p} \beta_{c_q}}{2\beta_{c_p} - \alpha_{c_q}}$, where $\alpha_{c_i} = \alpha_{c_i'} - \alpha_{c_q}$, any other bi-split of $c_i$ will not improve the modularity gain comparing with keeping the community structure unchanged.

**Proof.** By Proposition 1, $i$ and $j$ should belong to the same community after IEC/A/WI happened between $i$ and $j$, where $c_i = c_j$. Without loss of generality, we assume $i$ and $j$ belong to community $c_p$, even after certain bi-split. Therefore,

$$\Delta w > \frac{m \alpha_{c_p} - \beta_{c_p} \beta_{c_q}}{2\beta_{c_p} - \alpha_{c_q}} \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\left( \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_i} + 2\Delta w - \frac{(\beta_{c_i} + 2\Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right) + \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_c - \frac{\beta_c^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right) \right)$$

$$- \left( \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_p} + 2\Delta w - \frac{(\beta_{c_p} + 2\Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} + \alpha_{c_q} \right) \right)$$

$$\frac{\beta_{c_p}^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} + \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_c - \frac{\beta_c^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right) < 0$$

where $\beta_{c_i} = \beta_{c_p} + \beta_{c_q}$, and $c_p, c_q$ is a bi-split of $c_i$.

**Cross-Community EA/WI (CECA/WI):** Vertices $i$ and $j$ belong to two different communities (i.e., $c_i \neq c_j$). CECA/WI between $i$ and $j$ could cause three situations: (a) keep the community structure unchanged; (b) merge $c_i$ and $c_j$ into one community; and (c) split $c_i = c_i \cup c_j$ into other smaller communities. For instance, according to Proposition 3 if $\Delta w$ is large enough, merging $c_i$ and $c_j$ into one community (e.g., $c_k$) provides higher modularity gain than keeping the community structure unchanged. However, if $\Delta w$ is too large (as shown in Proposition 4), CECA/WI is equivalent to a two-step process: (a) CCEA/WI between
Proposition 3. (CCEA/WI Community Merge) After CCEA/WI between $i$ and $j$, where $c_i \neq c_j$, if and only if $\Delta w > \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_2 + \beta_2 - 2m + \sqrt{(2m - \alpha_2 - \beta_2)^2 + 4(m\alpha_2 + \beta_c\beta_c)})$, where $\alpha_2 = \alpha_c - \alpha_c$, and $\beta_2 = \beta_c$, merging $c_i$ and $c_j$ into $c_k$ (i.e., $c_k = c_i \cup c_j$) has higher modularity gain than keeping the community structure unchanged.

Proposition 4. (CCEA/WI Community Bi-split) After CCEA/WI between $i$ and $j$, where $c_i \neq c_j$, $c_k = c_i \cup c_j$, and $\{c_p, c_q\}$ is another bi-split of $c_k$ (i.e., $c_p \subseteq c_k$ and $c_q = c_k \setminus c_p$, if and only if $\Delta w > \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_2 + \beta_2 - 2m + \sqrt{(2m - \alpha_2 - \beta_2)^2 + 4(m\alpha_2 + \beta_c\beta_c)}) + \frac{m\alpha_1 - \beta_c\beta_c}{2m - \alpha_2 - \beta_2}$, where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_c - \alpha_c - \alpha_c$, $\alpha_2 = \alpha_c + \alpha_c$, $\alpha_3 = \alpha_c - \alpha_c$, $\alpha_4 = \alpha_c$ and $\beta_2 = \beta_c + \beta_c$, splitting $c_k$ into $c_p$ and $c_q$ has higher modularity gain than either keeping the community structure unchanged or merging $c_i$ and $c_j$ into $c_k$.

Proof. This proof could be easily derived from Proposition 2 and Proposition 3.

4.3.2 Edge Deletion/Weight Decrease (ED/WD)

In this scenario, an edge $(i, j, w_{ij})$ between two existing vertices $i$ and $j$ has been changed to $(i, j, w_{ij} - \Delta w)$, where $w_{ij} \geq \Delta w > 0$. Edge deletion is a special case of edge weight decrease. If $w_{ij} = \Delta$, the operation is edge deletion. If $w_{ij} > \Delta$, the operation is edge weight decrease. Depending on the edge property, there are two sub-scenarios:

Intra-Community ED/WD (ICED/WD): Vertices $i$ and $j$ belong to the same community (i.e., $c_i = c_j$). According to Proposition 5 if $i$ or $j$ has degree one, decreasing the edge weight between $i$ and $j$ will keep the community structure unchanged. Also, intuitively, if $i$ or $j$ has degree one, deleting the edge between $i$ and $j$ will result in the same community structure plus one or two singleton communities (i.e., the vertex of degree one will become singleton community). Except for the case above (i.e., $i$ or $j$ has degree one), ICED/WD between $i$ and $j$ could cause three other cases: (a) keep the community structure unchanged, if the community $c_i$ is still densely connected; (b) split $c_i$ into multiple smaller communities, if the community $c_i$ becomes sparsely connected; and (c) merge the community $c_i$ with some of its neighbor communities (i.e., the opposite of Remark 4). Since the analytical approach might be too complex and time consuming, we propose to initiate all the vertices within the communities, that adjacent to $i$ or $j$ (including $c_i$), as singleton communities.

Proposition 5. For any pair of vertices $i$, $j$ that belong to the same community (i.e., $c_i = c_j$), if $i$ or $j$ has only one neighbor vertex ($j$ or $i$), decreasing the edge weight between $i$ and $j$ does not split $i$ and $j$ into different communities.

Proof. Suppose the edge weight between vertices $i$ and $j$ has been decreased, where $c_i = c_j$. Let $Q^{(t+1)}_1$ be the modularity value if the community structure keeps unchanged, and
Let $Q_2^{(t+1)}$ be the (best case) modularity value if $i$ and $j$ are split into smaller communities (i.e., $c_i' \subseteq c_i$ and $c_j' = c_i \setminus c_i'$).

$$Q_2^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m - 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_i'} - 2\Delta w - \frac{(\beta_{c_i'} - 2\Delta w)^2}{m - 2\Delta w} \right)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_{c'} - \frac{\beta_{c'}^2}{2m - 2\Delta w} \right) \right) \tag{12}$$

$$Q_2^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m - 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_i'} - \frac{(\beta_{c_i'} - \Delta w)^2}{m - 2\Delta w} + \alpha_{c_j'} \right)$$

$$- \frac{(\beta_{c_j'} - \Delta w)^2}{2m - 2\Delta w} + \left( \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_{c'} - \frac{\beta_{c'}^2}{2m - 2\Delta w} \right) \right) \tag{13}$$

where $\beta_{c_i'} = \beta_{c_i'} + \beta_{c_j'}$.

$$Q_1^{(t+1)} - Q_2^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m - 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_i} - 2\Delta w - \alpha_{c_i'} - \alpha_{c_j'} \right)$$

$$- \frac{(\beta_{c_i'} - \Delta w)(\beta_{c_j'} - \Delta w)}{m - 2\Delta w}$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_{c'} - \frac{\beta_{c'}^2}{2m - 2\Delta w} \right) \right) \tag{14}$$

$$= \frac{(w_{ij}' - \Delta w)(2m - \alpha_{c_i}) + (w_{ij}' - \Delta w) - \alpha_{c_i'}\alpha_{c_j'}}{2(m - \Delta w)^2}$$

$$(w_{ij} > \Delta w, 2m > \alpha_{c_i})$. The conclusion follows. □

Cross-Community ED/WD (CCED/WD): Vertices $i$ and $j$ belong to two different communities (i.e., $c_i \neq c_j$). By Proposition 6, CCED/WD will strengthen the community structure, hence, we will keep the community structure unchanged.

**Proposition 6.** If vertices $i$ and $j$ belong to different communities ($c_i \neq c_j$), deleting an edge or decreasing the edge weight between $i$ and $j$ will increase the modularity gain coming from $c_i$ and $c_j$.

Proof. Let $Q_i^{(t+1)}$ and $Q_i^{(t)}$ be the modularities of $c_i$ before and after the CCED/WD operation. Then, we have:

$$\Delta Q = Q_i^{(t+1)} + Q_j^{(t+1)} - Q_i^{(t)} - Q_j^{(t)} = \frac{\Delta w \alpha_{c_i} + \alpha_{c_j}}{2m(m + \Delta w)}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\beta_{c_i} - \beta_{c_i}) - (\beta_{c_j} - \beta_{c_j})}{m - \Delta w} \left( \frac{\beta_{c_i} + \beta_{c_i}}{m - \Delta w} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \frac{(\beta_{c_j} - \beta_{c_j})}{m - \Delta w} \left( \frac{\beta_{c_j} + \beta_{c_j}}{m - \Delta w} \right) \tag{16}$$

Let $k = \min \left\{ \left( \frac{\beta_{c_i}}{m} - \frac{\beta_{c_i}}{m + \Delta w} \right), \left( \frac{\beta_{c_j}}{m} - \frac{\beta_{c_j}}{m + \Delta w} \right) \right\}$. Thus,

$$\Delta Q > k \frac{(\beta_{c_i} + \beta_{c_j}) - (\beta_{c_i} + \beta_{c_j})}{m - \Delta w} > \frac{k\Delta w(2m - \beta_{c_i} - \beta_{c_j})}{4m(m - \Delta w)} > 0 \tag{17}$$

where $2m > \beta_{c_i} + \beta_{c_j}, m > \Delta w$. The conclusion follows. □

### 4.3.3 Vertex Addition

In this case, a new vertex $i$ and its associated edges are added. On one hand, if $i$ has no associated edge, we make it as a singleton community and keep the rest community structure unchanged. On the other hand, if $i$ has one or more associated edges, some interesting cases would happen. For instance, if all of $i$’s associated edges connect to the same one existing community $c_j$, by Proposition 6, we should merge $i$ into $c_j$ and consider all of $i$’s associated edges as ICEA/WD. A more complicated case occurs when $i$’s associated edges connect to different existing communities. By Proposition 6, in this case, we could merge $i$ into community $c_j$ that has the highest $\Delta w_{ij}$. However, other than simply determining which community $i$ should merge into, we should also consider which set of vertices could together with $i$ to form a new community, or which community could be split into smaller communities, to further improve the modularity gain. To cope with all the cases, where $i$ has one or more associated edges, we propose to initialize $i$ and $j$ as a two-vertices community, where edge $e_{ij}$ has the highest weight among all $i$’s associated edges (randomly selecting a vertex $j$ if there are ties), and initialize all the other vertices within $i$’s adjacent communities as singleton communities.

**Proposition 7.** If a new vertex $i$ has been added and all of its associated edges are connected to the same existing community $c_j$, merging $i$ into community $c_j$ has higher modularity gain than keeping $i$ as a singleton community.

Proof. Let $Q_i^{(t+1)}$ denote the modularity value when merging $i$ into community $c_j, Q_i^{(t+1)}$ denote the modularity value when keeping $i$ as a singleton community, and $\Delta w > 0$ denote the sum of the weight of all $i$’s associated edges. Then, we have:

$$Q_1^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_j} + 2\Delta w - \frac{(\beta_{c_j} + 2\Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right)$$

$$+ \left( \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_{c'} - \frac{\beta_{c'}^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right) \right) \tag{18}$$

$$Q_2^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m + 2\Delta w} \left( \alpha_{c_j} - \frac{(\beta_{c_j} + \Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right)$$

$$- \frac{(\Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} + \left( \sum_{c \in C} \left( \alpha_{c'} - \frac{\beta_{c'}^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} \right) \right) \tag{19}$$

$$Q_1^{(t+1)} - Q_2^{(t+1)} = \frac{\Delta w(2m - \beta_{c_j}) + (\Delta w)^2}{2m + 2\Delta w} > 0 \tag{20}$$

where $2m \geq \beta_{c_j}$. Hence, the conclusion follows. □

**Proposition 8.** Suppose a new vertex $i$ has been added and its associated edges are connected to different existing communities. Let $\Delta w_{ip}$ denote the sum of the edge weights of vertex $i$’s associated edges that are connected to community $j$. Given two communities $c_p$ and $c_q$, if $\Delta w_{ip} > \Delta w_{iq}$, merging $i$ into $c_p$ has more modularity gain than merging $i$ into $c_q$.

Proof. Let $Q_1^{(t+1)}$ and $Q_2^{(t+1)}$ denote the modularity values when merging $i$ into community $c_p$ and community $c_q$,
respectively. Suppose $\triangle w_{ip} \geq \triangle w_{iq}$ and $\triangle w$ denoting the sum of all of the $i$’s associated edge weights. Then, we have:

$$Q_1^{(t+1)} - Q_2^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{2m + 2\triangle w} \left( \alpha_c - 2\triangle w_{ip} \right) - \frac{\beta_c + 2\triangle w_{ip}}{2m + 2\triangle w} + \frac{\alpha_q - (\beta_c + \triangle w_{iq})^2}{2m + 2\triangle w}$$

$$- \frac{1}{2m + 2\triangle w} \left( \alpha_c - (\beta_c + \triangle w_{ip})^2 + \alpha_q - (\beta_c + \triangle w_{iq})^2 \right) + 2\triangle w_{iq} - \frac{(\beta_c + \triangle w_{ip})^2}{2m + 2\triangle w}$$

$$= \frac{4m - 2\beta_c}{(2m + 2\triangle w)^2} (\triangle w_{ip} - (4m - 2\beta_c)\triangle w_{iq})$$

$$+ \frac{4\triangle w - 3\triangle w_{ip} - (4\triangle w - 3\triangle w_{iq})\triangle w_{iq}}{(2m + 2\triangle w)^2}$$

$$\geq \frac{(k_1 + k_2)(\triangle w_{ip} - \triangle w_{iq})}{(2m + 2\triangle w)^2}$$

where $k_1 = \min \{ 4m - 2\beta_c, \triangle w_{ip} \}$ and $k_2 = \min \{ 4m - 2\beta_c, \triangle w_{iq} \}$.

Since $2m > \beta_c$, $2m > \beta_c$, $\triangle w > \triangle w_{ip}$, $\triangle w > \triangle w_{iq}$ and $\triangle w_{ip} > \triangle w_{iq}$, we have $k_1 > 0$, $k_2 > 0$, and $Q_1^{(t+1)} - Q_2^{(t+1)} > 0$. Hence, the conclusion follows.

4.3.4 Vertex Deletion
In this case, an old vertex $i$ and its associated edges are deleted. On one hand, if $i$ has no associated edge, deleting $i$ has no influence on the rest of network, and hence, we should keep the community structure unchanged. On the other hand, if $i$ has too many associated edges, deleting $i$ might cause its community and neighbor communities being broken into smaller communities and potentially being merged into other communities. To handle this case, we propose to initialize all the vertices within $c_i$ and $i$’s neighbor communities as singleton communities.

4.4 Implementation and Analysis

4.4.1 Implementation
Algorithm 1 presents the DynaMo Initialization. The input contains the current network $G^{(t+1)}$, the previous network $G^{(t)}$ and the previous community structure $C^{(t)}$. The output contains two sets of communities, $\Delta C_1$ and $\Delta C_2$, that will be modified to initialize the intermediate community structure at the beginning of the second phase. $\Delta C_1$ contains a set of communities in $G^{(t)}$ to be separated into singleton communities, and $\Delta C_2$ contains a set of two-vertex communities to be created. Algorithm 2 presents the second phase, where the last two steps of Louvain algorithm is applied on the initialized intermediate community structure of $G^{(t+1)}$.

4.4.2 Time Complexity Analysis
The computation of our algorithm handling one network snapshot comes from two parts: (a) the initialization, and (b) the last two steps of Louvain algorithm. In the initialization, different network changes trigger different operations, thus resulting in different computation time. For instance, if one network change is ICEA/WI (i.e., $e_{ij}, c_i = c_j$), our algorithm (line 26-28) is designed to add $c_i$ into $\Delta C_1$, and add $c = \{i, j\}$ into $\Delta C_2$. The time complexity of both operations are $O(1)$, thus, the time complexity to deal with single change of ICEA/WI is $O(1)$. Similarly, the time complexities to deal with single change of CCEA/WI (line 29-35) and CCED/WD (no operation needed) are also $O(1)$. To deal with single change of ICEA/WI, VA or VD, our algorithm goes through the set of neighbor vertices of the changed edge, and thus, result in $O(\frac{|E|}{|V|})$ time complexity. Furthermore, as shown in Algorithm 1, each network snapshot usually has multiple network changes. Since the number of network changes is proportional to $\triangle E$, the overall time complexity of the initialization is $O(\langle \triangle E \rangle)$ or $O(\langle \triangle E \rangle \cdot \frac{|E|}{|V|})$.

The time complexity of the original Louvain algorithm is $O(|E|)$. However, compared with the Louvain initialization, our algorithm considers the pervers number community structure and designs an initialization phase to compress the number of edges left for the second phase as much as possible. Thus, the time complexity of the second phase of our algorithm is $O(|E^*|)$, where $|E^*| \ll |E|$. Hence, the overall best case time complexity of our algorithm is $O(\langle \triangle E \rangle + |E^*|)$, and the worst case is $O(\langle \triangle E \rangle \cdot \frac{|E|}{|V|} + |E^*|)$.

5 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION
In this section, we present a comprehensive comparison among our proposed algorithm, Louvain algorithm (static) and 5 other dynamic algorithms, in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. All the experiments have been conducted on 6 real world evolving social network datasets.

5.1 Experiment Setup

5.1.1 Experiment Environment
All the experiments were conducted on a PC with an Intel Xeon Gold 6148 Processor, 128GB RAM, running 64-bit Ubuntu 18.04 LTS operating system. All the algorithms and experiments are implemented using Java with JDK 8.

5.1.2 Baseline Approaches
We compare DynaMo with Louvain algorithm (Section 3.4), and 5 state-of-the-art dynamic algorithms: (i) Batch [20]: a batch-based incremental modularity optimization algorithm; (ii) GreMod [16]: a rule-based incremental algorithm that performs the predetermined operations on edge additions; (iii) QCA [15]: a rule-based incremental algorithm that updates the community structures according to the predefined rules of vertex/edge additions/deletions; (iv) LBTR-LR [16]: a learning-based algorithm that uses machine learning classifiers to update vertices’ community assignments. In our experiments, we use Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Logistic Regression (LR) as the machine learning classifiers, thus, two variants of LBTR: LBTR-SVM and LBTR-LR.

5.1.3 Real World Evolving Networks
We conducted all the experiments on 6 real world networks described below. Table I presents the dataset summaries.

- Cit-HepPh (Cit-HepTh) [36] dataset contains the citation networks of high-energy physics phenomenology (theory) papers from 1993 to 2003.
- DBLP [37] dataset contains a co-authorship network of computer science papers ranging from 1954 to 2015, where each author is represented as a vertex and a pair of authors
Algorithm 1: DynaMo Initialization (Init)

Input: $V^{(t+1)}, E^{(t+1)}, V^{(t)}, E^{(t)}, C^{(t)}$.
Output: $\Delta C_1, \Delta C_2$.
1 $\Delta E \leftarrow$ A set of edges changed from $E^{(t)}$ to $E^{(t+1)}$;
2 $\Delta V_{add} \leftarrow V^{(t)} \setminus V^{(t+1)}$;
3 $\Delta V_{del} \leftarrow V^{(t+1)} \setminus V^{(t)}$;
4 $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \emptyset$;
5 $\Delta C_2 \leftarrow \emptyset$;
6 for $e_{ij} \in \Delta E$ do
7     for $k \in \{i, j\}$ do
8         if $e_{ij} \in \Delta V_{add}$ then
9             $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_k\}$;
10            for $c_{kl} \in E^{(t)}$ do
11                $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_l\}$;
12         if $e_{ij} \in \Delta V_{add}$ then
13             $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_k\}$;
14            for $c_{kl} \in E^{(t+1)}$ do
15                $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_l\}$;
16                if $w_{kl} > w_{max}$ then
17                    $w_{max} \leftarrow w_{kl}$;
18                    $c \leftarrow \{k, l\}$;
19            $\Delta C_2 \leftarrow \Delta C_2 \cup \{c\}$;
20        if $i, j \notin \Delta V_{add}$ and $\Delta V_{del}$ then
21            if $e_{ij} \notin E^{(t)}$ or $w_{ij} > w_{ij}^{t+1}$ then
22                if $c_i = c_j$ then
23                    $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_i\}$;
24                    for $k \in \{i, j\}$ do
25                        for $c_{kl} \in E^{(t)}$ do
26                            $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_l\}$;
27                if $e_{ij} \notin E^{(t)}$ or $w_{ij} < w_{ij}^{t+1}$ then
28                    if $c_i = c_j$ then
29                        $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_i\}$;
30                        $\Delta C_2 \leftarrow \Delta C_2 \cup \{c\}$;
31                else
32                    $\Delta w = w_{ij}^{t+1} - w_{ij}^t$;
33                    $\alpha_2 = \alpha_2 + \alpha_{c_i} - \alpha_{c_j}$;
34                    $\beta_2 = \beta_2 + \beta_{c_i} + \beta_{c_j}$;
35                    $\delta_1 = 2m - \alpha_2 - \beta_2$;
36                    $\delta_2 = m\alpha_2 + \beta_{c_i} + \beta_{c_j}$;
37                    if $\Delta w + \delta_1 > \sqrt{\delta_1^2 + 4\delta_2}$ then
38                        $\Delta C_1 \leftarrow \Delta C_1 \cup \{c_i, c_j\}$;
39                        $\Delta C_2 \leftarrow \Delta C_2 \cup \{c\}$;
40                    return $\Delta C_1, \Delta C_2$.

Algorithm 2: DynaMo

Input: $G^{(t+1)}, G^{(t)}, C^{(t)}$.
Output: $C^{(t+1)}$.
1 $\Delta C_1, \Delta C_2 \leftarrow$ Init($V^{(t+1)}, E^{(t+1)}, V^{(t)}, E^{(t)}, C^{(t)}$);
2 $C^{(t+1)} \leftarrow C^{(t)}$;
3 for $c_i \in \Delta C_1$ do
4     $C^{(t+1)} \leftarrow C^{(t+1)} \cup \{c_i\}$;
5     for $k \in c_i$ do
6         if $c_k \notin \Delta C_1$ then
7             new singleton community: $c_k \leftarrow \{k\}$;
8 for $c = \{i, j\} \in \Delta C_2$ do
9     new two-vertex community: $c_k \leftarrow \{i, j\}$;
10     $C^{(t+1)} \leftarrow (C^{(t+1)} \setminus \{c_i, c_j\}) \cup \{c_k\}$;
11     $C^{(t+1)} \leftarrow$ Louvain($C^{(t+1)}$, $G^{(t+1)}$);
12 return $C^{(t+1)}$.

are linked to each other by an edge if they have collaborated in publishing at least one paper.

Facebook [38] dataset contains the user friendship establishment information from about 52% of the Facebook users in the New Orleans area, spanning from September 26th, 2006 to January 22nd, 2009. In this network, each vertex represents an unique Facebook user, and each edge represents an user-to-user friendship establishment link, where each edge contains a timestamp that presents the time of friendship establishment.

Flickr [39] dataset was obtained on January 9th, 2007, and contains over 1.8 million users and 22 million links, and each link has a timestamp that presents the time of subscribing link establishment. We selected a sub-network, where all the user-to-user following links were established from March 6th, 2007 to May 15th, 2007.

YouTube [40] dataset was obtained on January 15th, 2007 and consists of over 1.1 million users and 4.9 million links, and each link has a timestamp that presents the time of the subcribing link establishment. We selected a sub-network, where all the user-to-user subscribing links were established from February 2nd, 2007 to July 23rd, 2007.

5.1.4 Experimental Procedure

For each experimental network dataset, we applied the Louvain algorithm (as described in Section 4.2) on the initial network snapshot to obtain its initial community structure. For the rest of network snapshots, DynaMo and all the other 5 dynamic algorithms only take into account the initial community structure and the network changes between two consecutive network snapshots, while the static algorithm (i.e., Louvain) has to be applied on the whole network of each network snapshot. We analyzed all the experiment results in terms of the effectiveness (Section 5.2) and the efficiency (Section 5.3) towards detecting communities in the evolving networks. Each experiment has been conducted for 200 times to obtain the averaged experimental results.

5.2 Effectiveness Analysis

5.2.1 Effectiveness Metrics

We evaluate the effectiveness of the community detection algorithms using the following three metrics: (i) modularity, (ii) normalized mutual information (NMI), and (iii) adjusted rand index (ARI). As described in Section 5.3, modularity is designed to measure the strength of dividing a network into communities. The range of modularity is $[-1, 1]$. Modularity closing to 1 indicates strong community structure, while equaling to 0 means the community division is not better than random division. NMI and ARI are designed to measure the similarities of the community structures between the experiment result and the ground truth. Due to the lack of unified ground truth community structure of the real world networks, we use the results of Louvain algorithm...
as the ground truth, that usually yields higher modularity than the dynamic algorithms.

Let $C_t$ denote the ground truth community division, and $C_r$ denote the experiment result. The normalized mutual information (NMI) is defined as follows:

$$NMI(C_t, C_r) = \frac{2 \times I(C_t; C_r)}{H(C_t) + H(C_r)}$$

(22)

where $H(C_t)$ is the entropy of $C_t$, and $I(C_t; C_r)$ is the mutual information between $C_t$ and $C_r$. The NMI ranges from 0 to 1. NMI closing to 1 indicates that the ground truth and the result are similar.

The adjusted rand index (ARI) is defined as follows:

$$ARI(C_t, C_r) = \frac{2(ad - bc)}{b^2 + c^2 + 2ad + (a+d)(b+c)}$$

(23)

where $a$ is the number of pairs of vertices that are in the same community in both $C_t$ and $C_r$, $b$ is the number of pairs of vertices that are in the same community in $C_t$ and in different communities in $C_r$, $c$ is the number of pairs of vertices that are in different communities in $C_t$ and in the same community in $C_r$, $d$ is the number of pairs of vertices in different communities in both $C_t$ and $C_r$. In our case, ARI is the higher the better, and its highest possible value is 1.

5.2.2 Experimental Results

Figures 3 to 8 shows our effectiveness experimental results, including the modularity of 7 algorithms, the NMI and ARI of 6 dynamic algorithms. Below shows our observations.

- In terms of modularity (Figures 3a, 4a, 5a, 6a, 7a and 8a), DynaMo outperforms all the other dynamic algorithms. For instance, compared with Batch, the second best performed dynamic algorithm, DynaMo has over 2.6%, 2.2%, 4.3%, 2.1%, 1.1% and 2.2% better modularity averaged over all the network snapshots, and over 3.2%, 4.4%, 17.3%, 2.4%, 1.2% and 4.7% better modularity on the last network snapshot of Cit-HepPh, Cit-HepTh, DBLP, Facebook, Flickr and YouTube, respectively. Compared with Louvain algorithm, DynaMo has nearly identical performance, with only 0.49%, 0.38%, 0.06%, 0.7%, 0.5% and 0.5% less modularity averaged over all the network snapshots, and only 0.52%, 0.74%, 0.27%, 0.46%, 0.5% and 1.7% less modularity on the last network snapshot of Cit-HepPh, Cit-HepTh, DMLP, Facebook, Flickr and YouTube, respectively.

- In terms of NMI (Figures 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7b and 8b), DynaMo has the best performance, and the runner-up is changing between Batch and QCA on most of the networks. Compared with the runner-up algorithm, DynaMo has over 20.2%, 11.1%, 5.4%, 23.1%, 10.9% and 11.5% better NMI averaged over all the network snapshots, and over 23.1%, 18.0%, 21.5%, 26.8%, 12.9% and 19.6% better NMI on the last network snapshot of Cit-HepPh, Cit-HepTh, DBLP, Facebook, Flickr and YouTube, respectively.

- In terms of ARI (Figures 3c, 4c, 5c, 6c, 7c and 8c), DynaMo has the best performance on all six real world networks for most of the time, and only in the result of two network snapshots of Flickr, Batch outperforms DynaMo. In the ARI results, Batch is the runner-up for most of the time. Compared with the runner-up, DynaMo has over 27.4%, 26.7%, 224.6%, 31.2%, 32.4% and 38.3% better ARI averaged over all the network snapshots, and over 25.5%, 31.2%, 600.3%, 30.8%, 34.7% and 67.6% better ARI on the last network snapshot of Cit-HepPh, Cit-HepTh, DMLP, Facebook, Flickr and YouTube, respectively.

5.3 Efficiency Analysis

5.3.1 Time Complexity Analysis

Table 2 shows the theoretical time complexities of all the competing algorithms. DynaMo, QCA and GreMod have different time complexities (i.e., best/worst case) while running in different scenarios. For instance, as described in Section 4.4.2, DynaMo performs under the best case time complexity when the network changes are ICAE/WI, CCEA/WI or CCED/WD, and otherwise, it runs under the worst case time complexity. Similarly, QCA and GreMod perform under the best case time complexity if the network changes are ICAE or CCED, and otherwise, run under the worst case time complexity. For the other algorithms, the best case and the worst case have the same time complexity. Below shows the details about our analysis.

- Compared with Louvain, DynaMo has less time complexity, if the impact of the network changes of a network snapshot on its community structure is small enough to ensure $m_\delta \ll m$. The evolutionary nature of real world social networks, intuitively, assumes two consecutive network snapshots should have similar community structures.

| networks | $|V|$ | $|E|/|\Delta V|$ | vertex-type | $|E|$ | $|\Delta E|$ | edge-type | # of snapshots | time-interval | time-span |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cit-HepPh | 30,301 | 6,460 | author | 346,742 | 11,127 | co-citation | 31 | 4 months | 124 months |
| Cit-HepTh | 7,597 | 1,253 | author | 51,089 | 2,042 | co-citation | 25 | 5 months | 125 months |
| DBLP | 1,411,321 | 122,711 | author | 5,928,285 | 191,233 | co-authorship | 31 | 2 years | 62 years |
| Facebook | 59,302 | 12,765 | user | 592,406 | 20,399 | friendship | 25 | 1 month | 26 months |
| Flickr | 780,009 | 85,253 | user | 4,407,259 | 168,977 | follow | 24 | 3 days | 72 days |
| YouTube | 3,160,656 | 91,954 | user | 7,211,498 | 175,203 | subscription | 23 | 5 days | 165 days |

TABLE 1: Description of the Real World Evolving Networks [Notations: $|V|$ ($|E|$): # of unique vertices (edges); $|E|/|\Delta V|$ ($|E|/|\Delta E|$): avg. # of vertices (edges) changed per network snapshot; # of snapshots: total number of consecutive network snapshots; time-interval: period of time between two consecutive network snapshots; time-span: total time spanning of each network dataset].

TABLE 2: A comparison of the time complexities of the competing algorithms [Notations: $n = |V|$ ($m = |E|$): # of unique vertices (edges); $|V|$ ($|E|$): # of vertices (edges) changed; $m_\delta$ ($m_\gamma$): # of unique vertices (edges) after the initialization phase of Batch (DynaMo), and $m_\delta \ll m$ ($m_\gamma \ll m$); $T_{LR}$ ($T_{SV M}$): the time complexity of using logistic regression (support vector machine) in LBTR].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>algorithms</th>
<th>best case</th>
<th>worst case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louvain [24]</td>
<td>$O(m)$</td>
<td>$O(m)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch [18]</td>
<td>$O((v + \epsilon) \cdot m_\delta + m_\gamma)$</td>
<td>$O((v + \epsilon) \cdot m_\delta + m_\gamma)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DynaMo</td>
<td>$O((v + \epsilon) \cdot m_\delta + m_\gamma)$</td>
<td>$O((v + \epsilon) \cdot m_\delta + m_\gamma)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCA [15]</td>
<td>$O(c)$</td>
<td>$O(c)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreMod [16]</td>
<td>$O(c)$</td>
<td>$O(c)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBTR-LR [19]</td>
<td>$O(v \cdot T_{LR})$</td>
<td>$O(v \cdot T_{LR})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBTR-SVM [18]</td>
<td>$O(v \cdot T_{SV M})$</td>
<td>$O(v \cdot T_{SV M})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From our empirical studies, the assumption of $m_\ast < m$ always hold. It is also one of the reason that our dynamic algorithms are more efficient than the static algorithms in detecting communities in evolving networks. Otherwise, if all the vertices/edges have been changed to completely change the community structure of a network, the efficiency of our dynamic algorithms would downgrade to or even worse than the static algorithms.

- Compared with Batch [20], DynaMo has less initialization time complexity (i.e., $O(e \cdot m_\ast) < O((v + e) \cdot m_\ast)$), and different second phase time complexities (i.e., $m_\ast$ vs. $m_\ast$).

- Compared with QCA [15] and GreMod [16], who update the community structure according to the predefined rule of each network change and one at a time (i.e., not in a batch), DynaMo is more efficient if each network snapshot has more network changes, since DynaMo is capable of handling a batch of network changes together.

- Compared with LBTR [18], who uses machine learning models to decide if a vertex need to revise its community or not, DynaMo is more consistent and practical when dealing with different real world networks. Since the characteristics of an evolving network keep changing over time, LBTR has to keep updating the machine learning models to adapt the new characteristics. In such case, we have to take the training time into account. Also, the time complexity of LBTR highly depends on the machine learning algorithm utilized for the classification problem (e.g., $O(T_{SVM}) > O(T_{LR})$).
Fig. 6: The accuracy results on the Facebook network. (a) Modularity. (b) Normalized Mutual Information (NMI). (c) Adjusted Rand Index (ARI).

Fig. 7: The accuracy results on the Flickr network. (a) Modularity. (b) Normalized Mutual Information (NMI). (c) Adjusted Rand Index (ARI).

Fig. 8: The accuracy results on the YouTube network. (a) Modularity. (b) Normalized Mutual Information (NMI). (c) Adjusted Rand Index (ARI).

5.3.2 Empirical Result Studies

Since the theoretical time complexities always depend on the ideal scenario or extreme case, it is necessary to conduct empirical studies using real world networks. To ensure the comparison is as unbiased as possible, all the algorithms are implemented using Java and running on the same environment. Fig. 9 shows the cumulative elapsed time results, and below shows the details about our observations.

- Compared with Louvain [24], DynaMo has over 2x, 2x, 4x, 3x and 3x speed up on the series of network snapshots of Cit-HepPh, Cit-HepTh, DBLP, Facebook, Flickr and YouTube, respectively.

- Compared with Batch [20], DynaMo has over 3x, 5x, 2x, 7x and 5x speed up on the series of network snapshots of Cit-HepPh, Cit-HepTh, DBLP, Facebook and Flickr, respectively. DynaMo spends nearly the same amount of time as Batch on YouTube network.

- Compared with QCA [15], DynaMo has over 2x, 2x, 4x and 5x speed up on the series of network snapshots of Cit-HepTh, Facebook, Flickr and YouTube, respectively. DynaMo is as efficient as QCA on DBLP network, and spends slightly more time on Cit-HepPh network.

- Compared with GreMod [16], DynaMo spends more time on most of the networks, and only does better on the Flickr and YouTube network.

- Compared with LBTR [18], DynaMo is much more efficient than LBTR-SVM, and only spends slightly more time than LBTR-LR on certain networks.
### 5.4 Summary of the Experimental Evaluation

DynaMo outperforms all the other 5 dynamic algorithms on all six real world networks in terms of the effectiveness (i.e., modularity, NMI and ARI) of detecting communities. DynaMo has almost identical effectiveness performance as Louvain algorithm, with only 0.27% to 1.7% less modularity on certain networks. DynaMo also performs comparably well in terms of the efficiency. For instance, DynaMo outperforms Louvain, Batch and LBTR-SVM, and has similar performance as QCA and LBTR-LR in terms of efficiency of detecting communities. Even though GreMod acts more efficient than DynaMo, DynaMo is much more effective than GreMod (e.g., GreMod obtains the worst effectiveness metrics nearly on all datasets). In conclusion, DynaMo significantly outperformed the state-of-the-art dynamic algorithms in terms of effectiveness, and demonstrated much more efficient than the state-of-the-art static algorithm, Louvain algorithm, in detecting communities in evolving networks, while also maintaining similar efficiency as the best set of competing dynamic algorithms.

### 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed DynaMo, a novel dynamic modularity-based community detection algorithm, aiming to detect communities in evolving social networks. We also present the theoretical guarantees to show why/how our operations could maximize the modularity, while avoiding redundant and repetitive computations so far as possible. In the experimental evaluation, a comprehensive comparison has been made among our algorithm, Louvain algorithm and 5 other dynamic algorithms. Extensive experiments have been conducted on 6 real world networks. The experimental results show that DynaMo outperforms all the other 5 dynamic algorithms in terms of effectiveness, and achieves (on average) 2 to 5 times faster than Louvain algorithm.
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