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Abstract—Community detection is considered as a fundamental task in analyzing social networks. Even though many techniques have been proposed for community detection, most of them are based exclusively on the connectivity structures. However, there are node features in real networks, such as gender types in social networks, feeding behavior in ecological networks, and location on e-trading networks, that can be further leveraged with the network structure to attain more accurate community detection methods. We propose a novel probabilistic graphical model to detect communities by taking into account both network structure and nodes’ features. The proposed approach learns the relevant features of communities through a generative probabilistic model without any prior assumption on the communities. Furthermore, the model is capable of determining the strength of node features and structural elements of the networks on shaping the communities. The effectiveness of the proposed approach over the state-of-the-art algorithms is revealed on synthetic and benchmark networks.
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1 INTRODUCTION

A network is a set of inter-connected items with a powerful mathematical basis for modeling many real-world systems, such as the Internet, World Wide Web, and transportation networks [1]. Detection of communities as the main hidden structures of networks has attracted the interests of researchers from the early stages of the appearance of network science [2]. A community in a network is defined as a set of nodes with intense intra community connections while having sparse inter community links. Nodes within the same community are likely to share common properties and play similar actions [3]. The role of community structures in the functional modules of the networks has been applied on a wide range of fields including spammers identification in online social networks [4], image clustering [5], and detection the neural units dense modules [6].

Much effort has been carried out on various aspects and assumptions about communities while focusing primarily on the connectivity information. Algorithms to discover non-overlapping communities are generally aimed at partitioning the network into sub-networks which are densely connected internally, while weakly connected externally. Examples of such algorithms are graph partitioning [7], hierarchical agglomeration algorithm [8], optimization based methods [9] and many variants of spectral clustering method [10]. On the other hand, several methods have been proposed to discover overlapping communities, such as mixed membership stochastic block-models [11], map equation framework based on probabilistic flows (InfoMap) [12], label propagation (Fast-Greedy) [13], nonnegative matrix factorization (BigClam) [14], modularity based optimization (COMBO) [15], tracking the evolution of online social networks [16], neighborhood seed expansion [17], a unified approach on detection of general community structures [18], and asymmetric triangle cuts [19].

Indeed, the community detection can be considered as an ill-posed hard unsupervised learning problem. There are node (or edge) features that can be effectively used to provide better community structures [20], [21]. On the one hand, it is known that significant correlation exists between community structure and node features, hereafter called as “features”, in a variety of real networks [2]. On the other hand, most of the well-known approaches are based on applying only one of these two information sources. Exploiting features in the community detection process could yield better results. Moreover, it is shown that there is strong dependency between the communities and features in some real networks [22]. Recently, some researchers have addressed the community detection using network structure coupled with the features, such as single-assignment clustering heuristic [23], topic derived models [24], generative model (CESNA) [25], Bayesian Graph Clustering (BAGC) [26], and Expectation-Maximization (EM) approach [22]. However, most of these approaches are somewhat sensitive to correctness of the model specification.

In this paper, we propose a novel graphical model to find communities through a probabilistic approach. The proposed model provides the level of correlations between communities and features that could be used to select the suitable divisions of the network as well as the appropriate features. The summary of our contributions in this work are as follows,
2 RELATED WORKS AND MOTIVATION

2.1 Related works

The role of nodal features on different aspects of network modeling are considered in a variety of works such as the missing nodes prediction via non-parametric Bayesian inference [27], finding k-truss subgraphs with the aid of features [28], and network approach on topic modeling [29].

On community detection with nodal features, there are generally two types of techniques, model-free methods and generative models. Like the structure based algorithms with some optimality criteria to detect communities such as the modularity based methods [9], [30], [31] and label propagation [32], such model-free methods are proposed to exploit the features including structure mining [33], simulated annealing [34], Joint Community Detection Criterion (JCDC) [35], Semidefinite Programming (SDP) [36], and Covariance Assisted Spectral Clustering (CASC) [37]. Most methods in this category exploit features in the same way without considering the relationship between them and communities.

Generative models were initially introduced on connectivity based community detection including affiliation graph model [38], matrix factorization BigClam [14], Bayesian community detection [39], and nonparametric probabilistic model by conducting random walks [40]. Feature based generative models on community extraction have been proposed in some works such as topic modeling [24], CESNA [25], and stochastic block model [22]. In [25], a generative model was introduced to consider just the influence of community structures on features. The modified stochastic block model aligned with the features is modified in [22] to reveal the efficacy of each feature on community structures by employing the Expectation-Maximization inference stage. On the one hand, most of the model-free feature based methods suffer from the dependency to multiple tuning parameters such as JCDC [35], and CASC [37]. On the other hand, the generative feature based models on extraction of communities have some problems including the model sensitivity on the presumed graphical representation of the features and communities CESNA [25], and modeling a correlation of single feature with the community structure at a time [22].

2.2 Motivation

In general, there are two paradigms in constructing the effect of features on the community structure: (i) the assortative features like age, sexuality, race and overall personal user’s attributes having significant influence on the formation of communities, and (ii) the community generative features like education, living place, office location and user’s interests in social networks which is imitated from the community structure. To clarify the effect of features on the formation of community structure, we consider two real-world networks. Figure 1 (a) shows a snapshot of the Predator-Prey network where each node represents a unique marine creature of the Weddell Sea and the color of each node shows its living environment, “Pelagic” or “Benthic” [41]. Figure 1 (b) shows a snapshot of World Trade network, where each node (country) belongs to “Asia” or “Europe” [42]. As it can be seen, the features provide a useful insight on discovering the more likely community structures on these case studies.

Fig. 1: The influence of features on communities in two real networks, (a): Weddell Sea with feature “Environment” with two categories, “Pelagic” (Blue) and “Benthic” (Red). (b): World Trade with feature “continent” where each node(country) belongs to “Asia” (Blue) or “Europe” (Red).

Our primary aim in this work is to study how to extract community based on two different type of features, assortative and generative, which has not been considered in the earlier works. We propose a principled graphical model via the division of features into assortative and generative features to construct a general approach to deal with the community detection problem. It is assumed that each community can be formed by causal relationship of assortative features and the community generative features which are influenced within the community structure. The community generative features is called as generative features for simplicity.

The causal relationship is represented in a graphical model to encode the main elements of the community formation through two main sources: connectivity structure and features. The schematic representation of features and their relations on the community structures are depicted in Figure 2. The proposed approach is designed based on the different types of features in the probabilistic generative model. Moreover, it can also model the joint features altogether unlike most of ad-hoc based earlier methods [22], [35]. The parameters of the proposed model are learned through a likelihood based approach. Furthermore, the dependency of features on the community structure is computed through the learning phase that can be applied to infer the main ingredients on the construction of network communities.
The proposed approach consists of three main steps, which is depicted in Figure 3. Initially, the features are divided into assortative and generative. The first main step is to measure the dependency of features towards each community. In this step, the influence of assortative and generative features on the community formation is computed. The first main step is to measure the dependency of features towards each community. In this step, the influence of assortative and generative features on the community formation is computed. The relationship between communities is the second component of the proposed algorithm. The next important step is computing the probability membership function for each node, which is performed by statistical learning of the main parameters and iteratively updating the initial membership function to result in the final ones.

Output of the algorithm is twofold: the dependency weights of features to the community structures that is informative for interpretation of the attained results, and the community structure of the network.

3.1 Description of graphical model

Here, we describe the details of proposed community detection model. The proposed model provides a generative framework among the main factors in a graph structure to detect the community structures in a network. The graphical model is constructed based on main factors namely community membership $M$, community interaction matrix $\beta$, assortative features $S$, generative features $F$, the influence of assortative features on communities denoted by $I$ and the interaction of communities with features denoted by $W$. Figure 4 represents the graph structure of the proposed model.

The probability of creation of an edge between a pair of nodes is directly related to their communities and the interaction levels between communities based on a probabilistic generative approach. Particularly, it is assumed that two nodes $u$ and $v$ are connected by considering the following probability,

$$P((u, v) \in E) = 1 - \exp(-M_u^T \beta M_v)$$

(1)

where $M_u$ and $M_v$ are non-negative membership functions of nodes $u$ and $v$ toward each community and $\beta$ represents the probability matrix of interactions between different communities. If nodes $u$ and $v$ share more communities or belong to communities $c_i$ and $c_j$ with high level of interaction ($\beta_{c_i,c_j}$) among them, their tendency to establish an edge will be increased. Hence, nodes $u$ and $v$ do not share a connection with the following probability,

$$P((u, v) \notin E) = 1 - P((u, v) \in E) = \exp(-M_u^T \beta M_v)$$

(2)

Based on the generative probabilistic process between any pair of nodes $(u, v)$, each pair of nodes is independently distributed as Bernoulli distribution. Therefore, each element $A_{uv} \in \{0, 1\}$ of the adjacency matrix is generated according to the following generative approach,

$$P_{uv}=1 - \exp(-M_u^T \beta M_v)$$

$$A_{uv} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(P_{uv})$$

(3)
The graphical model in Figure 4 indicates that the generative features $F$ is conditionally dependent on variables $M$ and $W$, which is assumed to be parametrized through the following sigmoid probabilistic function,

$$ P(F_{uk} = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{i=1}^{K} M_{uci} W_{kci})} $$

(4)

where $F_{uk} = 1$ denotes the property of node $u$ to have the $k$th feature, $M_{uci}$ and $W_{kci}$ denote the membership of node $u$ in community $c_i$ and the interaction between the $k$-th feature and community $c_i$. In summary, we assume that $F_{uk}$ follows the Bernoulli distribution in the following way:

$$ P(F_{uk} = 0) = \frac{\exp(-\sum_{i=1}^{K} M_{uci} W_{kci})}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{i=1}^{K} M_{uci} W_{kci})} $$

(5)

Furthermore, communities are influenced by the assortative features $S$ and its weight parameters $I$ in the graph structure. In a similar way, the community membership of each node is estimated by,

$$ M_{uci} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{j \in I} I_{jci} S_{ujj})} $$

(6)

### 4 Parameters Learning

Here, we consider the learning and inference stage on the proposed probabilistic model. The probability distribution on the observed variables $M$ and $F$ is written as,

$$ P(G, F|M, \beta, I, W, S) = P(G|M, \beta, I, S)P(F|M, W) $$

(7)

The likelihood function is calculated based on the model configuration as follows,

$$ L(\theta) = \prod_{(u,v)} (1 - \exp(-M_{u}^T \beta M_{v}))^{a_{uv}} (\exp(-M_{u}^T \beta M_{v}))^{1 - a_{uv}} \times \prod_{u} \prod_{k \in F} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})} \right)^{F_{uk}} \times \left( \frac{\exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})} \right)^{1 - F_{uk}} $$

(8)

The well-known optimization approaches could not be applied to obtain the maximum of the non-linear likelihood function (8) which contains the latent variables $M$ and $W$. Some approximate algorithms have been proposed to solve the hard-ship of optimization problems with latent variables in machine learning such as the expectation-maximization algorithm (EM) [43], variational Inference [44] and block coordinate approach [44]. We employ the Block Coordinate Ascent algorithm to find the solution of the objective function in Eq (8). According to Block Coordinate Ascent approach, updating the parameters takes place in two main steps, (i) updating the first block, the membership function $M$, by fixing the second block, the parameters $\beta, I, W$, and (ii) updating the second block of parameters by fixing the first one. The log-likelihood function $\ell(\theta)$ is employed in our calculations that is more tractable than the likelihood in (8) as,

$$ \ell(\theta) = \sum_{(u,v)} a_{uv} \log (1 - \exp(-M_{u}^T \beta M_{v})) + (1 - a_{uv})(-M_{u}^T \beta M_{v}) + \sum_{u} \sum_{k \in F} F_{uk} \log \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})} \right) + (1 - F_{uk}) \log \left( \frac{\exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})} \right) $$

Details of the learning stage is follows.

#### 4.1 Updating the parameters

The first step is to update the values of membership function $M_{u}$. To do so, it is required to derive the partial derivative of the log-likelihood function (9) with respect to $M_{u}$ as,

$$ \frac{\partial \ell(M_{u})}{\partial M_{u}} = \sum_{v \in N(u)} \beta M_{v} \exp(-M_{u}^T \beta M_{v}) \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})} \right] - \beta M_{v} \left[ \frac{\exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})} \right] $$

(10)

where the set of neighbors of $u$ is represented by $N(u)$. Each $M_{u}$ is first updated by gradient ascent in Eq (10), and then transformed to space of $[0, \infty)$ to meet the non-negativity property,

$$ M_{u}(t + 1) = \max(0, M_{u}(t) + \alpha(\frac{\partial \ell(M_{u})}{\partial M_{u}})) $$

(11)

where $\alpha$ is the learning weight parameter. After updating $M_{u}$, the second block of parameters $(I, W, \beta)$ are updated once at a time.

First, the important probabilistic dependencies among the parameters are employed to simplify the calculations. The conditional independence between the parameters $(I, W, \beta)$, given $M_{u}$ is derived from the proposed probabilistic model. Also, the structure of the graphical model implies the probabilistic dependencies of $I$ to $\beta$ and $W$. Taking into account the relation of $M$ and $I$, and the chain rule to get $\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial I}$ for a node $u$ as,

$$ \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial I} = \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial M_{u}} \times \frac{\partial M_{u}}{\partial I} $$

(12)

The $\frac{\partial M_{u}}{\partial I}$ is obtained from Eq. (6) by,

$$ \frac{\partial M_{u}}{\partial I} = S_{u} \times \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{k \in F} S_{uk} I_{kc})} \right]^2 $$

(13)

Eq. (13) and Eq. (10) imply the updating procedure of $I$ as,

$$ I(t + 1) = I(t) + \alpha(\sum_{u \in V} \frac{\partial \ell(M_{u})}{\partial M_{u}} \times \frac{\partial M_{u}}{\partial I}) $$

(14)

In the next step, parameter $W$, which is responsible for the correlation levels between generative features and the community is updated according to the following,

$$ \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial W_{kci}} = \sum_{u} (F_{uk} - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\sum_{c} M_{uci} W_{kci})} M_{uci} $$

(15)
In a similar way, the final updating form of parameter $W$ takes the form as the following,

$$ W_{kc}(t + 1) = W_{kc}(t) + \alpha \left( \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial W_{kc}} \right) $$

(16)

To update $\beta$, the derivation of the log-likelihood function with respect to $\beta$ is calculated as,

$$ \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \beta} = \sum_{v \in N(u)} -M_v^T M_u \times \frac{\exp(-M_v^T \beta M_v)}{1 - \exp(-M_v^T \beta M_v)} + \sum_{v \notin N(u)} -M_v^T M_u $$

(17)

The Eq. (17) provides the updating procedure for $\beta$ as,

$$ \beta(t + 1) = \beta(t) + \alpha \left( \frac{\partial \ell(M_u)}{\partial \beta} \right) $$

(18)

Algorithm 1 Probabilistic Feature based Community Detection (PFCD)

1: Input: $G = (V, E), Features, Number of communities($k$)$
2: Output: $M$ Community memberships of each node.
3: Initialize: Initializing parameters.
4: $t \leftarrow 0$
5: while $|M_u(t + 1) - M_u(t)| \leq \text{threshold}$ do
6: $t \leftarrow t + 1$
7: for $i = 1$ to $|V|$ do
8: $DevM = \text{findDerivationM}()$
9: end for
10: $DevI = \text{findDerivationI}()$
11: $DevW = \text{findDerivationW}()$
12: $Dev\beta = \text{findDerivationBeta}()$
13: end while
14: $\text{end}$

4.2 PFCD algorithm

The proposed approach, PFCD (Probabilistic Feature based Community Detection) is represented in Algorithm 1. According to PFCD, the inputs are the network structure ($G$), the features ($S \cup F$), the number of assortative features ($|S|$), the number of generative features ($|F|$) and the number of communities ($k$). The final output is the membership function of each node. The relationship between different types of features and communities can also be two important outputs of the proposed algorithm with the aim of interpretation. After initialization of the parameters, the main part of the algorithm is performed in an iterative manner. The algorithm stops when the absolute difference between the subsequent log-likelihoods of the model (Eq. (3) ) is less than a threshold parameter, which is set to 0.001 in our setting. Function $\text{findDerivationM}$ is applied to compute the derivation of the log-likelihood function with respect to $M$ based on Eq. (10). The update procedure on $M$ is performed by $\text{UpdateM}$ based on Eq. (11). When updating the membership function for all nodes is finished, the next step is to update the parameters $I$, $W$ and $\beta$. The $\text{findDerivationI}$ calculates the derivation of the log-likelihood function with respect to $I$ by Eq. (13) and function $\text{UpdateI}$ updates $I$ by Eq. (14). $W$ which captures the correlation level between the communities and the generative features, is updated by $\text{FindDerivationW}$ and $\text{UpdateW}$ according to equations (15) and (16). $\beta$ is updated based on equations (17) and (18). The update procedure is repeated until the convergence criterion is met.

4.3 Computational Complexity

The complexity of PFCD in each iteration is linearly dependent on the number of communities, assortative and generative features in network. The process of updating of $PFCD$ consists of two parts, updating the membership value of each node toward each community and updating the weight of each feature to each community. The membership value is updated based on Eqs. (10) and (11). For each given node $u$, the process considers the membership of its neighbors $M_v, v \in N(u)$ and non-neighbors towards communities $M_v, v \notin N(u)$. Therefore, for each given node, Eq. (10) takes $O(|N(u)|k^2 + k)$ time for the neighbors and $O(|N(u)|k^2)$ time for the non-neighbors. After iterating on all nodes the time complexity is $O(|E| \times k^2)$.

The time complexity for each given node of the second component of Eq. (10) is related to $O(k \times |F|)$. As a result the time complexity of the second component iterating on all nodes would end up with $O(|V| \times k \times |F|)$. The next step is the weight computation for each feature, $\{I, W\}$, and the community interaction matrix, $\beta$. According to Eq. (13) the time complexity is related to multiplying $S_u \times k$, which can be done in $O(|V| \times k \times |S|)$. Accordingly, updating the parameter $W$ has complexity of $O(|V| \times k \times |F|)$ and the matrix $\beta$ takes $O(|E| \times k^2)$ for updating its values by considering Eq. (18). Therefore, the proposed method would have the complexity of $max(O(|E| \times k^2), O(|V| \times k \times |F|))$.

5 Experiments

Synthetic and real-world networks are used to evaluate performance of PFCD. The efficiency of the proposed model is demonstrated on the state-of-the-art community detection methods by considering the feature based methods and structure based ones. On state-of-the-art feature based methods, Cesna [25], JCDD [35], NC [22], BAGC [26], SDP [36], and CASC [27] are employed in the experiments. On state-of-the-art structure based methods, BigClam [14], FastGreedy [13], Infomap [12], Louvain [9], and COMBO [15] are applied in the experiments. Table 1 summarizes these algorithms.

Initially, synthetic networks are used to examine the proposed approach. Then, we compare the performance of PFCD on benchmark real networks with ground-truth communities. In our experiments, the ground-truth communities and presumed number of communities are used for all of the methods to yield a fair comparison as highly recommended [2]. Experiments are run on a desktop PC with 4GB memory and Core i5 CPU under JAVA using JGraphT library. The source codes are provided in the supplementary information. The weight parameter $\alpha$ is set as 0.001 in the experiments. The $\beta$ is initialized based on the conductance
measure approach \cite{45}. The algorithms are run with their default parameters.

### 5.1 Evaluation criteria

Two well-known evaluation criteria, the \textit{F1 score} and the \textit{NMI}, are applied to measure the accuracy of the community detection algorithms as compared to the ground-truth communities \cite{2}. \textit{F1 score} is a standard evaluation measure in machine learning and community detection tasks, which quantifies the relative frequency of the number of correct detections of the members in each community based on the gold-standard information. The second performance measure is \textit{NMI} which is the mutual information of the similarity (or dissimilarity) between the discovered communities and the ground-truth ones \cite{1}.

### 5.2 Synthetic networks

Synthetic networks are generated based on the degree-corrected stochastic block model \cite{35}. The generation process is performed at two phases. At the first phase, the structure of network is shaped and the features are provided to each node at the second phase.

At the first phase, a pair of nodes \((i,j)\) are sharing an edge independently from the other pairs. The probability of an edge generation between any pair of nodes depends on whether they are in a same community or not. If they share a community, the probability would be \(\beta \theta_i \theta_j \), otherwise is \(r \theta_i \theta_j \). Parameter \(\beta\) indicates the level of interaction between any pair of communities, such that higher level of \(\beta\) for a pair of communities \((i,j)\) results in more interactions of them. The \(r\) is used for handling the density inside the community and parameters \(\theta_i, \theta_j\) are used for controlling the degree of nodes. To avoid homogeneity in the generated networks, we set 10\% of nodes inside a community as hub by setting \(\theta_i = 10\) and for non-hub nodes \(\theta_i = 1\). We set \(\beta = 0.1\) and \(r = 0.25\) in generating the networks. The average degree of the resulted network is around 31. After shaping the structure of network, at the second phase we generate features for two communities from the Gaussian distribution \(\mathcal{N}(\mu,1)\), for nodes of the first community and \(\mathcal{N}(-\mu,1)\) for nodes of the second community. As \(\mu\) increases, the feature of each community becomes stronger. To reveal the impact of nodal features on communities, three different networks are generated with \(N = \{1000, 2000, 5000\}\) by considering three different scenarios \(\mu = \{2, 3, 5\}\) for each network. A summary of properties of the synthetic networks are given in Table 2.

The performance of \textit{PFCD} is demonstrated on these generated networks by using the state-of-the-art feature based methods in Table 1. The results are shown in Figures 5 and 6. As \(\mu\) increases, the influence of features on community structures becomes stronger. Due to the number of features in the generation of networks, there exists a slight difference between the proposed approach and other feature-enabled community detection methods. In addition, the main aim of the experiments on synthetic networks is to demonstrate the impact of features on the performance of community detection (Figures 7 and 8). We compare the proposed approach with the well-known structure-based methods in Table 1 to reveal the importance of features on community detection process by using F1-Score and NMI criteria. Figures 7 and 8 indicate that the proposed method outperforms the well-known structure based methods.

### Table 1: Overview of the state-of-the-art algorithms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cesna</td>
<td>Feature enabled Generative model</td>
<td>\cite{25}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCDIC</td>
<td>Joint Feature based Community Detection Criterion</td>
<td>\cite{35}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Modified Feature based Stochastic Block Model</td>
<td>\cite{26}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGC</td>
<td>Bayesian Graph Clustering</td>
<td>\cite{26}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Semi-Definite Programming</td>
<td>\cite{26}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASC</td>
<td>Covariance Assisted Spectral Clustering</td>
<td>\cite{26}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure based Community Detection Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BigClam</td>
<td>Find Overlapping community</td>
<td>\cite{14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-Greedy</td>
<td>Fast Overlapping community detection</td>
<td>\cite{13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infomap</td>
<td>Find Overlapping community by probabilistic flows</td>
<td>\cite{35}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvain</td>
<td>Heuristic method for detecting non-overlapping community</td>
<td>\cite{25}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBO</td>
<td>Find overlapping and non-overlapping communities</td>
<td>\cite{15}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Main properties of the synthetic networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Edges</th>
<th>Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000-2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>51578</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-3.5</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>56401</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-5</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>52488</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>177719</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-3.5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>181288</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>177592</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-2</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>819220</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-3.5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>783694</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>845994</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5: Results of \textit{PFCD} compared with feature based community detection methods (Table 1) in terms of F1-Score, where the horizontal axis represents three different scenarios for each generated network with sample sizes from 1000 to 5000.

Fig. 6: Results of \textit{PFCD} compared with the feature based community detection methods (Table 1) in terms of NMI, where the horizontal axis presents three different scenarios for each generated network with sample sizes from 1000 to 5000.
Fig. 7: Results of PFCD compared with the structure based community detection methods (Table 1) in terms of F1-Score, where the horizontal axis presents three generated networks with sample sizes from 1000 to 5000.

Fig. 8: Results of PFCD compared with the structure based community detection methods (Table 1) in terms of NMI, where the horizontal axis presents three generated networks with sample sizes from 1000 to 5000.

5.3 Real networks

We examine our approach on a number of benchmark real-world network dataset. The networks are from different domains including economy, biology, ecology, and social.

5.3.1 Dataset description

Three social friendship networks, namely Lawyer, CalTech, and Rice, are used in this study. The Lawyer dataset is derived from a study of corporate law partnership that was developed in a Northeastern US corporate law firm. It contains the friendship networks among 71 attorneys (partners and associates) of this company. There are several features for the members as part of the dataset, such as seniority, formal status, working office location, gender, law school attended, working hours, the years of activity, and attitudes on various management options [46]. We consider two Facebook subnetworks, namely CalTech and Rice, from the Facebook-100 dataset, which consists of the Facebook networks for 100 colleges and universities in the US. There are links between the members (student or faculty) inside each school, and also nodal features including the status of student/faculty, major, senior or junior, dormitory, year and high school information [47].

Five information networks are used in our experiments, including DBLP, ArXiv, WTrade, Internet, and PolBlogs. In DBLP repository, the nodes and edges represent the authors and co-authorship relationships. 20 keywords are extracted from the title of papers to represent four different fields: Data-Mining, Computer Graphics, Artificial Intelligence and Databases. The keywords include “classification”, “cluster”, “graphic” and “human”. In ArXiv, the nodes represent papers and the edges show citations between them. The features denote how often a specific keyword appears in the abstract of a paper. The ArXiv network contains 30 distinct keywords. WTrade is a dataset of various manufactures from 80 countries on metal trade commodities in 1994. The edges show the exports from one country to another for metal commodities. The nodes are countries with features such as the continent, position in world system and GDP. Internet network is a topological network where each node represents Autonomous Systems (AS) and the edges represent the path from an AS to another one. Communities are countries of the registered AS. PolBlogs is a network of hyperlinks between weblogs on US politics, recorded in 2005 by Adamic and Glance [48]. Each node is represented by its political affiliation, conservative or liberal. Patent [49] is a large citation networks on the utility patents granted which is maintained by the National Bureau of Economic Research during January 1, 1963 to December 30, 1999.

Two biological networks Predator-Prey and Malaria are employed in the experimental settings. Predator-Prey is an ecological network about 488 marine creatures living in the WeddellSea. Each creature has different features such as feeding type, feeding mode, environment and body mass [41]. Malaria dataset is a biological network of genetic sequences from the malaria parasites [50], [51]. In this network, the nodes represent 297 genes and their various shared amino acid substrings. The common process of recombination among genes to produce proteins generates a natural two-node mode network which consists two types of nodes: genes in HVRS (highly variables regions) and every HVR has different set of edges among the same nodes [51]. A summary of the datasets are given in Table 3.

At first, we consider the performance of PFCD without taking into account of features, Plain, along with some of the state-of-the-art structure based methods such as, BigClam [14], Fast-Greedy [15], Infomap [12], Louwain [9], and COMBO [15] (see Table 1). An automatic strategy is used on threshold specification in Plain approach, where each node is assigned to the community with the greater membership value than the average of the memberships of all nodes [2]. Figures 9 and 10 show the results. It reveals that the proposed method is able to perform as well as the other structure-based methods. Moreover, its result on some networks like Lawyer, CalTech and Rice is so competitive compared with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Seniority, Formal status, Working Office Location, Gender, Law School Attended, Working Hours, Years of Activity, Attitudes on Management Options</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalTech</td>
<td>Features for members (student or faculty) inside each school, including status of student/faculty, major, senior or junior, dormitory, year and high school information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Features for the nodes as part of the dataset, such as continent, position in world system and GDP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArXiv</td>
<td>Keywords from titles of papers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Keywords from titles of papers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolBlogs</td>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent</td>
<td>AS and assigned Code</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Summary of the real network datasets.
results of its original version. Actually, the PFCD algorithm without nodal features considers community as dense sub-graphs like most of other structure-based methods. The obtained results by considering just the structural properties are not good enough (less than 0.2) on certain type of networks such as DBLP, Arxiv, Internet, and Patent due to the fact that the community structures consist of the dense sub-graphs and assortative modules [49]. In addition, structure based methods perform better than the Plain on some networks such as Predator and PolBlogs (Figure 9) due to having small number of features. These results reveal the impact of features from the viewpoint of types and numbers on the detection of community structures in real networks, where Figure 11 demonstrate the usefulness of features on the community detection process.

![Fig. 9: Results of the proposed method compared with others by just considering connectivity structure, Plain, in terms of F1-score. The baseline methods include BigClam [14], Fast-Greedy [13], Infomap [12], Louvain [9], and COMBO [15].](image)

![Fig. 10: Results of the proposed method compared with others by just considering connectivity structure, Plain, in terms of NMI. The baseline methods include BigClam [14], Fast-Greedy [13], Infomap [12], Louvain [9], and COMBO [15].](image)

Then, the PFCD is compared with the the well-known structure based methods in Table 4. Figure 11 represents the results in terms of F1-score and NMI. We observe that considering nodal features in the community detection process leads to the superiority of PFCD compared to the algorithms that are only based on structural information. The difference is specially well pronounced in some networks, such as Lawyer, Malaria, Predator-Prey, DBLP, ArXiv and Internet, for which PFCD has higher F1-score and NMI than other algorithms.

Moreover, the performance of our approach are demonstrated with the state-of-the-art feature based algorithms in Table 4. The obtained results are shown in Figure 12. We observe that PFCD outperforms others in almost all experiments. Specifically in the networks for which features are completely dependent on the community structures, such as WTrade, PolBlogs, DBLP and ArXiv networks, the proposed approach performs better than the others. The results show that higher dependency between features and community structure can lead to higher accuracy in the community detection process. While JCDC performs well on small networks, it fails to accurately detect communities in large networks due to its dependency on multiple tuning parameters. NC considers only one type of feature as a metadata and fails to precisely detect communities. The results return similar weak performance of CESNA, on networks such as WTrade, Predator-Prey, Malaria, PolBlogs and ArXiv. On the division of the features into assortative and generative categories, we used NMI to select the appropriate assortative features due to the high level impact on the community structures. After selection the assortative features, the remaining features are used in the category of generative features. The details are reported in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>ASSORTATIVE FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Status, Office, Years</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalTech</td>
<td>Gender, Class year, Major, Residence</td>
<td>Class Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Gender, Class year, Major, Residence</td>
<td>Class Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBLP</td>
<td>extracted keywords from papers</td>
<td>Keyword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolBlogs</td>
<td>Political Affiliation(Liberal, Conservative)</td>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Trade</td>
<td>Continent, Positions</td>
<td>Continent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malara</td>
<td>Cys-PoLV labels</td>
<td>Cys-PoLV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WeddellSea</td>
<td>Feeding type, Feeding mode, Body mass, Environment</td>
<td>Feeding Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArXiv</td>
<td>Keywords from abstract of papers</td>
<td>Keywords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Country, Years</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The execution running time of PFCD along with NC, CESNA, and Louvain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>PFCD</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>CESNA</th>
<th>Louvain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WorldTrade</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolBlogs</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WeddellSea</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalTech</td>
<td>1.497</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBLP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArXiv</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>2818</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The execution running time of PFCD is compared with the state-of-the-art competitors in Table 5. CESNA with $O(E)$ and developed in C++, NC with $O(|V|^2 \times k^2)$ and developed in C, and the fast non-overlapping community detection method, Louvain, developed in C and taking $O(|V|\log(|V|))$. All of the experiments are performed using a single Lenovo machine with 4GB Ram and Core i5 CPU and the proposed method is implemented in JAVA using JGraphT library. It is worth mentioning that most of the feature-oriented methods are unable to report results in decent time because some of them were developed in MATLAB or require adjacency matrix ($|V| \times |V|$) which is not working on big networks. In the execution time of each method, Louvain algorithm is quite faster compared with the proposed algorithm because first of all its time complexity is $O(|V|\log(|V|))$ which is generally lower than
6 Case Study

Here, we demonstrate the effectiveness of features for detection of communities. Lawyer network is considered for further analyzing its communities and the role of features in each community structure. To illustrate the situation, Figure [13] depicts the adjacency matrix sorted by different features, status (Partner, Associate) and office location (Boston, Hartford). In Figure [13] part (a), yellow block denotes a group of lawyers with Partner status and blue block consists of lawyers with Associate status. In Figure [13] part (b), lawyers working in Boston are shown in yellow block, and the others working in Hartford are depicted in blue block. According to Figure [13], the features are strong enough to shape communities where nodes with similar features are more likely to share connections together compared with those with different features. The level of strength between the features and communities, is shown in Table 6. In the first glimpse, Table 6 shows that the proposed method is able to extract the unique set of features among all possible features for each community based on their strength levels. For example, feature Partner has a positive impact on the second community while it does not carry out the same impact on the first one. Moreover, the features, “lawyers with associate status”, and “the lawyer’s working offices located in Boston”, play important role for shaping the first community. In the same way, “lawyers with partner status” whose working offices located in Hartford” are more influential in shaping the second community. The proposed method is also able to prioritize the importance levels of specific features of each community. It is shown in Table 6, “status” is more important than “office location”.

TABLE 6: the Impact of each feature on each community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Hartford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11: Results of PFCD compared with the well-known structure based methods. The baseline methods include BigClam [14], Fast-Greedy [13], Infomap [12], Louvain [9], and COMBO [15] (Table 1)
Fig. 12: Results of PFCD compared with the benchmark feature based methods in terms of F1–score and NMI. The baseline methods include Cesna [25], JCDC [35], NC [22], BAGC [26], SDP [36] and CASC [37] (Table 1).

Fig. 13: Adjacency matrix according to the value of each feature. (a): status, (b): office. Points represent edges among nodes and each either yellow or blue block shows the group of nodes with a similar feature.

7 CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduced a novel graphical model based approach for community detection. The proposed approach, PFCD, considered both the network structure and nodal features. The different influence of nodal features on community structures are investigated in our proposed framework. The proposed model is inferred through an efficient probabilistic algorithm. The block-coordinate descent algorithm was employed to learn parameters of the model to deal with the latent variables in an efficient computational manner. In line with the discrimination of features influence on community formation, the priority of each feature on the structure of communities can be inferred from our model. The experimental results on synthetic networks justified the strength of the PFCD approach on detection of communities compared with the well-known methods. Furthermore, a variety of small to large real network datasets were used to evaluate the proposed model based on standard evaluation measures. The results on real networks showed the high performance of the proposed model and very promising results on the detection of community structures based on a network aligned with the nodal features.

There are some future works, such as representation learning approach to derive automatic features from the network structure and extending the proposed method to temporal networks.
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