Extended Stochastic Block Models with Application to Criminal Networks

Sirio Legramanti$^1$, Tommaso Rigon$^2$, Daniele Durante$^1$ and David B. Dunson$^3$

$^1$Department of Decision Sciences and Institute for Data Science and Analytics, Bocconi University
$^2$Department of Economics, Management and Statistics, University of Milano-Bicocca
$^3$Department of Statistical Science, Duke University

Abstract

Reliably learning group structure among the nodes in network data is challenging in several modern applications. We are particularly motivated by studying covert networks that encode relationships among criminals. These data are subject to measurement errors and often exhibit a complex combination of an unknown number of core–periphery, assortative and disassortative structures that may unveil the internal architecture of the criminal organization. The coexistence of such noisy block structures limits the reliability of community detection algorithms routinely applied to criminal networks, and requires extensions of model–based solutions to realistically characterize the node partition process, incorporate structured information from node attributes, and provide improved strategies for estimation, uncertainty quantification, model selection and prediction. To address these goals, we develop a novel class of extended stochastic block models (ESBM) that infer groups of nodes having common connectivity patterns via Gibbs–type priors on the partition process. This choice encompasses several realistic priors for criminal networks, covering solutions with fixed, random and infinite number of possible groups, and facilitates the inclusion of external node attributes in a principled manner. Among the new alternatives in our class, we focus on the Gnedin process as a realistic prior that allows the number of groups to be finite, random and subject to a reinforcement process coherent with the modular structures in organized crime. A general collapsed Gibbs sampler is proposed for the whole ESBM class, and refined strategies for estimation, prediction, uncertainty quantification and model selection are outlined. The ESBM performance is illustrated in realistic simulations and in an application to an Italian Mafia network, where we learn key block patterns revealing a complex hierarchical structure of the organization, mostly hidden from state–of–the–art alternative solutions.
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1 Introduction

Network data are ubiquitous in modern applications, and there is recurring interest in block structures defined by groups of nodes that share similar connectivity patterns (e.g. Fortunato and Hric, 2016). Our focus is on studying networks of individuals involved in organizing crime. In this setting, it is of
considerable interest to infer shared connectivity patterns among different suspects, based on data provided by investigations, to obtain insight into the hierarchical structure of criminal organizations (e.g. Campana, 2016; Faust and Tita, 2019; Diviák, 2020; Campana and Varese, 2020).

The relevance of this endeavor has motivated an increasing shift in modern forensic studies away from classical descriptive analyses of criminal networks (Krebs, 2002; Carley et al., 2002; Morselli, 2009; Malm and Bichler, 2011; Li et al., 2015; Agresti et al., 2016; Grassi et al., 2019; Cavallaro et al., 2020), and towards studying more complex group structures involving the monitored suspects (Ferrara et al., 2014; Calderoni and Piccardi, 2014; Magalingam et al., 2015; Calderoni et al., 2017; Robinson and Scogings, 2018; Liu et al., 2018; Sangkaran et al., 2020). These contributions have provided valuable initial insights into the internal structure and functioning of several criminal organizations. However, the focus has been on classical community detection algorithms (Girvan and Newman, 2002; Newman and Girvan, 2004; Newman, 2006; Blondel et al., 2008), which infer groups of criminals characterized by dense within–block connectivity and sparser connections between different blocks (Fortunato and Hric, 2016). Such approaches are overly simplified and ignore other fundamental block structures, such as core–periphery, disassortative and weak community patterns (e.g. Fortunato and Hric, 2016). These more nuanced structures are inherent to criminal organizations, which involve an intricate combination of vertical and horizontal hierarchies of block interactions (Paoli, 2007; Morselli et al., 2007; Le, 2012; Catino, 2014). Disentangling such complex architectures is fundamental to inform preventive and repressive operations, but requires improved methods combined with more realistic representations of criminal networks that incorporate a broader set of recurring block structures, beyond assortative communities.

An initial strategy for addressing the above objectives is to consider spectral clustering algorithms (Von Luxburg, 2007) and stochastic block models (Holland et al., 1983; Nowicki and Snijders, 2001). Both methods learn general block structures in network data and hence, despite their limited use in forensic studies, are expected to unveil criminal structures currently hidden to community detection algorithms. Nonetheless, as clarified in Sections 1.1–1.2, several aspects of criminal network studies still require careful statistical innovations. A crucial one is the coexistence of several community, core–periphery and disassortative architectures whose number, size and structure are unknown and partially obscured by the measurement errors arising from the investigations. To ensure accurate
learning in these challenging settings it is fundamental to rely on an extended, yet interpretable, class of model–based solutions encompassing a variety of flexible mechanisms for the formation of suspect groups. Such processes should also allow structured inclusion of external information and facilitate the adoption of principled methods for estimation, prediction, uncertainty quantification and model selection within a single realistic modeling framework.

1.1 The Infinito network

Our motivation is drawn from a large law–enforcement operation, named Operazione Infinito, which was conducted in Italy from 2007 to 2009 in order to disentangle and disrupt the core structure of the ’Ndrangheta mafia in Lombardy, north of Italy. As outlined in the pre–trial detention order produced by the preliminary investigation judge of Milan¹, such a criminal organization, also referred to as La Lombardia, is a key example of a deeply rooted, highly structured and hard to untangle covert architecture with a disruptive and pervasive impact, both locally and internationally (Paoli, 2007; Catino, 2014). This motivates our efforts to provide an improved understanding of its hidden hierarchical structures via innovative block–modeling of the relationships among its monitored affiliates.

Raw data are available online at https://sites.google.com/site/ucinetsoftware/datasets/covert-networks and comprise information on the co–participation of 156 suspects at 47 monitored summits of the criminal organization, as reported in the judicial acts¹ that were issued upon request by the prosecution. Consistent with our overarching goal of shedding light on the internal structure of La Lombardia via inference on the block connectivity patterns among its affiliates, we focus on the reduced set of 118 suspects that attended at least one summit and were classified in the judicial acts as members of this specific criminal organization. Since only 18% of these affiliate pairs co–attended at least one summit and, among them, just 5% co–participated in more than one meeting, we consider here the binary adjacency matrix indicating presence or absence of a co–attendance in at least one of the monitored summits. Due to the sparse and almost–binary form of the original counts, such a dichotomization leads to a negligible loss of information and is beneficial in reducing the noise

that may arise from investigations of multiple summits. Moreover, because of the vertical and highly regulated 'Ndrangheta coordinating processes (Paoli, 2007; Catino, 2014), the co-attendance of at least one summit is arguably sufficient to declare the presence of a connection among two affiliates.

More problematic is the possible presence of false negatives which may arise in such studies as a result of covert strategies implemented by the criminal organization to carefully balance the tradeoff between efficiency and security (Morselli et al., 2007). These covert patterns are not altered by the dichotomization procedure, and further motivate the development of improved methods for principled uncertainty quantification and structured borrowing of information among affiliates via the inclusion of available knowledge on the criminal organization and on suspects’ external attributes. For example, current forensic theories (e.g. Paoli, 2007; Catino, 2014) and initial quantitative analyses (e.g. Calderoni and Piccardi, 2014; Calderoni et al., 2017) suggest that the internal organization of 'Ndrangheta revolves around specific blood family relations, which may be further aggregated at the territorial level in structural coordinated units, named locali. Each locale controls a specific territory, and has a further layer of regulated hierarchy defined by a group of affiliates, and comparatively fewer bosses that are in charge of leading the locale, managing the funds, overseeing violent actions and guaranteeing the communication flows. Information on presumed locale membership and role can be retrieved, for each suspect of interest, from the judicial acts\footnote{1} of Operazione Infinito and, as shown in the graphical representation of the Infinito network in Figure 1, could help in assisting inference on the hidden underlying block structure, thus reducing the impact of covert strategies.

The inclusion of the aforementioned node attributes motivates a careful and principled probabilistic representation accounting for the fact that these external sources of information are produced by an investigation process and, hence, may be prone to measurement errors. Despite its relevance and potential benefits, this endeavor has been largely neglected in the analysis of criminal networks and, as discussed in Section 1.2, state-of-the-art methods for block-modeling lack a formal solution to include node attribute effects in the partition process and test for the magnitude of the improvements relative to no supervision. To cover this gap and flexibly learn the complex variety of block structures underlying noisy criminal networks, we develop a novel class of extended stochastic block models (ESBM) that formally quantify uncertainty in the suspects’ grouping structure — including in the number, size and composition of the blocks — via Gibbs-type priors (Gnedin and Pitman,
As clarified in Section 2, although the block–modeling literature has focused on a much less extensive class of processes, the Gibbs–type class is well motivated in providing broad, interpretable and realistic probabilistic generative mechanisms for the formation of suspects’ groups. This allows careful incorporation of probabilistic structure within a single modeling framework which is amenable to novel extensions for the inclusion of probabilistic homophily with respect to error–prone external attributes, and for careful model–based inference on the partition structure via refined algorithms for estimation, uncertainty quantification, model selection and prediction. To assess out–of–sample predictive performance, we perform inference on the $V = 84$ suspects affiliated to the 5 most populated locali, and hold out as a test set the 34 members of those smaller–sized locali with $\leq 6$ monitored affiliates. As discussed in Calderoni and Piccardi (2014), such a choice is also beneficial in reducing potential issues arising from the incomplete identification of low–sized locali during investigations, and, due to the modular organization of ’Ndrangheta (e.g. Paoli, 2007; Catino, 2014), it arguably leads to a more accurate learning of its core recurring hierarchies.
1.2 Relevant literature

The importance of learning block structures in network data has motivated a collective effort by various disciplines towards the development of methods for detecting node groups, ranging from algorithmic strategies (Girvan and Newman, 2002; Newman and Girvan, 2004; Newman, 2006; Von Luxburg, 2007; Blondel et al., 2008) to model–based solutions (Holland et al., 1983; Nowicki and Snijders, 2001; Kemp et al., 2006; Airoldi et al., 2008; Karrer and Newman, 2011; Athreya et al., 2017; Geng et al., 2019); see Fortunato and Hric (2016), Abbe (2017) and Lee and Wilkinson (2019) for an overview.

Despite being routinely implemented in criminal network studies, most algorithmic approaches focus on detecting communities characterized by dense connectivity within each block and sparser connections among different blocks (Girvan and Newman, 2002; Newman and Girvan, 2004; Newman, 2006; Blondel et al., 2008). This constrained search is expected to provide a limited and possibly biased view of the key modules that are hidden in criminal networks. For instance, Figure 1 clearly highlights a core–periphery structure underlying the Infinito network, with communities of affiliates in peripheral positions and groups of bosses at the core. According to panel (a) in Figure 2, state–of–the–art algorithms for community detection (Blondel et al., 2008) applied to the Infinito network obscure such patterns by over–collapsing some locali, while failing to separate affiliates from bosses.

These issues motivate a focus on alternative solutions aimed at grouping nodes which are characterized by common connectivity patterns within the network, rather than just exhibiting community structures. One possibility to address this goal from an algorithmic perspective is to rely on spectral clustering (Von Luxburg, 2007). This strategy accounts for general block structures and possesses desirable properties, including consistency in estimation of the partition structure underlying various model–based representations (Rohe et al., 2011; Sussman et al., 2012; Sarkar and Bickel, 2015; Lei and Rinaldo, 2015; Athreya et al., 2017; Zhou and Amini, 2019). As shown in panel (b) of Figure 2, this yields improvements in learning complex block structures within the Infinito network relative to classical community detection algorithms. Nonetheless, spectral clustering lacks extensive methods for inference beyond point estimation, requires pre–specification or heuristic algorithms to choose the unknown number of groups, and faces practical instabilities. As a result, this strategy is sub–optimal relative to carefully chosen model–based approaches; see panel (c) in Figure 2 for an example of the gains that can be obtained over spectral clustering by the methods developed in Sections 2–3.
Figure 2: Adjacency matrix of the *Infinito network* with nodes re-ordered and partitioned in blocks according to the clustering structure estimated under three different methods: (a) community detection via the Louvain algorithm (Blondel et al., 2008); (b) spectral clustering (Von Luxburg, 2007) with the number of groups obtained via a combination of the model selection procedures in the R package *randnet*; (c) ESBM with supervised Gnedin process prior. Side colors correspond to the different *locali*, with darker and lighter shades denoting bosses and affiliates, respectively.

Among the generative models for learning groups of nodes in network data, the stochastic block model (SBM) (Holland et al., 1983; Nowicki and Snijders, 2001) is arguably the most widely implemented and well-established formulation, owing also to its balance between simplicity and flexibility (Abbe, 2017; Lee and Wilkinson, 2019). In SBMs, the probability of an edge between two nodes only depends on their cluster memberships, thus allowing efficient inference on node groups and on block probabilities — which can also characterize disassortative, core–periphery or weak community patterns, and combinations of such structures (Fortunato and Hric, 2016). These desirable properties have motivated extensive theory (Zhao et al., 2012; Bickel et al., 2013; Olhede and Wolfe, 2014; Noroozi and Pensky, 2020) and various generalizations (Tallberg, 2004; Kemp et al., 2006; Handcock et al., 2007; Airoldi et al., 2008; Karrer and Newman, 2011; Schmidt and Morup, 2013; Newman and Clauset, 2016; Sengupta and Chen, 2018; Geng et al., 2019; Stanley et al., 2019) of the original SBM.

Most of the above extensions aim at addressing two fundamental open issues with classical SBMs, that also arise in criminal networks. First, in real–world applications the number of underlying groups is typically unknown and has to be learned from the data. Therefore, classical SBM formulations based on a fixed and pre–specified number of groups (Holland et al., 1983; Nowicki and Snijders, 2001) are conceptually unappealing in precluding uncertainty quantification on the unknown number of non–
empty clusters, while state–of–the–art model selection procedures for choosing this quantity (Le and Levina, 2015; Saldana et al., 2017; Wang and Bickel, 2017; Chen and Lei, 2018; Li et al., 2020) led to mixed and biased results when applied to realistic criminal networks in the simulation studies reported in Section 4. The second important problem is that, as discussed in Section 1, it is common to observe external and possibly error–prone node attributes that may effectively inform the grouping mechanism. Hence, SBMs require extensions to include such information in the partitioning process.

A successful answer to the first open issue has been provided by Bayesian nonparametric solutions replacing the original Dirichlet–multinomial process for node partitioning (Nowicki and Snijders, 2001) with alternative priors that allow the number of groups to grow adaptively with the size of the network via the Chinese restaurant process (crp) (Kemp et al., 2006; Schmidt and Morup, 2013) or be finite and random under a mixture–of–finite–mixtures representation (Geng et al., 2019). Inclusion of nodal attributes within the grouping mechanism is instead obtained via multinomial probit (Tallberg, 2004) or mixture models (Newman and Clauset, 2016; Stanley et al., 2019). Unfortunately, all these extensions have been developed separately and SBMs still lack a unifying framework, which would be conceptually and practically useful to clarify common properties, develop broad computational and inferential strategies, and identify novel solutions that may effectively address the problems arising from the criminal network application discussed in Section 1.1.

Motivated by the above discussion, we unify in Section 2 the aforementioned formulations within a general extended stochastic block model (ESBM) framework based on Gibbs–type priors (Gnedin and Pitman, 2005; De Blasi et al., 2013), which also allow the inclusion of error–prone node attributes in a principled manner via product partition models (PPMs) (Hartigan, 1990). Within this class, we focus on the Gnedin process (Gnedin, 2010) as an example of a prior which has not yet been employed in the context of SBMs, but exhibits analytical tractability, desirable properties, theoretical guarantees and promising empirical performance in applications to criminal networks; see panel (c) in Figure 2. As clarified in Section 3, our framework allows posterior computation via an easy–to–implement collapsed Gibbs sampler, and motivates general strategies for uncertainty quantification, prediction and model assessment, thus fully exploiting the advantages of a model–based approach over algorithmic strategies. The performance of key priors within the ESBM class and the magnitude of the improvements relative to state–of–the–art competitors are illustrated in Section 4 with extensive simulations.
focusing on realistic criminal network structures. In light of these results, we opt for a supervised
Gnedin process to analyze the *Infinito network* in Section 5, obtaining a novel in–depth view of the
modular organization of 'Ndrangheta that was hidden to previous quantitative studies. Concluding
remarks are provided in Section 6, where we also mention possible extensions to degree–corrected
stochastic block models (Karrer and Newman, 2011) and mixed membership stochastic block models
(Airoldi et al., 2008). Codes and data are available at https://github.com/danieledurante/ESBM
and in the Supplement Materials, where we also provide additional figures and analyses.

2 Extended Stochastic Block Models

Consider a binary undirected network with $V$ nodes and let $Y$ denote its $V \times V$ symmetric adjacency
matrix, with elements $y_{vu} = y_{uv} = 1$ if nodes $v$ and $u$ are connected, and $y_{vu} = y_{uv} = 0$ otherwise.
In our criminal network application self–loops are not allowed and, hence, are not included in the
generative model. In Section 2.1, we first present the statistical model relying on classical SBM
representations, and then characterize, in Section 2.2.1, the prior on the node partition via Gibbs–
type processes leading to our general ESBM class. Such a unified representation is further extended in
Section 2.2.2 to include information from error–prone node attributes. Consistent with our motivating
application, we focus on binary undirected edges and categorical attributes, but our approach can be
naturally extended to other types of networks and covariates, as highlighted in the final discussion.

2.1 Model formulation

SBMs (Holland et al., 1983; Nowicki and Snijders, 2001) partition the nodes into $H$ mutually exclusive
and exhaustive groups, with nodes in the same cluster sharing common connectivity patterns. More
specifically, SBMs assume that the sub–diagonal entries $y_{vu}, v = 2, \ldots, V, u = 1, \ldots, v − 1$ of the
symmetric adjacency matrix $Y$ are conditionally independent Bernoulli random variables $\text{Bern}(\theta_{z_v,z_u})$
with probabilities $\theta_{z_v,z_u} \in (0, 1)$ depending only on the group memberships $z_v$ and $z_u$ of the involved
nodes $v$ and $u$. Let $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_V)^T \in \{1, \ldots, H\}^V$ be the node membership vector associated to the
generic node partition $\{Z_1, \ldots, Z_H\}$, so that $z_v = h$ if and only if $v \in Z_h$, and denote with $\Theta$ the $H \times H$
symmetric matrix whose generic element $\theta_{hk}$ is the probability of a connection between a node in group
and a node in group \( k \). Then, the likelihood for \( Y \) is
\[
p(Y \mid z, \Theta) = \prod_{h=1}^{H} \prod_{k=1}^{h} \theta_{hk}^{m_{hk}} (1 - \theta_{hk})^{\bar{m}_{hk}},
\]
where \( m_{hk} \) and \( \bar{m}_{hk} \) denote the number of edges and non–edges between groups \( h \) and \( k \), respectively.

Classical SBMs (Holland et al., 1983; Nowicki and Snijders, 2001) assume independent Beta\((a,b)\) priors for the block probabilities \( \theta_{hk} \). Therefore, the joint density for the diagonal and sub–diagonal elements of the matrix \( \Theta \) is
\[
p(\Theta) = \prod_{h=1}^{H} \prod_{k=1}^{h} \left[ \theta_{hk}^{a-1} (1 - \theta_{hk})^{b-1} \right] B(a, b)^{-1},
\]
where \( B(\cdot, \cdot) \) is the Beta function. Although quantifying prior uncertainty in the block probabilities is important, the overarching goal in SBMs is to infer the node partition. Consistent with this focus, \( \Theta \) is usually treated as a nuisance parameter and marginalized out in \( p(Y \mid z, \Theta) \) via beta–binomial conjugacy, obtaining
\[
p(Y \mid z) = \prod_{h=1}^{H} \prod_{k=1}^{h} \frac{B(a + m_{hk}, b + \bar{m}_{hk})}{B(a, b)}.
\]
As we will clarify in Section 3, this marginalization is also useful for computation and inference. The likelihood in (1) is common to several SBM extensions, which differ in the choice of the probabilistic mechanism underlying \( z \). Let \( \bar{H} \geq H \) be the total number of possible groups in the whole population of nodes, and denote with \( z = (\bar{z}_1, \ldots, \bar{z}_V)^T \in \{1, \ldots, \bar{H}\}^V \) the indicators of the population clusters for the \( V \) observed nodes. A natural option to define the generative process for the partition is to consider a Dirichlet–multinomial distribution for \( \bar{z} \), obtained by marginalizing the vector of group probabilities \( \pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{\bar{H}}) \sim \text{Dirichlet}\(\beta\) out of a multinomial likelihood for \( \bar{z} \), in which \( \text{pr}(\bar{z}_v = h \mid \pi) = \pi_h \) for \( v = 1, \ldots, V \). If \( \bar{H} \) is fixed and finite, this leads to the original SBM (Nowicki and Snijders, 2001). However, as already discussed, the number of groups in criminal networks is usually unknown and has to be inferred from the data. A possible solution consists in placing a prior on \( \bar{H} \), which leads to the mixture–of–finite–mixtures (MFM) version of the SBM in Geng et al. (2019). Another option is a Dirichlet process partition mechanism, corresponding to the infinite relational model (Kemp et al., 2006). Such an infinite mixture model differs from MFM in that \( \bar{H} = \infty \), meaning that infinitely many nodes would give rise to infinitely many groups. Note that the total number of possible clusters \( \bar{H} \) should not be confused with the number of occupied clusters \( H \). The latter is defined as the number of distinct labels in \( \bar{z} \), and is upper bounded by \( \min\{V, \bar{H}\} \).

The aforementioned solutions are all specific examples of Gibbs–type priors (Gnedin and Pitman, 2005; De Blasi et al., 2013), thus motivating our unified ESBM class presented in Section 2.2. Before introducing such an extension it is worth noticing that \( \bar{z} \) identifies labeled clusters. Hence, a vector \( \bar{z} \) and its relabelings are regarded as distinct objects, even though they identify the same partition.
Throughout the rest of the paper we will rely on the previously–defined vector \( z \), which denotes all relabelings of \( \bar{z} \) that lead to the same partition. For simplicity, we assume that \( z_v \in \{1, \ldots, H\} \), which corresponds to avoiding empty groups. This choice does not modify likelihood in (1), which is invariant under relabeling, meaning that \( p(Y \mid z) = p(Y \mid \bar{z}) \).

### 2.2 Prior specification

As illustrated in Section 2.1, several priors for the group memberships have been considered in the context of sbms, including the Dirichlet–multinomial (Nowicki and Snijders, 2001), the Dirichlet process (Kemp et al., 2006), and mixtures of finite Dirichlet mixtures (Geng et al., 2019). These are all examples of Gibbs–type priors, which were introduced by Gnedin and Pitman (2005) and stand out for analytical and computational tractability (De Blasi et al., 2013). In Section 2.2.1 we propose the esbm as a unifying framework characterized by the choice of a Gibbs–type prior for the assignments. This formulation includes the previously–mentioned sbms as special cases and offers new alternatives by exploring the whole Gibbs–type class and its relation with ppm\textsuperscript{s} (Hartigan, 1990). This connection is exploited in Section 2.2.2 to supervise the prior via node attributes, possibly observed with error.

#### 2.2.1 Unsupervised Gibbs–type priors

Gibbs–type priors (Gnedin and Pitman, 2005) are defined on the space of unlabeled group indicators \( z \). For \( a > 0 \), denote the ascending factorial with \( (a)_n = a(a + 1) \cdots (a + n - 1) \) for any \( n \geq 1 \), and set \( (a)_0 = 1 \). A probability mass function \( p(z) \) is of Gibbs–type if and only if it has the form

\[
p(z) = \mathcal{W}_{V,H} \prod_{h=1}^{H} (1 - \sigma)^{n_h-1},
\]

(2)

where \( n_h \) denotes the number of nodes in cluster \( h \), \( \sigma < 1 \) is the so–called discount parameter and \( \{\mathcal{W}_{V,H} : 1 \leq H \leq V\} \) is a collection of non–negative weights satisfying the recursion \( \mathcal{W}_{V,H} = (V - H\sigma)\mathcal{W}_{V+1,H} + \mathcal{W}_{V+1,H+1} \), with \( \mathcal{W}_{1,1} = 1 \). Gibbs–type priors are a special case of ppm\textsuperscript{s} (Hartigan, 1990; Quintana and Iglesias, 2003), which are probability models for random partitions \( z \) of the form \( p(z) \propto c(Z_1) \cdots c(Z_H) \), where \( \{Z_1, \ldots, Z_H\} \) is the partition associated to \( z \), whereas \( c(\cdot) \) is a non–negative cohesion function measuring the homogeneity within each cluster. Such a connection will be useful to incorporate node–specific attributes in esbms. Interestingly, Gibbs–type priors represent the largest class of ppm\textsuperscript{s} which are also species sampling models (Pitman, 1996), meaning that the
membership indicators $z$ can be obtained in a sequential and interpretable manner according to

$$
\Pr(z_{V+1} = h \mid z) \propto \begin{cases} 
W_{V+1,H}(n_h - \sigma) & \text{for } h = 1, \ldots, H, \\
W_{V+1,H+1} & \text{for } h = H + 1.
\end{cases}
$$

(3)

Hence, the group assignment process can be interpreted as a simple seating mechanism in which a new node is assigned to an existing cluster $h$ with probability proportional to the current size $n_h$ of that cluster, discounted by a global factor $\sigma$ and further rescaled by a weight $W_{V+1,H}$, which may depend both on the size $V$ of the network and on the current number $H$ of non-empty groups. Alternatively, the incoming node is assigned to a new cluster with probability proportional to $W_{V+1,H+1}$.

Such a general mechanism is conceptually appealing in our application to criminal networks since it realistically accounts for group sizes $n_h$, network size $V$ and complexity $H$ in the formation process of the modular structure underlying the criminal organization, while providing a variety of possible generative mechanisms under a single modeling framework. In the examples below we show how commonly used priors in SBMs and unexplored alternatives of potential interest in criminal network studies can be obtained as special cases of (3) under appropriate choices of $W_{V,H}$ and $\sigma$.

**Example 1** (Dirichlet–multinomial, DM). Let $\sigma < 0$ and define $W_{V,H} = \beta^{H-1}/(\beta \tilde{H} + 1)^{V-1} \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} (\tilde{H} - h) \mathbb{1}(H \leq \tilde{H})$ for some $\beta = -\sigma$ and $\tilde{H} \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$. Then (3) coincides with the DM urn–scheme: $\Pr(z_{V+1} = h \mid z) \propto n_h + \beta$ for $h = 1, \ldots, H$ and $\Pr(z_{V+1} = H + 1 \mid z) \propto \beta(\tilde{H} - H) \mathbb{1}(H \leq \tilde{H})$.

**Example 2** (Dirichlet process, DP). Let $\sigma = 0$ and $W_{V,H} = \alpha^H/(\alpha)_V$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Then (3) leads to a CRP scheme: $\Pr(z_{V+1} = h \mid z) \propto n_h$ for $h = 1, \ldots, H$ and $\Pr(z_{V+1} = H + 1 \mid z) \propto \alpha$. The CRP can also be obtained as a limiting case of a DM process with $\beta = \alpha/\tilde{H}$, as $\tilde{H} \to \infty$.

**Example 3** (Pitman–Yor process, PY). Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and set $W_{V,H} = \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} (\alpha + h \sigma)/(\alpha + 1)^{V-1}$ for some $\alpha > -\sigma$. Then (3) characterizes the PY process: $\Pr(z_{V+1} = h \mid z) \propto n_h - \sigma$ for $h = 1, \ldots, H$ and $\Pr(z_{V+1} = H + 1 \mid z) \propto \alpha + H \sigma$. This scheme clearly reduces to the DP when $\sigma = 0$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>$H$ (growth)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>$\sigma &lt; 0$</td>
<td>Dirichlet–multinomial (DM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>$\sigma &lt; 0$</td>
<td>Gnedin process (GN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.a</td>
<td>Infinite</td>
<td>$\sigma = 0$</td>
<td>$O(\log V)$ Dirichlet process (DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.b</td>
<td>Infinite</td>
<td>$\sigma \in (0, 1)$</td>
<td>$O(V^\sigma)$ Pitman–Yor process (PY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A classification of Gibbs–type priors.
Example 4 (Gnedin process, GN). Let $\sigma = -1$ and $\mathcal{W}_{V,H} = (\gamma)_{V-H} \prod_{h=1}^{H-1} (h^2 - \gamma h) / \prod_{v=1}^{V-1} (v^2 + \gamma v)$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Then (3) identifies the GN process: $\text{pr}(z_{V+1} = h \mid z) \propto (n_h + 1)(V - H + \gamma)$ for $h = 1, \ldots, H$ and $\text{pr}(z_{V+1} = H + 1 \mid z) \propto H^2 - H\gamma$.

Other known and popular examples of tractable Gibbs–type priors can be found in Lijoi et al. (2007); De Blasi et al. (2013); Miller and Harrison (2018).

Examples 1–4 provide a variety of realistic generative mechanisms for the grouping structure in criminal networks, thus allowing analysts to choose the most suitable one for a given study, or possibly test different specifications under a single modeling framework. For example, DP and PY (Kemp et al., 2006) may provide useful constructions in the analysis of relatively unstable and possibly fragmented criminal organizations, such as terrorist networks, in which incoming affiliates lead to a growth in the number of structural modules characterizing the coordinating structure. As shown in Table 1, when the growth is expected to be rapid, i.e. $\mathcal{O}(V^\sigma)$, and possibility favoring the formation of low–sized groups, PY may be a more sensible choice relative to DP, which in turn would be recommended in regimes with slower increments, i.e. $\mathcal{O}(\log V)$. Organized crime, such as ’Ndrangheta, is instead characterized by a more stable and highly regulated modular architecture which might support the use of priors with a finite number $\bar{H}$ of population clusters, such as DM (Nowicki and Snijders, 2001) and GN. Clearly, in most forensic studies, $\bar{H}$ is unknown and, hence, quantifying uncertainty in $\bar{H}$ under GN provides a more realistic choice than fixing $\bar{H}$ as in DM. In fact, the GN process can be derived from DM by placing a prior on $\bar{H}$, thus making it random. Specifically, the distribution $p_{GN}(z)$ of $z$ under the GN process in Example 4 can be expressed as

$$p_{GN}(z) = \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \text{pr}_{GN}(\bar{H} = h)p_{DM}(z; 1, h),$$

where $p_{DM}(z; 1, h)$ denotes the Dirichlet–multinomial distribution in Example 1, with $\beta = 1$ and $\bar{H} = h$, whereas $\text{pr}_{GN}(\bar{H} = h) = \gamma(1 - \gamma)_{h-1}/h!$ can be interpreted as the prior on $\bar{H}$ under GN. Although different prior choices for $\bar{H}$ might be considered (Miller and Harrison, 2018; Geng et al., 2019), the GN process has conceptual and practical advantages in applications to criminal networks. First, the sequential mechanism described in Example 4 has a simple analytical expression that facilitates posterior inference and prediction. Moreover, the distribution $\text{pr}_{GN}(\bar{H} = h) = \gamma(1 - \gamma)_{h-1}/h!$ has the mode at 1, heavy tail and infinite expectation (Gnedin, 2010). Hence, the associated MFM favors parsimonious representations of the block structure underlying criminal organizations which facilitate
repressive operations, but preserves robustness to \( \bar{H} \) due to the heavy–tailed prior.

Priors on \( \bar{H} \) quantify uncertainty in the total number of groups that one would expect if \( V \to \infty \). In practice, the number of non–empty groups \( H \) occupied by the observed \( V \) nodes is of more direct interest. Under Gibbs–type priors this quantity has a closed form probability mass function which coincides with \( \text{pr}(H = h) = \mathcal{W}_{V,h}C(V, h; \sigma)\sigma^{-h} \) for every \( h = 1, \ldots, V \), where \( C(V, h; \sigma) \) denotes the so–called generalized factorial coefficient (Gnedin and Pitman, 2005). The DP case is recovered when \( \sigma \to 0 \). In https://github.com/danieledurante/ESBM and in the Supplement Materials we provide code to evaluate such quantities under the Gibbs–type priors in Examples 1–4, and then exploit these values to compute the prior expectation of \( H \), which can assist in choosing the hyperparameters. In addition to its practical relevance, such a result further clarifies the asymptotic behavior of \( H \). Indeed, the distribution of \( H \) converges to a point mass in scenario I, to a proper distribution in scenario II and to a point mass at infinity in scenario III. For instance, under GN in Example 4, we have that

\[
\text{pr}_{GN}(H = h) = \binom{V}{h} \frac{(1 - \gamma)_{h-1}(\gamma)_{V-h}}{(1 + \gamma)_{V-1}}, \quad h = 1, \ldots, V,
\]

and hence the expected value can be easily computed as \( \mathbb{E}_{GN}(H) = \sum_{h=1}^{V} h \cdot \text{pr}_{GN}(H = h) \). Note that \( \lim_{V \to \infty} \text{pr}_{GN}(H = h) = \text{pr}_{GN}(\bar{H} = h) = \gamma(1 - \gamma)_{h-1}/h! \).

The prior on \( \bar{H} \) induced by GN also guarantees posterior consistency for the estimated grouping structure. This follows from the theory for MFM in Geng et al. (2019), that actually applies to any DM with prior on \( \bar{H} \) supported on all positive integers. In particular, this holds for GN, thus providing further support for the use of such a prior in the motivating criminal network application. Instead, DP and PY may lead to inconsistent estimates for \( \bar{H} \) if the data are generated from a model with \( \bar{H}_0 < \infty \) (Miller and Harrison, 2014). Intuitively, this happens because DP and PY assume \( \bar{H} = \infty \).

Hence, we suggest Gibbs–type priors with \( \sigma \geq 0 \) only if the analyst believes that \( \bar{H}_0 = \infty \), that is, when the true number of groups is assumed to grow without bound with the number of nodes.

2.2.2 Supervised Gibbs–type priors

When node attributes \( x_v = (x_{v1}, \ldots, x_{vd})^\top \) are available for each \( v = 1, \ldots, V \), this external information may support inference on block structures, both in term of point estimation and in reduction of posterior uncertainty. As mentioned in Section 1, this is particularly relevant in applications to criminal networks where specific block structures could be purposely blurred by coverting strategies and,
hence, inclusion of informative attributes might help in revealing obscured modules. This solution should also account for the fact that node attributes collected in investigations may be error–prone.

An option to address the above goals within ESBMs in a principled manner is to rely on the PPM structure of Gibbs–type priors. Adapting results in Park and Dunson (2010) and Müller et al. (2011) to our network setting, this solution is based on the idea of replacing (2) with

$$p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{X}) \propto \mathcal{W}_{V,H} \prod_{h=1}^{H} p(\mathbf{X}_h)(1-\sigma)^{n_h-1}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_V)^\top$, whereas $\mathbf{X}_h = \{\mathbf{x}_v : z_v = h\}$ are the attributes for the nodes in cluster $h$. In (4), $p(\mathbf{X}_h)$ controls the contribution of $\mathbf{X}$ to the cluster cohesion by favoring groups that are homogeneous with respect to attribute values, while including uncertainty in the observed attributes.

Motivated by the application to the *Infinito network*, we consider the case in which each node attribute $x_v \in \{1, \ldots, C\}$ is a single categorical variable denoting a suitable combination between *locale* affiliation and role in the criminal organization. This is a common setting in criminal network studies, where node attributes often come in the form of exogenous partitions defined by the forensic agencies as a result of the investigation process. In these categorical settings, the recommended practice in the PPM literature (Müller et al., 2011) is to rely on the Dirichlet–multinomial cohesion

$$p(\mathbf{X}_h) \propto \frac{1}{\Gamma(n_h + \alpha_0)} \prod_{c=1}^{C} \Gamma(n_{hc} + \alpha_c), \quad (5)$$

where $n_{hc}$ is the number of nodes in cluster $h$ with attribute value $c$, and $\alpha_0 = \sum_{c=1}^{C} \alpha_c$, with $\alpha_c > 0$ for $c = 1, \ldots, C$. Including this cohesion function in equation (4) leads to the following urn scheme

$$\text{pr}(z_{V+1} = h | x_{V+1}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{X}) \propto \begin{cases} 
\left[\frac{(n_{hx_{V+1}} + \alpha_{x_{V+1}})}{(n_h + \alpha_0)}\right] \cdot \mathcal{W}_{V+1,H}(n_h - \sigma) & \text{for } h = 1, \ldots, H, \\
\left(\frac{\alpha_{x_{V+1}}}{\alpha_0}\right) \cdot \mathcal{W}_{V+1,H+1} & \text{for } h = H + 1.
\end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $n_{hx_{V+1}}$ is the number of nodes in cluster $h$ with the same covariate value $c = x_{V+1}$ as node $V + 1$, and $n_h$ is the total number of nodes in cluster $h$. As shown in (6), the introduction of $p(\mathbf{X}_h)$, defined as in (5), induces a probabilistic homophily structure which favors the attribution of a new node to those groups containing a higher fraction of existing nodes with its same attribute value.

Besides including realistic homophily structures, the above representation effectively accounts for possible noise in the observed predictors. Indeed, the expression for $p(\mathbf{X}_h)$ in equation (5) coincides with the marginal likelihood for the attributes of the nodes in group $h$ under the assumption that the
model underlying such quantities is defined by a multinomial with group–specific class probabilities \( \nu_h = (\nu_{1h}, \ldots, \nu_{Ch})^\top \) that are assigned a Dirichlet prior with parameters \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_C)^\top \). Under this interpretation, the supervised Gibbs–type prior in equation (4) can be re–expressed as \( p(z \mid X) \propto [W_{V,H} \prod_{h=1}^{H} (1 - \sigma)_{n_h - 1}] \prod_{h=1}^{H} p(X_h) \propto p(z)p(X \mid z) \), where \( p(z) \) denotes the unsupervised Gibbs–type prior in Section 2.2.1, whereas \( p(X \mid z) \) is the likelihood induced by the Dirichlet–multinomial model for the observed node attributes. Hence, learning block structures in \( Y \) under the supervised Gibbs–type prior can be interpreted as a two–step procedure in which the unsupervised prior on \( z \) is first updated with the likelihood for the observed attributes \( X \), and then such a first–step posterior enters as a new prior in the second step to be updated with the information from the observed network \( Y \). Under the assumption of conditional independence between \( Y \) and \( X \) given \( z \), such a two step process yields the actual posterior for \( z \), since \( p(z \mid Y, X) \propto [p(z)p(X \mid z)]p(Y \mid z) \propto p(z \mid X)p(Y \mid z) \).

3 Posterior Computation and Inference

In Section 3.1, we derive a collapsed Gibbs sampler that holds for any model within the ESBM class presented in Section 2. Then, in Section 3.2 we provide extensive tools not only for point estimation of the grouping structure, but also for uncertainty quantification, model selection and prediction. Despite their importance in routine applications including, for example, the Infinito network in Section 1.1, these three aspects have been largely neglected in the SBM literature.

3.1 Collapsed Gibbs Sampler

The availability of the urn schemes in (3) and (6) for the whole class of Gibbs–type priors allows derivation of a collapsed Gibbs sampler that holds for any ESBM (see Algorithm 1). At each iteration, we sample the group assignment of each node \( v \) from its full–conditional distribution given the

**Algorithm 1: Gibbs sampler for ESBM**

At each iteration, update the cluster assignments as follows:

For \( v = 1, \ldots, V \) do:

1. Remove node \( v \) from the network;
2. If the cluster that contained node \( v \) becomes empty, discard it [so that clusters \( 1, \ldots, H^- \) are non-empty];
3. Sample \( z_v \) from the categorical variable with probabilities as in (7) for every \( h = 1, \ldots, H^- + 1 \), where \( p(Y \mid z_v = h, z_{-v})/p(Y \mid z_{-v}) \) is defined in (8), whereas \( pr(z_v = h \mid X, z_{-v}) \) coincides with (9) or (10) depending on whether categorical node attributes are excluded or included, respectively.
Recalling Schmidt and Morup (2013), the last term in (7) can be simplified as

$$\Pr(z_v = h \mid Y, X, z_{-v}) = \Pr(z_v = h \mid X, z_{-v}) \frac{\Pr(Y \mid z_v = h, z_{-v})}{\Pr(Y \mid z_v = h, z_{-v})}. \tag{7}$$

Recalling Schmidt and Morup (2013), the last term in (7) can be simplified as

$$\frac{\Pr(Y \mid z_v = h, z_{-v})}{\Pr(Y \mid z_v = h, z_{-v})} = \prod_{k=1}^{H} \frac{B(a + m_{h,k}^- + r_{vk}, b + m_{h,k}^- + r_{vk})}{B(a + m_{h,k}^-, b + m_{h,k}^-)}, \tag{8}$$

where $m_{h,k}^-$ and $m_{h,k}^-$ denote the number of edges and non-edges between clusters $h$ and $k$, without counting node $v$, while $r_{vk}$ and $r_{vk}$ define the number of edges and non-edges between node $v$ and the nodes in cluster $k$. The prior term $\Pr(z_v = h \mid X, z_{-v})$ in (7) is directly available from either (3) or (6), depending on whether node attributes are excluded or included, respectively. In particular, the unsupervised Gibbs-type priors discussed in Section 2.2.1 yield

$$\Pr(z_v = h \mid X, z_{-v}) = \Pr(z_v = h \mid z_{-v}) \propto \begin{cases} \mathcal{W}_{V,H^-}(n_h^- - \sigma) & \text{for } h \leq H^- , \\ \mathcal{W}_{V,H^-+1} & \text{for } h = H^- + 1, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where $n_h^-$ and $H^-$ are the cardinality of cluster $h$ and the number of occupied groups, respectively, after removing node $v$ from $Y$. Whereas, the supervised extension in Section 2.2.2 leads to

$$\Pr(z_v = h \mid X, z_{-v}) \propto \begin{cases} \left[(n_{h,x_v}^- + \alpha_{x_v})/(n_h^- + \alpha_0)\right]\mathcal{W}_{V,H^-}(n_h^- - \sigma) & \text{for } h \leq H^- , \\ (\alpha_{x_v}/\alpha_0)\mathcal{W}_{V,H^-+1} & \text{for } h = H^- + 1, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where $n_{h,x_v}^-$ is the number of nodes in cluster $h$ with covariate value $c = x_v$ and $n_h^-$ is the total number of nodes in cluster $h$, both without counting node $v$. Under the priors in Table 1, both (9) and (10) admit the simple closed-form expressions reported in Examples 1–4.

Although Algorithm 1 leverages likelihood (1) with block probabilities $\theta_{hk}$ integrated out, a plug-in estimate for each $\theta_{hk}$ can be easily obtained. In particular, since $(\theta_{hk} \mid Y, z) \sim \text{Beta}(a + m_{hk}, b + m_{hk})$, we estimate $\theta_{hk}$ via

$$\hat{\theta}_{hk} = \mathbb{E}[\theta_{hk} \mid Y, z = \hat{z}] = \frac{a + \hat{m}_{hk}}{a + \hat{m}_{hk} + b + \hat{m}_{hk}}, \tag{11}$$

for each $h = 1, \ldots, \hat{H}$ and $k = 1, \ldots, h$, where $\hat{m}_{hk}$ and $\hat{m}_{hk}$ denote the number of edges and non-edges between nodes in groups $h$ and $k$ computed from the estimated cluster assignments in $\hat{z}$. In the next subsection, we describe improved methods for estimation of $z$, uncertainty quantification in group detection, model selection, and prediction.


3.2 Estimation, uncertainty quantification, model selection, prediction

While algorithmic methods return a single estimated partition, ESBM provides the whole posterior distribution over the space of node partitions. To fully exploit this posterior and perform inference directly on the space of partitions, we adapt the decision–theoretic approach of Wade and Ghahramani (2018) to the block modeling setting. In this way, we summarize posterior distributions on partitions leveraging the variation of information (\( \text{vi} \)) metric (Meilă, 2007), that quantifies distances between two clusterings by comparing their individual and joint entropies, and ranges from 0 to \( \log_2 V \). Intuitively, \( \text{vi} \) measures the amount of information in two clusterings relative to the information shared between them, thus providing a metric that decreases to 0 as the overlap between two partitions grows; see Wade and Ghahramani (2018) for a discussion of the key properties of \( \text{vi} \).

Under this framework, a formal Bayesian point estimate for \( z \) is that partition with lowest posterior averaged \( \text{vi} \) distance from the other clusterings, thus obtaining

\[
\hat{z} = \arg \min_{z'} \mathbb{E}_z [\text{vi}(z, z') \mid Y],
\]  

where the expectation is taken with respect to the posterior of \( z \). Due to the huge cardinality of the space of partitions, even for moderate \( V \), the optimization in (12) is typically carried out through a greedy algorithm (Wade and Ghahramani, 2018), as in the R package \texttt{mcclust.ext}.

The \( \text{vi} \) distance also provides natural strategies to construct credible sets around point estimates. In particular, one can define a \( 1 - \alpha \) credible ball around \( \hat{z} \) by ordering the partitions according to their \( \text{vi} \) distance from \( \hat{z} \), and defining the ball as containing all the partitions having less than a threshold distance from \( \hat{z} \), with the threshold chosen to minimize the size of the ball while ensuring it contains at least \( 1 - \alpha \) posterior probability. Summarizing this ball is non–trivial given the high–dimensional discrete nature of the space of partitions. In practice, as illustrated in our studies, one can report the partition at the edge of the ball, which we call credible bound. This form of uncertainty quantification complements the commonly–studied posterior similarity matrix that presents, for every pair of nodes, the relative frequency of MCMC samples in which such nodes are assigned to the same group. Relative to this quantity, the additional inference methods we propose are conceptually and practically more appealing as they allow estimation and uncertainty quantification directly on the space of partitions, thus facilitating interpretation and communication of the results to forensic agencies.

Another advantage of a Bayesian approach over algorithmic techniques is the possibility of model
selection through formal testing. In particular, we can test two models \( M \) and \( M' \) against each other by studying the Bayes factor (Kass and Raftery, 1995)

\[
\mathcal{B}_{M,M'} = \frac{p(Y \mid M)}{p(Y \mid M')} = \frac{\sum_z p(Y \mid z)p(z \mid M)}{\sum_z p(Y \mid z)p(z \mid M')}, \tag{13}
\]

Due to the unified structure of ESBMs, such an approach is highly general and allows comparisons between any two models in the ESBM class covering, for example, representations relying on different priors for \( z \) and formulations including or not node attributes. While for degenerate models, with \( p(z \mid M) = \delta_{z'} \), computing \( p(Y \mid M) \) reduces to evaluating (1) at a specific \( z' \) (Legramanti et al., 2020), for non-degenerate models we must rely on posterior samples \( z^{(1)}, \ldots, z^{(T)} \) from \( p(z \mid Y, M) \) to obtain an estimate of \( p(Y \mid M) \), for example through the harmonic mean (Raftery et al., 2007)

\[
\hat{p}(Y \mid M) = \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} p(Y \mid z^{(t)})^{-1} \right]^{-1}, \tag{14}
\]

where \( p(Y \mid z^{(t)}) \) is the marginal likelihood in (1) at \( z^{(t)} \). We shall note that (14) may face instabilities and slow convergence to \( p(Y \mid M) \), thus motivating other estimators (Gelman and Meng, 1998; Pajor, 2017). Such major issues did not occur in our empirical studies and results were overall coherent with other model assessment measures. Thus, we maintain (14) for its simplicity. As a global measure of goodness–of–fit we also study the misclassification error when predicting each \( y_{vu} \) with \( \hat{\theta}_{\hat{z}_v \hat{z}_u} \) from (11).

Recalling the motivating criminal network application, another fundamental goal in applied contexts is predicting the group membership \( z_{V+1} \) for a newly observed suspect \( V + 1 \). While common algorithmic strategies would require heuristic procedures, the urn scheme representation (3) of the Gibbs–type priors provides a natural construction to obtain formal estimates of group probabilities for incoming suspects, without conditioning on external attributes that are typically unavailable in early investigations of such new individuals. Combining equations (7)–(8) with the urn scheme in (3), a plug–in estimate for the predictive probabilities of the cluster allocations for node \( V + 1 \) is

\[
\Pr(z_{V+1} = h \mid Y, X, y_{V+1}, \hat{z}) = \Pr(z_{V+1} = h \mid \hat{z}) \prod_{k=1}^{\hat{H}} \frac{B(a + \hat{m}_{hk} + \hat{r}_{V+1,k}, b + \hat{m}_{hk} + \hat{r}_{V+1,k})}{B(a + \hat{m}_{hk}, b + \hat{m}_{hk})}, \tag{15}
\]

for every \( h = 1, \ldots, \hat{H} + 1 \), with \( \Pr(z_{V+1} = h \mid \hat{z}) \) as in (3). In (15), \( y_{V+1} = (y_{V+1,1}, \ldots, y_{V+1,V})^\top \) is the vector of newly observed edges between node \( V + 1 \) and those already in network \( Y \). The frequencies \( \hat{m}_{hk} \) and \( \hat{m}_{hk} \) denote instead the number of edges and non–edges between the existing nodes in groups \( h \) and \( k \) computed from the estimated cluster assignments in \( \hat{z} \), whereas \( \hat{r}_{V+1,k} \) and
\( \tilde{r}_{V+1,k} \) define the number of edges and non–edges between the incoming node \( V + 1 \) and the existing nodes in cluster \( k \), still evaluated at the estimated partition \( \hat{z} \). Note that, under the priors in Table 1, the quantity \( \text{pr}(z_{V+1} = h \mid \hat{z}) \) admits the closed–form expressions reported in Examples 1–4.

4 Simulation Studies

To assess ESBM performance and highlight benefits over state–of–the–art alternatives (Von Luxburg, 2007; Blondel et al., 2008; Amini et al., 2013), we consider three simulated networks of \( V = 80 \) nodes displaying various types of criminal block structures sampled from a SBM with \( H_0 = 5 \) groups and block probabilities either 0.75 or 0.25. As shown in Figure 3, the first network defines a horizontal criminal organization characterized by classical community patterns of varying size. The second network provides, instead, a more challenging scenario that exhibits a nested hierarchy of core–periphery, weak–community and disassortative patterns characterizing a vertical criminal organization. In particular, we assume the presence of two equally–sized macro–groups, each having a small fraction of bosses that interact with all the affiliates of the corresponding group and with an additional cluster of higher–level bosses. Finally, the last simulated network resembles more closely the block structures of the Infinito network, where we expect community patterns among the affiliates in each locale, core–periphery structures between such affiliates and the corresponding bosses, and weak–communities between the bosses of the different locali, resulting from coverting strategies.

As we will clarify in Table 3, state–of–the–art strategies (Von Luxburg, 2007; Blondel et al., 2008; Amini et al., 2013) applied to these three networks fail in recovering the true underlying blocks and show a tendency to over–collapse different groups, due to their inability to incorporate unbalanced noisy partitions and leverage attribute information. These results motivate implementation of ESBM, both with and without node attributes coinciding, in this case, with the true partition \( z_0 \). Within the Gibbs–type class, we first test the four representative unsupervised priors for \( z \) presented in Table 1, and then check whether introducing informative node attributes further improves the performance of the best unsupervised prior in each scenario. The hyperparameters are set so that the prior mean for the number \( H \) of non–empty clusters is close to \( 10 > H_0 \) under all priors. In this way we can check robustness of the results to the hyperparameter settings. Specifically, we set \( \alpha = 3 \) for the DP, \( \sigma = 0.6 \) and \( \alpha = −0.3 \) for the PY, \( \bar{H} = 50 \) and \( \beta = 3.5/50 \) for the DM, and \( \gamma = 0.45 \) for the GN. In implementing such models we consider the default uniform setting \( a = b = 1 \) for the prior on the
Figure 3: Simulated adjacency matrices in the three scenarios (one scenario per row) with side colors corresponding to the true partition (a), and posterior similarity matrices under the Gnédin process from the ESBM without (b) and with (c) node attributes, respectively. Colors on the side of matrices (b) and (c) correspond to the estimated partition.

Block probabilities and let $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_C = 1$ when including node attributes. From Algorithm 1 we obtain 40000 samples for $z$, after a conservative burn-in of 10000. In our experiments, inference has proven robust with respect to the initialization of $z$, but starting with one group for each node provides the best overall mixing, when monitored on the chain for the likelihood in (1) evaluated at the MCMC samples of $z$. Graphical analysis of the traceplots for such a chain suggests rapid convergence and effective mixing under all models. Algorithm 1 provides 150 samples of $z$ per second when implemented on an iMac with 1 Intel Core i5 3.4 GHz processor and 8 GB RAM, thus showing good efficiency. Table 2 summarizes the performance of the four priors.
Table 2: Performance of eSBM in the three scenarios with $H_0 = 5$, when excluding attributes ([unsup]), and when assisting the best unsupervised prior for each scenario with the true partition $z_0$ as node attribute ([sup]). Performance is measured by the logarithm of the marginal likelihood $\log p(Y)$ estimated as in (14), the posterior mean of the VI distance $E[\text{vi}(z, z_0) \mid Y]$ from $z_0$, the posterior median number of the non–empty clusters $H$ (with first and third quartiles in brackets), and the distance $\text{vi}(\hat{z}, z_b)$ among the estimated partition $\hat{z}$ and the 95% credible bound $z_b$.

The bolded values denote the best performances among the unsupervised priors within each column, whereas the bolded–italics values denote the best overall performance within each column.

Among the unsupervised Gibbs–type priors considered for $z$, the Gnedin process always performs slightly better in terms of marginal likelihood and posterior mean of the VI distance from the true partition $z_0$. More notably, it typically offers more accurate learning of the number of groups, with tighter interquartile ranges that always include the true $H_0 = 5$, and tighter credible balls around the VI–optimal posterior point estimate $\hat{z}$. In our experiments, GN was also the most robust to the hyperparameters. As expected, including informative attributes further improves the performance of the best unsupervised prior in each scenario, lowering by one order of magnitude $E[\text{vi}(z, z_0) \mid Y]$ and shrinking the credible balls. In a sense, this is the best setting, since we rely on the true $z_0$ as a node attribute. We also tried supervising with a random permutation of $z_0$. This resulted in a slight performance deterioration relative to the unsupervised GN prior, which is doubly reassuring. In fact, on one hand it shows that, under the proposed model selection criteria, an unsupervised prior would be preferred to one with non–informative attributes. On the other, the fact that performance deterioration is not dramatic suggests robustness in learning. According to Figure 3, unbalanced partitions are harder to infer, especially without attributes. However this gap vanishes when including informative attributes that can successfully support inference and reduce posterior uncertainty. All misclassification errors for in–sample edge prediction are about 0.24, almost matching the one...
Table 3: For the three simulation scenarios, performance comparison between ESBM with GN prior, and state–of–the–art competitors in the R libraries igraph and randnet. Such alternative strategies are the Louvain algorithm (Blondel et al., 2008), Spectral clustering (Von Luxburg, 2007) and Regularized Spectral clustering (Amini et al., 2013). The performance assessment focuses on the estimated number $\hat{H}$ of non–empty groups, the $v_i$ distance $v_i(\hat{z}, z_0)$ between the estimated and true partitions, and the absolute error between the estimated and true edge probabilities, averaged across the $V(V–1)/2$ node pairs. The bolded–italics values denote best performances within each column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>$\hat{H}$</th>
<th>$v_i(\hat{z}, z_0)$</th>
<th>Error [est]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESBM [GN unsup]</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>0.126 0.404 0.392</td>
<td>0.030 0.028 0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESBM [GN sup]</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong> <strong>0.159</strong> <strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.022</strong> <strong>0.026</strong> <strong>0.026</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvain</td>
<td>4 4 2</td>
<td>0.303 2.904 0.975</td>
<td>0.040 0.124 0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectral</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>0.557 2.806 0.497</td>
<td>0.045 0.132 0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectral [Reg]</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>0.557 2.634 0.604</td>
<td>0.045 0.121 0.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: For the three simulation scenarios, performance comparison between ESBM with GN prior, and state–of–the–art competitors in the R libraries igraph and randnet. Such alternative strategies are the Louvain algorithm (Blondel et al., 2008), Spectral clustering (Von Luxburg, 2007) and Regularized Spectral clustering (Amini et al., 2013). The performance assessment focuses on the estimated number $\hat{H}$ of non–empty groups, the $v_i$ distance $v_i(\hat{z}, z_0)$ between the estimated and true partitions, and the absolute error between the estimated and true edge probabilities, averaged across the $V(V–1)/2$ node pairs. The bolded–italics values denote best performances within each column.

expected under the true model. This suggests accurate calibration and tendency to avoid overfitting in ESBMs. Such a property is further confirmed by the performance in predicting, via (15), the group membership for 300 new nodes, among which 50 are simulated from a cluster not yet observed in the original networks. For this task, the missclassification errors under the supervised GN prior are 0.01, 0.08 and 0.09 in the first, second and third scenario, respectively.

To further clarify the magnitude of the improvements provided by the ESBM, Table 3 compares performance of GN prior — which proved the more accurate in Table 2 — with the results obtained under the state–of–the–art alternatives (Von Luxburg, 2007; Blondel et al., 2008; Amini et al., 2013) discussed in Section 1.2. In estimating $H$ under spectral clustering, we consider a variety of model selection criteria available in the R library randnet, and set $\hat{H}$ equal to the median of the values of $H$ estimated under the different strategies. These include the Beth–Hessian solution from Le and Levina (2015), the likelihood ratio strategy by Wang and Bickel (2017), and the cross–validation methods developed in Chen and Lei (2018) and Li et al. (2020). Unlike for ESBM with GN prior, these model–selection strategies display a tendency to systematically under–estimate the true number of non–empty groups, thus leading to reduced accuracy in learning the true partition and the exact edge probabilities, under spectral clustering. This accuracy reduction is also observed for the Louvain algorithm, especially in scenarios 2–3, due to the inability to account for complex block structures.
5 Application to the Infinito network

We apply the approach developed in Sections 2–3 to the Infinito network presented in Section 1.1. Despite its potential in unveiling the internal organization of ‘Ndrangheta, such a network has received little attention within the statistical literature, apart from initial analyses in Calderoni and Piccardi (2014) and Calderoni et al. (2017). These two contributions have the merit of providing early results on the relevance of block structures as key sources of knowledge to shed light on the internal architecture of criminal organizations. However, their overarching focus is on classical community structures and their relation with suspect attributes, such as locali affiliation and role. As clarified in Section 1 and in the simulation studies in Section 4, this approach rules out recurring block structures in criminal networks, fails to formally include attributes in the modeling process, and lacks extensive methods for uncertainty quantification, testing and prediction.

To address the above issues and obtain a deeper understanding of the internal structure behind La Lombardia, we provide an in–depth analysis of the Infinito network under the esbm class. As for the simulations in Section 4, we first identify a suitable candidate model by comparing the performance of the representative priors for z presented in Table 1, with hyperparameters inducing 20 expected clusters a priori. This value is four times the number of locali in the network, which seems reasonably conservative. In particular, we let $\alpha = 8$ for the dp, $\sigma = 0.725$ and $\alpha = -0.350$ for the py, $H = 50$ and $\beta = 12/50$ in the dm, and $\gamma = 0.3$ under gn. Posterior inference relies again on 40000 mcmc samples produced by Algorithm 1, after a burn–in of 10000. The traceplots for the likelihood in (1) suggest adequate mixing and rapid convergence as in the simulations, with similar running times.

As shown in Table 4, the gn prior yields the best performance also in the Infinito network, relative to the other examples of unsupervised Gibbs–type priors commonly implemented in network studies. This result also provides quantitative support for the conjecture expressed in Section 2.2.1 on the suitability of gn as a realistic prior for learning group structures in organized crime. Moreover, as seen in Table 4, supervising the gn prior with the additional information on role and locale affiliation leads to a higher marginal likelihood and lower posterior uncertainty, meaning that such attributes carry information about ‘Ndrangheta modules. Calderoni and Piccardi (2014) and Calderoni et al. (2017) investigated similar effects, but with a focus on descriptive analyses of classical community structures, thus obtaining results that partially depart from the expected vertical architecture of
Table 4: Performance of esbm in the Infinito network, when excluding attributes (unsup), and when assisting the best unsupervised prior with role–locale attributes (sup). Performance is measured by the logarithm of the marginal likelihood $\log p(Y)$ estimated as in (14). The bolded values denote the best performances among the unsupervised priors within each column, whereas the bolded–italics values denote the best overall performance within each column. We also provide the posterior median number of the non–empty clusters $H$ (with first and third quartiles in brackets), and the distance $vi(\hat{z}, z_b)$ among the estimated partition $\hat{z}$ and the 95% credible bound $z_b$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\log p(Y)$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unsup DM</td>
<td>$-791.45$</td>
<td>$14$ [14,15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsup DP</td>
<td>$-796.51$</td>
<td>$14$ [14,14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsup PY</td>
<td>$-800.37$</td>
<td>$14$ [14,14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsup GN</td>
<td>$\textbf{-788.82}$</td>
<td>$15$ [15,15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup GN</td>
<td>$\textbf{-785.82}$</td>
<td>$15$ [15,16]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Ndrangheta (Paoli, 2007; Catino, 2014). In fact, the authors obtain communities defined by unions of multiple locali, and seem unable to separate affiliates and bosses throughout the partition process. As shown in panel (a) of Figure 2, this tendency is confirmed when applying the Louvain algorithm (Blondel et al., 2008) to the Infinito network. Compared to the esbm in panel (c) of Figure 2, the Louvain algorithm leads to an overly coarsened view on the block structures in the Infinito network.

Recalling forensic theories on organized crime (e.g. Paoli, 2007; Catino, 2014), our conjecture is that 'Ndrangheta displays more complex block structures in which the pure communities among the affiliates within each locale are combined with a higher–level core–periphery coordinating structure between the bosses. Unlike for classical community detection algorithms, the esbm crucially accounts for these architectures, thus providing unprecedented empirical evidence in support of such forensic theories, as seen in Figures 4 and 5. These graphical assessments are based on a point estimate $\hat{z}$ of the partition structure under the supervised gn process prior, which we consider in the subsequent analyses of the Infinito network, due to its superior performance in Table 4 and the relatively low posterior uncertainty around the estimated partition $\hat{z}$ — the radius of the credible ball is far below the maximum achievable $vi$ distance of $\log_2 84 \approx 6.392$. To formally confirm the forensic hypotheses, we compute the Bayes factor in (13) between the supervised and unsupervised gn prior, with suspects’ attribute $X$ defining the conjectured structure. In particular, the class of each affiliate corresponds to the associated locale, whereas the bosses share a common label indicating that such members have
a leadership role in the organization. Moreover, a subset of the affiliates of the purple locale who are
know from the judicial acts\textsuperscript{1} to cover a peripheral role are assigned a distinct class. The resulting value
for $2 \log B_{\text{GN} \mid \mathbf{x}, \text{GN}}$ is 5.99, which provides a positive–strong evidence in favor of our conjecture, when
compared with the thresholds in Kass and Raftery (1995). As shown in Figure 2, such a fundamental
structure is hidden not only to community detection algorithms (Blondel et al., 2008), but also to
spectral clustering solutions (Von Luxburg, 2007) which account for more complex block structures.
This is further confirmed by the substantially higher values for the deviance $D = - \log p(Y \mid \hat{z})$ under
community detection algorithms ($D = 1185.50$) and spectral clustering ($D = 1054.37$), relative to
those provided by the unsupervised ($D = 776.39$) and supervised ($D = 774.41$) GN process prior. As
for the simulation study, in implementing spectral clustering we set $\hat{H}$ equal to the median of the
values of $H$ estimated under different selection strategies (Le and Levina, 2015; Wang and Bickel,
2017; Chen and Lei, 2018; Li et al., 2020). Since this estimate is lower than the one obtained under
the GN prior, we also compute the deviance for spectral clustering with the same number of non–
empty clusters $\hat{H} = 16$ inferred by the GN process, thus providing a more fair assessment not affected
by the different model complexities. This quantity is $D = 970.84$, thereby confirming the superior

Figure 4: Adjacency (a) and estimated edge–probability (b) matrices of the *Infinito network* with nodes re–ordered
and partitioned in blocks according to the clustering structure estimated under *ESBM* with supervised GN process prior.
Side colors correspond to the different *locali*, with darker and lighter shades denoting bosses and affiliates, respectively.
Figure 5: Network representation of the inferred clusters in the *Infinito network*. Each node denotes one group and edges are weighted by the estimated block probabilities. Node sizes are proportional to cluster cardinalities, while pie-charts represent compositions with respect to *locale* affiliations and leadership role; colors are the same as in Figure 4. To provide more direct insights, the composition with respect to role in the smaller-sized pie-charts is re-weighted to account for the fact that bosses are less frequent in the network relative to affiliates. Node positions are obtained via force-directed placement ([Fruchterman and Reingold, 1991](#)) to reflect strength of connections.

The above results are also confirmed in Figure 2, which clearly highlights the improved ability of the supervised GN process prior in learning the block structures that characterize the *Infinito network*. According to Figures 4 and 5, such modules suggest a nested partition structure mainly defined by the two macro-blocks of affiliates and bosses, which are further partitioned in sub-groups mostly coherent with the *locale* affiliation. The affiliates’ groups typically exhibit community patterns and connect to the hidden core mainly through the bosses of the corresponding *locale*, which in turn display weak assortative structures in the higher-level coordinating architecture among bosses of different *locali*. Figure 6 confirms this result by showing how affiliates’ groups are typically characterized by high local transitivity and low betweenness, whereas clusters of bosses display an opposite behavior. This is a fundamental finding which provides new empirical evidence on the attempt of ’Ndrangheta bosses to
address the tradeoff between efficiency and security (Morselli et al., 2007) via the creation of low-sized, sparse and secure core groups with a high betweenness that favors the flow of information towards larger and dense groups of affiliates, which guarantee efficiency. Besides these recurring architectures, the flexibility of esbm is also able to account for other informative local deviations. For instance, the first group in Figure 4 comprises affiliates from different locali, who were found in judicial acts¹ to have peripheral roles. Similarly, the moderate block-connectivity patterns between the purple locale and the yellow one in Figures 4–5, are consistent with the fact that the latter was created as a branching of the former¹. The green locale has instead more complex block structures among affiliates, with a fragmentation in various subgroups denoting middle-level leadership positions. According to the judicial acts¹, these positions typically refer to authority roles in overseeing criminal actions or in guaranteeing coordination between La Lombardia and leading 'Ndrangheta families in Calabria. Similar roles are covered also by the small fraction of affiliates allocated to groups of bosses. Among these affiliates it is worth highlighting the suspect allocated to a single group with the most central position in Figure 5. While not being classified as a boss in the judicial acts¹, such a suspect is a senior member of high rank in the organization with fundamental mediating roles between all the

Figure 6: Scatterplot of the average betweenness and local transitivity for each estimated cluster under the supervised gn prior. Sizes are proportional to cluster cardinalities, whereas the color of each point is set equal to the one occupying the largest portion of the associated pie-chart in Figure 5. Circles and squares represent groups mostly referring to affiliates and bosses, respectively, while the grey symbols denote cluster-specific measures computed from the partitions estimated under the Louvain algorithm (Blondel et al., 2008) (+) and spectral clustering (Von Luxburg, 2007) (×).
locali, and with the leading 'Ndrangheta families in Calabria. Hence, the actual position of such an affiliate in the vertical structure of La Lombardia may be much higher than currently reported.

As shown in Figures 2 and 6, all the above structures cannot be inferred under state–of–the–art alternatives, and therefore open new avenues to obtain a substantially improved understanding of the criminal network organization, along with refined predictive strategies for incoming affiliates. In particular, the predictive methods in Section 3.2 applied to the 34 held–out suspects in the Infinito network crucially allow one to recognize the role of incoming criminals without the need to include external information, that may not be available when a suspect is first observed. In fact, classifying the 34 held–out suspects via (15) with an unsupervised GN prior favors allocation of new affiliates to current clusters characterized by high normalized local transitivity and low normalized betweenness, whereas incoming bosses are assigned to groups with much lower difference among such quantities. More specifically, the average difference between these two network measures is 0.884 for the group of held–out affiliates, and 0.204 for the group of held–out bosses.

6 Discussion and Future Research Directions

Criminal networks provide a fundamental field of application where the advancements in network science can have a major societal impact. However, despite the relevance of such studies, there has been limited consideration of criminal networks in the statistical literature and the focus has been largely on restrictive methods that offer limited knowledge on the internal structure of criminal organizations. To cover this gap, we have proposed esbms as a broad class of realistic models that unifies most existing sbms via Gibbs–type priors. Besides providing a single methodological, theoretical and computational framework for various sbms, such a generalization facilitates the proposal of new models by exploring alternative options within the Gibbs–type class, and allows natural inclusion of attributes via connections with ppm. Both aspects are fundamental to investigate criminal networks. For example, we have shown in simulations that the Gnedin process, which to the best of our knowledge had never been used in sbms, provides a suitable prior for partition structures in organized crime, and can improve performance of the already–implemented DP, PY and DM in a variety of realistic criminal networks where routine strategies, such as community detection and spectral clustering, fail. The motivating Infinito network application clarifies the benefits of our extended
class of models and methods, providing formal unprecedented empirical evidence to several forensic theories on the internal functioning of complex criminal organizations, such as ‘Ndrangheta.

The present work offers many future directions of research. For example, the highly general and modular structure of ESBMs motivates application to modern real–world networks beyond criminal ones, and facilitates extensions to directed, bipartite and weighted networks. To address this goal, it is sufficient to substitute the beta–binomial likelihood in (1) with suitable ones, such as gamma–Poisson for count edges and Gaussian–Gaussian for continuous ones. Other types of suspect attributes beyond categorical ones can also be easily included leveraging the default choices suggested by Müller et al. (2011) for $p(\cdot)$ in (4) under continuous, ordinal and count–type attributes. Additional applications to other criminal networks and further extensions to alternative representations, such as the mixed membership SBM (Airoldi et al., 2008; Ranciati et al., 2020) and degree corrected SBM (Karrer and Newman, 2011), are also worthy of exploration. Despite the relevance of such constructions, we emphasize that in all the empirical studies in Sections 4 and 5, state–of–the–art model selection criteria (Chen and Lei, 2018; Li et al., 2020) provided support in favor of SBM rather than its degree corrected version. Moreover, while ESBM preserves interpretability and parsimony by avoiding mixed membership structures, it still allows quantification of uncertainty in the degree of affiliation to different groups via formal inference on the posterior similarity matrix and on the credible bounds.
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