

Detectability of hierarchical communities in networks

Leto Peel^{1,2,*} and Michael T. Schaub^{3,†}

¹*Institute of Data Science, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Maastricht University*

²*Department of Data Analytics and Digitalisation,*

School of Business and Economics, Maastricht University

³*Department of Computer Science, RWTH Aachen University*

We study the problem of recovering a planted hierarchy of partitions in a network. The detectability of a single planted partition has previously been analysed in detail and a phase transition has been identified below which the partition cannot be detected. Here we show that, in the hierarchical setting, there exist additional phases in which the presence of multiple consistent partitions can either help or hinder detection. Accordingly, the detectability limit for non-hierarchical partitions typically provides insufficient information about the detectability of the complete hierarchical structure, as we highlight with several constructive examples.

In the last decade, important theoretical advances have been made concerning community detection in networks. In their seminal work [1], Decelle et al. conjectured that a theoretical detectability limit exists, below which no efficient (i.e., polynomial time complexity) community detection algorithm can perform better than a random assignment. This limit has been formulated in terms of the planted partition model, a random graph model in which the nodes are split into k non-empty communities. Nodes in the same community are then connected with probability p_{in} and nodes in different communities are connected with probability p_{out} . The (correctly ordered) adjacency matrix of the graph can thus be described by k^2 blocks, where the diagonal blocks can be described by $d_{\text{in}} = np_{\text{in}}/k$, the expected number of edges within the same community, and the off-diagonal blocks can be described by $d_{\text{out}} = np_{\text{out}}/k$, the expected number of edges between a pair of distinct communities (for simplicity we allow for self-loops). For a network with n nodes and k groups of equal size, the condition for detectability can then be written as:

$$(d_{\text{in}} - d_{\text{out}})^2 \geq \langle d \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle d \rangle = d_{\text{in}} + (k-1)d_{\text{out}}$ is the expected degree of any node in the graph. The detectability limit is reached when Eq. (1) holds with equality.

The conjecture that there is such a detectability limit was first proven by a series of papers for the case $k=2$: Masoulié et al. [2] and Mossel et al. [3] independently provided sharp upper bounds for the detectability threshold. Mossel et al. [4] then provided a matching lower bound, thereby confirming the conjectured threshold in Eq. (1) holds for $k=2$. Since then we have seen numerous theoretical advances extending these results. Surveys of these advances and a historical overview are presented by Abbe [5] and Moore [6].

Until now, the focus of all these theoretical developments has been on the detection of a single partition of a network. Here we consider a setting where *multiple* consistent partitions exist at different resolutions, and

we are interested in the detectability of *all* of these partitions. More precisely, we are interested in networks that contain hierarchical groupings, in which communities are further divided into subgroups. Using theoretical arguments and computational experiments we will show that, compared to detecting a single partition, an even richer picture emerges when considering the detectability of these hierarchical groupings.

Detectability of a network partition. We start by briefly reviewing the situation for recovering a single partition from a graph generated from a stochastic block model (SBM). For simplicity, we will focus on undirected networks. The SBM is a probabilistic generative model from which we can sample networks of a finite size with a specified community structure. The SBM assigns each of the n nodes in a network to one of k groups of nodes. Here we assign nodes to groups according to a uniform distribution such that each node is assigned to any group with probability $1/k$. Each link A_{ij} of the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n \times n}$ is (up to the symmetry of the matrix) an independent Bernoulli random variable with a parameter that depends only the group assignments of nodes i and j . To compactly describe the model, we collect all these Bernoulli parameters in a symmetric affinity matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} \in [0,1]^{k \times k}$, in which the element Ω_{rs} represents the probability of an edge occurring between a node in group r and a node in group s . We represent the group assignment using a partition indicator matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \{0,1\}^{n \times k}$ with entries $H_{ij} = 1$ if node i belongs to group j and $H_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The expected adjacency matrix under the SBM is written as

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{H},\mathbf{\Omega}] = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{\Omega}\mathbf{H}^\top. \quad (2)$$

A special case of the SBM is the planted partition model, in which the affinity matrix comprises two parameters: $\Omega_{rr} = p_{\text{in}}$, representing the within group connectivity, and $\Omega_{rs} = p_{\text{out}}$ (for $r \neq s$, representing the across group connectivity). We can write the affinity matrix for a graph with n nodes and a k -group planted partition as:

$$\mathbf{\Omega} = p_{\text{in}}\mathbf{I}_k + p_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{1}_k\mathbf{1}_k^\top - \mathbf{I}_k), \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{I}_k and $\mathbf{1}_k$ are the k -dimensional identity matrix and the k -dimensional vector of all-ones, respectively.

The detectability limit as originally expressed in terms of Eq. (1) [1, 5, 6] is based on a planted partition model with equally sized groups in the limit where $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the connection probabilities p_{in} and p_{out} scale as $1/n$. Consequently, each node has a constant expected degree and the generated networks are sparse. Rearranging Eq. (1), we can write an expression for the signal-to-noise ratio for a planted partition (SNR_{PP}),

$$\text{SNR}_{\text{PP}} = \frac{(d_{\text{in}} - d_{\text{out}})^2}{\langle d \rangle}. \quad (4)$$

A lower SNR_{PP} indicates that the partition is harder to detect. Below the limit $\text{SNR}_{\text{PP}} = 1$, the partition becomes undetectable.

For the more general case of an SBM (with affinity matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$ and group indicator matrix \mathbf{H}), Abbe and Sandon [7] defined a more general signal-to-noise ratio as a function of the eigenvalues of the matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{H}$. With the eigenvalues $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_k|$ ordered in non-increasing magnitude, the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR_λ) is given as:

$$\text{SNR}_\lambda = \frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda_1}. \quad (5)$$

Here $\text{SNR}_\lambda = 1$ corresponds to the detectability limit and is equivalent to Eq. (4) for the planted partition model. A higher SNR_λ implies that it is easier to recover the planted partition. However, in the following section we will see that, for a hierarchical community partition, SNR_λ is not really informative about the detectability of the complete hierarchy.

We remark that as \mathbf{Q} is a non-negative matrix, λ_1 will always be non-negative according to Perron-Frobenius theory and SNR_λ is therefore always non-negative. Moreover, it can be shown that the eigenvalues of \mathbf{Q} correspond precisely to the nonzero eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{\Omega}]$.

Detectability of hierarchical partitions. We now consider a setup in which the network under consideration contains a hierarchical planted partition. The hierarchy consists of a coarse partition and a fine partition. The coarse partition contains k_1 equally-sized groups. Each group in the coarse partition is further partitioned into k_2 equally-sized groups to create the fine partition that contains $k = k_1 k_2$ groups in total. We will focus on the case that $k_1 = k_2 = 2$ and a three-parameter affinity matrix:

$$\mathbf{\Omega} = \frac{1}{n} \begin{bmatrix} a & b & c & c \\ b & a & c & c \\ c & c & a & b \\ c & c & b & a \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where a, b and c are parameters that do not depend on n . More generally, however, we can express the rescaled

matrix $\mathbf{Q} = n\mathbf{\Omega}/k$ for a two-level hierarchy as:

$$\mathbf{Q} = \frac{1}{k} [\mathbf{I}_{k_1} \otimes \boldsymbol{\omega} + c(\mathbf{1}_{k_1} \mathbf{1}_{k_1}^\top - \mathbf{I}_{k_1}) \otimes \mathbf{1}_{k_2} \mathbf{1}_{k_2}^\top], \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{where } \boldsymbol{\omega} = a\mathbf{I}_{k_2} + b(\mathbf{1}_{k_2} \mathbf{1}_{k_2}^\top - \mathbf{I}_{k_2}). \quad (7b)$$

The corresponding eigenvalues of \mathbf{Q} take three distinct values α_1, α_2 and α_3 , with different multiplicities:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= [a + (k_2 - 1)b + (k_1 - 1)k_2 c]/k && (\text{once}) \\ \alpha_2 &= [a + (k_2 - 1)b - k_2 c]/k && (k_1 - 1 \text{ times}) \\ \alpha_3 &= (a - b)/k && (k - k_1 \text{ times}). \end{aligned}$$

The eigenvalue with the largest magnitude will always be $\lambda_1 = \alpha_1$. The second largest eigenvalue λ_2 will depend on the parameters b and c . Since $\alpha_2 - \alpha_3 = (b - c)/k_1$, the second largest eigenvalue will be $\alpha_2 > \alpha_3$ when $b > c$ and $\alpha_3 > \alpha_2$ when $c > b$. In the degenerate case where $b = c$, both eigenvalues will be equal and the hierarchical community structure simply reduces to a planted partition into k groups.

To see why SNR_λ cannot be informative about the complete hierarchy, we can inspect the subspaces associated with these eigenvalues. The $(k_1 - 1)$ dimensional subspace $\mathcal{A}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ associated with the eigenvalue α_2 can be spanned by eigenvectors of the form:

$$v_t^{(s)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (s-1)k_2 < t \leq sk_2 \\ -1 & \text{if } sk_2 < t \leq (s+1)k_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (8)$$

where $v_t^{(s)}$ is the t -th element of the s -th eigenvector $\mathbf{v}^{(s)}$ with eigenvalue α_2 , where the index s ranges from $1 \leq s \leq (k_1 - 1)$. These eigenvectors relate to differences in link density between blocks at the coarse level, i.e., each entry of the vector $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}^{(s)}$ takes the expected sum of edges in one coarse block and subtracts the sum of edges in another coarse block. Similarly the $(k - k_2)$ dimensional subspace $\mathcal{A}_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ associated with the eigenvalue α_3 can be spanned by shifts of $[1, -1, 0, \dots, 0]^\top$ that analogously relate to the differences in link density between the fine-grained blocks. Hence, SNR_λ will be determined entirely by the differences at *either* the coarse *or* the fine hierarchical level, with no consideration to the nested structure of the problem. In fact, in the prototypical hierarchical case in which $b \gg c$, the value of SNR_λ will be driven entirely by the coarse group structure and the subgroup structure will be irrelevant, which is clearly not ideal.

To analyze the detectability of the partitions at each level of the hierarchy, we introduce two formulae for the signal-to-noise ratio that are commensurate with Eq. (4). First, we consider the signal-to-noise ratio $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$ to capture the detectability of the coarse partition at the first level of the hierarchy,

$$\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}} = \frac{(d_{\text{in}}^{(1)} - d_{\text{out}}^{(1)})^2}{\langle d \rangle}, \quad (9)$$




Figure 1. Increasing the SNR of the coarsest partition does not improve the finest partition. Fixing $\text{SNR}_{\text{fine}} = 1$ and varying $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$, we see that the performance of recovering the partition into 4 groups at second level of the hierarchy tends to the performance of random bipartitions of the groups at the first level.

where the degree parameters $d_{\text{in}}^{(1)}$ and $d_{\text{out}}^{(1)}$ are given by:

$$d_{\text{in}}^{(1)} = a/k + (k_2 - 1)b/k, \quad (10)$$

$$d_{\text{out}}^{(1)} = k_2 c/k = c/k_1, \quad (11)$$

and the average degree of the network is calculated as $\langle d \rangle = [a + (k_2 - 1)b + (k_1 - 1)k_2 c]/k = \alpha_1$, which corresponds to $\langle d \rangle = d_{\text{in}}^{(1)} + (k_1 - 1)d_{\text{out}}^{(1)}$ similar to the planted partition case.

Second, we define the signal-to-noise ratio SNR_{fine} to capture the detectability of the fine partition at the second level of the hierarchy,

$$\text{SNR}_{\text{fine}} = \frac{(d_{\text{in}}^{(2)} - d_{\text{out}}^{(2)})^2}{\langle d \rangle}, \quad (12)$$

where the corresponding in- and out-degree parameters are given by:

$$d_{\text{in}}^{(2)} = a/k \quad (13)$$

$$d_{\text{out}}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{k-1}[(k_2 - 1)b/k + (k - k_2)c/k]. \quad (14)$$

Using Eqs. (9) and (12) above, we can set the SNR for the coarse and fine partitions separately, within the constraints of preserving the mean degrees. Figure 1 illustrates this point and shows the partition recovery performance for a planted hierarchy with $k_1 = k_2 = 2$ and $k = 4$ groups. Performance is based on spectral clustering using the Bethe Hessian [8], where the number of groups are known. (In all experiments we use networks with $n = 4^7$ nodes.) This approach has previously been demonstrated to have near-optimal partition recovery performance right down to the detectability limit. Partition recovery is measured by means of the adjusted mutual

information (AMI) [9], for which $\text{AMI} = 0$ indicates performance as good as random guessing and $\text{AMI} = 1$ equals perfect recovery. In this experiment the fine partition is fixed at the limit of detectability (fix $\text{SNR}_{\text{fine}} = 1$), while we vary the detectability of the coarse partition (vary $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$). We see that as we increase $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$ the recovery performance increases for both partitions. However, while we can eventually reach perfect recovery for the coarse partition, the performance on the fine partition is bounded by a performance equivalent to choosing a random subpartitions of the coarse partition.

This shows numerically that the general signal-to-noise ratio SNR_λ does not give us an indication here that the fine split is effectively unrecoverable. Indeed SNR_λ is here equal to the signal-to-noise ratio of the more dominant coarse partition $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}} = \text{SNR}_\lambda$. To analyse the interplay between the two hierarchical partition levels in more details, we parametrize the ratio of the two signal to noise ratios via the ratio $\gamma := \text{SNR}_{\text{fine}}/\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$. Considering the regime in which $d_{\text{in}}^{(1)} \geq d_{\text{out}}^{(1)}$ and $d_{\text{in}}^{(2)} \geq d_{\text{out}}^{(2)}$, we can compactly reparametrize the affinity matrix [Eq. (7)] in terms of γ , $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$, and the average degree $\langle d \rangle$. Using this parametrization we can investigate the hierarchical detection problem in more detail.

Figure 2 displays the performance of recovering the fine partition, relative to a non-hierarchical planted partition into four groups (Fig. 2A) and relative to the coarse partition of the hierarchy (Fig. 2B), as we vary γ and $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$. Specifically, in Figure 3A we compare the recovery of a “flat” non-hierarchical planted partitions vs a hierarchical partitions with the same number of groups. We set $\text{SNR}_{\text{PP}} = \text{SNR}_{\text{fine}}$ (indicated by contours) to ensure a fair comparison. We see that for low values of SNR_{PP} the hierarchical partition is easier to recover as the presence of the coarse partition provides partial information about the fine partition. However, as we increase SNR_{PP} , we encounter a region where the hierarchical partition becomes harder to detect than the flat planted partition. Once both $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$ and SNR_{fine} are sufficiently high (around $\text{SNR}_{\text{PP}} \geq 6$) we find that the performance of flat and hierarchical partitions becomes equal.

In Figure 3B we compare the performance of recovering the fine partition relative to recovery of the coarse partition. As $\gamma \leq 1$, it means that $\text{SNR}_{\text{fine}} \leq \text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$ and so it is unsurprising to see that the coarser partition is often easier to detect than the finer partition. However, it may be less intuitive to see that as $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ the finer partition becomes more detectable, particularly when $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$ is small.

To investigate these transitions further, we set up another experiment in which we fixed the coarse signal to noise ratio at $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}} = 25$, and the average degree to $\langle d \rangle = 150$ and varied the ratio γ . Figure 3 shows the results of this experiment and we see that as we vary γ we encounter four distinct phases. A spy plot of an example adjacency matrix for each phase is shown in the bottom




Figure 2. Performance of recovering hierarchical planted partitions. (A) Difference in Adjusted mutual information (AMI) scores for recovering flat partitions versus hierarchical partitions as a function of the coarse signal-to-noise ratio ($\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$) and the ratio $\gamma = \frac{\text{SNR}_{\text{fine}}}{\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}}$. (B) Difference in AMI scores for recovering the finest partition versus the coarsest partition in the hierarchy.

of the figure.

In the first phase ($0 < \gamma < \sim 0.049$) the parameters of the affinity matrix have the relation $b > a > c$ and both levels of the hierarchy are detectable and the coarse partition is fully recoverable. In the second phase ($\sim 0.049 < \gamma < \sim 0.198$) the parameters a and b are approximately equal, which makes the fine partition undetectable beyond detection of the coarse partition, i.e., we can do no better than randomly partitioning each of the two coarse groups into two subgroups. We can use this observation to calculate the boundaries of this phase by considering the nested detectability limit of the fine groups within the coarse groups. This limit occurs when the nested SNR is equal to 1,

$$\text{SNR}_{\text{nested}} = \frac{(a-b)^2}{k_2(a+b(k_2-1))} = \frac{(a-b)^2}{k_2^2 g} = 1, \quad (15)$$

where $g = k_1 d_{\text{in}}^{(1)}$ is average in-degree of the coarse groups. Then we can derive the values of the parameters $a, b = g \pm \sqrt{k_1 g}$, where the factor k_1 adjusts for the fact that the subgraph of one of the coarse groups only contains n/k_1 nodes. In the third phase ($\sim 0.198 < \gamma < 1$) the parameters of the affinity matrix have the relation $a > b > c$, representing an assortative hierarchy in which the link density is concentrated in the diagonal blocks. Both hierarchical partitions are detectable in this phase with high accuracy. However, as $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ we see a drop in performance in detecting the coarse partition. This drop in performance occurs because when $\gamma = 1$, there is effectively no coarse partition in the hierarchy, since $b = c = \langle d \rangle - \sqrt{\langle d \rangle}$ and so we simply have a planted partition




Figure 3. Detection of hierarchical communities as a function of the ratio $\gamma = \frac{\text{SNR}_{\text{fine}}}{\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}}$. We fix $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}} = 25$ and as we vary the ratio γ the relationship between the three block densities a, b and c transitions across 4 different phases. Note that when $\gamma > 1$, spectral clustering prefers the partition $\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}$ (or the equivalent partition $\{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\}$) instead of $\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}$. At $\gamma = 0.2$ ($\text{SNR}_2 = 5$) there appears to be a detectability threshold for the partition into four groups, below which it is not possible to detect the finest partition any better than randomly partitioning the two groups in the coarser partition into four groups.

into four groups. In the final phase ($\gamma > 1$) the parameters of the affinity matrix have the relation $a > c > b$ and both partitions should be detectable because $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}} > 1$ and $\text{SNR}_{\text{fine}} > 1$. However, instead we observe poor performance for the spectral clustering in detecting the coarse partition into two groups, even though we can perfectly recover the fine partition. This observation is a result from a degeneracy in the solution: any three partitions created by pairing up the four groups at the finest level will result in a “good” partition at least in terms of spectral clustering. Consequently, we have a situation in which communities are detectable, but non-identifiable [10].

Conclusion. We have shown that the presence of multiple, consistent planted partitions can either enhance or diminish the detectability relative to networks with a single planted partition. Neither the general signal-to-noise ratio SNR_λ , nor the individual ratios $\text{SNR}_{\text{coarse}}$ and SNR_{fine} are sufficient on their own to describe the detectability of hierarchical partitions. Instead we must use these in combination with $\text{SNR}_{\text{nested}}$ in order to identify the complete set of phase transitions. In future we will investigate the effect of multiple inconsistent (i.e., non-nested) partitions [1, 11].

MTS was supported by the Ministry of Culture and Science (MKW) of the German State of North Rhine-

Westphalia (“NRW Rückkehrprogramm”).

* l.peel@maastrichtuniversity.nl

† schaub@cs.rwth-aachen.de

- [1] Aurelien Decelle, Florent Krzakala, Cristopher Moore, and Lenka Zdeborová, “Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications,” *Physical Review E* **84**, 066106 (2011).
- [2] Laurent Massoulié, “Community detection thresholds and the weak ramanujan property,” in *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (2014) pp. 694–703.
- [3] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly, “A proof of the block model threshold conjecture,” *Combinatorica* **38**, 665–708 (2018).
- [4] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly, “Reconstruction and estimation in the planted partition model,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **162**, 431–461 (2015).
- [5] Emmanuel Abbe, “Community detection and stochastic block models: Recent developments,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **18**, 1–86 (2018).
- [6] Cristopher Moore, “The computer science and physics of community detection: Landscapes, phase transitions, and hardness,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.00467 (2017).
- [7] Emmanuel Abbe and Colin Sandon, “Detection in the stochastic block model with multiple clusters: proof of the achievability conjectures, acyclic bp, and the information-computation gap,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.09080 (2015).
- [8] Alaa Saade, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová, “Spectral clustering of graphs with the bethe hessian,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27* (2014) pp. 406–414.
- [9] Nguyen Xuan Vinh, Julien Epps, and James Bailey, “Information theoretic measures for clusterings comparison: Variants, properties, normalization and correction for chance,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11**, 2837–2854 (2010).
- [10] Michael T. Schaub and Leto Peel, “Hierarchical community structure in networks,” in preparation (2020).
- [11] Leto Peel, Daniel B. Larremore, and Aaron Clauset, “The ground truth about metadata and community detection in networks,” *Science Advances* **3** (2017), 10.1126/sciadv.1602548.