

Modularity and Mutual Information in Networks: Two Sides of the Same Coin

Yongkang Guo Zhihuan Huang Yuqing Kong Qian Wang

CFCS, Computer Science Dept., Peking University
{yongkang_guo, zhihuan.huang, yuqing.kong, charlie}@pku.edu.cn

Abstract

Community structure is an important feature of many networks. One of the most popular ways to capture community structure is using a quantitative measure, modularity, which can serve as both a standard benchmark comparing different community detection algorithms, and a optimization objective for detecting communities. Previous works on modularity mainly focus on the approximation method for modularity maximization to detect communities, or minor modifications to the definition.

In this paper, we study modularity from an information-theoretical perspective and show that modularity and mutual information in networks are essentially the same. The main contribution is that we develop a family of generalized modularity measure, f -Modularity, which includes the original modularity as a special case. At a high level, we show the significance of community structure is equivalent to the amount of information contained in the network. On the one hand, f -Modularity has an information-theoretical interpretation and enjoys the desired properties of mutual information measure. On the other hand, quantifying community structure also provides an approach to estimate the mutual information between discrete random samples with a large value space but given only limited samples. We demonstrate the algorithm for optimizing f -Modularity in a relatively general case, and validate it through experimental results on simulated networks. We also apply f -Modularity to real-world market networks. Our results bridge two important fields, complex network and information theory, and also shed light on the design of measures on community structure in the future.

1 Introduction

Networks have attracted considerable attention over the past few years as a representation of real data in many complex system applications, including natural, social, and technological systems [17, 9, 23, 16, 14, 20, 24, 48, 36, 55, 6]. Among all the characteristics that have been found to occur in these networks commonly, one of the most important features is community structure [23, 17, 39, 51, 2], which comes from the fact that complex networks can be naturally partitioned into multiple modules or communities. Informally, nodes in the graph representation are grouped into sets of nodes such that each set of nodes are densely connected internally while cross-group connections are sparse.

One of the most widely used methods for analyzing community structure is modularity maximization. The modularity-based method was first proposed by Newman [42]. It aims to maximize the modularity function defined as

$$Q = \sum_i (e_{ii} - a_i^2),$$

where e_{ij} denotes the the fraction of edges in the network that connect vertices in community i to those in community j and $a_i = \sum_j e_{ij}$. Thus it actually measures the “distance” of the community structure in the real network from a random network without any community structure.

Along with the wide-acceptance of modularity, there has been extensive research on modularity-based techniques. However, while most follow-up researchers have been focusing on how to design a better method for modularity maximization to obtain a faster speed or a higher accuracy, few of them dived into modularity itself.

In this paper, we study modularity from an information-theoretical perspective and show that modularity and mutual information in networks are actually two sides of the same coin. Since the adjacency matrix of the network can be seen as the joint probability distribution of two discrete random variables, we can obtain the mutual information of them, which is intuitively related to the community structure. For example, if the adjacency matrix is a block diagonal matrix, there is naturally a good community partition with a high modularity for the network, and the value of mutual information is also high.

Following this intuition, we derive a more general definition of modularity, f -Modularity, based on f -Mutual Information [34], a generalization of Shannon mutual information. For a given network, maximizing f -Modularity is equivalent to approximating f -Mutual Information, with the adjacency matrix as the joint probability matrix of two discrete random variables. By substituting different convex functions f , we can get different instances of f -Modularity. The newly defined f -Modularity, just like Newman’s modularity, can be used to quantify community structure. Actually, by picking a particular f and adding some constraints, we will show that the original definition of modularity is a special case of ours. For other commonly used smooth convex functions, f -Modularity is easier to maximize due to the differentiability.

In addition, the process of deriving f -Modularity conversely inspires us a new approach to estimate mutual information. Determining the mutual dependence between two variables is a crucial matter in many research domains (e.g. search engine, telecommunication, machine learning [58, 11, 64, 50, 8, 32, 63]). Computing the mutual information seems straightforward given the joint probability distribution of two variables, but in real problems, mutual information can only be estimated from random samples without knowing the underlying distribution. It has been historically a hard task to estimate mutual information [49].

Many studies have focused on the estimation of mutual information between continuous random variables [7, 40, 35, 37, 60, 13, 19]. For discrete random variables, if they have only a few values with a relatively large sample size, we can obtain a good estimation of mutual information by estimating the joint distribution directly. However, things become complicated as the sample space grows larger but the number of samples is still limited. In such cases, no intrinsic structure can be utilized due to the discrete sample space, and any slight data noise of the samples will lead to a significantly different estimation result.

Our work provides a modularity-based method to estimate the mutual information between two discrete random variables with a large sample space. With proper assumptions for the underlying joint distribution, the maximum value of f -Modularity turns out to be an estimation of f -Mutual Information.

The main contribution of this paper is building a strong connection between modularity and mutual information in networks. The key insight is that the significance of community structure equals the amount of information contained in the network. Our approach develops a family of generalized modularity measure, f -Modularity, which has an information-theoretical interpretation and enjoys the desired properties of mutual information measure (Section 3). For the two tasks maximizing f -Modularity and approximating f -Mutual Information, we can achieve them both at the same time. The results of experiments on both simulated data and real-world data are shown in Section 4.

2 Related Work

We divide the related work into three parts. The first part introduces the research based on the modularity proposed by Newman [46], the second part includes the research on mutual information estimation, and the third part discusses the research that also combines community structure and information theory.

Modularity: Newman and Girvan [46] proposed Girvan–Newman algorithm, which splits the network into communities by the iterative removal of the edges with large centrality. This paper also defined a measure of network complexity as a stopping criterion, called modularity. In the next year, an alternative approach directly based on the idea of modularity maximization was proposed by Newman [42]. In order to avoid that an exhaustive search of all possible divisions will take at least an exponential amount of time, Newman chose an approximation algorithm based on a standard greedy optimization [42]. The algorithm divides the network into two parts, then repeats previous steps to divide those parts, and so forth [42, 44]. We will explain that Newman’s modularity is a special case of our f -Modularity. When we select a particular f function and add some constraints, the form of f -Modularity is the same as that in Newman’s algorithm.

As Brandes et al. [5] proved modularity maximization is a NP-complete problem, any efficient, i.e. polynomial-time, algorithm is only heuristic and yields suboptimal partitions on many instances. There are many modularity-based approximate optimization methods, with different methods offering different balances between lower complexity and higher accuracy [9, 25, 15, 17, 31, 4, 26]. Rather than pursuing a better approximation algorithm, our work pays more attention on the mathematical extension for modularity itself .

Despite the popularity of modularity, modularity-based approaches suffer from shortcomings, like resolution limit [18]. Hence several new quantitative metrics based on similar ideas, have been proposed to overcome the limitations, including modularity density [38], local modularity [41] and weighted modularity [27]. Compared to them, our extension for modularity is further, so that it can touch another important field, information theory.

Reichardt and Bornholdt [52] showed modularity maximization is equivalent to Hamiltonian minimization for a spin glass. Newman [45] showed the equivalence between modularity optimization and maximum likelihood methods for community detection. Similarly, our work also focuses on the underlying probabilistic interpretation of modularity.

Mutual Information Estimation: As for mutual information, most research on computing mutual information focused on continuous random variables rather than discrete random variables, perhaps because of the intrinsic structure of the sample space. Common approaches for the estimation include binning approach, likelihood-ratio estimators and kernel-density estimators [7, 40, 35, 37, 60, 13, 19]. Recent state-of-art approaches usually involve neural networks. Kong and Schoenebeck [33] proposed to train neural networks that take each sample pair of random variables as input and outputs values related to the probability density of the pair. Belghazi et al. [3] offered a general-purpose parametric neural estimator of mutual information based on dual representations of the KL-Divergence.

Recently there are some studies on the mutual information between a discrete variable and a continuous variable [54, 21, 30], but there is very little work considering the estimation of mutual information between two discrete variables. Seok and Kang [56] used recursive adaptive partitioning to calculate the mutual information between two discrete variables with many values. [28] considered an asymmetry case where one discrete random variable has a large number of effective states while the other has only a few, and provided a low-bias estimator for mutual information. In our study, since the joint probability matrix is regarded as the normalized adjacency matrix of a network, we make reasonable assumptions on the underlying distribution of the two discrete random variables. In this way, we can actually reduce the dimension of the sample space to obtain a robust estimation of mutual information.

Previous works combining community structure and information theory: Although both modularity and mutual information have a long history in the field of networks, there has never been a study that formally and closely connected them before.

Ziv et al. [65] proposed a new modularity measure as a summary of the network structure. As they distinguished, their newly defined “network modularity” and Newman’s modularity, referred as “partition modularity” in their paper, are not the same thing and have no mathematical connection. They considered the community detection as an information compression problem and designed an iterative algorithm based on the information bottleneck method [61], which involves mutual information. Our work follows Newman’s modularity and generalize it to a new family of modularity measures based on a generalized version of mutual information.

Danon et al. [12] proposed normalized mutual information (NMI) as a standard benchmark to compare different approaches for community detection. Their work used mutual information to quantify the relationship between the ground-truth communities and the algorithm-detected communities. In contrast, we compute the mutual information based on the adjacency matrix of the graph, which does not involve any ground truth. We use mutual information to quantify community structure.

Corso et al. [10] investigated mutual information as a general measure of structure in bipartite networks. They considered networks with different topologies, including modular networks, nested networks and compound networks with nested modules. Their mutual information was also calculated based on the adjacency matrix. However, unlike our paper, they did not consider the extension from Shannon mutual information to f -Mutual Information, nor the connection to modularity. They assumed the normalized adjacency matrix with sufficient samples already converges to the underlying distribution, while we consider the data noise and employ a duality approach to improve the robustness of mutual

information estimation.

3 f-modularity

In this section, we will derive f -Modularity from f -Mutual Information, a generalization of Shannon mutual information. After introducing our model with some basic notations, we will provide the definition of f -Modularity, based on the dual form of f -Mutual Information. By choosing different convex functions f and constraint sets C , we will get different instances of f -Modularity, one of which corresponds to the definition of Newman’s modularity. Finally, we illustrate an approximation algorithm to optimize the f -Modularity, in the case of differentiable objective functions and low rank constraints.

3.1 Frequency Matrix and Random Matrix

This subsection formally describes our setting for networks. First, we define the frequency matrix of a network as follows.

Definition 3.1 (Frequency Matrix \mathbf{F}). *Given a bipartite multigraph $G = \langle U, V, E \rangle$ and its biadjacency matrix \mathbf{B} , where $B_{u,v}$ is the number of edges between $u \in U$ and $v \in V$, the frequency matrix is defined as $\mathbf{F} := \mathbf{B}/N$ where $N = \sum_{u \in U, v \in V} B_{u,v}$ is the total number of edges. For a non-bipartite multigraph $G = \langle V, E \rangle$, given its adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} , we define $\mathbf{F} := \mathbf{A}/N$ where $N = \sum_{u,v \in V} A_{u,v}$.*

Our work can be applied to both bipartite networks and non-bipartite networks. Since any adjacency matrix of a non-bipartite multigraph can be treated as the biadjacency matrix of a bipartite multigraph, *w.l.o.g.*, we will mainly focus on bipartite networks. In the following context, a “network”, if not particularly indicated, refers to a bipartite network and a “graph”, if not particularly indicated, refers to a multigraph. The similar statement for non-bipartite networks holds with only slight modifications.

Here are two examples of the frequency matrix.

Example 3.2 (Country-Product). *U is a set of countries and V is a set of products. If country u exports product v , $B_{u,v} = 1$, otherwise, $B_{u,v} = 0$.*

Example 3.3 (Word-Context). *U is a set of words and V is a set of contexts. $B_{u,v}$ is the frequency that word u appears in context v among all N observations.*

Next, we will follow Newman [42] to define a null model, a random matrix. At a high level, modularity is a compact form measuring the distance from the real network to the random network. Here we use the same idea, but more precisely.

Definition 3.4 (Random Matrix \mathbf{J}). *Given a bipartite multigraph $G = \langle U, V, E \rangle$ and its frequency matrix \mathbf{F} , the random matrix \mathbf{J} (or the null model) is defined as*

$$J_{u,v} = (\deg(u) \deg(v) - \frac{1}{N} F_{u,v}) \frac{N}{N-1},$$

where $\deg(u) := \sum_{j \in V} F_{u,j}$ and similarly $\deg(v) := \sum_{i \in U} F_{i,v}$.

If the N edges of \mathbf{G} is N i.i.d. samples of random variables (X, Y) whose realizations are in (U, V) , the expected $F_{u,v}$ is the joint distribution $\Pr[X = u, Y = v]$. The expected $\deg(u)$ is the marginal distribution $\Pr[X = u]$ and the expected $\deg(v)$ is $\Pr[X = v]$, so $\deg(u)\deg(v)$ approximately estimates the product of the marginal distribution $\Pr[X = u]\Pr[Y = v]$. The following Lemma 3.5 tells us, it is \mathbf{J} in Definition 3.4 that makes an unbiased estimation.

Lemma 3.5. $E[J_{u,v}] = \Pr[X = u]\Pr[Y = v]$

Proof of Lemma 3.5.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j NF_{u,j} \sum_i NF_{i,v} &= (\sum_j \sum_n I_n(u, j)) (\sum_i \sum_{n'} I_{n'}(i, v)) \\ &= \sum_{n, n'} (\sum_j I_n(u, j)) (\sum_i I_{n'}(i, v)) \\ &= \sum_n I_n(u, v) + \sum_{n \neq n'} \sum_{i, j} I_n(u, j) I_{n'}(i, v) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_n(u, v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the } n\text{-th edge is } (u, v), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\sum_j NF_{u,j} \sum_i NF_{i,v}] &= \sum_n \Pr[X = u, Y = v] + \sum_{n \neq n'} \sum_{i, j} \Pr[X = u, Y = j] \Pr[X = i, Y = v] \\ &= N * \Pr[X = u, Y = v] + N(N - 1) \Pr[X = u] \Pr[Y = v]. \end{aligned}$$

By simple transformations, we have

$$E[J_{u,v}] = \Pr[X = u] \Pr[Y = v].$$

□

3.2 f -Divergence and Dual Version of f -Divergence

This subsection introduces f -Divergence, Fenchel's duality and f -Mutual Information. These are the main technical ingredients for defining f -Modularity.

Definition 3.6 (f -Divergence [1]). f -Divergence $d_f : \Delta_\Sigma \times \Delta_\Sigma \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a non-symmetric measure of the difference between distribution $\mathbf{p} \in \Delta_\Sigma$ and distribution $\mathbf{q} \in \Delta_\Sigma$ and is defined to be

$$d_f(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \mathbf{q}(\sigma) f\left(\frac{\mathbf{p}(\sigma)}{\mathbf{q}(\sigma)}\right),$$

where $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function and $f(1) = 0$.

KL-Divergence and Total Variance Distance are two common f -Divergences. When we pick $f(t) = t \log(t)$, we get KL-Divergence $d_{KL}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_\sigma \mathbf{p}(\sigma) \log \frac{\mathbf{p}(\sigma)}{\mathbf{q}(\sigma)}$, and when we pick $f(t) = |t - 1|$, we get Total Variance Distance $d_{TVD}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_\sigma |\mathbf{p}(\sigma) - \mathbf{q}(\sigma)|$.

Definition 3.7 (Fenchel Duality [53]). *Given any function $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we define its convex conjugate f^* as a function that also maps \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} such that*

$$f^*(x) = \sup_t tx - f(t).$$

Some common f functions for f -Divergence and their dual forms are shown in Table 1 [34].

Table 1: Reference Table for f, f^*

f -Divergence	$f(t)$	$\partial f(D)$	$f^*(\partial f(D))$
Total Variation Distance	$ t - 1 $	$\text{sgn}(\log D)$	$\text{sgn}(\log D)$
KL-Divergence	$t \log t$	$1 + \log D$	D
Pearson χ^2	$(t - 1)^2$	$2(D - 1)$	$D^2 - 1$
Jensen-Shannon	$-(t + 1) \log \frac{t+1}{2} + t \log t$	$\log \frac{2D}{1+D}$	$-\log(\frac{2}{1+D})$
Squared Hellinger	$(\sqrt{t} - 1)^2$	$1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{D}}$	$\sqrt{D} - 1$

Lemma 3.8 (Dual version of f -Divergence [47]).

$$d_f(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}) \geq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} u(\sigma) \mathbf{p}(\sigma) - \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} f^*(u(\sigma)) \mathbf{q}(\sigma) = \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}} u - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}} f^*(u)$$

where \mathcal{U} is a set of functions that maps Σ to \mathbb{R} . The equality holds if and only if $u(\sigma) \in \partial f(\frac{\mathbf{p}(\sigma)}{\mathbf{q}(\sigma)})$, i.e., the subdifferential of f on value $\frac{\mathbf{p}(\sigma)}{\mathbf{q}(\sigma)}$.

Function u is a distinguisher between distribution \mathbf{p} and distribution \mathbf{q} and the best distinguisher u^* maximizes the right side to be the f -Divergence between \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{q} . With the above lemma, we can also write a dual form as

$$d_f(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}) = \sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}} \partial f(D) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}} f^*(\partial f(D))$$

where \mathcal{D} is also a set of functions that maps Σ to \mathbb{R} and the best D^* satisfies $D^*(\sigma) = \frac{\mathbf{p}(\sigma)}{\mathbf{q}(\sigma)}$.

f -Mutual Information measures the correlation between two random variables X and Y . If the joint distribution $\Pr[X, Y]$ equals to the product of the marginal distributions $\Pr[X] \Pr[Y]$, X and Y has no correlation. f -Mutual Information measures correlation via f -Divergence between the joint distribution, denoted by XY , and the product of the marginal distributions, denoted by $X \otimes Y$.

Definition 3.9 (f -Mutual Information [34]). *Given two random variables X, Y , the f -Mutual Information between X and Y is defined as*

$$\text{MI}^f(X; Y) = d_f(XY; X \otimes Y) := \sum_{x, y} \Pr[X = x] \Pr[Y = y] f\left(\frac{\Pr[X = x, Y = y]}{\Pr[X = x] \Pr[Y = y]}\right)$$

where d_f is f -Divergence.

We use MI^f as the abbreviation of f -Mutual Information. For some specific f -Divergence such as Pearson χ^2 , we write it as $\text{MI}^{\text{Pearson}}$ or Pearson-MI. Two examples of f -Mutual Information are Shannon mutual information by picking f -Divergence as KL-Divergence [11] and $\text{MI}^{TV^D}(X; Y) := \sum_{x,y} |\Pr[X = x, Y = y] - \Pr[X = x] \Pr[Y = y]|$ by picking f -Divergence as Total Variation Distance.

Lemma 3.10 (Properties of f -Mutual Information [34]). *f -Mutual Information satisfies*

Symmetry $\text{MI}^f(X; Y) = \text{MI}^f(Y; X)$;

Non-negativity $\text{MI}^f(X; Y)$ is always non-negative and is 0 if X is independent of Y ;

Information-monotonicity $\text{MI}^f(T(X); Y) \leq \text{MI}^f(X; Y)$ where $T(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Sigma_X| \times |\Sigma_X|}$ is a possibly random operator on X whose randomness is independent of Y .

3.3 f -Modularity and Constraint Set

By Lemma 3.8, we have the dual form of f -Mutual Information,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MI}^f(X; Y) &= \sup_D \mathbb{E}_{XY} \partial f(D) - \mathbb{E}_{X \otimes Y} f^*(\partial f(D)) \\ &= \sum_{u,v} \partial f(D_{u,v}) \Pr[X = u, Y = v] - f^*(\partial f(D_{u,v})) \Pr[X = u] \Pr[Y = v]. \end{aligned}$$

This inspires the definition of f -Modularity:

Definition 3.11 (f -Modularity). *Given a bipartite multigraph \mathbf{G} whose frequency matrix is $\mathbf{F} \in [0, 1]^{U \times V}$, a constraint set C , the f -Modularity of \mathbf{G} is defined as*

$$\text{Mod}^f(\mathbf{G}) := \max_{\mathbf{D} \in C} \sum_{u,v} (\partial f(D_{u,v}) F_{u,v} - f^*(\partial f(D_{u,v})) J_{u,v}).$$

We use Mod^f as the abbreviation of f -Modularity. When picking some specific f -Divergence such as Pearson χ^2 , we write it as $\text{Mod}^{\text{Pearson}}$ or Pearson-Modularity. f -Modularity in a non-bipartite network is defined in the same way.

Matrix \mathbf{D} is the distinguisher that aims to separate the frequency matrix \mathbf{F} and the random matrix \mathbf{J} . Thus, f -Modularity not only is related to the amount of information in the graph, but also quantifies the concept of community structure by measuring the statistical distance between \mathbf{F} and \mathbf{J} . In addition, it inherits information-theoretical properties from f -Mutual Information, which we will validate based on multiple numerical experiments (see Section 4).

The constraint set C in the above definition controls the robustness of f -Modularity. If C is too rich, the robustness will be hurt and if C is too restricted, the two matrices may not be separated properly. A natural low-rank constraint, $C = \{\mathbf{D} | \text{Rank}(\mathbf{D}) \leq r\}$, can be a proper choice. With a low rank constraint $C = \{\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{Q}^\top | \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{U \times r}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times r}\}$, the definition can be rewritten as

$$\text{Mod}^f(\mathbf{G}) := \max_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}} \sum_{u,v} (\partial f(\mathbf{P}_u(\mathbf{Q}_v)^\top) F_{u,v} - f^*(\partial f(\mathbf{P}_u(\mathbf{Q}_v)^\top)) J_{u,v})$$

where \mathbf{P}_u denotes the u^{th} row of matrix \mathbf{P} (similar for \mathbf{Q}_v). Maximizing f -Modularity also finds the optimal embedding of vertices in U and V in r -dimensional space \mathbb{R}^r , \mathbf{P}^* and \mathbf{Q}^* . Thus intuitively, maximizing f -Modularity is actually equivalent to detecting r communities with overlapping, where one vertex can belong to more than one community. In the cases with proper constraints, such as Example 3.16 in the next subsection, it can output a fairly good partition without overlapping.

Remark 3.12 (Non-bipartite Multigraph). *For the non-bipartite multigraph, since there is only one set of vertices, the low rank constraint will be picked as $C = \{\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\top | \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{|U| \times r}\}$.*

3.4 Special Cases of f -Modularity

By plugging different convex functions f from Table 1, we can obtain several special cases of f -Modularity.

Example 3.13 (TVD-Modularity). *By picking $f(t) = |t - 1|$ and replacing $\text{sgn}(\log(D_{u,v}))$ by $S_{u,v} \in \{-1, 1\}$, we obtain*

$$\text{Mod}^{\text{tvd}}(\mathbf{G}) := \max_{\mathbf{S} \in \{-1, 1\}^{|U| \times |V|}} \sum_{u,v} S_{u,v} (F_{u,v} - J_{u,v})$$

Example 3.14 (KL-Modularity). *By picking $f(t) = t \log t$,*

$$\text{Mod}^{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{G}) := \max_{\mathbf{D} \in C} \sum_{u,v} ((1 + \log(D_{u,v}))F_{u,v} - D_{u,v}J_{u,v})$$

Example 3.15 (Pearson-Modularity). *By picking $f(t) = (t - 1)^2$,*

$$\text{Mod}^{\text{Pearson}}(\mathbf{G}) := \max_{\mathbf{D} \in C} \sum_{u,v} (2(D_{u,v} - 1)F_{u,v} - (D_{u,v}^2 - 1)J_{u,v})$$

Newman's modularity \approx TVD-Modularity Interestingly, with proper constraints, TVD-Modularity will lead to the original definition of modularity [43]. Newman's modularity is defined on a non-bipartite network, which can also fit for a bipartite network with a slight modification. For a non-bipartite network represented as a multigraph $G = \langle V, E \rangle$, we denote g_v to be the community to which vertex $v \in V$ belongs. With the notations of our model, Newman's modularity can be written as

$$Q = \sum_{u,v} (F_{u,v} - J_{u,v}) \delta(g_u, g_v),$$

where $\delta(r, s) = 1$ if $r = s$ and 0 otherwise. Although we define the random matrix differently from Newman, but notice that $J_{u,v} \approx \text{deg}(u) \text{deg}(v)$ when N is sufficiently large.

Let us consider the division of a non-bipartite network into just two communities as the greedy algorithm described in Newman [42, 44]. The index vector \mathbf{s} is defined as

$$s_v = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if vertex } v \text{ belongs to community 1,} \\ -1 & \text{if vertex } v \text{ belongs to community 2.} \end{cases}$$

Then we can write Newman's modularity in the form

$$Q = \sum_{u,v} (F_{u,v} - J_{u,v}) s_u s_v.$$

Example 3.16 (TVD-Modularity with 1-rank constraint on \mathbf{S}). *Given a non-bipartite network, with the constraint set $C := \{\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{s}\mathbf{s}^\top, \mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V| \times 1}\}$,*

$$\text{Mod}^{tvd}(\mathbf{G}) := \max_{\mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V| \times 1}} \mathbf{s}^\top (\mathbf{F} - \mathbf{J}) \mathbf{s}$$

In such case, TVD-Modularity is equivalent to original modularity by Newman [43]. For the division of a non-bipartite network into more than two communities, we just need to relax the 1-rank constraint to a r -rank ($r > 1$) version .

For other commonly used smooth convex functions, f -Modularity is easier to maximize due to the differentiability. Taking Example 3.15,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mod}^{Pearson}(\mathbf{G}) &= -1 + \max_{\mathbf{D} \in C} \sum_{u,v} (2D_{u,v}F_{u,v} - D_{u,v}^2J_{u,v}) \quad (\sum_{u,v} F_{u,v} = \sum_{u,v} J_{u,v} = 1) \\ &- 1 + \max_{\mathbf{D} \in C} \sum_{u,v} -J_{u,v} \left(D_{u,v} - \frac{F_{u,v}}{J_{u,v}} \right)^2 + J_{u,v} \left(\frac{F_{u,v}}{J_{u,v}} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to a weighted low rank approximation problem, on which there exists multiple algorithms [59, 57].

3.5 Optimization

The optimization of Newman’s modularity requires to find a solution in a discrete space, $\mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$. Our f -Modularity can avoid this difficulty by choosing smooth convex functions f , such as that in Pearson χ^2 -Divergence. Here we propose an approximation algorithm based on an efficient low-rank approximation subroutine. It works for a family of smooth convex functions f under the low-rank constraint.

Without constraint, Lemma 3.8 shows that the optimal distinguisher \mathbf{D}^* satisfies that for all u, v , $D_{u,v}^* = \frac{F_{u,v}}{J_{u,v}}$. Thus, with a low-rank constraint, optimizing the f -Modularity finds a distinguisher \mathbf{D}_r which is a low-rank approximation of \mathbf{D}^* . Thus, instead of optimizing the f -Modularity directly, we first compute the low-rank approximation of \mathbf{D}^* by a more efficient algorithm, Singular Value Decomposition (SVD). If we require the output to be non-negative, we can use Non-negative Matrix Factorization (NMF) [22]. We then replace the matrix \mathbf{D} in f -Modularity by the low-rank approximation of \mathbf{D}^* , \mathbf{D}_r . To select the rank, we will determine a threshold θ and pick the minimal r such that $\frac{\|\mathbf{D}^* - \mathbf{D}_k\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{D}^*\|_F^2} < \theta$ where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm.

4 Experiments

In this section, we validate our algorithm on numerical datasets and apply this algorithm to real-world datasets. In the numerical experiment part, we generate multiple bipartite multigraphs from known distributions. In our numerical experiments, we show that f -Modularity 1) estimates f -Mutual Information, 2) decreases as communities are contracted, and 3) vanishes when there is no community structure. We also apply our algorithm to a European procurement markets network [62] to illustrate the changes in their community structures.

Algorithm 1: Approximation of f -Modularity

Input: Frequency matrix \mathbf{F} , threshold θ

Output: Low-rank Distinguisher \mathbf{D}_r , modularity M

Initialization : $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$;

$J_{u,v} = (\deg(u) \deg(v) - \frac{1}{N} F_{u,v}) \frac{N}{N-1}$; // Compute the corresponding random matrix

$D_{u,v}^* = F_{u,v} / \max(J_{u,v}, \epsilon)$; // Use a small constant ϵ to avoid extreme cases.

$r = \arg \min_k \frac{\|\mathbf{D}^* - \mathbf{D}_k\|_F^2}{\|\mathbf{D}^*\|_F^2} < \theta$; // rank selection

$\mathbf{D}_r = \text{SVD}(\mathbf{D}^*, r)$; // Use SVD to obtain a rank- r approximation, can change to NMF

$M = \sum_{u,v} (\partial f(D_{u,v}) F_{u,v} - f^*(\partial f(D_{u,v})) J_{u,v})$;

4.1 Numerical Experiment

Data Generation We use the stochastic block model as the generator [29]. Given the ground truth partition with several communities, the model generates edges between vertices with the probability only depending on which community each endpoint belongs to. We use a special case of stochastic block model here to adapt to our setting so that the sum of probability over all edges is equal to 1. Fig. 1 shows an example of the model.

In detail, we initially have two sets of vertices (U, V) where the vertices are divided into m communities, $\{(U_1, V_1), (U_2, V_2), \dots, (U_m, V_m)\}$. Each community has $2n$ vertices and $|U_i| = |V_i| = n, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. For all vertex v , recall that we denote g_v to be the community to which vertex v belongs. For simplicity, we treat each community indifferently and set a hyper-parameter α ($0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$). We will generate a bipartite multigraph $G = \langle U, V, E \rangle$ with the probability of edge (u, v) to be

$$p(u, v) \propto \begin{cases} 1 & g_u = g_v, \\ \alpha & g_u \neq g_v, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

for all $u \in U, v \in V$. We will normalize this $(mn) \times (mn)$ matrix such that $\sum_{u,v} p(u, v) = 1$. The normalized matrix can be regarded as a joint probability distribution between two random variables X and Y with $\Pr[X = u, Y = v] = p(u, v)$. In our experiment, we generate $(mn)^2$ edges independently based on the underlying probability distribution matrix.

Community Contraction f -Modularity is defined based on f -Mutual Information thus inherits the properties in Lemma 3.10. First, f -Modularity is symmetric, i.e., $\text{Mod}^f(\langle U, V, E \rangle) = \text{Mod}^f(\langle V, U, E \rangle)$. Second, f -Modularity is non-negative and vanishes with a high probability when the graph has no community structure. Third, f -Modularity is approximately monotone regarding the level of community structure. Formally, recall that f -Mutual Information satisfies $\text{MI}^f(T(X); Y) \leq \text{MI}^f(X; Y)$ where $T(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Sigma_X| \times |\Sigma_X|}$ is a possibly random operator on X whose randomness is independent of Y . Performing operator T essentially multiplies a transition matrix to the joint distribution matrix over X and Y . From the perspective of network, if we reduce the level of community structure




Figure 1: **Stochastic block model.** We illustrate the model by a toy case where the number of communities $m = 3$, the size of each community $n = 3$ and $\alpha = 0.1$. The left matrix represents the underlying probability distribution and the right one shows the frequency matrix of a randomly generated graph.




Figure 2: **Community contraction process.** We contract the first two communities in the left one to obtain the right one.

by multiplying a transition matrix to the original graph distribution, f -Modularity will decrease.

Particularly, we pick a particular transition operator, community contraction, and check whether f -Modularity decreases as we contract the communities. In detail, we contract two communities $(U_1, V_1), (U_2, V_2)$ by allocating the probability evenly within the merged community. That is, for all $u \in U_1 \cup U_2, v \in V_1 \cup V_2$, we set the new probability of the edge (u, v) to be

$$p'(u, v) = \frac{\sum_{s \in U_1 \cup U_2, t \in V_1 \cup V_2} p(s, t)}{|U_1 \cup U_2| |V_1 \cup V_2|}.$$

Results We use Pearson-Modularity ¹ in our numerical experiments. We compare our method to a *baseline* estimator. The mutual information measure takes the joint distribution matrix as input and the baseline estimator uses the frequency matrix as input directly in Definition 3.9. From Fig. 3, we observe that

- **non-negativity:** our estimated Pearson-Modularity is non-negative and approximately vanishes when the graph does not have a community structure;
- **monotonicity:** when we contract communities, the estimated Pearson-Modularity approximately decreases;

¹We also evaluate KL-Modularity where we pick f -Divergence as KL-Divergence. We defer the results to the appendix.




Figure 3: **Pearson-Modularity under community contraction.** We consider size 200×200 bipartite random graphs with 40000 edges under different α . The initial distribution has 5 identical communities and we contract the communities in the sequence of $(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) \rightarrow (12)(3)(4)(5) \rightarrow (12)(34)(5) \rightarrow (12)(345) \rightarrow (12345)$. For each stage, we independently generate 100 random graphs based on underlying distribution and show the means and standard deviations on the above figure. The gray line is the theoretical value, the true Pearson-MI. The blue line shows the results of the baseline estimator and the green and orange lines are estimated by our algorithm. In particular, the orange line uses the true rank of the real distribution matrix, and the green line uses the method in our algorithm to select the rank with a consistent threshold $\theta = 0.9$. The heat maps below illustrate the corresponding distribution matrix.

- **noise elimination:** compared to the baseline, since we simulate relatively sparse networks, our estimated Pearson-Modularity provides a much more accurate estimation for the true Pearson-MI.

Thus, the results show that the estimated Pearson-Modularity inherits information-theoretical properties and provides a good estimation for the underlying true Pearson-MI.

4.2 Case Study on Real-world Market Data

We apply our f -Modularity calculation approach to a real-world dataset of public procurement contracts from EU member states covering 2008–2016 [62]. It contains 4,098,771 contracts in 26 countries. Since the participants in public procurement market can be clearly divided into winners and issuers, we can describe the market as a bipartite multigraph, with each edge representing a contract. Then we can study how the modularity changes in each country’s public procurement market from 2008 to 2016. We divide all countries into three categories based on the number of participants. Countries with size less than 3,000 are classified as category small, those between 3,000 and 10,000 are classified as category medium, and those over 10,000 are classified as category large.

We continue to use Pearson-Modularity and threshold 0.9 in our real-data experiments. Figure 4 shows how the modularity changes in countries of category small. We observe that the curves of Portugal and Slovakia have changed greatly. Figure 5 and Figure 6 show the results of the category medium and category large.

5 Conclusion

We propose a generalized modularity, f -Modularity, based on f -Mutual Information. When choosing the f -Divergence as Total Variance Distance and adding the low-rank constraint, we find this special case of f -Modularity matches the original modularity, which provides an information-theoretical interpretation to the concept of modularity.

We also give an algorithm that estimates f -Modularity. We validate this algorithm by multiple numerical experiments and apply it to real-world market network data to track how the modularity changes with national policies. This shows that our f -Modularity calculation approach can potentially be used to measure the effectiveness of the policy.

The optimization of f -Modularity conversely helps estimate the f -Mutual Information in the network. This is one of the few studies that considers the mutual information between discrete random variables with many values. This work focuses on the low-rank constraint. In the future, we will explore not only better rank selection algorithms but also different constraints. Another future work is to study networks with different topologies, like nested networks. Following the previous work [10], we will employ information-theoretical tools to quantify more features in networks other than modularity.

References

- [1] Syed Mumtaz Ali and Samuel D Silvey. 1966. A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 28, 1 (1966), 131–142.




Figure 4: **Modularity changes in public procurement market (small)**. In the figure above, each polyline represents the modularity changes of a country’s public procurement market from 2008 to 2016. We observe that among these countries, only the modularity in Portugal’s public procurement market has decreased significantly. This may be due to the fact that Portugal established Government Shared Services Entity (eSPap) in 2012 to unify the management of the public procurement market. The establishment of eSPap improves the efficiency of information circulation in the market and prevents participants from signing contracts with only a few specific objects, thereby reducing the modularity of the network. At the same time, we found that Slovakia’s modularity fluctuates greatly. A possible explanation is that Slovakia changed its policies several times between 2011 and 2015 in order to achieve the goal of “National Action Plan on Green Public Procurement in the Slovak Republic for years 2011 to 2015” (NAP GPP II).




Figure 5: **Modularity changes in public procurement market (medium)**. The above figure shows the market's modularity changes in countries of category medium. We notice that the modularity of these countries is generally decreasing except for Finland.




Figure 6: **Modularity changes in public procurement market (large)**. The above figure shows the market's modularity changes in countries of category large. Compared to smaller categories, the modularity of large public procurement markets is relatively stable, except for Germany and Poland whose modularity continuously decreases.

- [2] Punam Bedi and Chhavi Sharma. 2016. Community detection in social networks. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 6, 3 (2016), 115–135.
- [3] Mohamed Ishmael Belghazi, Aristide Baratin, Sai Rajeshwar, Sherjil Ozair, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Devon Hjelm. 2018. Mutual information neural estimation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 531–540.
- [4] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment* 2008, 10 (2008), P10008.
- [5] Ulrik Brandes, Daniel Delling, Marco Gaertler, Robert Gorke, Martin Hoefer, Zoran Nikoloski, and Dorothea Wagner. 2007. On modularity clustering. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering* 20, 2 (2007), 172–188.
- [6] Ed Bullmore and Olaf Sporns. 2009. Complex brain networks: graph theoretical analysis of structural and functional systems. *Nature reviews neuroscience* 10, 3 (2009), 186–198.
- [7] Atul J Butte and Isaac S Kohane. 1999. Mutual information relevance networks: functional genomic clustering using pairwise entropy measurements. In *Biocomputing 2000*. World Scientific, 418–429.
- [8] Peng Cao, Yilun Xu, Yuqing Kong, and Yizhou Wang. 2018. Max-MIG: an Information Theoretic Approach for Joint Learning from Crowds. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [9] Hocine Cherifi, Gergely Palla, Boleslaw K Szymanski, and Xiaoyan Lu. 2019. On community structure in complex networks: challenges and opportunities. *Applied Network Science* 4, 1 (2019), 1–35.
- [10] Gilberto Corso, Gabriel MF Ferreira, and Thomas M Lewinsohn. 2020. Mutual Information as a General Measure of Structure in Interaction Networks. *Entropy* 22, 5 (2020), 528.
- [11] Thomas M Cover. 1999. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] Leon Danon, Albert Diaz-Guilera, Jordi Duch, and Alex Arenas. 2005. Comparing community structure identification. *Journal of statistical mechanics: Theory and experiment* 2005, 09 (2005), P09008.
- [13] Georges A Darbellay and Igor Vajda. 1999. Estimation of the information by an adaptive partitioning of the observation space. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 45, 4 (1999), 1315–1321.
- [14] Yon Dourisboure, Filippo Geraci, and Marco Pellegrini. 2007. Extraction and classification of dense communities in the web. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World Wide Web*. 461–470.
- [15] Jordi Duch and Alex Arenas. 2005. Community detection in complex networks using extremal optimization. *Physical review E* 72, 2 (2005), 027104.

- [16] Gary William Flake, Steve Lawrence, C Lee Giles, and Frans M Coetzee. 2002. Self-organization and identification of web communities. *Computer* 35, 3 (2002), 66–70.
- [17] Santo Fortunato. 2010. Community detection in graphs. *Physics reports* 486, 3-5 (2010), 75–174.
- [18] Santo Fortunato and Marc Barthelemy. 2007. Resolution limit in community detection. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 104, 1 (2007), 36–41.
- [19] Andrew M Fraser and Harry L Swinney. 1986. Independent coordinates for strange attractors from mutual information. *Physical review A* 33, 2 (1986), 1134.
- [20] Linton Freeman. 2004. The development of social network analysis. *A Study in the Sociology of Science* 1 (2004), 687.
- [21] Weihao Gao, Sreeram Kannan, Sewoong Oh, and Pramod Viswanath. 2017. Estimating mutual information for discrete-continuous mixtures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.06212* (2017).
- [22] Nicolas Gillis. 2020. *Nonnegative Matrix Factorization*. SIAM.
- [23] Michelle Girvan and Mark EJ Newman. 2002. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 99, 12 (2002), 7821–7826.
- [24] Roger Guimera and Luis A Nunes Amaral. 2005. Functional cartography of complex metabolic networks. *nature* 433, 7028 (2005), 895–900.
- [25] Roger Guimera, Marta Sales-Pardo, and Luís A Nunes Amaral. 2004. Modularity from fluctuations in random graphs and complex networks. *Physical Review E* 70, 2 (2004), 025101.
- [26] Jiahao Guo, Pramesh Singh, and Kevin E Bassler. 2019. Reduced network extremal ensemble learning (RENEEL) scheme for community detection in complex networks. *Scientific reports* 9, 1 (2019), 1–11.
- [27] Nandinee Fariah Haq, Mehdi Moradi, and Z Jane Wang. 2019. Community structure detection from networks with weighted modularity. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 122 (2019), 14–22.
- [28] Damián G Hernández and Inés Samengo. 2019. Estimating the Mutual Information between Two Discrete, Asymmetric Variables with Limited Samples. *Entropy* 21, 6 (2019), 623.
- [29] Paul W Holland, Kathryn Blackmond Laskey, and Samuel Leinhardt. 1983. Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks* 5, 2 (1983), 109–137.
- [30] Qinghua Hu, Lei Zhang, David Zhang, Wei Pan, Shuang An, and Witold Pedrycz. 2011. Measuring relevance between discrete and continuous features based on neighborhood mutual information. *Expert Systems with Applications* 38, 9 (2011), 10737–10750.

- [31] Bisma S Khan and Muaz A Niazi. 2017. Network community detection: A review and visual survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.00977* (2017).
- [32] Ivan Kojadinovic. 2005. On the use of mutual information in data analysis: an overview. In *Proc Int Symp Appl Stochastic Models Data Anal.* 738–47.
- [33] Yuqing Kong and Grant Schoenebeck. 2018. Water from two rocks: Maximizing the mutual information. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation.* 177–194.
- [34] Yuqing Kong and Grant Schoenebeck. 2019. An information theoretic framework for designing information elicitation mechanisms that reward truth-telling. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)* 7, 1 (2019), 1–33.
- [35] Alexander Kraskov, Harald Stögbauer, and Peter Grassberger. 2004. Estimating mutual information. *Physical review E* 69, 6 (2004), 066138.
- [36] Ann E Krause, Kenneth A Frank, Doran M Mason, Robert E Ulanowicz, and William W Taylor. 2003. Compartments revealed in food-web structure. *Nature* 426, 6964 (2003), 282–285.
- [37] Nojun Kwak and Chong-Ho Choi. 2002. Input feature selection by mutual information based on Parzen window. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 24, 12 (2002), 1667–1671.
- [38] Zhenping Li, Shihua Zhang, Rui-Sheng Wang, Xiang-Sun Zhang, and Luonan Chen. 2008. Quantitative function for community detection. *Physical review E* 77, 3 (2008), 036109.
- [39] Fragkiskos D Malliaros and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2013. Clustering and community detection in directed networks: A survey. *Physics reports* 533, 4 (2013), 95–142.
- [40] Young-Il Moon, Balaji Rajagopalan, and Upmanu Lall. 1995. Estimation of mutual information using kernel density estimators. *Physical Review E* 52, 3 (1995), 2318.
- [41] Stefanie Muff, Francesco Rao, and Amedeo Caffisch. 2005. Local modularity measure for network clusterizations. *Physical Review E* 72, 5 (2005), 056107.
- [42] Mark EJ Newman. 2004. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks. *Physical review E* 69, 6 (2004), 066133.
- [43] Mark EJ Newman. 2006. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Physical review E* 74, 3 (2006), 036104.
- [44] Mark EJ Newman. 2006. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 103, 23 (2006), 8577–8582.
- [45] Mark EJ Newman. 2016. Equivalence between modularity optimization and maximum likelihood methods for community detection. *Physical Review E* 94, 5 (2016), 052315.
- [46] Mark EJ Newman and Michelle Girvan. 2004. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical review E* 69, 2 (2004), 026113.

- [47] XuanLong Nguyen, Martin J Wainwright, and Michael I Jordan. 2010. Estimating divergence functionals and the likelihood ratio by convex risk minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 56, 11 (2010), 5847–5861.
- [48] Gergely Palla, Imre Derényi, Illés Farkas, and Tamás Vicsek. 2005. Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society. *nature* 435, 7043 (2005), 814–818.
- [49] Liam Paninski. 2003. Estimation of entropy and mutual information. *Neural computation* 15, 6 (2003), 1191–1253.
- [50] Hanchuan Peng, Fuhui Long, and Chris Ding. 2005. Feature selection based on mutual information criteria of max-dependency, max-relevance, and min-redundancy. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 27, 8 (2005), 1226–1238.
- [51] Mason A Porter, Jukka-Pekka Onnela, and Peter J Mucha. 2009. Communities in networks. *Notices of the AMS* 56, 9 (2009), 1082–1097.
- [52] Jörg Reichardt and Stefan Bornholdt. 2006. Statistical mechanics of community detection. *Physical review E* 74, 1 (2006), 016110.
- [53] R Tyrrell Rockafellar et al. 1966. Extension of Fenchel’duality theorem for convex functions. *Duke mathematical journal* 33, 1 (1966), 81–89.
- [54] Brian C Ross. 2014. Mutual information between discrete and continuous data sets. *PloS one* 9, 2 (2014), e87357.
- [55] Mikail Rubinov and Olaf Sporns. 2010. Complex network measures of brain connectivity: uses and interpretations. *Neuroimage* 52, 3 (2010), 1059–1069.
- [56] Junhee Seok and Yeong Seon Kang. 2015. Mutual information between discrete variables with many categories using recursive adaptive partitioning. *Scientific reports* 5, 1 (2015), 1–10.
- [57] Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Alon Gonen, and Ohad Shamir. 2011. Large-scale convex minimization with a low-rank constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1106.1622* (2011).
- [58] Claude E Shannon. 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal* 27, 3 (1948), 379–423.
- [59] Nathan Srebro and Tommi Jaakkola. 2003. Weighted low-rank approximations. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*. 720–727.
- [60] Taiji Suzuki, Masashi Sugiyama, Jun Sese, and Takafumi Kanamori. 2008. Approximating mutual information by maximum likelihood density ratio estimation. In *New challenges for feature selection in data mining and knowledge discovery*. PMLR, 5–20.
- [61] Naftali Tishby, Fernando C Pereira, and William Bialek. 2000. The information bottleneck method. *arXiv preprint physics/0004057* (2000).

- [62] Johannes Wachs, Mihály Fazekas, and János Kertész. 2020. Corruption risk in contracting markets: a network science perspective. *International journal of data science and analytics* (2020).
- [63] Janett Walters-Williams and Yan Li. 2009. Estimation of mutual information: A survey. In *International Conference on Rough Sets and Knowledge Technology*. Springer, 389–396.
- [64] Yilun Xu, Peng Cao, Yuqing Kong, and Yizhou Wang. 2019. L_DMI: A Novel Information-theoretic Loss Function for Training Deep Nets Robust to Label Noise. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 6222–6233.
- [65] Eytan Ziv, Manuel Middendorf, and Chris H Wiggins. 2005. Information-theoretic approach to network modularity. *Physical Review E* 71, 4 (2005), 046117.

Appendix




Figure 7: **KL-Modularity under community contraction.** We estimate KL-Modularity in the above figures. The corresponding KL-MI is Shannon mutual information. The logarithmic term in KL-Modularity requires that its input matrix must be non-negative. Thus, we use NMF instead of SVD in our algorithm. Other settings are the same as Fig. 3.