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Abstract

The $\beta$-model is a powerful tool for modeling network generation driven by node degree heterogeneity. Its simple yet expressive nature particularly well-suits large and sparse networks, where many network models become infeasible due to computational challenge and observation scarcity. However, existing estimation algorithms for $\beta$-model do not scale up; and theoretical understandings remain limited to dense networks. This paper brings several major improvements to the method and theory of $\beta$-model to address urgent needs of practical applications. Our contributions include: 1. method: we propose a new $\ell_2$ penalized MLE scheme; we design a novel algorithm that can comfortably handle sparse networks of millions of nodes, much faster and more memory-parsimonious than any existing algorithm; 2. theory: we present new error bounds on beta-models under much weaker assumptions; we also establish new lower-bounds and new asymptotic normality results; distinct from existing literature, our results cover both small and large regularization scenarios and reveal their distinct asymptotic dependency structures; 3. application: we apply our method to large COVID-19 network data sets and discover meaningful results.
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1 Introduction

1.1 The $\beta$-model: formulation, motivating data examples and previous work

The $\beta$-model, named by Chatterjee et al. (2011), is an exponential random graph model (ERGM) with the degree sequence as the exclusively sufficient statistic. It is a popular model for networks mainly driven by degree heterogeneity. Under this model, an undirected and binary network of $n$ nodes, represented by its adjacency matrix $A = (A_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, is generated by

$$
P(A_{i,j} = 1) = \frac{e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*}}{1 + e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*}}, \quad A_{i,j} = A_{j,i}, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq n$$

(1)
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where \( \beta^* = (\beta^*_1, \ldots, \beta^*_n) \) denote the true model parameters, and \( \{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \) are mutually independent. Set \( A_{i,i} \equiv 0 \) for all \( i \). The negative log-likelihood function is

\[
L(\beta) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \log \left(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}\right) - n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i d_i.
\]

(2)

where \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) are observed node degrees: \( d_i = \sum_{j \neq i} A_{i,j} \).

The \( \beta \)-model is a simple, yet expressive tool for describing degree heterogeneity, a feature of paramount importance in many networks (Albert and Barabási, 2002; Babai et al., 1980; Fienberg, 2012). Here we briefly describe two motivating data sets that demonstrate the significant merits of \( \beta \)-model. The first data set contains social networks between a group of Swiss students before and during COVID-19 lockdown (Elmer et al., 2020). For privacy protection, the researchers only released the total number of connections/interactions of each student, but not the detailed adjacency matrix. The \( \beta \)-model particularly well-fits this type of network data collected or released with strong privacy since it only requires the degrees for parameter estimation, as is evident according to (2). Our second motivating data set is a citation network extracted from a massive COVID-19 knowledge graph (Steenwinckel et al., 2020). It contains \( n \approx 10^7 \) non-isolated nodes with just \( 2.1 \times 10^7 \) million edges. For this very large and sparse network, we need a simple model, for two reasons: high requirement of computational efficiency, and scarcity of available information. These considerations make \( \beta \)-model a very good candidate. We will present detailed analysis of these two data sets using our proposed method; see Section 5.

Since its birth, the \( \beta \)-model has attracted a lot of research interest. The early-year works Chatterjee et al. (2011); Hillar and Wibisono (2013); Holland and Leinhardt (1981); Park and Newman (2004); Rinaldo et al. (2013); Yan and Xu (2013) study basic model properties and establish existence, consistency and asymptotic normality of the vanilla MLE. Then the research branched into a few main directions. Chen and Olvera-Cravioto (2013); Stein and Leng (2021); Yan (2017); Yan et al. (2019, 2016) extend the model for directed and bipartite networks; Karwa and Slavković (2016); Pan and Yan (2020); Yan (2021) study differential privacy in \( \beta \)-model; Gao (2020); Graham (2017); Stein and Leng (2020, 2021); Su et al. (2018); Yan et al. (2019) study various joint \( \beta \)-models that incorporate node or edge covariates; Wahlström et al. (2017) calculates the Cramer-Rao bound for repeated observations. Most related to this paper’s topic are the recent works Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2020, 2021). They propose \( \ell_0 \) - and \( \ell_1 \)-regularized MLEs for estimating \( \beta \)-models with \( \ell_0 \) parameter sparsity. The main purpose is to address sparse networks. Mukherjee et al. (2018) studies a different variant of \( \beta \)-model for sparse network with a known sparsity parameter.

1.2 Pain points in the current \( \beta \)-model methodology and theory, and other interesting questions

Despite the significant development in the past decade, there remain several significant gaps in both methodology and theory of the \( \beta \)-model.

I. The first pain point, as pointed out by Chen et al. (2021), is the insufficient account for network sparsity. Prior to Chen et al. (2021), \( \beta \)-model’s theory such as Chatterjee et al. (2011); Yan and Xu (2013) requires a network density of \( \rho_n \gtrsim 1/\log^a n \) for some constant \( a > 0 \) to guarantee estimation consistency. This is a particularly serious limitation since many modern networks are far sparser. As we will see, Chen et al. (2021) pushes the network sparsity requirement down to \( \rho_n \gtrsim n^{-1/2} \); and Stein and Leng (2020, 2021) require \( \rho_n \gtrsim n^{-1/2} \cdot ||\beta^*||_0 \). However, Chen et al. (2021) makes the strong assumption that in \( \beta^*_i = c_i \log n + o(\log n) \), we know \( c_i \) and only need to estimate the
o(log n) part. In practice, we would not know \( c_i \log n \); on the contrary, the estimation of this part is in fact the main source of estimation error. Also, both Chen et al. (2021) and Stein and Leng (2021) require \( \| \beta \|_0 \ll n^{1/2} \). One naturally raises a few immediate questions. In light of Chen et al. (2021), can we achieve \( \ell_\infty \) consistency for moderately sparse networks \( \rho_n \gg n^{-a} \) for some constant \( a \in (0, 1) \) without making other strong assumptions? If we consider the weaker \( \ell_p \) consistency for some \( p \in (0, \infty) \) like that in Stein and Leng (2020, 2021), can we further relax the network sparsity requirement? Can we enable \( \beta \)-model to handle sparser networks where \( \rho_n \ll n^{-1/2} \), even with strong assumptions?

II. The second major concern is computation. While available tools for many other network problems, including community detection (Amini et al., 2013), graphon estimation (Chatterjee, 2015), method of moments (Zhang and Xia, 2021) and others, can scale up to \( 10^4 \sim 10^5 \) nodes or more, existing \( \beta \)-model estimation methods, most of which are based on GLM algorithms, can only scale up to around 1000 nodes with a considerable memory cost. This is somewhat contradictory to the simple nature of this model. Part of this paper’s motivation is our new idea: can we exploit network sparsity to accelerate estimation?

III. Existing literature typically addresses the basic question of the existence of MLE in an unrestricted parameter space by two strategies. One line is represented by Rinaldo et al. (2013) that proposes the following sufficient condition. For \( B \in \{0, 1\}^{(2) \times n} \) that maps the vectorization of \( A \)’s upper triangle to the degree sequence \( d \), its convex hull should contain \( d \) as an interior point; Chen et al. (2021) assumes a similar condition. Such condition is obscure and inconvenient for both verification in practice and downstream analysis. The other line of approaches, represented by Chatterjee et al. (2011); Yan et al. (2016); Yan and Xu (2013) and others, depend on unrealistic network sparsity assumptions as aforementioned. One naturally wonders: can we crank out a set of more “edible” conditions that hopefully only depend on model parameters, not the data \( A \), with relaxed network sparsity assumption, that can guarantee the existence of MLE within a desired range with high probability?

Apart from the main questions raised above, answers to the following interesting questions also remain largely open. First, there exists little study on lower-bound results for \( \beta \)-model’s estimation accuracy. Wahlström et al. (2017) gives Cramer-Rao lower bound for \( \hat{\beta}_i \) for a fixed \( i \) with repeated edge-wise observations. But what about the entire estimator; what about loss functions other than MSE; and can we establish minimax-type lower-bounds for true parameters over some range?

Second, for statistical inference, many existing works prove asymptotic normality of their estimators under various conditions Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2020, 2021); Yan et al. (2016); Yan and Xu (2013). But all existing results speak for a fixed index set of \( \hat{\beta}_i \)’s. If, as the set up in Theorem 1 of Chen et al. (2021) suggests, the set of \( \beta_i \)’s of scientific interest enlarges as \( n \to \infty \)? Recent development in probability theory (Chernozhukov et al., 2017) points out that in fact the entire \( d \) is asymptotically normal, which lights the hope. Surprisingly, the task of utilizing this result to prove for \( \beta \)-model’s estimator remains a challenge that requires novel technical treatments to bound some unwanted remainders.

The third interesting question was inspired by the recent seminal works Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2020, 2021) that bring regularization into \( \beta \)-model estimation. Intuitively, various regularization schemes all bring \( \hat{\beta} \) entries towards some shrinkage destination, in own fashions, respectively. Therefore, it is a very interesting scientific question how to quantify the impact of the regularization in several aspects: existence of MLE solution, consistency and error bounds, and asymptotic behavior. Chen et al. (2021) and Stein and Leng (2020, 2021) present the first set of results in this regard, but they only
consider particular choices of small amounts of regularization. It remains an interesting open question to quantitatively study and compare the impacts of light and heavy regularization penalties on the estimator.

1.3 Our contributions

In this paper, we address the pain points presented in Section 1.2. The merits of our work span methodology, theory and application aspects. Our methodological contributions are three-fold.

i. First, we propose a novel \( \ell_2 \) penalty. It is a soft version of \( \ell_0 \) (Chen et al., 2021) and \( \ell_1 \) (Stein and Leng, 2020, 2021) penalties and flexible for modeling networks where \( \beta^* \) may not be \( \ell_0 \) sparse. Its global smoothness greatly simplifies the study of solution existence and convergence. Moreover, the smoothness enables the estimation equation (10) that plays a key role in deriving improved error bound and asymptotic normality results for small and large regularization \( \lambda \)'s; like approach might not be easy for \( \ell_0 \) and \( \ell_1 \) regularization schemes.

ii. Second, we provide three sets of sufficient conditions for the existence of MLE, covering various network density regimes. Our conditions are much simpler, verifiable and interpretable than existing convex-hull based conditions in Rinaldo et al. (2013) and Chen et al. (2021). In particular, our first sufficient condition covers the vanilla MLE with no regularization that much relaxes over Chatterjee et al. (2011); Yan and Xu (2013).

iii. Third, we make a novel use of the well-known monotonicity lemma Chen et al. (2021); Hillar and Wibisono (2013) and design a novel algorithm that is both lightning-fast and memory parsimonious. Our new algorithm can comfortably scale up to sparse networks with \( O(10^7) \) or even more nodes, taking just a few minutes to compute on a personal computer.

On the theory side, we prove novel results that significantly improves and enriches the theoretical understanding of \( \beta \)-model and its estimation, mainly in the following aspects.

i. First, for dense networks, we prove \( \ell_\infty \) consistency for \( \rho_n \gg n^{-1/4} \) and \( \ell_2 \) consistency for \( \rho_n \gg n^{-1/2} \), with \( \lambda = 0 \). In other words, correcting the old impression in Chatterjee et al. (2011) and Yan and Xu (2013) that the vanilla MLE is only consistent in the very dense regime \( \rho_n \gg 1/\text{Polynomial}(\log n) \), we show that it maintains consistency for much sparser networks without needing any regularization.

For sparse networks where \( n^{-1} \ll \rho_n \lesssim n^{-1/2} \), we provide the first consistency result for \( \beta \)-models. To our best knowledge, no similar result for this regime exists in literature. (As we shall explain, Chen et al. (2021) requires \( \rho_n \gg n^{-1/2} \) if not knowing the oracle information of the true active set of \( \beta^* \).) In this very challenging regime, our analysis shows the clear importance and merits of regularization in achieving consistency; also additional conditions limiting the overall heterogeneity of the true network seem necessary.

In the theoretical analysis of this part, we develop novel techniques to handle challenging parts in the proof. As a result, when \( \lambda \to \infty \), unlike Stein and Leng (2020) and Stein and Leng (2021) whose error bounds diverge to \( \infty \), our theorems show that the error bound would converge to that of an Erdos-Renyi model fit, better matching the intuition.

ii. Second, we present novel asymptotic normality theorems. While existing results only regard a fixed set of \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) indexes, we allow the index set to expand at an \( o(n^{1/2}) \) rate. Our result is the first high-dimensional asymptotic normality result for \( \beta \)-models.

We present two asymptotic normality theorems for dense networks with no to little regularization, and for sparse networks with heavy regularization, respectively. Our analysis reveal the different
dependency structures between the entries of $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ in this two scenarios. The results are intuitive but also challenging to quantitatively prove. We again use our original technique mentioned in the previous bullet point in the analysis here.

iii. Third, our theoretical results also enriches the literature of $\beta$-models by touching less-studied areas. We provide results on the convergence speeds of the gradient and Newton’s methods, respectively, with warm initialization. We also present the first systematic lower-bound study of $\beta$-model estimators for the three most popular norms $\ell_0$, $\ell_1$ and $\ell_\infty$.

We also applied our method to analyzing real-world data sets of challenging sizes. As aforementioned, our method is distinctively effective in handling very large and sparse networks. In data example 2b, we ran our algorithm on a million-node sparse network and obtained meaningful results. Our code only took a few minutes to estimate this network on a personal computer.

1.4 Notation

We inherit the asymptotic notion $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, $\lesssim$ and $\asymp$ from standard calculus. Let $1 = (1, \ldots, 1)^T$. For any vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ and matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, define matrices $V(u)$ and $V(U)$ as follows: for all $1 \leq \{i \neq j\} \leq n$, define $\{V(u)\}_{i,j} = e^{u_i + u_j}/(1 + e^{u_i + u_j})$ and $\{V(U)\}_{i,j} = e^{U_{i,j}}/(1 + e^{U_{i,j}})$; and for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, define $V_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n, j \neq i} V_{i,j}$ for $V = V(u)$ or $V = V(U)$. For any vector $x$, inherit the standard notion of $\ell_p$ norms $\|x\|_p$ for $p = 0, 1, 2, \infty$. For any matrix $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, define $\|J\|_\infty = \sup_{x \neq 0} \|Jx\|_\infty/\|x\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^n |J_{i,j}|$. Also inherit Frobenius norm $\| \cdot \|_F$ and spectral norm $\| \cdot \|_{\text{op}}$ from standard matrix analysis. For two matrices $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, write $A_1 \geq A_2$ to denote element-wise comparison: $A_{1,i,j} \geq A_{2,i,j}$ for all $1 \leq \{i, j\} \leq n$. Finally, we introduce two concepts of “sparsity”. The concept network sparsity $\rho_n = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} E[A_{i,j}]/(\binom{n}{2})$, while the concept $\beta$ sparsity for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ means most $\beta_i$’s equal some common value.

2 Our method

2.1 The $\ell_2$-regularized MLE for $\beta$-model

Recall that $\mathcal{L}(\beta)$ denotes the negative log-likelihood function of the vanilla $\beta$-model. Let $\lambda$ be a tuning parameter, and $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector indicating shrinkage destination. We propose the following $\ell_2$-regularized likelihood function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda;\beta_0}(\beta) = \mathcal{L}(\beta) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\beta - \beta_0\|^2_2. \quad (3)$$

Here, $\beta_0$ may reflect our prior knowledge on the true values of $\beta$. For example, it could be the estimation of another network layer on the same set of individuals in a multi-layer network, such as the connection between Wikipedia entries in different languages. But in general, we do not know $\beta_0$. We put the parallel study of the known-$\beta_0$ case in Supporting Information due to page limit, see Section 7.1.2. When $\beta_0$ is unknown, optimizing over $\beta_0$ given $\beta$ yields $\beta_0 = \hat{\beta} \cdot 1$. This is the formulation we will mainly focus on throughout this paper.

$$\hat{\beta}_\lambda = \arg \min_{\beta} \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta), \quad \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta) = \mathcal{L}(\beta) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\beta - \hat{\beta} \cdot 1\|^2_2. \quad (4)$$

The same practice of setting a shrinkage destination parallel to $1$ agrees with Chen et al. (2021) and Stein and Leng (2021). Here let us clarify the difference between their and our notation system. In their system, most $\beta_i$’s equal a common value, denoted by $\mu/2$, and their $\beta_i$ means different from ours, which
we shall call $\gamma_i$. That is, in their model, $\beta_i = \mu/2 + \gamma_i$, and they further impose $\ell_0$ sparsity on $\gamma_i$’s and estimate $\mu$ and $\gamma_i$. In our framework, however, given any $\beta$, the optimal $\mu$ is $\hat{\beta}$. Therefore, we do not set up a separate $\mu$ parameter for succinctness.

Before proceeding to the estimation method, we make an important remark.

**Remark 1.** The comparison between our $\ell_2$-shrinkage on $\beta$ and the $\ell_0$-sparsity assumption on $\beta$ seems conceptual analogous to the comparison between ridge regression and $\ell_0$-sparsity in classical linear regression. However, there is a crucial distinction between the two settings. Understanding this distinction is key to understanding the reason and meaningfulness behind our $\ell_2$-shrinkage. In linear regression, with a large number $p$ of covariates such that $n \ll p$, an $\ell_0$-sparsity on the regression coefficient vector $\beta^{(\text{reg})}$ is indispensable for achieving a meaningful estimation.

But the network setting is very different. In a sparse network, the number of observations is not $O(n)$, but instead $O(n^2)$. Meanwhile, the number of parameters is also limited to $O(n)$. Therefore, under the common assumption that $\rho_n \gg n^{-1}$ (Bickel and Chen, 2009; Zhao et al., 2012), we have $\rho_n n^2 \gg n$. In other words, in the language of regression, estimating the $\beta$-model might not be a truly high-dimensional setting as the amount of observations still overwhelms the number of parameters.

Consequently, the $\ell_0$ sparsity pursued by Chen et al. (2021) and Stein and Leng (2021), while very natural and reasonable, might not be as necessary as that in regression, in order to achieve an accurate parameter estimation for sparse networks. Our $\ell_2$ shrinkage, as a softer penalty compared to $\ell_0$ and $\ell_1$ counterpart, may therefore preserve more nodal individualism while maintaining overall estimation accuracy.

### 2.2 Parameter estimation

For narration simplicity, define projection matrices into the subspace spanned by $\mathbb{I}$

$$\mathcal{P} = n^{-1} \mathbb{I} \mathbb{I}^T, \quad \mathcal{P}_\perp = I - n^{-1} \mathbb{I} \mathbb{I}^T$$

The gradient of $\mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta)$ is

$$F_i(\beta) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta)}{\partial \beta_i} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n \\atop j \neq i}} \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}} - d_i + \lambda(\beta_i - \bar{\beta}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \tag{6}$$

The Jacobian of $\mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta)$ can be denoted by $F'(\beta)$, which is more precisely specified as follows

$$\{F'(\beta)\}_{i,j} = \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \beta_j}(\beta) = \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})^2} - \frac{\lambda}{n}, \quad 1 \leq \{i \neq j\} \leq n \tag{7}$$

$$\{F'(\beta)\}_{i,i} = \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \beta_i}(\beta) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n \\atop j \neq i}} \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})^2} + \frac{(n-1)\lambda}{n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \tag{8}$$

Using the notion $V(\beta)$ in Section 1.4, we can rewrite the Jacobian as

$$F'(\beta) = V(\beta) + \frac{\lambda}{n} \mathbb{I} \mathbb{I}^T = V(\beta) + \lambda \mathcal{P}_\perp, \tag{9}$$

It can be proved that $F'(\beta)$ is strictly positive-definite, so that $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ is a strongly convex function. Moreover, under proper assumptions, the optimal $\hat{\beta}_\lambda := \arg \min_\beta \hat{\beta}_\lambda(\beta)$ exists and is an inner-point of the parameter space. For more details, see Lemma 2. With the existence and uniqueness of $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$, we can solve it from the
following estimation equation:

\[ F(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) = 0 \]  

(10)

The solution to (10) can be found by gradient method or Newton’s method. The computation complexity of each iteration is \(O(n^2)\). This much improves over the GLM approach employed by Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2021); Yan et al. (2016, 2015) and others. As pointed out by Section “Cost of Computation” in Amazon H2O (2021), also see Equation (4.26) in Section 4.4.1 of Hastie et al. (2009), the computation cost of GLM estimation of \(\beta\)-model requires at least \(O(n^3)\) time. This is clearly infeasible for moderately large networks \(n \approx 10^4\).

2.3 Very fast novel algorithm “IDEA” via degree-index dimensionality reduction

Despite the significant improvement in scalability compared to existing \(\beta\)-model estimators, fitting a \(\beta\)-model to huge and sparse networks remains a grave challenge. The \(O(n^2)\) cost of gradient or Newton method remains infeasible for huge networks of \(10^6\) or more nodes. On the other hand, in real world, network data at this size scale are typically very sparse. For example, the network in our second data example Steenwinckel et al. (2020) (see Section 5.2) contains 1.3 million nodes with only 4.2 million edges.

Clearly, techniques that can utilize this sparsity to achieve dimensionality reduction are urgently needed.

In this section, we propose a novel algorithm called Indexed-by-Degree Estimation Algorithm (IDEA) that exploits the full power of a monotonicity lemma. Our method greatly reduces dimensionality and, to our best knowledge, is the first truly scalable \(\beta\)-model estimator. To start, we present the monotonicity lemma. This lemma per se is not new, results akin to which are long-familiar to \(\beta\)-model researchers since Hillar and Wibisono (2013).

**Lemma 1.** When the optimal solution \(\hat{\beta}_\lambda\) to (4) exists, it is unique. Moreover, it satisfies that for any \(1 \leq i < j \leq n\), if \(d_i = d_j\), then \(\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} = \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,j}\).

Here we relegate the existence of \(\hat{\beta}_\lambda\) to later Section 3.1. The proof of Lemma 1 is a close variant of Lemma 1 in Chen et al. (2021), but Chen et al. (2021) focuses on using this property to select their tuning parameter. In contrast, we realize that monotonicity can in fact greatly reduce and simplify the entire estimation procedure, leading to a giant leap in computation and memory efficiency. Arguably, our method is the first to fully unleash the power of this well-known property. To describe our approach, let \(d_{(1)} < d_{(2)} < \cdots < d_{(m)}\) be the sorted unique values of all observed degrees, where \(m = \|\text{Unique}\{d_1, \ldots, d_n\}\|\). Set up degree-indexed parameters \(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_m\) as follows. For each \(k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\), let \(n_k\) be the number of \(d_i\)’s that equal \(d_{(k)}\), and let \(\mathcal{D}_k := \{i_1^{(k)}, \ldots, i_{n_k}^{(k)}\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}\) be all the indexes whose degrees equal \(d_{(k)}\), namely, \(d_{i_1^{(k)}} = \cdots = d_{i_{n_k}^{(k)}} = d_{(k)}\), while \(d_j \neq d_{(k)}\), for all \(j \notin \mathcal{D}_k\). Then the objective function \(\mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta)\) can be “re-parameterized” into a function of \(\delta\), called \(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\lambda(\tilde{\delta})\), as follows:

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\lambda(\tilde{\delta}) := \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta) = \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq m} n_k n_\ell \log \left(1 + e^{\delta_k + \delta_\ell}\right) + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m} \frac{n_k (n_k - 1)}{2} \log \left(1 + e^{2\delta_k}\right) - \sum_{k=1}^m n_k d_{(k)} \delta_k + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{k=1}^m n_k (\delta_k - \tilde{\delta})^2
\]

(11)

where we define

\[
\tilde{\delta} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m n_k \cdot \delta_k
\]

(12)
to be the weighted average, conceptually analogous to $\hat{\beta}$ under the original parameterization. The gradient of $\tilde{L}_\lambda(\beta)$ is

$$G_k(\delta) := \frac{\partial \tilde{L}_\lambda(\beta)}{\partial \delta_k} = \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq m, \ell \neq k} n_k n_\ell \frac{e^{\delta_k + \delta_\ell}}{1 + e^{\delta_k + \delta_\ell}} + n_k(n_k - 1) \frac{e^{2\delta_k}}{1 + e^{2\delta_k}} - n_k d(k) + n_k(\delta_k - \bar{\delta}) \lambda \quad (13)$$

and its Jacobian, denoted by $J$, is specified as follows

$$J_{k\ell}(\delta) = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{L}_\lambda(\delta)}{\partial \delta_k \partial \delta_\ell} = n_k n_\ell \frac{e^{\delta_k + \delta_\ell}}{(1 + e^{\delta_k + \delta_\ell})^2} - \frac{n_k n_\ell}{n} \lambda, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \{k \neq \ell\} \leq m \quad (14)$$

$$J_{kk}(\delta) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq m, \ell \neq k} n_k n_\ell \frac{e^{\delta_k + \delta_\ell}}{(1 + e^{\delta_k + \delta_\ell})^2} + 2n_k(n_k - 1) \frac{e^{2\delta_k}}{(1 + e^{2\delta_k})^2} + n_k \left(1 - \frac{n_k}{n}\right) \lambda, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq m \quad (15)$$

The new Jacobian is also diagonally dominant

$$J_{kk} - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq m, \ell \neq k} J_{k\ell} = 2n_k(n_k - 1) \frac{e^{2\delta_k}}{(1 + e^{2\delta_k})^2} \geq 0$$

and the existence and uniqueness of the solution $\hat{\delta}_\lambda$ can be inherited from that of $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$. Also, $\hat{\delta}_\lambda$ can be found by a gradient or Newton’s method that solves the estimation equation $G(\delta) = 0$.

Our proposed IDEA method (13)–(15) enjoys several significant merits. First, by definition, $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ explicitly maps one-to-one to $(\hat{\delta}_\lambda, \{D_k\}_{k=1,...,m})$. Consequently, while direct theoretical analysis of $\hat{\delta}_\lambda$ is very tricky because its accompanying index sets $D_k$’s are data-dependent, we could equivalently study $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ that is much more convenient for theoretical analysis.

Second, $\hat{\delta}_\lambda$ hugely improves over $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ in computational efficiency for large and sparse networks, where $m$ is typically several orders smaller than $n$. Notice that as the first step of our algorithm, evaluating all node degrees only costs $O(\rho n^2)$, whereas the conventional GLM-based algorithms such as Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2020, 2021); Yan et al. (2015) need at least $\Omega(n^2)$. For example, the data set Steenwinckel et al. (2020) contains $n \approx 1.3$ million nodes but only $m = 459$ different degrees. Many nodes share common low degrees, see Table 1. Clearly, on this data set, using our re-parameterization could achieve a huge dimensionality reduction that enables running even Newton’s method on this network of seemingly prohibitive size.

### Table 1: Frequencies of low degrees in the data set Steenwinckel et al. (2020), total $n = 1304155$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of nodes with this degree</td>
<td>684003</td>
<td>132123</td>
<td>48126</td>
<td>24586</td>
<td>15189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of nodes, unit: %</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.4 Further discussions

There are two main unanswered questions at the end of this section, including: the existence of $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ that satisfies (10); and how to select the tuning parameter $\lambda$. Their answers require careful analysis, thus will be addressed in Sections 3.1 and 3.
Another interesting question is when we have the prior knowledge of a known \( \beta_0 \) in (3). This \( \beta_0 \) could be the outcome of another method, or the estimation of a similar network. Due to page limit, we sink the method and theory for this setting to Supporting Information.

3 Theory: consistency, convergence rate, lower-bounds and asymptotic normality

3.1 Existence and whereabouts of the estimator

Before presenting any main theoretical result, we shall first address the existence and, further, whereabouts of \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \). Suppose the true parameter \( \beta^* \) belongs to the following parameter space: 

\[
\beta^* \in [a_1^* \log n, a_2^* \log n]^n
\]

for some constants \( a_1^*, a_2^* \). We will establish the result that under proper conditions, the estimated \( \beta \) satisfies 

\[
\hat{\beta}_\lambda \in S_n := [a_1 \log n, a_2 \log n]^n
\]

for some constants \( a_1, a_2 \). Based on these, we define the following quantities that will play key roles in the theory:

**Definition 1.** *For the true parameter value \( \beta^* \), define*

\[
b_n = \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{(1 + e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*})^2}{e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*}}, \quad c_n = \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{(1 + e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*})^2}{e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*}} \tag{16}
\]

*Also, for the range of the estimator \( S_n \), define*

\[
\tilde{b}_n = \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \sup_{\beta \in S_n} \frac{(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})^2}{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}, \quad \tilde{c}_n = \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \inf_{\beta \in S_n} \frac{(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})^2}{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}} \tag{17}
\]

As we will see, these quantities will characterize the difficulty of the problem. Readers who are familiar with the works Chen et al. (2021) and Stein and Leng (2021) might immediately recall, as they pointed out, that one natural treatment is to limit the optimization of the objective function \( \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta) \) within a given range \( \beta \in S_n \) for some pre-fixed \( a_1, a_2 \). While this is a good strategy at least for numerical stability, in this paper, we take a different approach that by properly setting the tuning parameter \( \lambda \) based on network sparsity, \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) will fall inside the interior of \( S_n \) automatically, with high probability. The key distinction is that in this case, the moment equation \( F(\beta) = 0 \) has a unique solution inside \( S_n \), which leads to many important results, such as some of our new error bounds and much improved asymptotic normality results. Also, in our numerical algorithms, we prefer not to artificially limit the range of \( \beta \), but let it freely vary in the entire \( \mathbb{R}^n \) – the kite is tethered implicitly by \( \lambda \).

**Lemma 2.** *On the unconstrained optimal solution \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{L}_\lambda(\beta), \) we have*

(i). For any \( \lambda > 0 \), there exists a finite \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( F(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) = 0 \).

(ii). If one of the following three sets of conditions holds:

(a). Condition set 1:

\[
|a_1^*|, |a_2^*| < \frac{1}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = o(n^{1/2}). \tag{18}
\]
(b). Condition set 2:

\[ a_2 > -\frac{1}{4}, \quad a_2^* < \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \gtrsim n^{1/2}, \]

\[-\frac{1}{2} < a_1 < a_1^*, \quad \text{and either holds:} \]

\[ \begin{cases} 
  a_1 + a_2 < -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{or} \\
  n^{a_1 + a_2 + 1} < \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*}}{1 + e^{\beta_i^* + \beta_j^*}}.
\end{cases} \]  

(20)

(c). Condition set 3:

\[ |a_1^*|, |a_2^*| < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \gg n. \]  

(21)

In cases 1 and 3, \( a_1, a_2 \) only need to satisfy that \( a_1 < a_1^* \leq a_2^* < a_2 \). Then with probability at least \( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \) for some \( C_0 > 0 \), the following event takes place:

\[ \mathcal{A}_1 := \hat{\beta}_\lambda \text{ is an interior point of } \mathcal{S}_n. \]

Part (i) guarantees that for any \( \lambda > 0 \), a finite solution \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) exists, and then part (ii) is devoted to the main concern whether \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) falls into \( \mathcal{S}_n \) or not. In part (ii), Condition set 1 pertains to networks with density at least \( \rho_n \gg n^{-1/2} \), that is, the sparsest networks that the theory of Stein and Leng (2021) can handle. We notice that in this case, in fact the condition \( \lambda > 0 \) in Part (i) can be waived and one may set \( \lambda = 0 \). This echoes the common method of unregularized MLE in early \( \beta \)-model literature (Chatterjee et al., 2011; Rinaldo et al., 2013; Yan and Xu, 2013), despite our required network density condition is much weaker than theirs. Condition set 3 regards very sparse networks with \( \rho_n \gg n^{-1} \). This is also a widely-recognized minimal assumption in classical network literature Bickel and Chen (2009); Zhao et al. (2012). The most complicated condition set 2 depicts the intermediate case where the network could be mostly sparse but there are a few high-degree nodes. Notice that different from Condition sets 1 and 2, the second condition set does not impose conditions on \( a_1, a_1^* \) in the same way as \( a_2, a_2^* \). This is because we would rather put more stringent assumptions on \( a_2, a_2^* \), in exchange of relaxing the lower bound on \( a_1, a_1^* \) as much as possible, respecting the high observed sparsity of real-world networks.

In existing literature, to guarantee MLE solution existence, Theorem 1 of Rinaldo et al. (2013) and Appendix B of Chen et al. (2021) both require that the degree vector \( d \) is an interior point of \( B \), where \( B \) is solved from \( d = B \cdot \text{vec}(A) \) for \( \text{vec}(A) \) being the vectorization of \( A \). In sharp contrast, our Lemma 2 provides a much cleaner sets of conditions for MLE existence that depend only on the model configuration and choice of the tuning parameter, not the observed data.

3.2 Main theoretical results (1): consistency

We first present a \( \ell_{\infty} \) type consistency result.

**Theorem 1.** Define

\[ \Gamma(n, \beta^*; \lambda) := \log^{1/2} n \cdot \frac{\lambda}{b_n^{-1} n + \lambda} + \frac{(n \log n)^{1/2} + \| P_{\parallel} \beta^* \|_{\infty} \lambda}{b_n^{-1} n + \lambda} \left( 1 + \frac{b_n}{c_n} \cdot \frac{\| P_{\perp} \beta^* \|_{\infty} \lambda}{b_n^{-1} n + \lambda} \right) \]

(22)

Assume event \( \mathcal{A}_1 \) in Lemma 2 takes place and

\[ b_n \cdot c_n^{-1} \Gamma(n, \beta^*; \lambda) \to 0 \]

(23)
holds. Then the regularized MLE \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) satisfies
\[
\mathbb{P}\left\{ \Vert \hat{\beta}_\lambda - \beta^* \Vert_\infty \leq C_1 \Gamma(n, \beta^*; \lambda) \right\} \geq 1 - n^{-C_2}
\]  
(24)

for some constants \( C_1, C_2 > 0 \), where \( C_1 \) depends on \( C_2 \).

Also, if initialized at some \( \hat{\beta}^{(0)}_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_n \), where recall \( \mathcal{S}_n \) defined in Section 3.1, the Newton method has the following convergence speed guarantee: the \( (t + 1) \)th iteration \( \hat{\beta}^{(t+1)}_\lambda \) satisfies
\[
\Vert \hat{\beta}^{(t+1)}_\lambda - \hat{\beta}_\lambda \Vert_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2^t} \left\{ \left( \frac{n \log n}{b_n^{-1} n + \lambda} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{\log^{1/2} n}{b_n^{-1} n} \right\}
\]

(25)

Our Theorem 1 sharply contrasts Theorem 2 of Stein and Leng (2021) and its earlier counterparts, Corollary 1 and Theorem 2 in Stein and Leng (2020), in which, their error bounds scale linearly or quadratically in \( \lambda \). Despite the different settings that their \( \lambda \) tunes an \( \ell_1 \) penalty while ours is \( \ell_2 \), both share a common intuitive understanding that as \( \lambda \to \infty \) in either setting, the resulting estimator would effectively fit an Erdos-Renyi model to the data. The resulting error bound should scale up with \( n^{-1/2} \| \hat{\beta}_\lambda - \beta^* \|_2 \) or \( n^{-1} \| \hat{\beta}_\lambda - \beta^* \|_1 \), but should not scale up linearly or quadratically in \( \lambda \). In contrast, our error bound (22) well-matches the intuition and provides the first quantification of the estimator’s behavior for both small and large \( \lambda \)'s.

Behind this new result is our novel proof technique. A key technical step in establishing Theorem 1 is to upper bound \( \| F'(\beta^*) \|^{-1} F(\beta^*) \). Conventional analysis, such as Fan et al. (2020), separately bounds \( \| F'(\beta^*) \|^{-1} \| \cdot \|_\infty \) and \( \| F(\beta^*) \|_\infty \). That would lead to an error bound that scales up linearly in \( \lambda \). In sharp contrast, by exploiting our original observation that \( V(\beta^*) + \lambda I \) is nearly parallel to \( I \) for large \( \lambda \), we establish a much improved bound directly on \( \| F'(\beta^*) \|^{-1} F(\beta^*) \). For more details, see the proof of Theorem 1 in Supporting Information.

Among all the assumptions that Theorem 1 needs, (23) is the bottleneck. The most hostile setting is a mostly sparse network with a few high-degree nodes, in which case \( \tilde{c}_n^{-1} \approx 1 \) and (23) effectively requires the network density \( \rho_n \) to be at least \( n^{-1/4} \), since \( \| \mathcal{L}_\lambda \beta^* \|_\infty \neq 0 \) due to degree discrepancy. To understand the cause, we notice that (23) comes from a Lipschitz assumption on \( F'(\beta) \), a classical condition required by the convergence of Newton’s method and, to our best knowledge, could not be easily relaxed. Presence of high degree discrepancy makes \( F'(\beta) \) ill-conditioned and its Lipschitz coefficient very large. We could also understand this by considering a “nicer” setting, where the network is sparse with no hub nodes, namely, \( \max_i \beta_i^* \leq a_2 \log n \) for constant \( a_2 < 0 \). In this case, \( \tilde{c}_n^{-1} \) can cancel part of \( b_n \) and alleviate the strong assumption. The more homogeneous the degrees are, the more cancellation \( \tilde{c}_n^{-1} \) could deal on \( b_n \) and weaker assumption is needed. One possible remedy for networks with well-clustered node degree sequences, one can estimate for subnetworks consisting of high- and low-degree nodes, respectively, exactly similar to a classical strategy for community detection in sparse networks that simply eliminates high-degree nodes (Jing et al., 2021). But considering many real-world networks, such as those we present in Section 5, do not have very high degree hubs (namely, we can think \( \tilde{c}_n^{-1} \approx 1 \)), but they have rather continuous degree distribution, the result in Theorem 1’s type might be more meaningful than one for the aforementioned divide-and-conquer strategy. We notice that Stein and Leng (2021) reports that with a finite number of different \( \beta_i^* \)'s, they can prove \( \ell_1 \)-consistency for network sparsity down to \( n^{-1/2} \). Their result is more comparable to our \( \ell_2 \)-consistency presented in Theorem 2. The problem’s difficulty seems different for \( \ell_\infty \)-consistency.

Algorithm-wise, our assumption that the Newton’s method is initiated inside \( \mathcal{S}_n \) is not essential. The objective function \( \mathcal{L}_\lambda \) is strongly convex when \( \beta \) ranges over any bounded subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \), thus Newton’s method with backtracking will find the global optimum (Tibshirani, 2015). However, the strong convexity
coefficients depend on \( \beta \)'s bound, which depends on \( n \), so we place this assumption mostly for result cleanness. In other words, we only analyze the quadratically convergent phase (Boyd et al., 2004).

Finally, we compare our result to Theorem 1 in Chen et al. (2021). Translated to our paper's notation system, their model is \( \beta_i = (\alpha - \gamma/2) \log n + \beta_i^\perp - \mu_i^\perp/2 \), where \( \alpha \in [0, 1) \), \( \gamma \in [0, 2) \) and \( 0 \leq \gamma - \alpha < 1 \) (active) or \( \beta_i = -\gamma/2 \log n + \beta_i^\perp \) (inactive), which yields \( 2\alpha - \gamma > -1/2 \). It seems their result allows network sparsity to be \( \rho_n \gg n^{-1} \), however, they require two substantively strong assumptions. First, they assume \( \alpha \) and \( \gamma \) are known, and the unknown \( \beta_i^\perp \) and \( \mu_i^\perp \) are \( o(\log n) \), diminishing compared to the known part. In contrast, we consider the much more difficult problem of estimating the entire \( \beta_i \) without any oracle knowledge. Second, they assume they most \( \beta_i^\perp \)'s are zero and that they know which ones are nonzero. To relax this strong assumption, they need a \( \beta \)-min condition in their Corollary 8, which yields \( \alpha \log n \gg \min_{i \in S} \beta_i \gtrsim \log \left\{ 1 + (\log n/\log n)^{1/2} \cdot e^{(\gamma+2\alpha)/\gamma} \right\} \approx (1/2 + \gamma + 2\alpha) \log n \). Combined with other conditions, the sparsest network they can handle becomes \( \rho_n \gg n^{-1} \). Moreover, notice this is achieved when \( \alpha = 0, \gamma \to 1^- \), namely, the network is an Erdos-Renyi graph. A third strong assumption, implicit in their formulation, is that node degrees are mostly homogeneous, since the inhomogeneity part, described solely by \( \beta_i^\perp \), is \( o(\log n) \), diminishing compared to the invariant \( (\alpha - \gamma/2) \log n \) shared by all nodes, unless \( \alpha = \gamma/2 \). In other words, even for dense networks, the model of Chen et al. (2021) requires more homogeneity in the true model to counter. For very sparse networks, this agrees with the implicit opinion of Chen et al. (2021) that we might need good amount of homogeneity for estimation consistency.

Next we present a novel \( \ell_2 \) bound.

**Theorem 2.** With event \( A_1 \) in Lemma 2, we have

(i). The optimal solution \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) can be found by a gradient descent method. Specifically, if initialized inside \( S_n \), setting the step size \( \delta_{\text{Gradient}} \) to be

\[
\delta_{\text{Gradient}} := \left( (n - 1)/2 + \lambda \right)^{-1},
\]

the gradient descent update at the \((t + 1)\)th iteration satisfies

\[
\|\beta^{(t+1)}_\lambda - \hat{\beta}_\lambda\|_2 \leq \exp \left\{ - \frac{(n - 1)/2 + \lambda}{b_{n-1}(n - 1)} \cdot t \right\} \|\beta^{(0)}_\lambda - \hat{\beta}_\lambda\|_2
\]

(ii). The eventual convergent solution \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) satisfies

\[
n^{-1/2} \cdot \|\hat{\beta}_\lambda - \beta^*\|_2 \lesssim \left( \frac{\log n}{b_{n-1}^{-1} + (b_n/c_n)^{-2}\lambda} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\log n + (b_n/c_n)^{-2}\lambda}{b_{n-1}^{-1} + (b_n/c_n)^{-2}\lambda} \right)^{1/2}
\]

Compared to \( \ell_\infty \) consistency, the \( \ell_2 \) consistency requires much weaker assumptions. This is naturally anticipated, since \( n^{-1/2} \|u\|_2 \leq \|u\|_\infty \) for any \( u \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Combined with with Lemma 2, Theorem 2 can be interpreted as follows. In case 1 of Lemma 2, namely, \( |\beta_i^*| < (1/4) \log n \), setting the sample space \( S_n = \left[ \pm (n/\log n)^{1/2 - \epsilon_0} \right]^n \) for a small enough \( \epsilon_0 \) such that \( (1/4 - \epsilon_0) \log n \geq \max_i \beta_i^* \), we can achieve \( \ell_2 \)-consistency with \( \lambda = 0 \). Recall that this corresponds to network density above \( n^{-1/2} \). For sparser networks, we need both a very large \( \lambda \) and an additional assumption that \( n^{-1/2} \|P_{\perp} \beta^*\|_2 \ll (b_n/c_n)^{-2} \). Here, \( n^{-1/2} \|P_{\perp} \beta^*\|_2 \) represents the true parameter heterogeneity, and \( b_n/c_n \) encodes the size of search space for parameter estimation. A larger search space means higher difficulty, and no surprise it would require more homogeneity in the true model to counter. For very sparse networks, this agrees with the implicit opinion of Chen et al. (2021) that we might need good amount of homogeneity for estimation consistency.
3.3 Main theoretical results (2): lower bounds

After seeing the two upper bound results, one naturally wonders about the lower bound results. In existing β-model literature, the study of lower bounds remains largely blank. In Theorem 3, we present lower bound results for ℓ_2, ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms, across all network sparsity regimes.

**Theorem 3** (Lower bound of ℓ_∞ and ℓ_2 errors). Assume the conditions of Lemma 2 hold, then we have

\[
\inf_{\hat{\beta}} \sup_{\beta^* \in S_n} n^{-1/2} \cdot E[\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2] \gtrsim (\tilde{c}_n^{-1} n)^{-1/2}
\]

\[
\inf_{\hat{\beta}} \sup_{\beta^* \in S_n} n^{-1} \cdot E[\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_1] \gtrsim (\tilde{c}_n^{-1} n)^{-1/2}
\]

\[
\inf_{\hat{\beta}} \sup_{\beta^* \in S_n} E[\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_\infty] \gtrsim (\tilde{c}_n^{-1} n)^{-1/2}
\]

The closest result we know exists in GLM literature Lee and Courtade (2020). Combined with the set up of the design matrix in Stein and Leng (2020), Theorem 7 in Lee and Courtade (2020) yields a rate \(\tilde{c}_n n^{-1}\) lower bound for \(n^{-1} \cdot E[\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2]\). It is unclear how their proof can be adapted for ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms. Lee and Courtade (2020) also remarks that currently no matching upper bound is known, unless the GLM reduces to an ordinary linear model, which is not the case here. Earlier, Section III.A of Wahlström et al. (2017) presents a marginal Cramer-Rao bound of \((\sum_j \neq i E[A_{ij}])^{-1}\) on \(\hat{\beta}_i\) for any fixed index \(i\) with repeated observations on each edge. Their result also only concerns the mean-squared loss.

Apart from these, we are not aware of any other akin results in existing β-model literature.

Our next remark addresses the interpretation of Theorem 3 per se, for dense networks, where \(n^{-1} \gg n^{-1/4}\). In this case, comparing the lower bounds in Theorem 3 with the upper bounds in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we see that their discrepancy is positively-related to the size of the search space, encoded by \(\tilde{b}_n/\tilde{c}_n\) or similarly \(b_n/c_n\). This could be understood similarly to the interpretation of Theorem 2.

3.4 Main theoretical results (3): asymptotic normality

In this part, we present our novel results on asymptotic normality of the estimator. For cleanness, we only consider case 1 (dense network with \(\lambda = 0\)) and 3 (very sparse network with large \(\lambda\)) of Lemma 2. The main reason for doing so, roughly speaking, is that the asymptotic entry dependency structures of the penalized MLE \(\hat{\beta}_\lambda\) are completely different under the two settings. Understandably, the behavior of \(\hat{\beta}_\lambda\) in the intermediate case 2 is very challenging to characterize. We leave it to future work.

**Theorem 4** (Asymptotic normality). Suppose index set \(J \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}\) satisfies \(|J| = o(n^{1/2})\). With event \(A_1\) in Lemma 2, we have

(i). (Dense network with \(\lambda = 0\)) Under case 1 of Lemma 2, also assume

\[
b_n = o\{(n/\log n)^{1/2}\}
\]

\[
b_n/c_n = o\{(n/\log n)^{1/4}\}
\]

Then setting \(\lambda = 0\), we have

\[
(\hat{\beta}_\lambda - \beta^*) \overset{d}{\to} \mathcal{N}\left[0, \{D(\beta^*)\}^{-1}_{J,J}\right]
\]

where \(D(\beta^*)\) is the diagonal matrix extracted from \(V(\beta^*)\).
(ii). (Sparse network with a large \( \lambda \)) Under case 3 of Lemma 2, suppose
\[
\tilde{c}_n^{-1}b_n^{3/2}\|P_\perp \beta^*\|_\infty^2 \ll \bar{b}_n
\]  
where recall that \( \bar{b}_n = \frac{(1 + e^{2\beta^*})^2/e^{2\beta^*}}{2b_n^{-1/2}n^2} \), then with \( \lambda \gg n \), we have
\[
\hat{\beta}_\lambda = \frac{1}{2b_n^{-1/2}n^2} \frac{d}{2} \left( \bar{b}_n/2 \right) (\bar{A} - E[\bar{A}]) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \beta^* \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \frac{d}{2} \left( \bar{b}_n/2 \right) N(0, \text{Var}(\bar{A})) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 
\end{bmatrix} \text{(36)}
\]

In other words, for any \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \), we have
\[
\text{Cor}(\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i}, \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,j}) \rightarrow 1.
\]
The convergence \( d \rightarrow \) in both parts are accompanied by diminishing multivariate Berry-Esseen type finite sample uniform error bounds.

Parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4 sharply contrast each other. To better understand their difference, let us consider a special case \( \beta^* = \beta_{1/n}^* \). The dependency structure we find in Part (ii) is natural, since a large \( \lambda \) would heavily push all entries of \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) close to each other; on the other hand, however, it is indeed comparatively surprising that even under heavy regularization, \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) still approximates normal after proper rescaling. Our result also quantifies the asymptotic normality center and covariance. Our theoretical calculations well-match simulation results in Section 4.2.

Our Theorem 4 is much stronger than all existing akin results for \( \beta \)-models in that we present the first high-dimensional asymptotic normality result, whereas others state results for a fixed index set. The base result we use to prove Theorem 4 is a recent high-dimensional CLT regarding \( d - E[d] \) by Chernozhukov et al. (2017). Using their result to prove Theorem 4, however, is still nontrivial. In our proof of Theorem 1, we present a novel analysis originated from our observation that \( \{V(\beta^*) + \lambda I\}^{-1} \) is nearly parallel \( \perp \). For more details, see Supporting Information.

4 Simulations

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our method, using gradient and Newton methods, respectively, for optimizing \( L_\lambda(\beta) \). In all experiments, we set
\[
\beta_1^* = \cdots = \beta_{[n/5]}^* = \gamma \log n, \quad \beta_{[n/5]+1}^* = \cdots = \beta_n^* = \alpha \log n
\]

We consider five different configurations. The first two simulation settings consider relatively dense networks, where we impose a small \( \lambda \) value; whereas the other two settings consider a sparser network, with small and large \( \lambda \)’s, respectively. We record the following aspects of measurements: (1). Convergence speed. We record \( \|\hat{\beta}^{(t)} - \hat{\beta}_\lambda\|_2 \) versus iteration, where \( \hat{\beta}^{(t)} \) is the estimated \( \hat{\beta} \) at the \( t \)th iteration. (2). Relative error \( \|\hat{\beta}_\lambda - \beta^*\|_2/\|\beta^*\|_2 \). We record and present the change of log-relative error as a log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
<th>(iv)</th>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>(vi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True ( \gamma )</td>
<td>-1/3</td>
<td>-1/2</td>
<td>-2/3</td>
<td>-2/3</td>
<td>-2/3</td>
<td>-2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True ( \alpha )</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>-2/3 + 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working ( \lambda )</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network sparsity</td>
<td>Dense ( \leftrightarrow ) Sparse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree heterogeneity</td>
<td>Low ( \leftrightarrow ) High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularization ( \lambda )</td>
<td>Small ( \leftrightarrow ) Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Simulation set up
increases linearly. (3). Computation time. (4). Asymptotic normality of $(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_2)$ for two fixed indexes (1, 2). We also evaluate (6). The numerical performance of our proposed AIC-type criterion for selecting the tuning parameter $\lambda$.

For all settings, we run both gradient and Newton’s methods. For gradient method, we use an adaptive step size, that is, if the $(t + 1)$th iteration improves the objective function, then step size is multiplied by 1.2 and update $\hat{\beta}_\lambda \leftarrow \hat{\beta}^{(t+1)}_\lambda$, otherwise by 0.8 and keep $\hat{\beta}_\lambda = \hat{\beta}^{(t)}_\lambda$. Due to page limit, we only present the simulation results for settings (i)–(vi) in the main paper, and sink (v) and (vi) into Section in Supporting Information. For the same reason we present an illustrative subset of convergence and asymptotic normality results. For better organization clarity, we partition the above six aspects into three sub-simulations: Simulation 1 contains (1)–(3) concerning the convergence rate, accuracy and computational speed of our method; Simulation 2 studies (3)–(5) and (6) focusing on validating and intuitively understanding the interpretation of our asymptotic normality result Theorem 4.

4.1 Simulation 1: Performance of our method: convergence speed, accuracy and time cost

In this simulation, we implement our accelerated algorithm IDEA introduced in Section 2.3, equipped with gradient and Newton methods, respectively. Figure 1 reports the simulation results. Row 1 shows the convergence rate of the two methods for small and large sample sizes. We observe that the gradient method with the choice of step-size guided by the theory (26) converges decently quickly. It costs longer to converge for large networks because the step-size given by (26) diminishes in order to counter the potentially larger magnitude in the gradient $\|F(\beta)\|_{\infty} = O(\rho_n \cdot n)$, but it is a safe choice that could be slightly too conservative. In comparison, Newton’s method invariantly converges within very few iterations. Row 2 shows the asymptotic behavior of the $\ell_2$ error bounds of our method equipped with gradient and Newton methods. The problem becomes more difficult as one travels from setting (i) to setting (iii), and the error readings from the Y-axis in plots in Row 2 confirm this understanding. Row 3 confirmed the theoretical $O(n^2)$ computational complexity of our method. Notice that although Newton’s method needs much less iterations, each of its iteration requires a matrix inversion, so overall it is clearly but not hugely faster than gradient method. Overall, our methods show very high computational efficiency and a clear advantage over the conventional GLM approach. GLM packages could not handle networks over 1000 effectively and requires an infeasible amount of memory when $n \approx 10000$. For this reason we were unable to show them as a comparison benchmark in these plots.

4.2 Simulation 2: Validation of our theory on $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$’s asymptotic normality

In this part, we show simulation plots that validate our Theorem 4. We first plot the 1-dimensional marginal empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,n}$ under our simulation settings (i) and (vi), respectively in Figure 2. Overall, the numerical results well-match our Theorem 4’s predictions. Row 1 shows that when the network is moderately dense, even without regularization we can still achieve consistency. In this case, as Part (i) of Theorem 4 asserts, the asymptotic normal distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,n}$ would be centered at the true $\beta^*_i$. Row 2 shows the opposite case. When network is very sparse, we need a large $\lambda$ to possibly maintain consistency. As Part (ii) of Theorem 4 predicts, the asymptotic normality center would be a very different value from the true $\beta^*_i$, but instead marked by the magenta dashed line computed according to formula (36). Our second main observation that matches the understanding of Theorem 4 is the distinct behaviors of Rows 1 and 2 as $n$ increases. In Row 1, the normality center better matches the true $\beta^*$ for larger $n$, as in this case $\lambda = 0$ and no systematic bias would be introduced by regularization. The observation we see in Row 2, however, is very different. Recall that its corresponding Part (ii) of Theorem 4 holds for
Figure 1: Row 1: convergence speed, setting (i), plots 1 & 2: $n = 50$, 3 & 4: $n = 12800$; plots 1 & 3: gradient, 2 & 4: Newton; Row 2: log average $\ell_2$ errors, from left: settings (i)–(iv); Row 3: computation time, from left: settings (i)–(iv).

$\lambda \gg \tilde{b}_n^{-1}n$. However, row 2 fixes $\lambda$ and increases $n$, therefore the assumption here is increasingly violated. This explains the gradual departure of the normality center from the magenta line. Next, in Figure 3, we show scatter plots to illustrate the dependency structure between $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,1}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,2}$. Figure 3 provides clear empirical evidences that well-match our novel normality result Theorem 4. Traveling from left to right in Row 1 of Figure 3, as $\lambda$ increases with other settings fixed, we see an increasing dependence relationship between $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,1}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,2}$, exactly as predicted by Part (ii) of our Theorem 4. Traveling from the right-most plot in Row 1 and then into Row 2, we are increasing $n$ with a fixed $\lambda$. This is roughly equivalent to decreasing $\lambda$ and traveling from large $\lambda$ back to small $\lambda$, since recall that the “small” or “large” of a chosen $\lambda$ is determined by its comparison with $b_n^{-1}n$ and $(n \log n)^{1/2}$. In this comparison sequence, we clearly see an increasing independence, which again confirms the prediction of our Theorem 4.

5 Data examples

5.1 Data example 1: COVID-19 impact on Switzerland student mental health

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has significant psychological impacts. To measure the effect of lockdown on a group of Swiss students, Elmer et al. (2020) collected data before and after the beginning the pandemic. The original data set contains measurements on 2 cohorts of students dated 2019-04 (cohort 1), 2019-09 and 2020-04 (both cohort 2). For better comparability, we select the 2019-09 and 2020-04
subgroups since they share many individuals in common. The variables fall into two main categories: 1. mental health, including depression, anxiety, stress and loneliness; 2. sociality, encoded by students’ self-reported number of other students, with whom they have the following types of relations: friendship, pleasant interactions, emotional support, informational support and co-study.

First, as mentioned in introduction, the public data set only discloses the degrees of sociality variable but not the adjacency matrices, making most network models, such as GLM-based methods Stein and Leng (2020); Yan et al. (2019), inapplicable. Second, the two subgroups contain 207 (2019-09) and 271 (2020-04) students, respectively, sharing 202 students in common. On one hand, the degrees of each common student collected at two time points might not be directly comparable since network sizes are different. But the part of the networks by students who only appear in one subgroup also contains useful information, and we do not want to simple cut it out. Therefore, with these two considerations, we first fit a $\beta$-model to each network and then on the common set of students, we perform a joint analysis of the differential sociality variable $\hat{\beta}_{2020-04,i} - \hat{\beta}_{2019-09,i}$ with their mental health variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>friend</th>
<th>p.interaction</th>
<th>e.support</th>
<th>inf.support</th>
<th>co-study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean degree (2019-09)</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>6.454</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>2.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. dev. (2019-09)</td>
<td>(2.554)</td>
<td>(4.225)</td>
<td>(1.503)</td>
<td>(1.692)</td>
<td>(2.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean degree (2020-04)</td>
<td>4.007</td>
<td>5.657</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>1.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. dev. (2020-04)</td>
<td>(2.878)</td>
<td>(3.810)</td>
<td>(1.749)</td>
<td>(1.835)</td>
<td>(2.071)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a third consideration. Both networks, despite their small sizes, are very sparse, as shown in Table 3. This suggests the need of proper regularization. The degree distribution supports that $\beta_i$’s might not be $\ell_0$-sparsity, and our proposed $\ell_2$ regularization seems a more suitable approach. We fit one $\beta$-model to each sociality variable, attempting different choices of $\lambda$. Figure 4 shows how the values of $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ changes over different choices of the tuning parameter $\lambda$. Throughout this data application, we set $\lambda = 10$ for a mild amount of regularization, in view of network sparsity.

Recall our goal is to study the relationship between mental health and sociality, track the impact...
Figure 3: Joint distribution of $(\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,1}, \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,2})$. Row 1: fix $n = 50$ and increase $\lambda \in \{0.1, 10, 200\}$; row 2: fix $\lambda = 200$ and increase $n \in \{100, 400, 1600\}$; the other simulation configurations are identical across all 6 plots.

Figure 4: Sensitivity analysis of $\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}$ over different choices of $\lambda$.

Table 4 suggests that loneliness appears to be the most significantly impacted aspect of students’ mental health. It becomes the prominent factor at the early stage of the pandemic lockdown, reflected
Table 4: Estimated CCA coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>depression</td>
<td>0.259 (0.813)</td>
<td>0.009 (0.994)</td>
<td>0.659 (0.413)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>-0.468 (0.616)</td>
<td>-0.096 (0.928)</td>
<td>-0.427 (0.583)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stress</td>
<td>0.164 (0.864)</td>
<td>-0.995 (0.257)</td>
<td>-0.766 (0.226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loneliness</td>
<td>0.903 (0.121)</td>
<td>1.058 (0.116)</td>
<td>0.525 (0.386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend</td>
<td>-0.734 (0.296)</td>
<td>-0.600 (0.396)</td>
<td>-0.119 (0.838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.interaction</td>
<td>0.891 (0.186)</td>
<td>0.366 (0.615)</td>
<td>0.884 (0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.support</td>
<td>-0.178 (0.822)</td>
<td>-0.923 (0.174)</td>
<td>-0.733 (0.539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.support</td>
<td>-0.467 (0.575)</td>
<td>0.742 (0.332)</td>
<td>0.322 (0.565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-study</td>
<td>-0.307 (0.644)</td>
<td>-0.406 (0.512)</td>
<td>-0.360 (0.503)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

by both the “2020-04” column and the “difference” column. We also notice the dropped importance of the competing variables depression and anxiety. This echoes the reported findings in Elmer et al. (2020) that for many students, study and exam pressures that translate into these two variables had become secondary, giving way to loneliness that was significantly amplified by the pandemic lockdown. On the sociality side, as anticipated, we did observe clear negative association between loneliness and in-person sociality variables, such as friend and co-study. Interestingly, CCA identifies an increasingly positive association between loneliness and pleasant interaction when entering lockdown. To understand why this observation does not conflict with the observation that loneliness in general increases and pleasant interaction drops, we recall that the CCA reflects the level of “synchronization” between variables’ deviations from their own centers. In other words, those who feel much more loneliness than average tend to be those who also have comparatively much more pleasant interactions, but not co-study as in-person reactions are restricted in lockdown. This aligns with the common understanding that students largely switched their interaction format from face-to-face to digital (first paragraph beneath Figure 4 on page 12 of Elmer et al. (2020)). The result also clearly reveals the negative psychological impact of such transform.

5.2 Data example 2: fast analysis of two huge COVID-19 knowledge graphs

In this subsection, we apply our accelerated estimation method in Section 2.3 onto two huge COVID-19 knowledge graphs. These applications clearly demonstrate our method’s significant superiority in scaling up and memory efficiency compared to previous methods.

The first data set Wise et al. (2020) is part of the open-access Amazon data lake that is still updating real-time at the frequency of several times per hour. We analyze the version downloaded at 20:06pm UTC on 15th September, 2021. After cleaning, the citation network contains $n = 57312$ papers (nodes). The second data set Steenwinckel et al. (2020) was transcribed from the well-known Kaggle CORD-19 data challenge in 2020. We downloaded the data from https://www.kaggle.com/group16/covid19-literature-knowledge-graph, which contains $n = 1304155 \approx 1.3$ million nodes. The reason we choose to study these two particular COVID-19 knowledge graph databases is that they are comparatively well-documented and maintained and require less effort to clean. The sizes of these data are prohibitive for the conventional GLM-based algorithms for fitting $\beta$-models, such as Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2020); Yan et al. (2015) and Stein and Leng (2021), which need hours to compute networks of a few thousand nodes. In sharp contrast, our code only costs less than 10 minutes on a personal computer to estimate for Steenwinckel et al. (2020) ($n \approx 1.3$ million).

Both data sets are structured following the typical knowledge graph fashion. The raw data are
formatted in such 3-tuples: (entity 1, relation, entity 2). Examples include (paper 1, cites, paper 2), (paper, authored by, author 1): one entry for each author, (author, membership, institution 1) and (institution, in, country/region). In this study, we focus on the paper citation network and ignore edge directions like did in Li and Yang (2021) and Liu et al. (2019). Indeed, there are many interesting scientific problems that one can potentially ask regarding these data sets. Due to page and scope limits, in this paper, we focus on findings arguably most relevant to β-model.

5.2.1 Data set 2a: the ISWC 2020 transcription of Kaggle CORD-19 data challenge

We first analyze the transcribed Kaggle data set (Steenwinckel et al., 2020). Compared to the Amazon data set Wise et al. (2020), Steenwinckel et al. (2020) has a larger citation network but fewer nodal variables and no map between paper and topics (keywords). Therefore, its analysis is comparatively simpler than the Amazon data. However, in this ISWC transcription of Kaggle data, we should be alerted that most of the 1.3 million nodes in the complete network here are not COVID-19 studies, but general medical literature. We would use the complete network to estimate \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \); afterwards, we use metadata.csv in Kaggle CORD-19 open challenge to filter and only keep COVID-19 papers, similar to the treatment in Rausch (2020).

Here, we focus on the nodal covariate country and compare the empirical distributions of \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) entries corresponding to different countries. We selected 6 representative countries/regions in the study of pandemic: UK, China, USA, EU (we counted France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Switzerland and Netherlands, which constitute the overwhelming majority of papers from EU), Japan plus South Korea, and India. All other papers are collected by the “Other” category. To choose a proper tuning parameter, we vary \( \lambda \in \{25, 50, 100, 200, 400\} \) and plot the track of \( \text{Sign}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) \odot \log(|\hat{\beta}_\lambda|) \) in Figure 5. Based on this empirical guidance, we choose \( \lambda = 100 \). Then we run our accelerated Newton’s method on the complete network, and filter \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) entries using CORD-19 metadata as aforementioned. As we clearly see, Figure 5 is very different from Figure 4 due to their very different network sparsity levels. This echoes our Lemma 2 and consistency theorems in Section 3 in that for mildly dense networks, we favor small \( \lambda \) choices to avoid regularization-induced bias; however, for large and sparse networks, a decent amount of regularization would be necessary.

Figure 5: Track of \( \text{Sign}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) \odot \log(|\hat{\beta}_\lambda|) \), Left: Steenwinckel et al. (2020); right: Wise et al. (2020)

Table 5 reports the numerical summary of estimation results and Figure 6 shows the region-wise histograms. Our findings are as follows. First, we see that the 6 selected regions, as Table 5 shows, have similar \( \hat{\beta}_\lambda \) distribution locations and spans, and they are all clearly right-skewed. But we also
Table 5: Estimated $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>JpKr</th>
<th>India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry count</td>
<td>53336</td>
<td>5265</td>
<td>13574</td>
<td>4214</td>
<td>10041</td>
<td>2173</td>
<td>1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{std}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda)$</td>
<td>(0.290)</td>
<td>(0.385)</td>
<td>(0.399)</td>
<td>(0.359)</td>
<td>(0.369)</td>
<td>(0.351)</td>
<td>(0.351)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Overlapping histograms of estimated $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ by region

understand the observed right-skewness is perhaps partially due to the regularization effect that brings the lower estimated $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ entries closer to each other. Second, despite different total paper counts, the $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ distributions across the 6 regions we studied show similar marginal distributions. Inspecting the raw data, we understand that this can be partially attributed to the active international collaboration and mutual citation. Overall, we see from Figure 5 the clear evidence of solidarity and unbiasedness among scientists and researchers studying COVID-19.

5.2.2 Data set 2b: the Amazon public COVID-19 data lake, knowledge graph section

The Amazon public COVID-19 data lake Wise et al. (2020) documents less papers ($n = 57312$) than Steenwinckel et al. (2020), but provides richer details on each entry, including a list of “topics”, which can be understood as key words that are not specified by the authors but automatically learned by a latent Dirichlet allocation (Blei et al., 2003) text analysis (see the “Graph Structure” section of Kulkarni et al. (2020)). The outcome can be represented as a list for paper $i$: \{$\text{topic}_j^{(i)} : s_j^{(i)} | j = 1, \ldots, k_i$\}, where $s_j^{(i)} \in [0, 1]$ is a score indicating the relevance of the topic. Here, we are interested in finding the “core” and “peripheral” topics in current literature. Our approach is to propose a “Weighted Accumulative Beta Score (WABS)”. For each concept $j$, let $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be the index set of all papers that specify $j$ in its relevant topic list, and $s_j^{(i)}$ be the corresponding relevance score reported in the data set. We define

$$WABS_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_j} \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,j} \times s_j^{(i)} \quad (37)$$

We remark two considerations in designing WABS. First, we design it as a sum, rather than an average, because the total count carries useful information and should be reflected in the measure. But also, our
second consideration in designing (37) is to prevent “quantity over quality” by re-weighting each relevance score \(s_j^{(i)}\) by the paper’s global popularity \(\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i}\). In plain words, for a topic to sit at the center of the knowledge base, not only it should be a closely relevant topic of many papers, but further, it needs to be associated with many influential papers. Meanwhile, connecting to too many “peripheral” papers in the literature should deal negative impact on the rank of a topic. Similar to the aforementioned point in our analysis of data example 1 (Elmer et al., 2020), our proposed WABS measure inherits the scale-free advantage from \(\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}\), thus is comparable across networks of potentially very different sizes.

Table 6: Summary statistics for top- and bottom-50 concepts, ranked by Weighted Accumulative Beta Score (WABS)

| Concept Category | Paper # | Avg\(|d_i|\) | WABS | Concept Category | Paper # | Avg\(|d_i|\) | WABS |
|------------------|---------|-------------|------|------------------|---------|-------------|------|
| infection        | dx name | 21430       | 9.23 | 8225.66          | pain    | dx name     | 1392 | -341.67 |
| respiratory syndrome | dx name | 8298  | 11.30 | 3610.80         | surgery | dx name     | 1248 | 3.88   |
| respiratory tract | sys. organ | 5666  | 13.06 | 3580.74         | injury  | dx name     | 1903 | 4.62   |
| viral infection   | dx name | 7408  | 9.92  | 3350.25         | tumor   | dx name     | 1768 | 4.64   |
| pneumonia         | dx name | 5377  | 12.58 | 2907.42         | trauma  | dx name     | 1012 | 3.73   |
| lung              | sys. organ | 7151  | 10.58 | 2674.28         | breast  | sys. organ  | 1220 | 3.84   |
| fever             | dx name | 6490  | 10.32 | 2565.88         | skin    | sys. organ  | 3747 | 5.07   |
| death             | dx name | 9250  | 9.08  | 2492.65         | cancer  | dx name     | 3420 | 5.07   |
| vaccine           | treatment | 6128  | 9.76  | 2300.47         | bone    | sys. organ  | 1060 | 5.19   |
| cough             | dx name | 4337  | 11.70 | 2220.71         | abdomen | sys. organ  | 548  | 3.79   |
| infect            | dx name | 6644  | 10.48 | 2230.50         | stroke  | dx name     | 582  | 4.67   |
| diarrhea          | dx name | 3758  | 10.92 | 1601.96         | chemotherapy | treatment | 1012 | 4.70   |
| culture           | test name | 6519  | 9.27  | 1943.69         | breast cancer | dx name | 579 | 3.24   |
| respiratory disease | dx name | 2985  | 13.59 | 1927.54         | joint   | sys. organ  | 1147 | 5.16   |
| respiratory infection | dx name | 3436  | 12.07 | 1927.31         | wound   | dx name     | 814  | 4.31   |
| die               | dx name | 5106  | 10.23 | 1709.91         | metastasis | dx name | 471 | 2.48   |
| rt-pcr test       | test name | 2819  | 14.56 | 1697.87         | obesity | dx name     | 840  | 5.90   |
| titer             | test name | 2955  | 11.19 | 1567.53         | injury  | dx name     | 378  | 2.83   |
| respiratory syncytial virus | dx name | 3223  | 11.62 | 1465.27         | tuberculosis | dx name | 2374 | 5.65   |
| pcr test          | test name | 3826  | 10.29 | 1561.54         | bladder | sys. organ  | 526  | 4.39   |
| influenza dx      | dx name | 3570  | 9.25  | 1532.95         | ECG     | test name   | 223  | 2.15   |
| phylogenetic analysis | test name | 1948  | 15.33 | 1513.80         | fracture | dx name | 297  | 3.59   |
| respiratory tract | dx name | 2286  | 12.57 | 1402.85         | ultrasound | test name | 420 | 3.70   |
| respiratory virus | dx name | 2247  | 12.59 | 1390.12         | insuline | generic name | 498 | 3.44   |
| rsv               | dx name | 2558  | 10.81 | 1382.48         | urinary tract infection | dx name | 451 | 3.91   |
| throat            | sys. organ | 2486  | 13.09 | 1323.66         | soft tissue | sys. organ | 332 | 2.75   |
| kidney            | sys. organ | 3885  | 11.00 | 1299.52         | neoplasm | dx name | 321 | 2.70   |
| HIV               | dx name | 5603  | 7.65  | 1216.55         | thyroid | sys. organ  | 378  | 4.54   |
| respiratory illness | dx name | 1830  | 13.82 | 1212.84         | le | sys. organ | 365 | 3.48   |
| adenoavirus       | dx name | 2559  | 11.24 | 1161.80         | ischemia | dx name | 388 | 3.40   |
| ribavirin         | generic name | 1379  | 16.55 | 1160.71         | urinrinary tract | sys. organ | 662 | 4.34   |
| serum sample test | test name | 2014  | 12.22 | 1135.51         | burn    | dx name     | 340  | 3.13   |
| human metapneumovirus | dx name | 1477  | 14.41 | 1079.35         | prostate | sys. organ | 688 | 4.77   |
| streptomycin      | generic name | 2422  | 8.77  | 1076.98         | metronidazole | generic name | 282 | 2.73   |
| vomiting          | dx name | 2220  | 11.22 | 1073.20         | alzheimer ’s disease | dx name | 469 | 3.78   |
| hand              | sys. organ | 6646  | 7.54  | 1050.81         | tooth   | sys. organ  | 341 | 2.87   |
| lcov              | test name | 856   | 25.52 | 1038.77         | ulcer   | dx name     | 387 | 3.29   |
| chest             | sys. organ | 2622  | 12.34 | 1003.15         | leg    | sys. organ  | 593 | 4.08   |
| penicillin        | generic name | 2970  | 8.22  | 1000.78         | bowel   | sys. organ  | 792 | 4.67   |
| respiratory symptom | dx name | 1730  | 14.20 | 995.05          | blood pressure | test name | 597 | 5.79   |
| plaque            | dx name | 2202  | 10.38 | 953.57          | extremity | sys. organ | 445 | 4.23   |
| interferon        | generic name | 1934  | 12.24 | 938.87          | abscesse | dx name | 460 | 4.23   |
| liver             | sys. organ | 4825  | 8.99  | 933.31          | Malaria  | dx name     | 429  | 4.75   |
| parainfluenza virus | dx name | 1631  | 12.73 | 929.38          | mri     | test name   | 486 | 6.43   |
| gastroenteritis virus | dx name | 1016  | 20.89 | 902.23          | cephalosporin | generic name | 486 | 4.32   |
| hepatitis virus   | dx name | 1424  | 16.55 | 896.50          | carcinoma | dx name | 314 | 2.71   |
| rhinovirus        | dx name | 2904  | 10.38 | 886.86          | hair    | sys. organ  | 492 | 3.98   |
| asymptomatic      | dx name | 2263  | 10.53 | 886.70          | Le | sys. organ | 281 | 2.67   |
| viral replication  | dx name | 1568  | 14.85 | 876.52          | blindness | dx name | 307 | 2.89   |
| respiratory disease syndrome | dx name | 1423  | 17.12 | 876.29          | nerve   | sys. organ  | 465 | 4.57   |

In view of the \(\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}\) track plot in the right panel of Figure 5, we select \(\lambda = 40\) and run our fast Newton’s
method to obtain $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ and then compute WABS scores. Table 6 reports the top- and bottom-50 topics ranked by their WABS ratings. The outcome well-matches our intuitive understandings. For instance, the top-ranked list contains relevant organs such as respiratory tract, lung and throat that are directly related to COVID-19 as a respiratory disease, but also includes organs like kidney and liver, which are now widely-believed important attack objectives of the virus (Fan et al., 2020; Hirsch et al., 2020; Pei et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). Top-ranked concepts related to testing methods and treatments, including culture (meaning “viral culturing”), PCR, phylogenetic analysis (related to backtracking ancestors of the virus and monitoring latest variants) and vaccine, also reflect the current mainstream approaches. The other top entries cover important symptoms and related viruses.

In contrast, most concepts ranked in the bottom seem to lack either specificity, such as dx:pain, procedure:surgery and organ:skin; or relevance, such as dx:injury, treatment:chemotherapy, dx:tumor and organ:bone. Comparing the top- and bottom-lists, we see that our proposed WABS score yields evidently more meaningful result than several potential alternative approaches, such as simply ranking concepts by counting the number of papers they present. Some clearly irrelevant entries in the bottom-list, such as injury, tumor and cancer, have comparable or even higher paper-presence counts than some top-tiers including respiratory illness, phylogenetic analysis and asymptomatic. Our criterion WABS, based on our proposed efficient $\beta$-model fitting for large networks, effectively recognizes the consistent presence of the latter set of concepts in high-influence research papers.

6 Discussion

In this paper, we focus exclusively on analyzing the network. We also analyze nodal covariates in data examples, but they do not participate in the network generation model. The reason is mainly three-fold. First, we pursue a good understanding of a simple model, and then gradually push forward towards more complex ones. Even at the first stage of this approach, our paper shows that a lot can be done with much still remaining for future work. The second reason is that the joint modeling with covariates (Stein and Leng, 2020, 2021; Yan et al., 2019) may encounter substantive challenge in large and sparse networks, where the response is highly to extremely imbalanced, with most 0’s and few 1’s. Some treatments may be necessary to properly address this issue, see analogous discussions in classification (Sun et al., 2009). Considering the current load of contents in this paper, we take a simple route for cleanness: first apply our developed methodology, tuned by theoretical guidance, to analyze the sparse network, and then perform downstream multivariate analysis using the estimated $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$ and nodal covariates. The third reason is computation. As pointed out by Stein and Leng (2021), the monotonicity lemma would not hold for a joint model involving covariates. Consequently, the joint model could not yet effectively scale up beyond $n \approx 10^3$ nodes. The data examples we studied in this paper have up to $10^7$ nodes and are typically very sparse.

Another interesting question is whether our work can be extended to bipartite and directed networks. We envision extension to bipartite networks to be quite natural, as Lemma 1 easily extends to the bipartite case, after slight adoptions. Extension to direct networks, however, is nontrivial and would require novel treatment, because there, the lack of symmetry $A_{i,j} \neq A_{j,i}$ would break Lemma 1. Due to page and scope limits, we study this topic in an ongoing project but not in this paper.

On selecting the tuning parameter, our Lemma 2, Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 4 provide some theoretical guidance. Also, our analysis of three real-world data sets demonstrate a rule of thumb: selecting the smallest $\lambda$ that stabilizes the estimated $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$. Nonetheless, one may still wonder if a fully automated tuning is possible. Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2020) and Stein and Leng (2021) can employ BIC since they pursue $\ell_0$ sparsity. We impose a soft regularization and thus BIC is no longer
applicable. In Supporting Information, we propose a new AIC-type criterion for automated tuning of \( \lambda \), and demonstrate its usefulness in an illustrative simulation. But similar to Chen et al. (2021); Stein and Leng (2020) and Stein and Leng (2021), rigorous theoretical justification of BIC or AIC type tuning might be a challenging future work.

Our paper exclusively focuses on analyzing \( \beta \)-models with independent edge generation. There exist a line of fine works that address dependent edges (Frank and Strauss, 1986; Hunter et al., 2012; Schweinberger and Stewart, 2020). While edge dependency is a very interesting and important topic, we do not study it in this paper for two reasons. First, as is clear to readers, even for independent-edge \( \beta \)-models, there still remains much to explore. We would first pursue a better understanding of simpler models, and then push towards more complex ones. Second, in large and sparse networks, the scarcity of observed information and the large number of parameters set extraordinary challenges that might not permit us to fit a model of even moderate sophistication.
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