

# Automatic detection of multilevel communities: scalable and resolution-limit-free

Kun Gao, Xuezao Ren, Lei Zhou and Junfang Zhu

*School of Science, Southwest University of Science and Technology, Mianyang 621010,  
Sichuan Province, People's Republic of China*

## Abstract

Community detection in complex networks has been hindered by two defects: (1) the resolution limit problem, which restrains simultaneous detection for communities of heterogeneous sizes, and (2) divergent outputs of the optimization algorithm, which set hurdles for the differentiation of more relevant and significant results. In this paper, we suggest a renewed method for community detection via a scalable community fitness function. Due to its scalability, this method is on the one hand free of the resolution limit problem, even in large heterogeneous networks, and on the other hand capable of detecting multiple levels of communities in deep hierarchical networks. Moreover, we propose a strict definition for the term “plateau,” which has been always loosely used in previous literature, to help us remove random and irrelevant outputs *automatically*—without any artificial selection. As a result, our method has “neat” outputs that include only stable and informative plateaus. On synthetic networks with prearranged community structures, our method outperforms most previous methods by recreating the prearranged communities accurately, while on real-world networks, it discovers reasonable community structures that fit the ground truth we already know about the network.

**Keywords:** community detection, resolution limit problem, multilevel communities, Louvain algorithm

## 1. Introduction

Community, also known as network cluster, is a mesoscopic structure ubiquitous in many real-world systems whose topologies are generally described by complex networks [1]. Since highlighted by Girvan and Newman in 2002 [2], community structure of network has deserved much attention from many researchers, especially physicists and mathematicians [3, 4, 5]. Being distinct from the microscopic (single-node) or the macroscopic (whole-network) statistical properties of complex networks, community structure characteristically reveals functional, relational or social information from groups of nodes [1]. Community detection aims at exploring optimized divisions of a network into groups of nodes, with the connections inside each group being denser than those between different groups [6]. It is expected that a community detection method may perfectly recreate community structures that are already known from other studies, or make promising predictions on the structures or functions of a given network [2]. Ideally, if a certain community structure within a network can be recognized even by visual inspection, then a good method of community detection should not fail to discover it [7].

Nevertheless, to detect communities from a network is always a challenge. Related studies can be traced back all along to “graph partitioning” in graph theory [8], or “hierarchical clustering” in sociology [9]. For large graphs, finding an exact solution to a partitioning task has been proven an NP-complete problem [6, 8]—and in the case of complex networks it is even more complicated: the total number of communities is usually unknown [6], the sizes of different communities may differ by orders of magnitude [10], and the overall structure of the whole network can be multilevel or hierarchical [10, 11, 12]. Existing methods for community detection commonly turn to heuristic algorithms for acceptably good solutions [6]; most typically, many methods use a *quality function* to assess the validity of each potential partition of the network. This quality function, is customarily formulated into either a modularity function in modularity-based methods [6, 13, 14, 15, 16], or a Hamiltonian of a first principle Potts model [17] in certain dynamical methods [18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. Heuristic algorithm is then implemented to optimize the quality function, i.e., to maximize the modularity, or minimize the Potts Hamiltonian.

Community detection method based on function optimization has been argued to be limited by two major drawbacks. The first one is the well-known *resolution limit problem* raised by Fortunato and Barthelemy in 2007 [23]. Depending on the numbers of intra connections of communities and the total number of connections within the whole network, a modularity optimization method tends to merge small communities (even if they are well-defined clusters as complete graphs) into larger but sparser ones. This reveals a fact that modularity optimization method can’t find communities of small sizes, like microscope can’t find microbes beyond its resolution range. For quality functions other than modularity, the same phenomenon has also been observed [24]. To overcome such a limit, a variety of “multiresolution” methods [3, 16, 19, 21] and “resolution-limit-free” [22, 25] methods have been suggested. The former uses a tunable parameter to alter the resolution, and enables the detection on communities of different levels in different resolution scales, while the latter refrains from using a “null model” to avoid the resolution limit. However, a further study by Lancichinetti and Fortunato [7] pointed out that the resolution limit problem is actually induced simultaneously by two opposite tendencies: the tendency of merging small clusters, and the tendency of breaking large ones. When communities in a same network have very different sizes, it becomes impossible for an optimization method, no matter modularity-based or Hamiltonian-based, to avoid both biases simultaneously. Multiresolution and resolution-limit-free methods seem to have outperformed other methods only because the cluster sizes used in their tests are too close to one another, spanning less than one order of magnitude [7]. When the cluster sizes vary over up to two orders of magnitude,

as in many real-world networks [10, 26], existing multiresolution and resolution-limit-free methods also fail to detect the expected community structures [7].

The second drawback of community detection is that finding an optimal division for a given network is normally infeasible. It has been recognized that the modularity landscape of a network is often “glassy,” including an exponentially growing (with system size) numbers of local maxima [7, 27]. These local maxima may all be very close to the “global” maximum in terms of modularity, but the corresponding partitions of the network can be topologically very different from one another [27]. This implies that not only an exactly optimal division for a network is intrinsically unreachable [7], but the accessible solutions in practice can be largely unstable and inconsistent. Multiresolution methods furtherly aggravate the problem: communities detected at “irrelevant” resolution scales are often messy: they are mostly incomprehensible and, for all practical purposes, uninformative. Although it has been argued that inquiring which is the “best” or “most relevant” scale of resolution is an ill posed question [3], many methods still manage to find out the most *stable* resolution scales within which persistent structures of communities emerge. If an identical community structure is repeatedly detected (as local maxima) at a series of different resolutions, this community structure is considered as a stable solution to the community detection task. The existence of such stable solutions is an “observed fact” [3]: they display strong “plateaus” against the resolution parameter [21]. It has become popular in previous literature to rank the relevance of different resolution scales by the strength of plateaus; stable solutions retrieved from strong plateaus have been demonstrated to be frequently consistent with the *a priori* knowledge about the network [3, 16, 21].

Nonetheless, existing methods using the stability of plateaus are not yet satisfying. On the one hand, a “plateau” is supposed to reflect multiple times of convergence onto an identical topology of community structure at different resolutions. However, no *explicit* comparison on the topologies of different data points within a same plateau has been presented in previous literature, leaving a doubt that these data points may sometimes represent not the same communities at all. Some methods as in [3, 28, 29] simply distinguish plateaus by the numbers of communities, some by the values of the modularity [16], while some others as in [21] execute information-based quantitative comparisons among the topologies of communities detected on multiple “replicas” of the network at each *fixed resolution*—yet communities detected at *varying resolutions* are still not compared. According to the discussion in [27], none of such definitions can guarantee each plateau as defined represents an identical community structure. On the other hand, evaluating the stability of plateaus by their lengths is not always effective. Although large plateaus are almost all stable [3, 16, 21], stabilities of small plateaus are uncertain: some of them can be stable and informative, but some others are just “noise-like.” In some transitional resolution scales, small plateaus emerge randomly: they exhibit different topologies in different realizations, and in each realization, they just randomly converge to a local maximum merely by chance. Previous literature simply ignores all small plateaus, stable or unstable, or artificially selects their preferred results through the *a priori* knowledge about the network. Due to these defects, we believe a strict definition for the term “plateau,” as well as an effective strategy to evaluate the stability of plateaus, are both urgently needed.

In this paper, we propose a renewed method for the detection of multilevel communities at varying resolutions. To avoid the resolution limit problem, instead of the widely used modularity function [6], we adopt a modified community “fitness function” [16] to evaluate the quality of our communities. We employ a Louvain algorithm [30] to maximize this community fitness function. Then we implement an automatic differentiation on all the detected communities; only the best-and-unique solutions are retained and organized into stable plateaus in the final outputs.

## 2. Method

A typical multilevel community detection method includes three components: (1) a community quality function with a tunable resolution parameter, (2) an optimization algorithm to maximize (or minimize) the community quality function, and (3) a strategy to pick out relevant results from messy outputs. In this section, we introduce our method. We adopt a slightly modified community “fitness function” [16] as our quality function, and employ a “Louvain” algorithm [30] to maximize it. Then we propose a strategy to filter the outputs and organize stable community structures into “plateaus,” where our term of “plateau” will be more explicitly defined than those in previous literature.

### 2.1 Community Fitness function

In this paper, we choose the “fitness function” proposed by Lancichinetti and Fortunato [16] as our community quality function. We choose this function because it is by design more “scalable” than traditional quality functions and is promising to avoid the resolution limit problem. The original form of the community fitness function proposed in [16] is

$$F = \sum_{\mathcal{G}} f^{\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{\mathcal{G}} \frac{k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}}{(k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}} + k_{out}^{\mathcal{G}})^{\alpha}}. \quad (\text{Formula 1})$$

Here  $\mathcal{G}$  denotes a community given by a certain division of the network,  $f^{\mathcal{G}}$  quantifies the fitness (i.e., quality) of community  $\mathcal{G}$ , and  $F$  assesses the quality of all communities: larger values of  $F$  indicate more reasonable community structures.  $k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $k_{out}^{\mathcal{G}}$  in the formula stand for the *in-degree* and *out-degree* of community  $\mathcal{G}$ , defined in the same way as those in previous literature such as [12].  $\alpha$  ( $\alpha > 0$ ) is a *resolution parameter* that tunes the resolution: large values of  $\alpha$  yield small communities, while small values of  $\alpha$  instead deliver large communities [16].

The original form of  $F$  as shown in formula 1 can be directly used in our method; actually we do use it in many of our calculations in the following part of this paper. For networks of relatively simple structures,  $F$  is sufficiently good—yet for those having multilevel or hierarchical structures, it will be helpful to introduce an additional parameter to rescale the range of resolution for the fitness function. In this paper, we adopt the following modified form of  $F$

$$F_{\alpha}^{\beta} = \sum_{\mathcal{G}} (F_{\alpha}^{\beta})^{\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{\mathcal{G}} \frac{(k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}})^{\beta}}{(k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}} + k_{out}^{\mathcal{G}})^{\alpha}}. \quad (\text{Formula 2})$$

Here the power exponent  $\beta$  ( $\beta \geq 1$ ) is our newly introduced “*scaling factor*,” when  $\beta = 1$ , formula 2 degrades to formula 1. The scaling factor  $\beta$  amplifies the varying range of the resolution parameter  $\alpha$ ; in supplementary material, we estimate for each fixed  $\beta$  the “relevant” range of  $\alpha$  is  $\beta - 1 < \alpha < 2\beta - 1$ . Here the upper bound  $2\beta - 1$  prevents unexpected splitting of large communities, while the lower bound  $\beta - 1$  avoids inappropriate merging of small communities. For networks having only one significant community level, scanning within  $(\beta - 1, 2\beta - 1)$  is usually sufficient for the expected communities being detected. But for networks having multiple community levels, within  $(\beta - 1, 2\beta - 1)$  only communities of the lowest level (i.e., communities of smallest sizes which cannot be split further) can be detected. To obtain communities of higher levels, it is required to merge small communities into larger ones, thus the lower bound  $\beta - 1$  must be relaxed. In practice, we run our algorithm with the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  varying between 0 and  $2\beta - 1$ , which makes our detection on different levels of communities within different resolution scales become possible.

## 2.2 Heuristic optimization algorithm

Since optimizing a community quality function has been proven an NP-complete problem [6, 8], heuristic algorithms are generally adopted to obtain the *best accessible solutions*. Early methods such as those in [2, 6] usually have heavy demands on computational resources, while more recently a number of faster algorithms have been proposed [13, 26, 30, 31, 32]. Among them, the “Louvain” algorithm raised by Blondel *et al.* [30] has been widely adopted due to its prominent efficiency and high accuracy. The label “Louvain” comes from the authors’ affiliation (UCLouvain); alternatively, it is also called a “BGLL” algorithm by the authors’ initials. Originally, the Louvain algorithm is designed as a greedy algorithm to optimize the standard modularity function proposed by Newman [30]; similar algorithm has also been adopted to optimize a Potts Hamiltonian by other methods [21, 22].

We employ the Louvain algorithm to optimize our community fitness function (formula 2) in this paper. Here we briefly describe its steps; for more details, please refer to [30].

- (1) *Initialize communities*. At the very beginning, each node of the network is designated to an individual community. A network consisting of  $N$  nodes is then divided into  $N$  communities of size 1.
- (2) *Optimize communities of the lowest level*. Sequentially consider each node of the network and scan its neighboring communities (i.e., communities sharing at least one edge with the node in focus). Calculate the potential gains of the fitness function (formula 2) if the node in focus was moved from its original community to each of its neighboring communities. Place the node in the community that leads to a maximum value of the fitness function.
- (3) *Iterate until convergence*. Repeat step (2) until a maximum value of formula 2 is reached where no more moves of any node may further increase this value. During this process, the sequence of orders of nodes is randomized every time a new round of iteration is started.
- (4) *Merge communities to build a higher community level*. Consider each community obtained at the convergence of step (3) as a *fixed module*; hereafter all its members (nodes) must be moved together. Repeat steps (2) and (3) by moving each fixed module in the same way as moving a node. During this process, connected modules gradually condense to form higher levels of communities, until a maximum value of formula 2 is reached.
- (5) *Iterate until convergence at the highest level*. Repeat step (4) and detect communities at all levels, until the highest level is detected where no further merging of any communities can increase the fitness function.
- (6) *Output communities*. Communities of different levels detected by the above steps (1) to (5) form a hierarchical structure; each level can be independently outputted, if needed. In this paper, we only output the highest level since it has a maximum value of the fitness function among all levels.

As a heuristic method, the Louvain algorithm does not guarantee on multiple “replicas” of a given network [21], it always converges to exactly the same solution. Customarily, people take the replica having a maximum value of the fitness function as the best solution obtained at a given resolution. In this paper, we adopt an even stricter strategy the filter the outputs, by which we retain only the *best-and-unique* solutions, as we will describe in the next section.

### 2.3 Strategy of filtering the outputs

When the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  varies, the Louvain algorithm optimizing our fitness function may converge to different solutions corresponding to different topologies of community structures. As a matter of fact, not all resolution scales are necessarily stable, or apparently yield any reasonable output. Previous methods customarily retrieve the most “relevant” resolution scales by the stability of “plateaus” [3, 16, 21, 27, 28, 29], only the term “plateau” was everywhere loosely defined (see our argument in the Introduction). In this paper, we suggest a much stricter definition for “plateau,” and correspondingly a stricter strategy to identify them. By our definition, a plateau is a continuous scale of resolution within which a heuristic optimization algorithm uniformly converges to a *unique* topology of community structure. To identify such plateaus, it is required to compare the topologies of not only solutions obtained at each fixed resolution, but also those obtained at varying resolutions. In practice, we suggest the following strategy to discover such plateaus:

- (1) *At each fixed resolution*, with fixed values of parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we implement the Louvain algorithm on multiple replicas of the given network. Among the outputs of all replicas, we adopt the one with the highest value of the fitness function as the *best solution* obtained at this resolution. In addition, we require the topology of this best solution must be *unique*: in case two or more solutions have equally highest values of the fitness function but represent not exactly the same topology, these solutions will be all abandoned, and the corresponding resolution will be considered unstable and does not contribute to any potential plateau.
- (2) *At different resolutions*, with varying values of  $\alpha$  (during which the value of  $\beta$  is still fixed), we run the above step (1) and obtain the best-and-unique solutions at all resolutions except unstable ones. Then we compare the topologies of all best-and-unique solutions obtained and organize their corresponding resolution scales into plateaus: resolutions within a same plateau must correspond to an identical topology of community structure.

Plateaus defined and identified as above ensure all resolutions within a same plateau strictly yield an identical topology of community structure—only then can the stability (or significance) of plateaus be measured by their lengths. It has become a convention in previous literature [3, 16, 21, 27, 28, 29] to take communities detected by large plateaus as the most relevant results, or artificially select favored results that best fit the *a priori* knowledge about the network. To our viewpoint, all plateaus, as long as they are stable, should have their own particular information [3]: they represent different topologies, and most typically, different community levels. Thus we refrain from selecting our results by the lengths of plateaus. Instead, our method automatically filters all the results by the above strategy, and outputs “only the stable, and all the stable plateaus.”

For some networks whose fitness landscape is really glassy [7], sometimes it is not sufficient to remove unstable results from multiple realizations; some small and unstable plateaus may survive the comparison of multiple realizations. In this case, a further step may help. We run our method in multiple “ensembles,” where each ensemble involves multiple realizations of the Louvain algorithm implemented on the given network. Each ensemble outputs an independent set of plateaus. We then take an *intersection* over all sets of plateaus obtained in different ensembles: if at a certain resolution different ensembles yield different community structures, this resolution will be considered unstable and *knocked out* from the plateaus in the final output. Namely, by such an intersection we require not only “one plateau one topology,” but also this topology be unique through multiple ensembles. This constraint removes all small and unstable plateaus effectively and inartificially.



### 3. Results

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our method on six different networks: three synthetic and three real-world, which all have been widely used as benchmarks in previous literature. All networks selected have *a priori* community structures: synthetic networks contain prearranged communities during their constructions, while real-world networks all have standard divisions given by previous studies. We then investigate the performance of our method in reproducing such *a priori* communities for these networks.

The following calculations are implemented in the same way for all networks: with each fixed scaling factor  $\beta$ , we vary the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  from 0 to  $2\beta-1$ , with a stepwise increment  $\Delta\alpha = 0.01$ . At each resolution, we carry out 20 ensembles each involving 1000 realizations of the Louvain algorithm implemented on the given network. Plateaus in the final output are then obtained through an intersection over the outputs of all 20 ensembles.

This section is organized as following: in [section 3.1](#), we test our method’s ability of detecting multilevel community structures on homogeneous hierarchical networks; in [section 3.2](#), we test the robustness of our method on heterogeneous networks with communities of varying sizes; finally, in [section 3.3](#), we inspect its performance on real-world networks.


#### 3.1 On synthetic networks with hierarchical community structures

We firstly test our method with two hierarchical networks: the homogeneous in degree network H13-4 proposed by Arenas *et al.* [1], and the RB scale-free hierarchical network named after Ravasz and Barabasi [10]. Both these networks have multiple community levels, within which communities of the same level have homogeneous sizes. We expect our method reproduces multilevel community structures of these networks accurately.

The H13-4 network includes 256 nodes and 2 prearranged community levels, whose topology is shown in [figure 1 \(a\)](#). Every node of the H13-4 network has 18 randomly connected edges; among them 13 are restricted within the same first-level community (shown as the red edges in [figure 1\(a\)](#)), 4 edges (shown in blue) stretch out of their first-level community but still end up in the same second-level community, while only one edge (shown in brown) finally arrives at a different second-level community. The prearranged community structure within the H13-4 network is explicit: the first community level involves 16 communities each containing 16 nodes, and then every four first-level communities constitute one second-level community; besides, a third but trivial level is to merge the whole network into one single community. We implement our method on the H13-4 network in 20 ensembles with  $\beta=1$ . [Figure 1 \(b\)](#) shows the output of one single ensemble: three major plateaus emerge, corresponding respectively to the three prearranged community levels (including the third and trivial level), and the related topologies also perfectly match the prearranged ones. At very high resolutions ( $\alpha \geq 0.90$ ), a number of small plateaus emerge (see the “noise-like” data points denoted by red crosses in [figure 1 \(b\)](#)), dividing the network into irregular numbers of communities such as 25, 31, 32 and 71. These small plateaus are unstable: they all disappear in the intersection over 20 ensembles, while the three major plateaus all pass through the intersection without being affected (see [figure 1 \(c\)](#)). In conclusion, our method has perfectly reproduced the prearranged community structures within the H13-4 network.

It should be noted that although we exhibited different plateaus by their corresponding *numbers of communities* in the vertical axes of [figure 1 \(b\)](#) and [\(c\)](#), our plateaus are identified *not* simply by their numbers of communities, but through a complete comparison on the topologies of all solutions


obtained at all resolutions. This ensures that all data points within a same plateau strictly represent exactly the same community structure. On the other hand, since the H13-4 network has relatively simple community structure, with  $\beta=1$  our result is already sufficiently good;  $\beta>1$  simply yields the same result.



**Figure 1.** Communities in the H13-4 network. (a) Topology of the H13-4 network. With inner edges shorter than outer edges, the network is naturally displayed as 16 communities of the first level, or 4 communities of the second level. There are three types of edges in the network: red edges within the same first-level community, brown edges between different second-level communities, and blue edges between different first-level communities but still within the same second-level community; the proportions of these three types of edges are 13:1:4. (b) Plateaus outputted by a single ensemble with  $\beta=1$ . There are three major plateaus (with texts indicating their numbers of communities) which are stable, and a few “noise-like” plateaus (denoted by red crosses) that are unstable. (c) Intersection over all plateaus outputted by 20 ensembles, which retains all the stable plateaus but removes the noises.

Next we detect communities for the Ravasz-Barabasi (RB) networks [10]. The smallest RB network is RB5, which is a complete graph consisting of 5 nodes and 10 edges, see figure 2 (a). We call node 0 the *central node*, and all other nodes *peripheral nodes* of the RB5 network. RB5 is a basic unit to constitute larger RB networks. For example, five RB5 units, one in the center and four on the periphery, constitute an RB25 network, as shown in figure 2 (b) and (c). These RB5 units are connected in the following way: *every* peripheral node of the peripheral units is connected to the central node of the central unit, but the peripheral units themselves are not connected to one another. Note that in figure 2 (b) and (c), for convenience we did not shift the central node of each RB5 unit slightly off the center as in figure 2 (a): each RB5 unit in figure 2 (b) and (c) is still a complete graph containing 10 edges, only the diagonal edges become invisible by overlapping with other edges. In the same way, five RB25 networks constitute an RB125 network, as shown in figure 3. Obviously, the RB network is a fractal-like hierarchical network, which can grow infinitely.





**Figure 2.** Communities in the RB25 network. (a) An RB5 network is a complete graph consisting of 5 nodes and 10 edges. We call node 0 the central node, and all other nodes peripheral nodes of the RB5 network. (b) An RB25 network is composed of five RB5 units, one in the center and four on the periphery. Every peripheral node of the peripheral unit is connected to the central node of the central unit, but different peripheral units are not connected to one another. Ideally an RB25 network is expected to be divided into 5 communities: each RB5 unit makes a community. (c) A slightly different division than (b), which divides the RB25 network into 6 communities. Four peripheral RB5 units make four communities, and the central RB5 unit is divided into two communities: the central node makes one community and all peripheral nodes make the other; identical division has also been discovered previously in [34]. (d) and (e): Plateaus obtained from single ensembles of our community detection method with  $\beta=1$  and  $\beta=2$ .

The prearranged community structure within an RB network is apparent: an RB network with  $5^n$  nodes (hereafter we call it an “RB $5^n$ ” network”) is expected to be “naturally” divided into  $5^{n-1}$  RB5 units on the lowest community level, or  $5^{n-2}$  RB25 units on a higher level, and so on, constructing a hierarchical structure of  $n$  levels. However, *such “natural” divisions should not be taken for granted*. One problem is, within each RB $5^m$  unit ( $2 \leq m \leq n$ ), the central node (e.g., the red hollow circles in figures 2 (c), 3 (b) and 3 (c)) is connected to *every* peripheral node of the same unit. By the “natural” division, this central node always has more out-connections than in-connections, which violates the customary definition of community in a strong sense [33]. For example, the central node of an RB25 network in figure 2 (b) has 10 in-connections but 16 out-connections. Moreover, when the network becomes larger this problem gets even more serious: when  $n \geq 3$  the natural division further violates the definition of community in a weak sense [33]. Figure 3 (a) shows an example: the central RB5 community (red circles) within an RB125 network has an out-degree of 80 (all contributed by its central node), but an in-degree of only 20. Therefore, it should be reasonable to break up the central


community and isolate its central node as an individual community, as we did in [figure 2 \(c\)](#), as well as suggested by [\[34\]](#). On the lowest community level, each RB25 unit tends to be divided into 6 communities, thus an  $RB5^n$  network ( $n \geq 2$ ) will be divided into  $6 \times 5^{n-2}$  communities; [figure 3 \(b\)](#) shows an example that an RB125 network is so divided into 30 communities. Similarly, on a higher level, each RB125 unit can be divided into 10 communities: 4 peripheral RB25 communities, plus 6 communities from the central RB25 unit, as shown in [figure 3 \(c\)](#). On this level, an  $RB5^n$  network ( $n \geq 3$ ) will be divided into  $10 \times 5^{n-3}$  communities. Following this regulation, on the  $m$ -th community level ( $2 \leq m \leq n$ , here  $m=1$  stands for the lowest level), it is each  $RB5^{m+1}$  unit that is divided into  $4m+2$  communities, thus an  $RB5^n$  network ( $n \geq m+1$ ) will be finally divided into  $(4m+2) \times 5^{n-m-1}$  communities; [supplementary figure 1 \(a\)](#) exhibits an RB625 network as 14 third-level communities. [Table 1](#) summarizes a list of the numbers of communities given by the divisions described above on different levels of the RB networks. Next we demonstrate these divisions are *most robust*, and will be rightly discovered by our method.

RB5 <sup>n</sup> Networks	Community Levels ( <i>m</i> )					
	1 (Lowest)	2	3	4	5	6
RB25 ( <i>n</i> =2)	6	1	/	/	/	/
RB125 ( <i>n</i> =3)	30	10	1	/	/	/
RB625 ( <i>n</i> =4)	150	50	14	1	/	/
RB3125 ( <i>n</i> =5)	750	250	70	18	1	/
RB15625 ( <i>n</i> =6)	3750	1250 (fails to detect)	350	90	22 (fails to detect)	1

**Table 1.** Numbers of communities in the most robust divisions for the RB networks on different community levels. Here  $m=1$  stands for the lowest community level, which divides the network into smallest communities that cannot split further;  $m$  is restricted to be no larger than  $n$ . Numbers in this table all follow such a formula:  $(4m+2) \times 5^{n-m-1}$ . Our method detects all levels of communities when the network is not too large ( $n \leq 5$ ). When  $n$  is as large as 6 (an RB15625 network), the second and fifth levels, which are supposed to contain 1250 and 22 communities, are both missed in our result.

For the RB networks, our method detects different communities with different  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . With  $\beta=1$ , for all RB networks we detect only two community levels: the highest (but trivial) level that merges the whole network into one community, and the lowest level that divides the network into smallest communities that cannot split further; *intermediate levels, if exist, are all missed*. On the other hand, with  $\beta=1$  we detect different divisions for the lowest level. Except the robust divisions as listed in the first column of [table 1](#), we also detect the “natural” divisions, but only for *small* RB networks including RB25 and RB125 (see [figure 2 \(b\)](#) and [figure 3 \(a\)](#)); for larger RB networks, the natural divisions can no longer stand since they violate the customary definitions of community too seriously. Besides, with  $\beta=1$  an RB125 network can alternatively be divided into 26 communities—this can be done by isolating only the central node of each RB125 unit as an individual community, but keeping all peripheral units intact (see [figure 3 \(d\)](#)). Comparing to the divisions listed in [table 1](#), this variant division can be taken as a result of a “relaxed stringency.” With the such a stringency, an  $RB5^n$  network ( $n \geq 3$ ) can be divided into  $26 \times 5^{n-3}$  communities; this explains the plateaus for 26, 130, 650 and 3250 communities emerging in [figure 3 \(e\)](#) and [supplementary figures 1 \(b\), 2 \(a\) and 2 \(c\)](#). Since all these plateaus have similar community sizes (around 5), we classify them all to the lowest community level. Moreover, with a further relaxed stringency, where only the central node

of each RB625 unit is isolated as an individual community, an RB625 network can be divided into 126 communities. Yet such a stringency has been too relaxed that it only produces a very tiny plateau for the RB625 network in [supplementary figure 1 \(b\)](#), but hasn't been observed anywhere else.



**Figure 3.** Communities in the RB125 network. (a)–(d): Four different community structures detected by our method within the RB125 network. In each subfigure, we exhibit different communities with different colors and shapes of nodes (note triangles in different directions also represent different communities). (a) shows the “natural” division for the network: each RB5 unit makes a community; (b) shows the most “robust” division of the network on the lowest community level: each RB25 unit splits to 6 communities as in [figure 2 \(c\)](#), and the whole network is divided into 30 communities; (c) shows a robust division on the second level: it divides the network into 10 communities; (d) shows an alternative division of the network into 26 communities with a “relaxed stringency” on the lowest

community level: only the RB5 unit in the center of the whole network is divided into 2 communities (see the hollow red circle and red squares in the figure), while all other RB5 units are kept intact. (e) and (f): Plateaus obtained by our method in single ensembles with  $\beta=1$  and  $\beta=2$ . In (e), with  $\beta=1$  only the first community level can be detected, but there emerge three different divisions (plateaus) for it: 30 communities (as in (b)), 25 communities (i.e., the “natural” division as in (a)) and 26 communities (as in (d)). (f): with  $\beta=2$  both community levels are detected. The first level contains only the 30-community division (as in (b)), while the second level only the 10-community division (as in (c)). These divisions can be detected with different values of  $\beta$  (including  $\beta>2$ ), thus we say they are the most “robust” divisions for the RB networks.

The above results suggest that community detection with  $\beta=1$  is still not satisfying: one major problem is, almost all the resolution scales are occupied by the highest and lowest community levels; intermediate levels are seriously compressed and cannot be observed at all. To fix this problem, we take a larger value of  $\beta$ , which could amplify the varying range of the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  from  $(0, 1)$  to  $(0, 2\beta-1)$ . It turns out that with  $\beta\geq 2$ , our method detects *all community levels* including the intermediate levels for the RB networks. On each community level, it only outputs the most robust divisions as listed in table 1, but discards the variants due to relaxed stringencies. We show in figures 2 (e), 3 (f) and supplementary figures 1 (c) and 2 (b) the plateaus obtained with  $\beta=2$ ; with  $\beta>2$  we simply get similar results. These results confirm that the scaling factor  $\beta$  does rescale the resolutions, and facilitates our detection on multiple levels of robust community structures effectively.

Nevertheless, the scalability of our community fitness function (formula 2) is still limited. It enables our detection on up to five community levels within the RB25~RB3125 networks—but when the network becomes even larger, such as in an RB15625 network, our method starts to fail in detecting certain community levels. For example, in supplementary figure 2 (d), the plateaus for the second and fifth community levels, which are expected to have 1250 and 22 communities, are both missing. In the corresponding resolution scales where these community levels are expected to emerge, the Louvain algorithm fails to converge to a stable solution. Actually, the scaling factor  $\beta$  does not amplify the resolution scales for different community levels evenly: the highest and lowest levels always occupy a majority of the resolution scales. When  $\beta=2$ , roughly all intermediate levels of the RB networks are limited within  $\alpha=1\sim 1.6$ . When the number of intermediate levels becomes large, some levels will be compressed and become hard to detect. Increasing  $\beta$  further does not solve this problem. As shown in supplementary figure 3, with the increase of  $\beta$ , the resolution scales for intermediate community levels does not expand much. Within the scope of this paper, the limit of our method is to detect up to five community levels on the RB networks; to detect more community levels, an improved method should be worth studying in the future.


### 3.2 On synthetic networks with communities of heterogeneous sizes

In [7], the authors argued on an LFR benchmark network [35], when the community sizes vary enormously, all previous methods of multiresolution lose their effectiveness. In this section, we test our method on exactly the same network. The LFR benchmark network, as proposed by Lancichinetti *et al.* [35], has *heterogeneous* topology: both the degrees of nodes and the sizes of communities follow power-law distributions, and span by different orders of magnitude. Each node is preassigned to a community: it shares a fraction of  $1-\mu$  of its connections with the other nodes of the same community, and the rest fraction  $\mu$  with nodes in other communities;  $\mu$  is called a *mixing parameter*. Obviously, large values of  $\mu$  weaken the validity of the preassigned community structure. Especially, when  $\mu\geq 0.5$ , the preassigned communities violate the customary definitions of community in both




a strong sense and a weak sense, which respectively require  $k_{\text{in}} > k_{\text{out}}$  for every node, and  $\sum k_{\text{in}} > \sum k_{\text{out}}$  for every community [33]. However, the preassigned community structure may continue being well founded as long as most nodes still retain more connections within its own community than sharing connections with any other communities, as suggested by [36]. A good community detection method is expected to recreate the preassigned communities for an LFR network at least under small values of  $\mu$ ; some methods in previous literature even do so when  $\mu$  is as large as 0.8. Since the topology of an LFR network is constructed randomly, it is not straightforward to compare the communities detected in different realizations, a *normalized mutual information* (NMI) [37] is then generally adopted to evaluate the consistency between the detected communities and the preassigned ones; NMI equals to 1 indicates they agree with each other perfectly.

In [7], the authors tested the effectiveness of a bunch of community detection methods on the LFR network; they argued that multiresolution methods can outperform other methods only if the sizes of different communities are “too close to one another” (as in the networks studied in figure 4 (b)-(e)). In large LFR networks, when the community sizes vary from 10 to 1000 (as in the networks in figure 4 (f)-(i)), multiresolution methods fail to detect the expected community structures even when the mixing parameter  $\mu$  is far below 0.5. Figure 4 shows the effectiveness of our method tested on the LFR networks built with exactly identical parameters as those in figures 6-9 of [7]. Since the LFR network is not multilevel, for each network we run in a single ensemble 1000 realizations of the Louvain algorithm with  $\beta=1$ ;  $\beta=2$  simply yields the same results. We show in figure 4 the values of our best NMIs with the preassigned communities at different values of  $\mu$ . The performance of our method can be evaluated by a threshold  $\mu_0$  at which the NMI between our results and the preassigned ones starts to deviate from perfection: when  $\mu \leq \mu_0$ , the NMI always equals to 1. Besides, our “best” results are not artificially selected among a mess of various results: they are always suggested by our strongest plateaus, or the second strongest plateaus in case the strongest ones suggest to trivially merge the whole network into one community. Multiresolution methods tested in [7] mostly perform well on the networks studied in subfigures (b)-(e), which are *relatively* small and homogeneous—but they all perform much worse on the networks in subfigures (f)-(i), which are larger and more heterogeneous. In contrast, our method, being also a multiresolution method, recreates the expected communities perfectly for all networks, at least till  $\mu$  is around 0.5. This suggests that our method performs more robustly on large heterogeneous networks than previous methods; it seems to have overcome the resolution limit problem caused by network heterogeneity as described in [7].



(a) Structure of an LFR network.



**Figure 4.** Communities in the LFR network. (a) Schematics of an LFR network, with communities having heterogeneous sizes. (b)-(i) Normalized mutual information (NMI) between our detected communities and the preassigned ones for the LFR networks with varying  $\mu$ . Network parameters include: network size  $N$ , average degree  $\langle k \rangle$ , maximum degree of nodes  $k_{\max}$ , power-law exponents of the degree distribution  $\tau_1$  and of the community size distribution  $\tau_2$ , and the minimal and maximal sizes of communities  $s_{\min}$  and  $s_{\max}$ . In all subfigures,  $\langle k \rangle = 20$ ,  $\tau_1 = 2$ ; other parameters are all labelled in each subfigure.


### 3.3 On real-world networks

In this section, we investigate three real-world networks: Zachary’s karate club network [38], Lusseau *et al.*’s dolphins social network [39], and the American college football network [2]. We detect communities for these networks with our method, and compare our results with the standard divisions given by previous methods.


Figure 5 shows the community structures within the karate club network. This network consists of 34 nodes representing 34 members of a karate club; connections between nodes imply consistent interactions between the corresponding members outside the club. Due to a disagreement between



the club president (John A.) and a part-time instructor (Mr. Hi), the club later split into two clubs, the officers' and Mr. Hi's; members of the club also diverge to follow their own favorite leader (see the communities split by the dashed line in figure 5 (a)). Community detection methods in previous literature have attempted to recreate such a fission by mathematical models; among them the results given by Newman and Girvan [6], and by Medus *et al.* [40], are largely accepted as two standard divisions for the karate club network.



(a) Community structures in the karate club network.




**Figure 5.** Communities in the karate club network. (a) Structure of the network. Here we show three representative divisions for the network, all divide the network into four communities. We show our division by nodes of different fill colors (blue, maroon, green and turquoise), Newman and Girvan's division [6] by nodes of different edge colors (red, yellow, cyan and pink), and Medus *et al.*'s division [40] by different node shapes (circle, square, hexagon and octagon). The dashed line in the figure divides the network into two parts, corresponding to a fission which had actually happened to the club. (b)-(c) Plateaus obtained through an intersection over 20 ensembles each involving 1000 realizations of the Louvain algorithm at each resolution with  $\beta=1$  and  $\beta=2$ . Numbers above plateaus indicate the numbers of communities for three community levels: the highest level, the lowest level, and the most "representative" level which we have visualized in (a). Figure 6 (c)-(d) and figure 7 (b)-(c) in the following part of this paper are also drawn in the same way.

Being different to the synthetic networks that display “discrete” levels of communities in the last section, real-world networks generally involve more “continuous” levels of communities. For example, in the karate club network we detected 12 levels of communities, which are *all stable and unique* in certain resolution scales. Their numbers of communities take every value from 1 to 12; see figure 5 (b)-(c) for their plateaus, and supplementary figure 4 for the network divisions. These community levels roughly form a hierarchical structure: lower-level communities are mostly subsets of higher-level communities, with only minor reassembling between a few of the levels (denoted by the dashed rectangles in supplementary figure 4). Among all community levels, our 2-community division suggests a different topology to the actual fission of the club. However, such a division is consistent with the results suggested in [41, 42], which has also been known as the only solution to divide the karate club network into communities all in a strong sense [43]. From the third level on, communities in a weak sense start to emerge in our detection; these communities can be properly merged to recreate the clubs after the fission. In figure 5 (a), we display our 4-community division by nodes of different fill colors (blue, maroon, green and turquoise). We choose such a division as our most representative division for two reasons: (1) it exhibits a most robust plateau among all non-trivial community levels detected by different values of  $\beta$  (including  $\beta > 2$ , which is not shown since they yield similar results as  $\beta = 2$ ), and (2) it is the highest community level whose communities all fit the customary definitions of community in either a strong sense or a weak sense; higher levels all contain small communities that violate the customary definitions. As exhibited in figure 5 (a), blue nodes and turquoise nodes roughly recreate Mr. Hi’s club, while maroon nodes and green nodes recreate the officers’. Comparing to the actual fission of the club, among all 34 members only nodes 9 and 10 are misclassified. We notice that node 10 has only two neighbors: node 3 joined Mr. Hi’s club, and node 34 joined the officers’. It’s not sufficient to determine which choice for node 10 should be better than the other based on the network connections only. In previous literature such as [38], node 10 has been identified as a member of “no faction” (see Table 1 in [38]). We chose to classify it into Mr. Hi’s club only to maximize the fitness function. As for node 9, it evidently has more connections to the officers’ club than to Mr. Hi’s. According to [38], node 9 acted as a “weak supporter” of the officer, but he chose to join Mr. Hi’s club only for a special reason: his black belt; all methods including Zachary’s own model had misclassified the club for node 9. Therefore, our classification is acceptable since it has largely recreated the ground truth.

On the 4-community level, our result is also consistent with known results in previous literature. In figure 5 (a), for comparison we exhibit the division given by Newman and Girvan through their random walk betweenness method [6] by nodes of different edge colors (red, yellow, cyan and pink), and the division proposed by Medus *et al.* [40] by nodes of different shapes (circle, square, hexagon and octagon). It can be observed that all three divisions including ours are largely consistent with one another. The only differences lie in the classifications for nodes 10, 24 and 28. For node 10, as we have discussed above, there is no firm evidence to support either of its choices. As for nodes 24 and 28, Medus *et al.*’s classification leads to a higher out-degree than in-degree for node 24, and an equal out-degree to in-degree for node 28. Our classification ensures both these nodes have higher out-degrees than in-degrees, which is also consistent with Newman and Girvan’s classification, thus our result should deserve more reasonableness than Medus *et al.*’s.

Next we discuss the dolphins’ social network (hereafter we call it the “dolphins’ network” for short). The dolphins’ network was compiled by Lusseau and his collaborators from seven years of field studies on a bottlenose dolphins’ society living in Doubtful Sound, New Zealand [39, 44]. To our knowledge, the first version of this network was established in [44], including 40 individuals of dolphins; after that an extended version including 62 vertexes and 159 edges was published in [39].


In the dolphins' network, vertexes represent individuals of dolphins, while edges imply associations between dolphin pairs occurring more often than expected by chance [45]. Newman and Girvan firstly divided this network into two communities in [6], which allegedly correspond to a “known division” of the dolphins' society. The larger one of these two communities can be further divided into four smaller communities. In figure 6 (a), we visualize the structure the dolphins' network, as well as Newman and Girvan's divisions to 2 or 5 communities [6]; such divisions have later been cited by both Newman and Lusseau [45, 46]. In [45], the smallest community containing only two nodes (Zipfel and TSN83, see the purple nodes in figure 6 (a)) was merged into a larger community (i.e., the community shown in red in figure 6 (a)) so that the total number of communities decreased to four.



**Figure 6.** Communities within the dolphins' social network. (a) Newman and Girvan's division for the dolphins' network. Rectangles and ellipses differentiate two major groups, in which ellipses can be further divided into four smaller communities, indicated by different colors (cyan, red, turquoise and purple). (b) Our division for the dolphins' network. It can be divided into two communities by different shapes of nodes (rectangle or ellipse), or seven communities by different colors of nodes (blue, orange, cyan, red, turquoise, green and purple). The dashed line in both (a) and (b) indicates an allegedly “known division” of the dolphins' society [6] due to a temporary leave of a “central individual,” SN100. (c)-(d) Plateaus drawn in the same way as figure 5 (b)-(c).


In the same way as on the karate club network, we apply our method on the dolphins' network with  $\beta=1$  and 2; plateaus obtained through an intersection over 20 ensembles are exhibited in figure 6 (c) and (d). Similar to the karate club network, the dolphins' network also contains multiple levels of communities, whose numbers of communities vary from 1 to 21. Different levels of communities roughly form a hierarchical structure, with minor reassembling of communities between few of the neighboring levels. Among all non-trivial community levels, our 2-community division exhibits a strongest plateau; whose topology has been visualized in figure 6 (b) by different shapes of nodes (rectangle or ellipse). On higher levels, our 7-community division turns out to be most comparable to the 5-community division given by Newman and Girvan; in figure 6 (a) and (b), we exhibit these two divisions by different colors of nodes. Obviously, two of our smallest communities (orange and green) can be merged into the blue and red communities to perfectly recreate Newman and Girvan's 5-community division.

On our 2-community level, comparing to the standard division given by Newman and Girvan, our division misclassifies only one node, SN89, among all 62 nodes—but altering to the resolution scale of our 7-community level, this node will be reclassified to the “right” group. We suggest that *the resolution under which an observation was made is vital*. It should be noted that Newman and Girvan's 2-community division comes from a combination of their 5 communities; it was actually observed under the resolution of a 5-community level. On the 2-community level, we notice that SN89 has only two connections: one to SN100, the central node with the highest betweenness, and the other to Web, an individual among the rectangles. It was said that the “known division” between the two groups of dolphins was due to a temporary leave of SN100: interactions between the two groups were restricted while SN100 was away and became more common when it reappeared [6]. We argue that when SN100 was away, presumably the interaction between SN89 and the ellipses should also be cut off—however its interaction with the rectangles can be maintained through the connection to Web. Therefore, our classification for SN89 *under the resolution of a 2-community level* should be reasonable, and well consistent with the ground truth.



(a) Communities in the American college football network.





**Figure 7.** Communities within the American college football network. (a) Structure of the network: 115 nodes represent 115 college football teams; edges denote scheduled games between these teams. Our method detected 12 communities out of the network, shown as 12 densely connected circles in the figure. We differentiate the conferences these football teams belong to with different node colors, and annotate beside each community the name of the conference with which *most* teams within the community are affiliated. (b)-(c) Plateaus drawn in the same way as figure 5 (b)-(c).

The American college football network is constructed from the schedule of Division I games for the 2000 season of United States college football [2]. It consists of 115 nodes representing 115 college football teams, identified by their college names. Among these teams, 110 are affiliated with 11 different conferences each containing 8 to 12 teams, and the rest 5 teams belong to no conferences and are identified as “IA independents” (nodes 37, 43, 81, 83 and 91, see the red hexagons in figure 7 (a)). Edges of the network represent scheduled games between the connected teams, which turn out to be much more frequent between teams of the same conference than between teams of different conferences. Inter-conference games also exist; they are observed to be highly correlated with the geographical distances between the related teams: teams that are geographically close to one another are more likely to play games than those separated by large geographic distances [2]. Girvan and Newman applied their community detection algorithm on the American college football network, and had correctly recreated the conference affiliations for most teams [2]. With our method, we also detect multiple community levels within this network (see figure 7 (b) and (c)), among which the strongest plateau suggests a 12-community division that is well consistent with the division given by Girvan and Newman [2], and performs remarkably well in recreating the conference affiliations for most teams, see figure 7(a).

Communities detected by our method are naturally displayed in figure 7 (a) with edges inside communities being shorter than those between different communities. Text beside each community denotes the name of the conference that *most* teams within that community are affiliated with, while the conference affiliation for every single node is differentiated by different node colors. Obviously, most conferences have been perfectly recreated by our communities, with only minor differences as listed below: (1) “IA independents” is not a conference, nor did its five teams play games frequently with one another. These teams are assigned to four different communities whose members did play games with them. (2) Conference Sunbelt (black nodes enclosed by the dashed rectangle in figure 7 (a)) is split into two communities; members of different communities seldom played games with one another. (3) Node 111 (Texas Christian) belongs to Conference USA, but it did not play even a

single game with any other teams of the same conference—instead it played quite some games with teams in conference Western Athletic and is then assigned to community of the latter. For the same reason, node 29 (Boise State) is assigned to one of the communities of Sunbelt instead of Western Athletic. Girvan and Newman’s result (data not shown, please refer to [2]) agrees with ours on all the above (1)–(3); the only difference lies in the assignment for node 37 (Central Florida): in [2] it is assigned to the same community as conference Mid American, but in our result it belongs to one of the communities of Sunbelt. The ground truth tells us node 37 is actually IA independent; it has three connections to Mid American, but two to Sunbelt. We assign it to the latter only because that will maximize the global fitness function.

#### 4. Discussion

In Results, we have demonstrated the effectiveness of our method on three classes of networks: hierarchical, heterogeneous and real-world. The outperformance of this method can be attributed to two properties: (1) (re)scalability of the community fitness function, and (2) stability of the outputs. The original form of the community fitness function introduced in [16] is by design more “scalable” than traditional community quality functions, for example, the modularity function  $Q$  proposed by Newman [13], which is generally reformulated as [3, 7, 12, 23]

$$Q = \sum_{\mathcal{G}} Q^{\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{\mathcal{G}} \left[ \frac{k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m} - \left( \frac{k^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m} \right)^2 \right].$$

Here  $m$  is the total number of edges within the whole network,  $Q^{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $k^{\mathcal{G}} = k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}} + k_{out}^{\mathcal{G}}$  represent the modularity and “total” degree of community  $\mathcal{G}$ . Obviously, the value of  $Q^{\mathcal{G}}$  depends heavily on the community size. For example, in an LFR network, since  $k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}} / k^{\mathcal{G}} = 1 - \mu$  ( $\mu$  is the mixing parameter),

$$Q^{\mathcal{G}} = \frac{k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m} - \left( \frac{k^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m} \right)^2 = \frac{k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m} \left[ 1 - \frac{k^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m(1-\mu)} \right].$$

If within the network both the number of edges and the number of communities are large,  $2m$  is expected to be much greater than  $k^{\mathcal{G}}$ , then  $\frac{k^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m(1-\mu)} \approx 0$ , so that  $Q^{\mathcal{G}} \approx \frac{k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}}{2m} \propto k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}$ . This reflects a fact that the modularity  $Q^{\mathcal{G}}$  increases almost linearly with the community size (here without loss of generality, we measure the community size by the in-degree rather than the number of nodes). Large gaps of  $Q^{\mathcal{G}}$  exist between communities of different sizes in a heterogeneous network, which inhibits small and large communities being detected simultaneously. In contrast, the community fitness function (formula 1)

$$f^{\mathcal{G}} = \frac{k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}}}{(k^{\mathcal{G}})^{\alpha}} = (1-\mu)^{\alpha} (k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}})^{1-\alpha} \propto (k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}})^{1-\alpha}.$$

Since  $\alpha > 0$ , apparently  $f^{\mathcal{G}}$  increases more slowly with the community size than  $Q^{\mathcal{G}}$ : it tends to narrow the gap between large and small communities. As a result, in a heterogeneous network, communities



having close inner densities of connections but far different sizes can be simultaneously identified by the community fitness function  $F$ , but not by the modularity function  $Q$ . The generalized version of  $Q$  proposed by Reichardt and Bornholdt [19] does not solve the problem: it introduces a resolution parameter  $\gamma$  in the following way

$$Q_\gamma = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \left[ \frac{k_{in}^{\mathcal{C}}}{2m} - \gamma \left( \frac{k^{\mathcal{C}}}{2m} \right)^2 \right].$$

However, since  $\left( \frac{k^{\mathcal{C}}}{2m} \right)^2$  plays a minor role in the formula,  $\gamma$  is not effective enough to rescale  $Q_\gamma$

and overcome the resolution limit problem [7]. Similar problem also holds for a majority of previous multiresolution methods, including the popular Hamiltonian-based Potts models [18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. That explains why previous multiresolution methods perform poorly on heterogeneous networks, as argued by [7], while our method in this paper turns out to have outperformed all of them (see Section 3.2).

Furthermore, by introducing a scaling factor  $\beta$  to the community fitness function as in formula 2, we make it “rescalable.” The fitness function originally introduced in [16] has  $\beta$  fixed to 1 (as in formula 1); correspondingly, the varying range of the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  is between 0 and 1. According to our estimation in supplementary material, such a varying range is a “relevant” scale of resolution, within which both the merging of small communities and the splitting of large ones are restricted. Therefore, for multilevel networks, only the lowest community level can be expected to be detected. Although we stressed that our estimation was made by *necessary but not sufficient conditions*—in principle it is still possible for higher levels of communities to emerge, in practice with  $\beta=1$  we only detected the highest (but trivial) and lowest levels, but missed all the intermediate levels. In contrast, when  $\beta>1$ , it rescales the whole resolution range by a multiple  $2\beta-1$ , which amplifies the resolution scales for different community levels by varying degrees, and effectively facilitates our detection on all levels of communities. As a result, for the RB hierarchical networks, our method managed to detect up to five levels of communities accurately with  $\beta=2$ , which to our knowledge, hasn’t been done by any other methods in previous literature.

Nevertheless, our scaling factor  $\beta$  in formula 2 rescales the resolutions unevenly: comparing to the highest and lowest levels, expansions for the resolution scales of intermediate community levels are relatively minor. As a result, for networks having too many community levels, our method fails to detect some of them (for example, in supplementary figure 2 (d) the second and fifth community levels of the RB15625 network are missed). On the other hand, when the network size is too large, it becomes difficult for the original Louvain/BGLL algorithm to work out. Improved methods and algorithms are to be studied in the future.

The second property of our method, stability of the outputs, is mainly due to our strict definition for “plateau.” It has been popular to rank the relevance of outputs by the persistence of plateaus in previous literature. However, as we have argued in the Introduction, if the term “plateau” was only loosely defined, and cannot guarantee all data points within a same plateau represent an identical topology of community, such ranks are then unreliable and suspicious. Although we believe most plateaus in previous literature did have identical topologies, it hasn’t been explicitly stated at all. In this paper, by requiring not only “one plateau one topology,” but also each data point represents a “best-and-unique” solution at each resolution, we remove the above suspicious, and reject unstable outputs as well. This has remarkably improved the stability of our outputs. One proof is, on synthetic

networks such as H13-4 and the RB networks, all plateaus outputted by our method are relevant to known community structures (see [figures 1-3](#) and [supplementary figures 1-2](#)). In contrast, previous methods output all local best solutions without requiring uniqueness: plateaus for the same networks outputted by these methods are much more *redundant*. Small plateaus emerge in transitional regions between large plateaus; see figure 1 in [\[3\]](#), figure 2 in [\[21\]](#), figure 3 in [\[22\]](#), figures 2&3 in [\[29\]](#), and so on. These small plateaus are mostly not stable, nor are they interpretable by any known network structures. Some of them perform “noise-like” by converging to different topologies within different realizations. Here we just raise a *simplified* example: for an RB25 network, one can merge its central node (i.e., the red hollow circle in [figure 2 \(c\)](#)) to a *randomly chosen* peripheral RB5 unit (say, the green left-pointing triangles on the bottom right) and form a community of 6 nodes. Then an RB25 network can be divided into 5 communities: one of 6 nodes, three of 5 nodes, and the last one of 4 nodes. In our detection, such divisions did emerge in certain resolution scales. Here the problem is, if the central node can be merged to one of the peripheral units to reach a local best solution, it can also be merged to any one of the other peripheral units for equally good solutions, since the network is symmetrical. In asymmetrical networks, there also exist large numbers of local best solutions, which have similar qualities of communities, but totally different topologies [\[7, 27\]](#). These local best solutions are not unique, and the community detection algorithm just converges to one of them merely by chance. To our viewpoint, such randomly converged solutions should be less informative than more definite ones. Previous literature usually selectively interprets only the “most relevant” results, but ignores all the rest. In this paper, we require our results being *best and unique*, which *automatically* removes redundant outputs. As a result, all our outputs are stable and relevant; they are largely interpretable, and do not need any artificial or arbitrary selection.

When applied to real-world networks, our method also outputs many small plateaus that fill up almost all the resolution scales: their numbers of communities take almost every value from one to maximum. That’s why we suggest *real-world networks may have continuous levels of communities*, although customarily most of them are not even considered as multilevel networks. Being different to the small plateaus detected for synthetic networks, small plateaus for real-world networks are all stable: they have consistent topologies over multiple realizations as well as multiple ensembles of calculations. Inquiring which community level is the most informative, or which resolution scale is the most relevant, have been argued as “natural but ill posed questions” [\[3\]](#). Community detection is purely topology-based, but the relevance of detected communities is up to our *a priori* knowledge about the network—whether the *a priori* knowledge can be well reconstructed from the network topology, is *a posteriori*. For example, whether the interactions between the club members make an essential indication for the fission of the karate club, and under which resolution such an indication is the most significant, are both worthy questions. It has been observed that communities suggested by our strongest plateaus often coincide with the ground truths—but it does not mean at all that communities suggested by other plateaus (i.e., other levels of communities) should be irrelevant or uninformative. As proposed by [\[3\]](#), all structures detected are embedded in the network topology; they should all have their own particular information. Real-world connections, especially for human interactions, are essentially multilevel: we have social circles of different sizes, and different levels. Therefore, our observation on the multilevel structures of real-world networks should be noteworthy.

Finally, we discuss the computational complexity of our method. The BGLL (i.e., Louvain) algorithm we employed for our optimization has been reported to have linear complexity on typical and sparse data [\[30\]](#); this hasn’t been altered in this paper since we directly used its openly accessed code. Complexity introduced by our procedures is mainly due to calculations in multiple realizations and multiple ensembles. (1) For each group of fixed parameters ( $\alpha, \beta$ ), we run the algorithm in 1000 realizations to make sure it converges to a best solution. In practice, it’s usually not necessary to run

so many realizations; 100 realizations will be sufficiently enough in most cases. (2) With each fixed  $\beta$ , we vary  $\alpha$  from 0 to  $2\beta-1$ , with a stepwise increment  $\Delta\alpha=0.01$ , to search every scale of resolution and discover all potential plateaus. In practice, to reduce unnecessary computations, we suggest to firstly use a relatively larger value of increment for a global and rough search, and then use smaller values for detailed searches in focused regions. (3) For some networks we run multiple “ensembles;” each ensemble involves multiple realizations of community detection with varying  $\alpha$ , to remove the randomly emerged small plateaus that cannot be eliminated by single-ensemble computations (as in figure 1 (b) and (c)). In practice, for most networks, this is not necessary. For example, for the real-world networks we investigated in section 3.3, single-ensemble detection is sufficient: they yield almost the same results as multiple ensembles. We run multiple ensembles for these networks in section 3.3 only to make sure all plateaus detected are stable (which is important to our purpose in this paper). To summarize, based on a classical BGLL/Louvain algorithm, our method can be carried out efficiently on various classes of complex networks.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a scaling factor  $\beta$  to the community fitness function  $F$  proposed in [16], and raised a renewed method for community detection on multilevel complex networks. Our renewed community fitness function inherits the property of *scalability* from the original version of  $F$ , which ensures our method performs excellently on large heterogeneous networks without being affected by the resolution limit problem. Besides, this renewed fitness function is also “*rescalable*,” a properly large value of  $\beta$  amplifies the resolution scales and facilitates our detection on multiple levels of communities. On hierarchical RB networks, our method successfully discovered up to five levels of communities. Moreover, we suggested a strict definition for the term “plateau,” which has on the one hand rectified the ambiguous use of the term in previous literature, and on the other hand remarkably improved the stability of our outputs. Consequently, our method *automatically* filters out redundant results such as those due to random convergence of a heuristic algorithm, without any artificial selection. On real-world networks, our method discovers continuous levels of communities; under certain resolution scales, consistent results to the ground truths can be observed. Finally, our method can be implemented with fast heuristic algorithms to improve its computation efficiency; in this paper, we carried it out with a classical Louvain/BGLL algorithm, which turned out to be very efficient in detecting communities on both synthetic and real-world complex networks.

Our work in this paper has revealed the advantages of one class of *scalable* community quality functions. Their outperformance on both heterogeneous and hierarchical networks notwithstanding, for community detection on extremely large or deep networks, community quality functions with specifically developed properties (such as higher sensitivity to detect more intermediate levels), as well as optimization algorithms with both higher capacity and higher efficiency, are definitely worth pursuing in future studies.

## Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the “One Thousand Talents Program” of Sichuan Province with Grant No. 17QR003, the Doctoral Research Funding with Grant Nos. 16zx7112, KZ001212 and 21zx7115, Southwest University of Science and Technology, Mianyang, Sichuan, P.R. China.

## Availability of tools and data

All tools and data used in this paper are publicly available.

Freely available code for the Louvain/BGLL algorithm can be downloaded from the webpage of Vincent Blondel: <https://perso.uclouvain.be/vincent.blondel/research/louvain.html>. We did not modify the source code except substituting our own community fitness function for the original modularity function.

Source code to create the LFR benchmark networks can be downloaded from:

<https://sites.google.com/site/santofortunato/inthepress2>.

Real-world network data can be downloaded from the webpage of Mark Newman: <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/netdata/>.

## References

- [1] Arenas A, Diaz-Guilera A, Perez-Vicente C J. Synchronization Reveals Topological Scales in Complex Networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 2006, **96**(11): 114102.1-114102.4.
- [2] Girvan M, Newman M E. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the United States of America*, 2002, **99**(12): 7821-7826.
- [3] Arenas A, Fernández S, Gómez S. Analysis of the structure of complex networks at different resolution levels. *New Journal of Physics*, 2007, **10**(5): 053039.
- [4] Newman M E J. Detecting community structure in networks. *European Physical Journal B*, 2004, **38**(2): 321-330.
- [5] Arenas A, Danon L, Díaz-Guilera A, Gleiser P M, Guimera R. Community analysis in social networks. *European Physical Journal B*, 2004, **38**(2): 373-380.
- [6] Newman M, Girvan M. Finding and Evaluating Community Structure in Networks. *Physical Review E*, 2004, **69**(2): 026113.
- [7] Lancichinetti A, Fortunato S. Limits of modularity maximization in community detection. *Physical Review E*, 2011, **84**(6): 066122.
- [8] Garey M R and Johnson D S. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, San Francisco (1979).
- [9] Scott J. *Social Network Analysis: A Handbook*. Sage Publications, London, 2nd edition (2000).
- [10] Ravasz E and Barabasi A. Hierarchical organization in complex networks. *Physical Review E*, 2003, **67**(2): 026112.
- [11] Leskovec J, Lang K J, Dasgupta A, and Mahoney M W. Statistical properties of community structure in large social and information networks. In *Proceeding of the 17th international conference on World Wide Web*, 2008, pages 695-704, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- [12] Fortunato S. Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports*, 2010, **486**(3-5): 75-174.
- [13] Newman M. Analysis of weighted networks. *Physical Review E*, 2004, **70**: 056131.

- [14] Clauset A. Finding local community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, 2005, **72**(2): 026132.
- [15] Luo F, Wang J Z and Promislow E. Exploring Local Community Structures in Large Networks. *Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI 2006 Main Conference Proceedings) (WI'06)* 0-7695-2747-7/06.
- [16] Lancichinetti A, Fortunato S, Kertész J. Detecting the overlapping and hierarchical community structure of complex networks. *New Journal of Physics*, 2009, **11**(3): 033015.
- [17] Reichardt J, Bornholdt S. Partitioning and modularity of graphs with arbitrary degree distribution. *Physical Review E*, 2007, **76**(1): 015102.
- [18] Reichardt J, Bornholdt S. Detecting Fuzzy Community Structures in Complex Networks with a Potts Model. *Physical Review Letters*, 2004, **93**(21): 218701.
- [19] Reichardt J, Bornholdt S. Statistical mechanics of community detection. *Physical Review E*, 2006, **74**(2): 016110.
- [20] Hastings M B. Community Detection as an Inference Problem. *Physical Review E*, 2006, **74**(2): 035102.
- [21] Ronhovde P, Nussinov Z. Multiresolution community detection for megascale networks by information-based replica correlations. *Physical Review E*, 2009, **80**(1): 016109.
- [22] Ronhovde P, Nussinov Z. Local resolution-limit-free Potts model for community detection. *Physical Review E*, 2008, **81**(2): 046114.
- [23] Fortunato S and Barthelemy M. Resolution limit in community detection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the United States of America*, 2007, **104**(1): 36-41.
- [24] Kumpula J M, Saramaki J, Kaski K, Kertesz J. Resolution limit in complex network community detection with Potts model approach. *European Physical Journal B*, 2007, **56**: 41-45.
- [25] Traag V A, Dooren P V, Nesterov Y. Narrow scope for resolution-limit-free community detection. *Physical Review E*, 2011, **84**(1): 016114.
- [26] Clauset A, Newman M E J, Moore C. Finding community structure in very large networks. *Physical Review E*, 2004, **70**: 066111.
- [27] Good B H, Montjoye Y D, Clauset A. Performance of modularity maximization in practical contexts. *Physical Review E*, 2009, **81**(2): 046106.
- [28] Le Martelot E, Hankin C. Multi-scale Community Detection using Stability Optimisation. *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, 2013, **9**(3): 323-348.  
DOI: 10.1504/IJWBC.2013.054907
- [29] Xiang J, Tang Y N, Gao Y Y, Zhang Y, Deng K, Xu X K, Hu K. Multi-resolution community detection based on generalized self-loop rescaling strategy. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics & Its Applications*, 2015, **432**:127-139.
- [30] Blondel V D, Guillaume J L, Lambiotte R, Lefebvre E. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics Theory & Experiment*, 2008: P10008.
- [31] Newman M. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, 2004, **69**: 066113.

- [32] Saha S, Ghreera S P. Nearest Neighbor search in Complex Network for Community Detection. *Information* (Switzerland), 2015, **7**(1): 17.
- [33] Radicchi F, Castellano C, Cecconi F, Loreto V, Parisi D. Defining and identifying communities in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the United States of America*, 2004, **101**: 2658–2663.
- [34] Chen C, Fushing H. Multiscale community geometry in a network and its application. *Physical Review E*, 2012, **86**(4):1-7.
- [35] Lancichinetti A, Fortunato S, Radicchi F. Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms. *Physical Review E*, 2008, **78**: 046110.
- [36] Hu Y, Chen H, Zhang P, Li M, Di Z, Fan Y. A New Comparative Definition of Community and Corresponding Identifying Algorithm. *Physical Review E*, 2008, **78**(2): 026121.
- [37] Fred A L N, Jain A K. Robust data clustering. in *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision Pattern Recognition* (Computer Society, Toronto, 2003), Vol. **2**, page 128.
- [38] Zachary W W. An Information Flow Model for Conflict and Fission in Small Groups. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 1977, **33**(4): 452-473.
- [39] Lusseau D. The emergent properties of a dolphin social network. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences* (suppl.), 2003, **270**: S186-S188. DOI 10.1098/rsbl.2003.0057.
- [40] Medus A, Acuna G, Dorso C O. Detection of community structures in networks via global optimization. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 2005, **358**(2-4): 593-604.
- [41] Zhou H. Distance, dissimilarity index, and network community structure. *Physical Review E*, 2003, **67**: 061901.
- [42] Huang J, Sun H, Liu Y, Song Q and Weninge T. Towards Online Multiresolution Community Detection in Large-Scale Networks. *PLoS One*, 2011, **6**(8): e23829. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0023829
- [43] Chen H, Hu Y, Di Z. Community detection with cellular automata. *Journal of Beijing Normal University (Natural Science)*, 2008, **44**(2): 153-156.
- [44] Lusseau D, Schneider K, Boisseau O J, Haase P, Slooten E, Dawson S M. The bottlenose dolphin community of Doubtful Sound features a large proportion of long-lasting associations. *Behavioral Ecology & Sociobiology*, 2003, **54**(4): 396-405.
- [45] Lusseau D, Newman M. Identifying the role that animals play in their social networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, 2004, **271** (Suppl. 6): S477-S481.
- [46] Lusseau D. Evidence for social role in a dolphin social network. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 2007, **21**(3):357-366.



## Supplementary material: relevant range of the resolution parameter $\alpha$

In this section, we make a rough estimation on the relevant range of the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  for each fixed scaling factor  $\beta$  in the community fitness function

$$F_\alpha^\beta = \sum_{\mathcal{G}} \frac{(k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}})^\beta}{(k_{in}^{\mathcal{G}} + k_{out}^{\mathcal{G}})^\alpha} \quad (\text{Formula 2 in the main text})$$

It has been discussed in [7] that the resolution limit problem in community detection is due to two opposite tendencies (or *biases*): the tendency of merging small communities into larger ones, and the tendency of breaking large ones into smaller pieces. These tendencies/biases can often occur simultaneously. A strict deduction for a “relevant” resolution range, within which both biases can be avoided, is not straightforward—nor is it necessary for our purpose in this paper. In this section, we investigate each bias separately, and then give a rough estimation on the bounds of the relevant range for the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  in formula 2. It should be noted that our purpose is very simple: *all we need is a rough range for  $\alpha$  to vary in*. Therefore, we only investigate *necessary conditions*, rather than sufficient or necessary-and-sufficient conditions.

### I. Upper bound of $\alpha$ : splitting a random graph

With fixed  $\beta$ , since large values of  $\alpha$  deliver small communities, the upper bound of  $\alpha$  can be estimated by the limit at which the fitness function  $F_\alpha^\beta$  starts to split a graph inappropriately into smaller parts. For such an estimation, one useful reference is the random graph: since a random graph is believed to have no communities, by any algorithm it shouldn't be split into smaller pieces [7].

Suppose we have a random graph consisting of  $N$  nodes, with probability  $p$  each pair of nodes shares an edge between them. Consider splitting the graph into two parts: subgraph  $\mathcal{M}$  contains  $m$  nodes ( $0 \leq m \leq N$ ), while subgraph  $\mathcal{N}$  contains  $N-m$  nodes. Both  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  are random graphs with identical connection probability  $p$ .

Subgraph  $\mathcal{M}$  (containing  $m$  nodes) is expected to have  $\frac{m(m-1)}{2}p$  intra-connections, thus it has a total in-degree  $k_{in}^{\mathcal{M}} = m(m-1)p$ . Each node of  $\mathcal{M}$  shares with each node of  $\mathcal{N}$  a connection with probability  $p$ , thus the out-degrees  $k_{out}^{\mathcal{M}} = k_{out}^{\mathcal{N}} = m(N-m)p$ . Then the fitness of community  $\mathcal{M}$  can be calculated as

$$(F_\alpha^\beta)^{\mathcal{M}} = \frac{[m(m-1)p]^\beta}{[m(m-1)p + m(N-m)p]^\alpha} = \frac{m^{\beta-\alpha} (m-1)^\beta p^{\beta-\alpha}}{(N-1)^\alpha} \quad (1)$$

Similarly, the fitness of community  $\mathcal{N}$  can be calculated as

$$(F_\alpha^\beta)^{\mathcal{N}} = \frac{(N-m)^{\beta-\alpha} (N-m-1)^\beta p^{\beta-\alpha}}{(N-1)^\alpha} \quad (2)$$

Then the fitness of the whole network (with respect to a division to  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$ ) is

$$\left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}} + \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{N}} = [m^{\beta-\alpha}(m-1)^{\beta} + (N-m)^{\beta-\alpha}(N-m-1)^{\beta}] p^{\beta-\alpha} (N-1)^{-\alpha} \quad (3)$$

In comparison, if the whole network is recognized as one community (indicated by  $\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}$ ), its fitness can be calculated as

$$\left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}} = N^{\beta-\alpha} (N-1)^{\beta} p^{\beta-\alpha} (N-1)^{-\alpha} \quad (4)$$

We do not hope the random graph  $\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}$  be split into subgraphs  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$ , which requires

$$\left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}} > \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}} + \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{N}} \quad (5)$$

Substitute (3) and (4) into (5), we get

$$N^{\beta-\alpha} (N-1)^{\beta} > m^{\beta-\alpha} (m-1)^{\beta} + (N-m)^{\beta-\alpha} (N-m-1)^{\beta}, \text{ for any } 0 < m < N \quad (6)$$

Inequality (6) is equivalent to the following statement, i.e., the maximum of the function

$$f_{\alpha}^{\beta}(m) = m^{\beta-\alpha} (m-1)^{\beta} + (N-m)^{\beta-\alpha} (N-m-1)^{\beta} \quad (7)$$

should be reached at  $m=0$  or  $m=N$ .

(7) is a  $(2\beta-\alpha)$ -order polynomial on variable  $m$ ; a full set of its extrema (either maxima or minima) is difficult to solve. Here we simply make a very rough estimation on the solution of (6): we notice that due to symmetry,  $f_{\alpha}^{\beta}(m)$  has an extremum at  $m=N/2$  (we do not care it's a maximum or a minimum). As a *necessary condition*, (6) at least requires

$$f_{\alpha}^{\beta}(0) = f_{\alpha}^{\beta}(N) > f_{\alpha}^{\beta}\left(\frac{N}{2}\right) \quad (8)$$

Substitute (7) into (8) we get

$$N^{\beta-\alpha} (N-1)^{\beta} > 2^{\alpha-2\beta+1} N^{\beta-\alpha} (N-2)^{\beta} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{i.e.,} \quad 2^{\alpha-2\beta+1} < \left(1 + \frac{1}{N-2}\right)^{\beta} \quad (10)$$

Obviously, when  $\alpha \leq 2\beta-1$ , (10) can be always satisfied. In other words, when  $\alpha \leq 2\beta-1$ , at least a random graph would not be split into two subgraphs of the same size. This makes a necessary condition for avoiding the first bias (inappropriate splitting of large communities); in this paper, we simply take  $2\beta-1$  as the upper bound of the resolution parameter  $\alpha$ .

## II. Lower bound of $\alpha$ : merging complete graphs

Merging small and dense communities into larger but sparser ones, reflects the resolution limit problem at the other end of the resolution scale: small values of  $\alpha$  may cause this problem. Suppose we have a couple of *complete graphs*:  $\mathcal{M}$  consisting of  $m$  nodes and  $\mathcal{N}$  consisting of  $n$  nodes. If  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  are identified as two independent communities, it is straightforward to calculate their in-degrees:  $k_{in}^{\mathcal{M}} = m(m-1)$ ,  $k_{in}^{\mathcal{N}} = n(n-1)$ . As for their out-degrees, for simplicity we assume  $\mathcal{M}$

and  $\mathcal{N}$  are *disconnected*, i.e.,  $k_{out}^{\mathcal{M}} = k_{out}^{\mathcal{N}} = 0$ . Then the fitness of the network with  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  identified as separate communities can be calculated as

$$\left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}} + \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{N}} = m^{\beta-\alpha}(m-1)^{\beta-\alpha} + n^{\beta-\alpha}(n-1)^{\beta-\alpha} \quad (11)$$

For convenience, denote  $m(m-1) = a$ ,  $n(n-1) = b$ ,  $\beta - \alpha = k$ , then (11) becomes

$$\left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}} + \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{N}} = a^k + b^k \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  are merged into one large community (indicated by  $\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}$ ), the in-degree, out-degree and fitness of this large community can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} k_{in}^{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}} &= m(m-1) + n(n-1) = a + b, \\ k_{out}^{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}} &= 0, \\ \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}} &= [m(m-1) + n(n-2)]^{\beta-\alpha} = (a+b)^k \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

We expect  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  being identified as two independent communities, which requires

$$\left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}} + \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{N}} \geq \left(F_{\alpha}^{\beta}\right)^{\mathcal{M}+\mathcal{N}} \quad (14)$$

$$\text{i.e.,} \quad a^k + b^k \geq (a+b)^k \quad (15)$$

Consider a function of  $k$ :  $f(k) = a^k + b^k - (a+b)^k$ , (15) is equivalent to finding out a range of  $k$  within which  $f(k) \geq 0$ .


Since  $\frac{df}{dk} = a^k \ln a + b^k \ln b - (a+b)^k \ln(a+b)$ , without loss of generality, we assume  $m \leq n$ ,  $a \leq b$ , then

$$\frac{df}{dk} \leq a^k \ln b + b^k \ln b - (a+b)^k \ln b = [a^k + b^k - (a+b)^k] \ln b = f(k) \ln b$$


Since  $f(1)=0$ , then  $\left.\frac{df}{dk}\right|_{k=1} \leq f(1) \ln b = 0$ , indicating that  $f(k)$  is not increasing in the neighborhood of  $k=1$ . Therefore, when  $k < 1$ , i.e.,  $\alpha > \beta - 1$ , presumably  $f(k) \geq 0$ , so that (15) would be satisfied. In this paper, we take  $\beta - 1$  as the lower bound of  $\alpha$ .

Combining the above **I** and **II**, we estimate a “relevant range” for the resolution parameter  $\alpha$  with a fixed value of the scaling factor  $\beta$ :  $\beta - 1 < \alpha < 2\beta - 1$ . It should be noted that this range of  $\alpha$  was *roughly* estimated through *necessary conditions* rather than sufficient or necessary-and-sufficient conditions: the “real” relevant scale of resolution can be expected to fall in this range, as a proper sub-region probably—but resolution limit problem can still exist in the rest part of this range since a sufficient condition is not guaranteed here.


## Supplementary Figures



Supplementary figure 1. Communities in the RB625 network. (a) Topology of the RB625 network. Here by different shapes and colors of nodes, we show a division on the third community level (14 communities). (b) and (c): Plateaus detected for the RB625 network by our method with  $\beta=1$  and 2; these plateaus are obtained through an intersection over the outputs of 20 ensembles, each involving 1000 realizations of the Louvain algorithm at each resolution.




**Supplementary figure 2.** Plateaus detected for the RB3125 and RB15625 networks with  $\beta=1$  and 2. In each subfigure, plateaus are obtained through an intersection over the outputs of 20 ensembles, each involving 1000 realizations of the Louvain algorithm at each resolution. Subfigures (a)-(c) are perfectly consistent with our discussions in the main text. However, in (d), for the RB15625 network, our detection starts to deviate from perfection: the second and fifth community levels (1250 and 22 communities) are missing, and the small plateau for the division of 142 communities turns out to be a hybrid of different levels of communities: each of the four peripheral RB3125 units is divided into 18 communities (as on the fourth community level of RB3125), while the central RB3125 unit is divided into 70 communities (as on the third community level of RB3125).



[Supplementary figure 3](#). Plateaus for the RB15625 network detected with  $\beta=2\sim 5$ . For each subfigure, we run 20 ensembles, each involving 1000 realizations at each resolution. Plateaus in the figure are obtained through an intersection over the outputs of all 20 ensembles.  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  in the figure indicate the upper and lower bounds of the resolution scales of the highest and lowest community levels; all intermediate community levels should be detected within the scale  $\alpha_1 < \alpha < \alpha_2$  (plateaus not shown). It can be observed that the gap between  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  does not increase linearly with  $\beta$ , thus increasing the value of  $\beta$  does not necessarily help to detect more intermediate levels of communities in large RB networks.





**Supplementary figure 4.** Multi-level community structures within the karate club network detected by our method. Different levels of communities roughly exhibit a hierarchical structure, with minor reassembling of communities (indicated by the dashed rectangles) between a few of the neighboring levels. We distinguish communities defined with different stringencies by different fill colors: red indicates communities defined in a strong sense, blue in a weak sense, while grey fits no customary definitions of community.