

SILVAN: Estimating Betweenness Centralities with Progressive Sampling and Non-uniform Rademacher Bounds

Extended version

Leonardo Pellegrina

Dept. of Information Engineering, University of Padova
Padova, Italy
pellegrini@dei.unipd.it

Fabio Vandin

Dept. of Information Engineering, University of Padova
Padova, Italy
fabio.vandin@unipd.it

“*Sim Sala Bim!*” – Silvan *

ABSTRACT

Betweenness centrality is a popular centrality measure with applications in several domains, and whose exact computation is impractical for modern-sized networks. We present SILVAN, a novel, efficient algorithm to compute, with high probability, accurate estimates of the betweenness centrality of all nodes of a graph and a high-quality approximation of the k most central nodes of a graph. SILVAN follows a progressive sampling approach, and builds on recently improved bounds on Monte-Carlo Empirical Rademacher Averages, a fundamental tool from statistical learning theory. SILVAN relies on a novel estimation scheme that leads to *non-uniform* bounds on the deviation of the estimates from the true values of the between centrality of all the nodes, providing tight guarantees on the quality of the approximation. Our extensive experimental evaluation shows that SILVAN extracts high-quality approximations while outperforming, in terms of number of samples and accuracy, the state-of-the-art approximation algorithm with comparable quality guarantees.

1 INTRODUCTION

The computation of node centrality measures, which are scores quantifying the importance of nodes, is a fundamental task in graph analytics [36]. *Betweenness centrality* is a popular centrality measure, defined first in sociology [1, 24], that quantifies the importance of a node as the fraction of shortest paths in the graph that go through the node.

The computation of the *exact* betweenness centrality for all nodes in a graph $G = (V, E)$ can be obtained with Brandes’ algorithm [14] in time $O(|V||E|)$ for unweighted graphs and in time $O(|V||E| + |V|^2 \log |V|)$ for graphs with positive weights, which is impractical for modern networks with up to hundreds of millions of nodes and edges. Several works (e.g., [22, 47]) proposed heuristics to improve Brandes’ algorithm, but they do not improve on its worst-case complexity. In fact, for unweighted graphs a corresponding lower bound (based on the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis) was proved in [10]. The impracticality of the exact computation for modern networks, and the fact that between centrality is often used in exploratory analyses of the data, have motivated the study of

efficient algorithms to compute approximations of the betweenness centrality, trading precision for efficiency.

Several works [11, 41, 44] have recently proposed sampling approaches to approximate the betweenness centrality of all nodes in a graph. The main idea is to sample shortest paths uniformly at random, and use such paths to estimate the betweenness centrality of the nodes. As for all sampling approaches, the main difficulty is then to relate the estimates obtained from the samples with the corresponding exact quantities, providing guarantees on the quality of the estimates. [11, 41, 44] all provide rigorous approximations of the betweenness centrality, and [41, 44] rely on tools from statistical learning theory, such as the *VC-dimension* [50], the *pseudodimension* [40], or *Rademacher Averages* [30], which have been successfully used to obtain rigorous approximations for other data mining tasks (e.g., pattern mining [42, 43, 45]). Recent work [39] has shown that a more advanced tool from statistical learning theory, namely the *Monte-Carlo Empirical Rademacher Averages (MCERA)* [2] (see Section 3.2), leads to improved results in pattern mining, mostly thanks to its *data-dependent* nature (in contrast to *distribution-free* tools such as the VC-dimension and the pseudodimension).

Our contributions. In this work we study the problem of approximating the betweenness centralities of all nodes in a graph. We propose SILVAN, *eStimatIng betweenness centraLity with progressiVe sAmpling and Nonuniform rademacher bounds*, a novel, efficient, progressive sampling algorithm to approximate betweenness centralities while providing rigorous guarantees on the quality of the approximation. The approximation computed by SILVAN is probabilistically guaranteed to be within an additive factor ϵ , specified by the user.

SILVAN relies on novel, advanced and significantly sharper bounds on the relation between the MCERA and the maximum deviation of families of functions [38]. We show that all quantities required to compute such bounds can be updated efficiently and incrementally as samples are generated and processed. This work is the first to show the practicality of such bounds and to use them for data mining applications.

We propose variants of SILVAN that allow to obtain improved additive bounds by using non-uniform bounds on the maximum deviation and also lead to efficiently computable relative approximations. Moreover, we show how to use our improved bounds to bound relative deviations and to rigorously approximate the top- k betweenness centralities. All these variants rely on an efficient *data-dependent* approach that, combined with the tight bounds from the

* [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silvan_\(illusionist\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silvan_(illusionist))

© 2021 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). This is the author’s version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution.

MCERA, results in effective progressive sampling methods with tight approximation guarantees.

We perform an extensive experimental evaluation, showing that SILVAN improves the state of the art by providing improved approximations for a given sample size, or, vice versa, by requiring much smaller sample sizes to achieve a given approximation quality. For the extraction of the top- k betweenness centralities, our algorithm provides approximations with fewer false positives while using smaller sample sizes.

2 RELATED WORK

We now review the works on approximating the betweenness centralities that are most relevant to our contributions. In particular, we focus on approaches that provide guarantees on the quality of the approximation. We refer the reader interested in other related work on betweenness centralities to the presentation of such contributions in [41] and in [44].

The first practical sampling algorithm to approximate the betweenness centrality of all nodes with guarantees on the quality of the approximation is presented in [41]. The algorithm is based on the notion of VC-dimension, a key definition in statistical learning theory. Using the VC-dimension of shortest paths, [41] proves that when m shortest paths are sampled uniformly at random, the estimated betweenness centralities approximate the true betweenness centralities within an additive error of $O(\sqrt{\log(D/\delta)}/m)$, where D is the vertex diameter of the graph (or an upper bound to such quantity), with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$. While interesting, this result is characterised by the *worst-case* and *distribution-free* nature of the VC-dimension, and thus may provide an overly conservative bound in many cases. In fact, it cannot be used to design a *progressive* approach to estimate betweenness centralities that adapts to the estimates obtained from the data.

The first rigorous approach based on progressive sampling is ABRA [44]. ABRA builds on the theory of Rademacher averages and pseudodimension, a generalization of VC-dimension to real-valued functions, and does not require an estimate of the vertex diameter. However, this approach suffers by two key limitations. First, while the use of Rademacher averages alleviates the drawback of distribution-free complexities, ABRA leverages on a *deterministic* and *worst-case* upper bound to the Rademacher complexity (based on Massart’s Lemma [34, 35, 48]), which provides conservative results in most cases [39]. Second, similarly to [41], its approach is based on *uniform and variance-agnostic bounds* that hold for all nodes in the graph G . In contrast, our algorithm SILVAN uses *efficiently computable, non-uniform, and variance-dependent bounds* for different subsets of the nodes, which lead to a significant reduction of the number of samples required to obtain rigorous guarantees.

More recently, [11] proposed KADABRA, a progressive sampling algorithm based on an adaptive approach. Differently from [41] and [44], KADABRA does not build on tools from statistical learning theory, and proposes a refined *data-dependent* scheme to assign non-uniform probabilistic confidences on the estimates of the betweenness centrality of each individual node, achieving improved approximations compared to [41] and [44]. Our algorithm SILVAN uses a similar intuition and data-dependent approach, but it integrates it with approximation bounds that are valid *simultaneously*

over *sets of nodes* rather than focused on each individual node, and on improved bounds on the deviation obtained through refined results for Rademacher averages. As we will show in our experimental evaluation, such contributions lead to significant improvements on the approximation quality compared to KADABRA.

[41], [44], and [11], all propose variants of their algorithms for the approximation of the top- k betweenness centralities. Our algorithm SILVAN achieves better results for this task as well, thanks to the improved bounds on the Rademacher averages it employs and to the non-uniform bounding scheme that characterizes it.

Other papers study different, but related, problems and notions of centrality. [21] uses an approach similar to [41], and based on pseudodimension, to estimate percolation centrality. [17] considers the problem of computing closeness centrality, which is the inverse of the average distance of a node to all other nodes in a graph, and which is a popular importance measure in the study of social networks. [9] considers closeness and harmonic centralities through HyperLogLog counters [8, 23]. [3] proposes a new algorithm for selecting the k nodes with the highest closeness centralities in a graph. [17] proposes an algorithm based on probability proportional to size sampling to estimate closeness centralities. [33] studies the problem of finding a set of at most k nodes of maximum betweenness centrality, where the betweenness centrality of a set is defined analogously to the betweenness centrality of nodes [28, 51], and present efficient randomized algorithms to obtain rigorous approximations with high probability. [4] studies the problem of increasing the betweenness centrality of a node by adding new links. Other recent works considered extending the computation of the betweenness centrality to dynamic [5, 6, 27] and uncertain graphs [46]. Some variants of our algorithm use estimates of the vertex diameter of a graphs, for which several approximation approaches have been proposed (e.g., [19, 20, 32]), including some for distributed frameworks [16].

3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce the basic notions used in the remaining of the paper.

3.1 Graphs and Betweenness Centrality

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. For ease of exposition, we focus on undirected and unweighted graphs. However, our algorithms can be easily adapted to directed and/or weighted graphs. For any pair (s, t) of different nodes ($s \neq t$), let σ_{st} be the number of shortest paths between s and t , and let $\sigma_{st}(v)$ be the number of shortest paths between s and t that *pass through* (i.e., contain) v . The (normalized) *betweenness centrality* $b(v)$ of a node $v \in V$ is defined as

$$b(v) = \frac{1}{|V|(|V| - 1)} \sum_{s \neq v \neq t} \frac{\sigma_{st}(v)}{\sigma_{st}}.$$

Some of our algorithms rely on the knowledge of the *vertex diameter* of a graph G , defined as the maximum number of nodes in any shortest path of G . (The vertex diameter of G is equal to the diameter of G plus 1, if G is unweighted.)

3.2 Rademacher averages

Rademacher averages are a core concept in statistical learning theory [30]. We now present the main notions and results used in our work. While Rademacher averages are defined for arbitrary distributions and for real valued functions, here we focus on the scenario of interest for the estimate of betweenness centralities. Let \mathcal{X} be a finite domain and consider the uniform distribution over the elements of \mathcal{X} . Let \mathcal{F} be a family of functions from a domain \mathcal{X} to $[0, 1]$, and let $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ be a collection of (independent and uniform) samples from \mathcal{X} . For each function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, define its average value in \mathcal{X} as $\mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$ and its average value over the sample \mathcal{S} as $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f(s_i)$. Let $U(\mathcal{X})$ be the uniform distribution on domain \mathcal{X} . Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim U(\mathcal{X})}[f(x)] = \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f), \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)] = \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f).$$

Given \mathcal{S} , we are interested in the *supremum deviation* $D(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ of $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)$ from $\mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f)$ among all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, that is

$$D(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f) - \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f)|.$$

A key quantity to obtain a data-dependent upper bound to the supremum deviation $D(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ is the *Empirical Rademacher Average* (ERA) $\hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ of \mathcal{F} on \mathcal{S} , which is defined as follows. Let $\sigma = \langle \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m \rangle$ be a collection of m i.i.d. Rademacher random variables (r.v.'s), each taking value in $\{-1, 1\}$ with equal probability. The ERA $\hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ of \mathcal{F} on \mathcal{S} is

$$\hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}) = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i f(s_i) \right].$$

Computing the ERA $\hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ is usually intractable, since there are 2^m possible assignments for σ and for each such assignment a supremum over the functions in \mathcal{F} must be computed. A useful approach to obtain sharp probabilistic bounds on the ERA is given by Monte-Carlo estimation [2]. For $c \geq 1$, let $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{c \times m}$ be a $c \times m$ matrix of i.i.d. Rademacher r.v.'s. The *c-samples Monte-Carlo Empirical Rademacher average* (*c-MCERA*) $\hat{R}_m^c(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ of \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{S} using σ is:

$$\hat{R}_m^c(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \sigma) = \frac{1}{c} \sum_{j=1}^c \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_{j,i} f(s_i).$$

The *c-MCERA* allows to obtain sharp *data-dependent* probabilistic upper bounds to the supremum deviation, as they directly estimate the complexity of sets of functions given by Rademacher averages. For this reason, they are often significantly more accurate than other methods [39], such as the ones based on often loose *deterministic upper bounds* to Rademacher averages (i.e., Massart's Lemma [34]), or other *distribution-free* notions of complexity, such as the VC-dimension. A well known potential drawback of the *c-MCERA* is that it may be hard to compute, due to the supremums over the set of functions \mathcal{F} over the assignments of σ [2]. We will show in Section 4 that for the case of betweenness centralities, all quantities relevant to the *c-MCERA* can be efficiently and incrementally be updated as shortest paths are randomly sampled.

The proof of the main result (Theorem 4.1 below) builds on the combination of the most refined concentration inequalities relating Rademacher averages to the supremum deviation [12].

It relies on recent [38] general results, adapted to our scenario, that provide tight probabilistic bounds to the concentration of the *c-MCERA* and of empirical estimators of important quantities (such as, the supremum variance of the functions under consideration). Such novel results are essential to achieve accurate bounds to the supremum deviation.

Let the *Rademacher complexity* $R(\mathcal{F}, m)$ of a set of functions \mathcal{F} be defined as $R(\mathcal{F}, m) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}) \right]$. We now state some intermediate results that hold for all families \mathcal{F} of functions $f \in [0, 1]$, and that are used to prove our improved bound on the supremum deviation $D(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ (see Theorem 4.1 in Section 4.1). The first result relates $R(\mathcal{F}, m)$ to the *expected* supremum deviation.

LEMMA 3.1. Symmetrization Lemma [35, 48] *Let Z be either $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f) - \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f)\}$ or $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f) - \mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)\}$. Then it holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [Z] \leq 2R(\mathcal{F}, m).$$

The following gives a variance-dependent bound to the supremum deviation above its expectation, and it is due to Bousquet [13].

THEOREM 3.2. (Thm. 2.3 [13]) *Let $\tau \doteq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\text{Var}(f)\}$, and let Z be either $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f) - \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f)\}$ or $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f) - \mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)\}$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \lambda$ over \mathcal{S} , it holds*

$$Z \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [Z] + \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right) (\tau + 2\mathbb{E}[Z])}{m} + \frac{\ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{3m}}.$$

The next result bounds $R(\mathcal{F}, m)$ above its estimate $\hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$.

THEOREM 3.3. [12, 37] *With probability $\geq 1 - \lambda$ over \mathcal{S} , it holds*

$$R(\mathcal{F}, m) \leq \hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}) + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{m} \right)^2 + \frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})}{m} + \frac{\ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{m}}.$$

The next gives a tight bound to $\hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$ from the *c-MCERA* $\hat{R}_m^c(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$.

THEOREM 3.4. (Thm. 11 [38]) *Let \hat{w} be defined as*

$$\hat{w} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (f(s_i))^2.$$

Let $Z = \hat{R}_m^c(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma} [Z] = \hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S})$. With probability $\geq 1 - \lambda$ over σ it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma} [Z] \leq Z + \frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{cm} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{cm} \right)^2 + \frac{4(Z + \hat{w}) \ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{cm}}.$$

The next result shows that $\sup_f \mathbb{E} [f]$ can be tightly estimated using $\sup_f \mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)$.

THEOREM 3.5. (Thm. 21 [38]) *Let $\hat{f} = \sup_f \mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)$. With probability $\geq 1 - \lambda$ over \mathcal{S} it holds*

$$\sup_f \mathbb{E} [f] \leq \hat{f} + \frac{\ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{m} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{m} \right)^2 + \frac{2\hat{f} \ln \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)}{m}}.$$

4 SILVAN: EFFICIENT PROGRESSIVE ESTIMATION OF BETWEENNESS CENTRALITIES

We now introduce SILVAN, *eStimatIng betweenness centraLity with progressiVe sAmpling and Nonuniform rademacher bounds*, our progressive algorithm for the efficient estimation of betweenness centralities, and its variants with different guarantees. We start by proving in Section 4.1 an improved bound on the supremum deviation. We then describe, in Section 4.2, our algorithm SILVAN that builds on such improved bound to obtain an approximation within *additive* error ε of the betweenness centrality for all nodes. We then show, in Section 4.3, how the bound of Section 4.1 can be adapted to obtain a *nonuniform approximation* of the betweenness centrality of the nodes, leading to an improved approximation algorithm with additive error. Next, in Section 4.4 we show how to obtain a *relative* approximation of the betweenness centrality of the nodes. Finally, in Section 4.5 we show how to adapt SILVAN to obtain a rigorous approximation of the k nodes with highest betweenness centrality.

4.1 Improved Bound on the Supremum Deviation

We now prove an improved bound on the supremum deviation that holds for all families \mathcal{F} of functions f with value in $[0, 1]$, building on the results introduced in Section 3.2.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let \mathcal{F} a family of functions with codomain in $[0, 1]$. Let $\hat{f} = \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)$, that is an estimate of $\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}[f]$ computed from sample \mathcal{S} , and \hat{w} as in Thm. 3.4. Let \tilde{r} the value of the c -MCERA of \mathcal{F} computed on \mathcal{S} and σ . Define $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{R}}$ as*

$$\begin{aligned} d &\doteq \hat{f} + \frac{\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{m} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{m}\right)^2 + \frac{2\hat{f}\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{m}} \\ v &\doteq \begin{cases} 1/4, & \text{if } d \geq 1/2, \\ d(1-d), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \tilde{R} &\doteq \tilde{r} + \frac{2\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{cm} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{2\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{cm}\right)^2 + \frac{4(\tilde{r} + \hat{w})\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{cm}} \\ R &\doteq \tilde{R} + \frac{\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{m} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{m}\right)^2 + \frac{2\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)\tilde{R}}{m}} \\ \varepsilon_{\mathbb{R}} &\doteq 2R + \sqrt{\frac{2\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)(v+4R)}{m} + \frac{\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta}\right)}{3m}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

With probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the choice of \mathcal{S} and σ , it holds $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}) \leq \varepsilon_{\mathbb{R}}$.

PROOF. Define the events E_i and E as

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \text{“} \max_f \mathbb{E}[f] > d \text{”}, \quad E_2 = \text{“} \hat{R}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}) > \tilde{R} \text{”}, \\ E_3 &= \text{“} \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}, m) > R \text{”}, \quad E_4 = \text{“} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f) - \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f)\} > \varepsilon_{\mathbb{R}} \text{”}, \\ E_5 &= \text{“} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\mu_{\mathcal{X}}(f) - \mu_{\mathcal{S}}(f)\} > \varepsilon_{\mathbb{R}} \text{”}, \quad E = \text{“} \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}) > \varepsilon_{\mathbb{R}} \text{”}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the statement is proved if $\Pr(E) \leq \delta$, and that the event E is contained in the event $\bigcup_i E_i$, meaning that $\Pr(E) \leq \Pr(\bigcup_i E_i)$. To upper bound the probabilities of E_1, E_2 , and E_3 , we apply Theorems 3.2-3.5 with $\lambda = \delta/5$: $\Pr(E_1) \leq \delta/5$ is a consequence of Thm. 3.5; $\Pr(E_2) \leq \delta/5$ follows from Thm. 3.4; $\Pr(E_3) \leq \delta/5$ follows from Thm. 3.3. Then, we remark that $\sup_f \mathbb{E}[f] \leq d$ and $f \in [0, 1]$ implies $\sup_f \text{Var}(f) \leq v$ using Bhatia and Davis inequality on variances [7], that implies $\text{Var}(f) \leq \mathbb{E}[f](1 - \mathbb{E}[f])$. From twice the application of Thm. 3.2 to bound $\Pr(E_4)$ and $\Pr(E_5)$ below $\lambda = \delta/5$, Lemma 3.1, and a union bound over the 5 events we defined, each true with probability $\leq \delta/5$, we obtain that the event E is true with probability at most δ :

$$\Pr(E) \leq \Pr\left(\bigcup_i E_i\right) \leq \sum_i \Pr(E_i) \leq \delta. \quad \square$$

Our algorithm SILVAN uses the result above to obtain accurate estimates of the betweenness centralities, by employing binary functions (i.e., with values in $\{0, 1\}$). However, the result above may be useful also when other, nonbinary, estimators are used (e.g., the one in [44]), and can also be easily extended to bounded functions in the interval $[a, b]$.

4.2 Additive Approximation with Uniform Bounds

Our algorithm SILVAN works by sampling shortest paths in G uniformly at random, using the following sampling procedure considered in previous works [11, 41]: sample two uniformly random nodes s, t , and then a uniformly distributed shortest path π between s and t . It is easy to see that with this procedure the probability $\Pr[v \in \pi]$ that a node v is in π is $\Pr[v \in \pi] = b(v)$. By repeatedly sampling paths according to this distribution, SILVAN estimates $b(v)$ for all nodes $v \in V$. In particular, for each node $v \in V$ and a shortest path π , define the binary function $\tilde{b}_v(\pi)$, with $\tilde{b}_v(\pi) = 1$ if $v \in \pi$, and $\tilde{b}_v(\pi) = 0$ otherwise. Let Π be the set of all shortest path in G . Then the average value of function \tilde{b}_v on domain Π is $\mu_{\Pi}(\tilde{b}_v) = b(v)$. Now, by considering a sample \mathcal{S} of m samples uniformly at random from Π one obtains the estimate $\tilde{b}(v) = \mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\tilde{b}_v) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}} \tilde{b}_v(\pi)$. Note that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}}[\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\tilde{b}_v)] = \mu_{\Pi}(\tilde{b}_v) = b(v)$ (see Section 3.2).

SILVAN is based on a *progressive sampling* approach. At a high level, the algorithm works in iterations, and in iteration i SILVAN extracts an approximation of the values $b(v)$ for all $v \in V$ from a sample \mathcal{S}_i , which is a collection of $m_i = |\mathcal{S}_i|$ randomly sampled shortest paths. Then SILVAN checks whether a suitable *stopping condition* is satisfied. If the *stopping condition* is satisfied, the algorithm reports the achieved approximation.

The aforementioned approach is followed by all our algorithms; in this section we show how to achieve a ε -approximation of the set $BC(G) = \{b(v) : v \in V\}$, defined as follows. A set $\tilde{BC}(G) = \{\tilde{b}(v) : v \in V\}$ is an ε -approximation of $BC(G) = \{b(v) : v \in V\}$ if it holds, for all $v \in V$, that $|b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \varepsilon$.

Algorithm 1 describes the algorithm SILVAN to compute an ε -approximation of $BC(G)$ by employing the bounds of Section 3.2. SILVAN starts by initializing the estimates $\tilde{b}(v)$ of $b(v)$, \hat{f} , and the values $\tilde{r}(v, j)$ to 0 for all $v \in V$ and all $j \in [1, c]$. Then, the iterations of the algorithm start on line 5; the function `stoppingCond` checks the stopping condition and, if satisfied, stops the execution of the algorithm. The function `nextSampleSize` provides the number m_i of samples to process. In our experiments we only consider a geometric progression such that $m_i = 1.2 \cdot m_{i-1}$, but general schedules can be used. We discuss in Section 5.1 how to set the first sample size m_1 . After the i -th shortest path π is sampled with the function `samplePath`, the algorithm computes the values $\tilde{r}(v, j) = \sum_{x=1}^i \sigma_{j,x} \tilde{b}_v(\pi_x)$ for $j = 1, \dots, c$ and for nodes $v \in \pi$; such values are used to obtain the estimate \tilde{r} of the c -MCERA at the end of each iteration. Note that the values $\tilde{r}(v, j)$ are easily updated after each sample π is drawn (line 15) by increasing $\tilde{r}(v, j)$ according to the values of σ_j . The algorithm also maintains, across iterations, the estimate $\hat{f} = \max_{v \in V} \tilde{b}(v)$, which can, again, easily be updated across iterations (line 14). Note that \hat{w} can be kept updated as \hat{f} , but we ignore it since, for binary functions, $\hat{w} = \hat{f}$. Using the value \tilde{r} of the c -MCERA and \hat{f} , the algorithm computes an upper bound ε_R to the supremum deviation using Eq. (1) that, for iteration i , holds with probability $\delta_i = \delta/2^i$ (that is, in Eq. (1) δ is replaced by $\delta/2^i$). The stopping condition `stoppingCond` is then defined as $\varepsilon_R \leq \varepsilon$. When the stopping condition is satisfied, the algorithm returns the vector \tilde{b} , normalized by m_i , containing the values $\tilde{b}(v)$ for all $v \in V$.

The following result establishes the guarantees provided by SILVAN. The proof is based on the results of Section 3.2.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *With probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, the output \tilde{b} of SILVAN is a ε -approximation of $BC(G)$.*

PROOF. We first prove that, at the end of the i -th iteration, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, it holds that the supremum deviation is $\leq \varepsilon_R$ with probability $\geq 1 - \delta/2^i$. This is consequence of the following facts that are easy to verify: 1) \tilde{r} is the correct value of the c -MCERA; 2) \hat{f} is equal to $\max_v \tilde{b}(v)$; 3) ε_R , at the end of iteration i , is computed using the bound of Theorem 4.1 with probability parameter $\delta/2^i$ (i.e., in Thm. 4.1 δ is replaced by $\delta/2^i$).

We now prove the statement. Let τ be a random variable equal to the index of the iteration in which the algorithm stops. Let the event A_i be defined as

$$A_i = \text{"at } i\text{-th iteration, } \exists v : \varepsilon_R < |b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)|\text{"}.$$

The algorithm is correct if A_τ is false, thus we want to prove that $\Pr(A_\tau) \leq \delta$. Note that, since we have proved that at the end of the i -th iteration, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, it holds that the supremum deviation is $\leq \varepsilon_R$ with probability $\geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2^i}$, we have that $\Pr(A_i) \leq \frac{\delta}{2^i}$. (Following analogous derivations discussed in [11], we remark that A_τ depends on the random variable τ , and it should not be confused

Algorithm 1: SILVAN

Input: Graph $G = (V, E)$, $c \geq 1$, $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$.
Output: ε -approximation of BC for all $v \in V$, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$

```

1  $i \leftarrow 0; m_0 \leftarrow 0; \hat{f} \leftarrow 0$ 
2 forall  $v \in V$  do
3    $\tilde{b}(v) \leftarrow 0$ 
4   forall  $j \in [1, c]$  do  $\tilde{r}(v, j) \leftarrow 0$ 
5 while not stoppingCond() do
6    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
7    $m_i \leftarrow \text{nextSampleSize}()$ 
8    $\hat{f} \leftarrow \hat{f} m_{i-1}$ 
9   for  $m_i - m_{i-1}$  times do
10     $\pi = \text{samplePath}()$ 
11    forall  $j \in [1, c]$  do  $\sigma_j \leftarrow -1$  or  $1$  w. eq. prob.
12    forall  $v \in \pi$  do
13       $\tilde{b}(v) \leftarrow \tilde{b}(v) + 1$ 
14       $\hat{f} \leftarrow \max\{\hat{f}, \tilde{b}(v)\}$ 
15      forall  $j \in [1, c]$  do  $\tilde{r}(v, j) \leftarrow \tilde{r}(v, j) + \sigma_j$ 
16     $\tilde{r} \leftarrow \frac{1}{cm_i} \sum_{j=1}^c \max\{\tilde{r}(v, j) : v \in V\}$ 
17     $\hat{f} \leftarrow \frac{\hat{f}}{m_i}$ 
18     $\varepsilon_R \leftarrow$  from Eq. (1)
19 return  $\tilde{b}/m_i$ 

```

with A_i for a fixed i .) We have that

$$\Pr(A_\tau) = \sum_{j=1}^N \Pr(A_j \cap \tau = j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \Pr(A_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\delta}{2^j} \leq \delta.$$

□

4.3 Improved Additive Approximation with Non-uniform Bounds

We now present a variant of SILVAN that requires fewer samples to obtain an ε -approximation of $BC(G)$. This variant uses non-uniform bounds on the deviations of the estimates of the values $b(v)$, obtained with a *data-dependent* scheme based on the observed values of elements of $BC(G)$ and inspired by the approach of [11].

The algorithm works in two phases: in the first, it samples m' shortest paths from G and computes a first coarse approximation $\tilde{BC}_1(G)$ of $BC(G)$. Using $\tilde{BC}_1(G)$, the algorithm computes, in the second phase, a tight approximation $\tilde{BC}_2(G)$ of $BC(G)$. We now describe how to use the information in $\tilde{BC}_1(G)$ to guide the second phase. In order to obtain an ε -approximation of $BC(G)$ with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, it must hold that ε_R (from (1)) is, at the end of an iteration of the algorithm, $\leq \varepsilon$. We observe that the quantities that most impact the value of ε_R are \hat{f} (that is an estimate of $\max_v b(v)$) and \tilde{r} (the estimated c -MCERA). In particular, small values of \hat{f} lead to smaller “tail bound terms” (the terms of (1) that are added to the estimate \tilde{r} of Rademacher Averages) but also, potentially, to smaller values of \tilde{r} (as $\tilde{r} \leq \hat{f}$).

The main idea behind our data-dependent approach is to partition the set V of nodes into t sets $\{V_i, i \in [1, t]\}$ according to the information contained in $\tilde{BC}_1(G)$; then, we compute an ε -approximation for each of the t partitions, guaranteeing that all of them are valid simultaneously with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$. This strategy is supported by the fact that, in many real-world graphs, the distribution of $\{b(v)\}$ is skewed, with only few nodes having large values of betweenness centrality; therefore, this suggests to handle separately sets of nodes with different values of betweenness centrality. This strategy is in some sense similar to the one adopted by KADABRA, which assigns confidence parameters δ_v for each $v \in V$ in a data-dependent manner, such that the probability that the approximation $\tilde{b}(v)$ of $b(v)$ is not accurate is below δ_v for each node $v \in V$, with $\sum_{v \in V} \delta_v \leq \delta$. Our approach, instead, uses Rademacher averages to obtain t approximations that are valid for sets of nodes, instead of considering each node individually; as we will show in Section 5, this key difference results in tighter bounds on the supremum deviation.

We now describe a principle to guide the partition of V into t sets using $\tilde{BC}_1(G)$. First, let $t \geq 1$ and P be a partitioning of V into t subsets $P = \{V_i\}$. Define \hat{f}_i as $\hat{f}_i = \max_{V_i} \tilde{BC}_1(V_i)$. Then, define \tilde{r}_i to be the estimate of the c -MCERA computed in the first pass of the algorithm over nodes in V_i . We want to minimize the quantity

$$\max_{i \in [1, t]} \left\{ 2\tilde{r}_i + \sqrt{\frac{2(4\tilde{r}_i + \hat{f}_i) \ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta_i}\right)}{m'}} + \frac{\ln\left(\frac{5}{\delta_i}\right)}{3m'} \right\} \quad (2)$$

w.r.t. the set $\{\delta_i : i \in [1, t]\}$, the partitioning P of V , and t , under the constraints $t \geq 1$, $\delta_i > 0$, and $\sum_i \delta_i = \delta$. Equations (2) gives a proxy for (1), as “function” of the partition of V . We may observe how the quantities involved in (2) are impacted by the choice of P . First, we remark that \tilde{r}_i may decrease by removing elements from V_i , as in the computation of the c -MCERA the supremum is taken w.r.t. a lower number of elements. Then, the second term of the argument of the max increases with \hat{f}_i : partitions with larger values of \hat{f}_i will have a larger bound. For this reason, it is convenient to allocate in the same partition nodes with similar values of $\tilde{b}(v)$. Combining these intuitions, a good partition of V should have partitions V_i of small size containing elements with high values of $\tilde{b}(v)$, balancing the values of \tilde{r}_i and \hat{f}_i , and larger partitions with lower values of $\tilde{b}(v)$. The number of partitions t impacts the bounds through the values of δ_i , that have to decrease as t increases.

A simple greedy strategy to partition V according to (2) is to iteratively split existing partitions, until it is not possible to decrease (2). However, simpler but effective approaches can be used as well. For example, from \tilde{BC}_1 one can consider the $t - 1$ nodes with highest estimated betweenness centrality as separate subsets, and consider the other nodes as a single partition. Intuitively, this partitioning scheme should be effective in cases where the values of $b(v)$ are highly skewed, and it is extremely simple to implement.

For example: let v_1, \dots, v_n be the nodes of V sorted so that $\tilde{b}(v_j) \geq \tilde{b}(v_{j+1})$, where $\tilde{b}(v_j)$ are the estimates of $b(v_j)$ computed in the first phase. Start with $t = 1$, and $P = \{V\}$, and repeat the following: increase t by 1, set $\delta_i = \delta/t$, and find the index $j \in [0, n]$ that partitions $V_i \in P$ into $V'_i = \{v_x \in V_i : x \leq j\}$ and $V''_i = \{v_x \in V_i : x > j\}$, such that $P' = P \setminus V_i \cup V'_i \cup V''_i$ minimizes (2). This step is repeated until it is not possible to decrease (2). Finally, optimize the values of $\{\delta_i\}$.

In fact, this is the scheme we use in our experimental evaluation, and the results of Section 5 show that this data-dependent strategy almost always improves w.r.t. to the one described in Section 4.2 in many real-world graphs.

After obtaining P and the set $\{\delta_i\}$, we run SILVAN to obtain, for each $V_i \in P$, an ε -approximation globally valid, for all $v \in V$, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$. This is done by keeping track, in line 14, of t values of \hat{f} and computing, in lines 16 and 18, t values of \tilde{r} and ε_R , one for each set V_i . The stopping condition `stoppingCond()` is defined as $\varepsilon_R \leq \varepsilon$ for all $V_i \in P$. We may observe that, since the first phase is *completely independent* from the second phase of the algorithm, the approximation guaranteed in the second phase holds for any partition P and for any assignment of $\{\delta_i\}$ that are decided in the first phase, opening the possibility of designing better heuristics than the minimization of (2). Naturally, a particularly bad choice of the partition P may lead to worse results w.r.t. what obtained with $t = 1$ (i.e., when the nodes are not partitioned in a data-dependent fashion). In any case, one can concurrently execute the algorithm with multiple partitions (i.e., one computed at the first phase, and the variant with $t = 1$) *on the same randomly sampled shortest paths* with an appropriate union bound, obtaining improvements if at least one partition leads to smaller bounds, and a negligible performance decrease in the worst case.

We conclude remarking that one may be tempted to partition V *while sampling* and computing the approximation in the second phase of the algorithm; however, since the partition of the nodes and the computation of the bounds are done on the same data, one has to handle the dependences between the events “ v is assigned to partition V_i ” and “bounds on nodes $\in V_i$ are correct”. Our approach is a first step towards data-dependent non-uniform deviations bounds: obtaining a procedure that allows to *fully adaptively* partition V , without any external and independent information, is a challenging but very interesting research direction.

4.4 Relative Approximations

While in some cases additive approximations, for which $|\tilde{b}(v) - b(v)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $v \in V$, are sufficient, in several practical cases *relative* approximation, for which each $|\tilde{b}(v) - b(v)|$ depends on the value $b(v)$, may be more informative. For example, when the values $b(v)$ are highly skewed, one may prefer to have relative approximations of the type “ $\tilde{b}(v)$ is within 10% of the value of $b(v)$ ” than an additive approximation of the type “ $|\tilde{b}(v) - b(v)| \leq 0.05$ ” that is either unnecessarily precise for high values of $b(v)$ or uninformative for low values of $b(v)$.

Motivated by this intuition, in this Section we discuss how to adapt our proposed non-uniform bounds to the problem of computing relative approximations of betweenness centralities. First, we show how to obtain such approximation progressively and adaptively as samples are processed. Lastly, we present distribution-free bounds based on the VC-dimension and knowledge of the vertex diameter of the graph to upper limit the maximum number of samples required to guarantee different notions of relative approximations.

Many definitions of “relative approximations” are available; we now present the most studied ones. Let $\gamma : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a function describing the desired accuracy of the estimate $\tilde{b}(v)$ of

$b(v)$ for the node $v \in V$, such that it holds

$$|b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \gamma \left(b(v), \tilde{b}(v) \right).$$

Using γ we can treat the different notions of approximations in an unified way. Let $\eta, \theta \in (0, 1]$ be two parameters, where η represents the desired relative accuracy of the approximation, while θ usually selects the range of nodes of interest for the approximation (e.g., all nodes with $b(v) \geq \theta$). Cortes et al. [18] consider the relative deviations given by

$$\gamma \left(b(v), \tilde{b}(v) \right) \doteq \eta \sqrt{\max\{b(v), \tilde{b}(v)\}}. \quad (3)$$

[31] instead studies the quantity

$$\gamma \left(b(v), \tilde{b}(v) \right) \doteq \eta \left(b(v) + \tilde{b}(v) + \theta \right). \quad (4)$$

[26] considers a relative approximation in which the function γ is defined as

$$\gamma \left(b(v), \tilde{b}(v) \right) \doteq \eta \max\{\theta, b(v)\}. \quad (5)$$

We now show how non-uniform bounds on the absolute differences between the betweenness centrality $b(v)$ of a node v and its estimate $\tilde{b}(v)$ can be used for obtaining *any* of such relative approximations. Assume that, at some point of the algorithm, it holds, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, that, for all $v \in V$,

$$b(v) \in [\ell(v), u(v)],$$

for some $0 \leq \ell(v) \leq u(v) \leq 1$. It is possible to verify that the guarantees required by the appropriate approximation are satisfied by checking that it holds, for all v , that

$$|x - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \gamma \left(x, \tilde{b}(v) \right), \forall x \in [\ell(v), u(v)].$$

To obtain such approximation, the non-uniform variant of SILVAN may follow the same strategy described in the previous section. In particular, (2) is replaced by the constraints imposed by γ , that is, the maximum deviation of nodes in a given V_i has to be smaller than the corresponding argument of (2), and one has to choose the V_i 's (and the δ_i 's) so that each constraint is likely to be satisfied in the second phase. A simpler approach, following what discussed in Section 4.3, is to choose the V_i 's according to the estimated values of $b(v)$, so that nodes with similar values of $b(v)$ end up in the same V_i . This is the strategy followed in our experimental evaluation to obtain a relative approximation of the set of top- k nodes (described in Section 4.5).

In the rest of this section, we present novel distribution-free bounds, based on the VC-dimension and the vertex diameter D of the graph, to obtain different notions of relative approximations. Such bounds are useful to limit the maximum number of iterations of a progressive sampling algorithm.

First, let $h = \log_2(2(D-2))$, and define the function $S_G(x)$ as

$$S_G(x) = \min \left\{ 2x(D-2), \left(\frac{2ex}{h} \right)^h, |V| \right\}.$$

The following proves properties of the function $S_G(x)$, that we use to upper bound the *shatter coefficient* (see [48] and [41] for formal definitions) of the range space of shortest paths.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Let a graph G with vertex diameter D . Then, for all $x \geq D/2$, the shatter coefficient of any sample of shortest paths of size $2x$ is at most $S_G(x)$.*

PROOF. First, we have from [41] (Cor. 1) that the VC-dimension of the range space associated to shortest paths is at most $h = \log_2(2(D-2))$. Therefore, from Sauer-Shelah-Perles's Lemma [48] it holds that the number of distinct ranges that intersect $2x$ samples is at most $(2ex/h)^h$. Then, we observe that such number cannot be larger than $|V|$, the size of the set of functions that we consider. Furthermore, since each shortest path contains at most $D-2$ inner vertices, we have that $2x$ shortest paths contain at most $2x(D-2)$ distinct vertices. Taking the minimum of all such bounds gives the statement. \square

By combining the proposition above with recent results from statistical learning theory (Corollary 1 of [18]), we obtain the following, which establishes an upper bound on the number m of samples required to obtain a relative approximation (defined by taking γ as in (3)) with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, for a given η , and for fixed vertex diameter D and δ .

THEOREM 4.4. *Let G be a graph with vertex diameter $\leq D$. Let $\eta, \delta \in (0, 1)$, and let m be*

$$m = \min \left\{ x \geq \frac{D}{2} : 2 \sqrt{x^{-1} \left(\ln(S_G(x)) + \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) \right)} \leq \eta \right\}.$$

Denote \tilde{b} be the output of SILVAN after sampling at least m shortest paths. Then, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, the following holds simultaneously, for all $v \in V$:

$$|b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \eta \sqrt{\max\{b(v), \tilde{b}(v)\}}.$$

The following result establishes a sufficient number of samples for SILVAN to obtain an approximation such that the relative deviations γ are as in (4), and follows from Theorem 2 of [18].

THEOREM 4.5. *Let G be a graph with vertex diameter $\leq D$. Let $\eta, \delta \in (0, 1)$, $\theta > 0$ and let m be*

$$m = \min \left\{ x \geq \frac{D}{2} : \sqrt{1 - x\theta \left[x\theta + 2 \left(\ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) + \ln(S_G(x)) \right) \right]^{-1}} \leq \eta \right\}.$$

Denote \tilde{b} be the output of SILVAN after sampling at least m shortest paths. Then, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, the following holds simultaneously, for all $v \in V$:

$$|b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \eta \left(b(v) + \tilde{b}(v) + \theta \right).$$

The next result gives an upper bound to the number of samples to obtain a relative approximation, where γ is as in (5). It follows from composing Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 2.9 of [26].

THEOREM 4.6. *Assume the setting of Theorem 4.5, with $\eta \in (0, 1/4)$. Then, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, the following holds simultaneously, for all $v \in V$:*

$$|b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq 4\eta \max\{\theta, b(v)\}.$$

4.5 Top- k Approximation

In this Section we propose a variant of SILVAN for computing an approximation of the set of top- k central nodes. First, denote the nodes v_1, \dots, v_n sorted according to their betweenness centrality, such that $b(v_i) \geq b(v_{i+1})$. The set $TOP(k)$ of top- k nodes is defined as

$$TOP(k) = \{(v_i, b(v_i)) : i \leq k\}.$$

We are interested in computing an approximation $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ of $TOP(k)$ with the following guarantees:

- $(v, b(v)) \in TOP(k) \implies (v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$;
- $(v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k) \implies |b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \gamma(b(v), \tilde{b}(v))$;
- $(v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$ and $(v, b(v)) \notin TOP(k) \implies b(v_k) - b(v) \leq \xi(b(v), b(v_k))$.

The first guarantee ensures that all nodes in $TOP(k)$ are in the approximation; the second assures that all the estimates in the approximation are close to the true values of the betweenness centrality, within accuracy given by the function γ ; the last condition ensure that all nodes v not in the exact set $TOP(v)$ of the top- k nodes are in the approximation only if their betweenness centrality $b(v)$ is not too distant from $b(v_k)$, according to a given function ξ (that indirectly depends on γ).

We now discuss how to modify SILVAN to obtain an approximation $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ of $TOP(k)$ with the aforementioned guarantees. Assume, at the end of some iteration of SILVAN, that we have confidence intervals $CI_v = [\ell(v), u(v)]$ for each $v \in V$, such that $b(v) \in CI_v, \forall v$. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be the ordering defined above. As $b(v_k)$ and v_k are both unknown, we need a principled way to identify *bounds* to $b(v_k)$. To do so, we simply generalize a standard approach for approximating top- k sets to the case of non-uniform bounds. Let $v_1^{\ell}, \dots, v_n^{\ell}$ be the sequence of nodes ordered according to $\ell(\cdot)$, such that $\ell(v_i^{\ell}) \geq \ell(v_{i+1}^{\ell})$. Then, let v_1^u, \dots, v_n^u be the sequence of nodes ordered according to $u(\cdot)$, such that $u(v_i^u) \geq u(v_{i+1}^u)$. We have the following relations between $b(v_k)$, $u(v_k^u)$, and $\ell(v_k^{\ell})$.

PROPOSITION 4.7. *It holds $\ell(v_k^{\ell}) \leq b(v_k) \leq u(v_k^u)$.*

PROOF. We prove both bounds by contradiction. Assume that it holds $b(v_k) < \ell(v_k^{\ell})$. From the definition of $\ell(v_k^{\ell})$, that there are k nodes $\{v_i^{\ell}, i \leq k\}$ such that $\ell(v_i^{\ell}) \geq \ell(v_k^{\ell}) > b(v_k)$, and it holds, for all of them, that $b(v_i^{\ell}) \geq \ell(v_i^{\ell})$. This implies that there are k nodes such that $b(v_i^{\ell}) > b(v_k)$, that is in contradiction with the definition of v_k . Then, assume that $b(v_k) > u(v_k^u)$. From the definition of v_k , there are k nodes $\{v_i, i \leq k\}$ with $b(v_i) \geq b(v_k) > u(v_k^u)$. However, this contradicts the definition of v_k^u , since for all of k of them $u(v_i) \geq b(v_i) > u(v_k^u)$. \square

We show that verifying whether a given set $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ satisfies the accuracy requirements given by the functions $\gamma(\cdot)$ and $\xi(\cdot)$ can be done by inspecting the confidence intervals CI_v for each candidate v to be inserted in $T\tilde{O}P(k)$, as done in Section 4.4. We now discuss this in more details for a specific γ , but the approach is general and thus can be adapted to other definitions.

In this work we consider γ as in (5), for $\theta = b(v_k)$ and a given $\eta \in (0, 1)$. We now prove that a properly chosen set of nodes allows to achieve an high-quality approximation of the top- k nodes.

THEOREM 4.8. *Define the set $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ as*

$$T\tilde{O}P(k) = \{(v, \tilde{b}(v)) : u(v) \geq \ell(v_k^{\ell})\},$$

and assume that, for all $(v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$,

$$\frac{\tilde{b}(v)}{1 + \eta \max\{\ell(v_k^{\ell})/\ell(v), 1\}} \leq \ell(v) \leq b(v) \leq u(v) \leq \frac{\tilde{b}(v)}{1 - \eta}. \quad (6)$$

Then, $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ is an approximation of $TOP(k)$ with the following guarantees:

- $\{v : (v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)\} \supseteq \{v : (v, b(v)) \in TOP(k)\}$,
- $|b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \eta \max\{b(v_k), b(v)\}, \forall (v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$,
- $b(v) \geq \tilde{b}(v) - \eta b(v_k), \forall (v, b(v)) \notin TOP(k)$ and $(v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$.

PROOF. For the first guarantee, we note that if $(v, b(v)) \in TOP(k)$, then $b(v) \geq b(v_k)$; therefore, we have $u(v) \geq b(v) \geq b(v_k) \geq \ell(v_k^{\ell})$. This means that v is in $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ since $u(v) \geq \ell(v_k^{\ell})$. For the second, we note that it is sufficient to verify that

$$|u(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \eta \max\{b(v_k), u(v)\}, \text{ and} \quad (7)$$

$$|\ell(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \eta \max\{b(v_k), \ell(v)\} \quad (8)$$

both hold for all $(v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$. In both r.h.s. above, we can replace $b(v_k)$ by $\ell(v_k^{\ell})$ since Proposition 4.7 implies $b(v_k) \geq \ell(v_k^{\ell})$. Considering (7), we have

$$|u(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| = u(v) - \tilde{b}(v) \leq \eta \max\{\ell(v_k^{\ell}), u(v)\}$$

when $\tilde{b}(v) \geq u(v)(1 - \eta \max\{b(v_k)/u(v), 1\})$. Since, by hypothesis, $\ell(v_k^{\ell}) \leq u(v)$, we obtain $\max\{\ell(v_k^{\ell})/u(v), 1\} = 1$. Trivially, (7) is true if $u(v) \leq \tilde{b}(v)/(1 - \eta)$. To verify (8), we observe that

$$|\ell(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| = \tilde{b}(v) - \ell(v) \leq \eta \max\{\ell(v_k^{\ell}), \ell(v)\}$$

corresponds to the assumed lower bound to $\ell(v)$. The last guarantee is a consequence of the second and $\max\{b(v_k), b(v)\} = b(v_k)$. \square

We now show that by imposing stricter constraints on $\ell(v)$ for all $v \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$, we obtain even sharper guarantees.

THEOREM 4.9. *Assume the setting of Thm. 4.8, with, for all $(v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$,*

$$\frac{\tilde{b}(v)}{1 + \eta} \leq \ell(v) \leq b(v) \leq u(v) \leq \frac{\tilde{b}(v)}{1 - \eta}. \quad (9)$$

Then, $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ satisfies the following guarantees:

- $\{v : (v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)\} \supseteq \{v : (v, b(v)) \in TOP(k)\}$,
- $|b(v) - \tilde{b}(v)| \leq \eta b(v), \forall (v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$,
- $b(v) \geq b(v_k) \left(\frac{1 - \eta}{1 + \eta} \right)^2, \forall (v, b(v)) \notin TOP(k), (v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$.

PROOF. The first guarantee is immediate from Theorem 4.8. The second follows directly from (9). We now focus on the third. Let $\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_k$ be the sequence of nodes in order of $\tilde{b}(\cdot)$, such that $\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i) \geq \tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_{i+1})$. From 9 we have that, for all \tilde{v}_i ,

$$\frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i)}{1 + \eta} \leq \ell(\tilde{v}_i) \leq u(\tilde{v}_i) \leq \frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i)}{1 - \eta},$$

but also that

$$\frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_{i+1})}{1+\eta} \leq \frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i)}{1+\eta}, \text{ and } \frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_{i+1})}{1-\eta} \leq \frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i)}{1-\eta}.$$

Notice that $v_k^\ell \neq v_k^u$ in general; nevertheless, we show it is possible to bound $u(v_k^u) - \ell(v_k^\ell)$. Considering \tilde{v}_k , we have that

$$\frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_k)}{1+\eta} \leq \ell(v_k^\ell) \leq u(v_k^u) \leq \frac{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_k)}{1-\eta};$$

the lower bound to $\ell(v_k^\ell)$ follows from the definition of v_k^ℓ , since there are k values $\ell(\tilde{v}_i) \geq \tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i)/(1+\eta)$, $i \geq k$; the upper bound to $u(v_k^u)$ follows from the fact that there are k values $u(\tilde{v}_i) \leq \tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i)/(1-\eta)$, $i \geq k$. We combine previous inequalities to obtain

$$b(v) \geq \ell(v) \geq \frac{\tilde{b}(v)}{1+\eta} \geq u(v) \frac{1-\eta}{1+\eta} \geq \ell(v_k^\ell) \frac{1-\eta}{1+\eta} \geq b(v_k) \left(\frac{1-\eta}{1+\eta} \right)^2. \quad \square$$

To obtain the approximation described by Theorem 4.8 (resp. Theorem 4.9), Algorithm 1 is modified to output $T\tilde{O}P(k)$ when its stopping condition verifies that (6) (resp. (9)) holds for all $(v, \tilde{b}(v)) \in T\tilde{O}P(k)$. From the probabilistic guarantees of SILVAN and Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.8 (resp. Theorem 4.9), it follows that the output of this modified algorithm is an accurate approximation of $TOP(k)$ with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$.

For the non-uniform variant of SILVAN, we consider a slightly modified way to partition the set of nodes V described in Section 4.3. We perform, as described previously, a first sampling phase to obtain an estimate $\tilde{B}C_1(G) = \{\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_i)\}$ of $\{b(v_i)\}$, where \tilde{v}_i is the sorted sequence of nodes according to $b(\cdot)$. We stop the sampling of the first phase after at least k distinct nodes have been observed at least few times, therefore after $\approx 1/b(v_k)$ sampled shortest paths. Then, for a constant $a > 1$, we create $\lceil \log_a(\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_1)/\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_k)) \rceil + 1$ partitions and we assign each node v in the partition of index $\max\{\lceil \log_a(\tilde{b}(v)/\tilde{b}(\tilde{v}_k)) \rceil, 0\}$. Intuitively, this allows to partition V such that nodes in the same partition have betweenness centrality within a factor a : this enables to fully exploits the variance-dependent bounds at the core of SILVAN.

5 EXPERIMENTS

We implemented SILVAN and tested it on several large graphs. Our experimental evaluations has the following goals: evaluate the improved bounds on the maximum deviation employed by SILVAN; assess the effectiveness of the progressive sampling approach of SILVAN; evaluate the performance of SILVAN in extracting the top- k betweenness centralities.

Experimental Setup. We implemented SILVAN by modifying the C++ implementation of KADABRA made available from its authors. All the code was compiled with GCC 8 and run on a machine with 2.30 GHz Intel Xeon CPU, 512 GB of RAM, on Ubuntu 14.04, with 64 cores. All experiments were performed using multithreading with 64 threads. Our implementation of SILVAN is available at. We compare SILVAN with KADABRA, that has been shown [11] to uniformly and significantly outperform previous methods. The

implementation of KADABRA is also available in the widely used *NetworkKit* framework [49].

Graphs. We tested SILVAN on 12 challenging graphs from SNAP and LASAGNE previously analysed by KADABRA [11] and other previous methods [41, 44]. The characteristics of the graphs are described in detail in Table 1.

Table 1: Statistics of graphs. \tilde{D} is the estimated vertex diameter (such that $D \leq \tilde{D}$), and \hat{f} is the estimate of $\max_v\{b(v)\}$.

G	$ V $	$ E $	\tilde{D}	\hat{f}
ca-GrQc	5.24e4	1.45e5	21	1.58e-3
cit-HepPh	9.91e6	8.41e5	17	5.88e-7
cit-HepTh	9.91e6	7.04e5	19	7.41e-6
cnr_2000	3.25e5	6.12e6	9	0.1995
com-amazon	5.48e5	1.85e6	57	0.0112
dip20090126	1.99e4	1.22e5	7	0.5012
email-Enron	3.67e4	3.67e5	17	0.0646
in_2004	1.35e6	2.89e7	9	0.1288
oregon1_010526	6.55e4	4.68e4	13	0.0095
p2p-Gnutella31	6.25e4	2.95e5	16	0.0077
soc-epinions	7.59e4	8.11e5	17	0.0724
wiki-Vote	8.30e3	2.01e5	9	0.0447

5.1 Absolute Approximation

We first consider the task of computing an ε absolute approximation to the betweenness centrality of all nodes.

Effectiveness of SILVAN's Bounds. We first compare the guarantees obtained by KADABRA with the bounds at the core of SILVAN, based on variance-dependent Monte-Carlo Rademacher Averages. To do so, in this first setting we launch KADABRA with different parameters ε to compute an absolute approximation of all nodes, and, in parallel, execute SILVAN *on the same sampled shortest paths* processed by KADABRA. When KADABRA stops, we compute the bounds on the supremum deviation guaranteed by both methods; in this way, we compare KADABRA and SILVAN independently of the choice of the sample schedule and of the confidence assigned to each iteration of our progressive approach. For testing the non-uniform variant of SILVAN (see Section 4.3), we let both algorithms use the same sampled shortest paths in their first phases, that are always a fraction of the overall number of samples, to make the comparison fair. We let ε_K and ε_R be, respectively, the upper bounds to the maximum absolute deviation from KADABRA and SILVAN.

For every dataset, we choose at least 20 values of ε randomly sampled from the interval $[10^{-6}, 10^{-2}]$, and we run KADABRA with parameter ε . For every dataset, we ensure that ε makes the running times tractable; i.e., we make sure ε is at least $\max\{10^{-6}, 10^{-3} \cdot \max_v b(v)\}$ (e.g., for dip20090126 we considered $\varepsilon \in [10^{-3}, 10^{-2}]$), as the number of samples and the running time increase, roughly, with $\max_v b(v)/\varepsilon^2$. We fix $\delta = 0.05$, and use $c = 100$ for SILVAN.

In Figure 1, Column (a), we compare ε_K , from KADABRA, with ε_R , from SILVAN. In many cases, ε_R is smaller than ε_K , but for




Figure 1: Comparison between the accuracy of absolute approximation from KADABRA (ε_K) and SILVAN (ε_R) and their performance. We split the results for the 12 graphs in two groups, each displayed in a different row. Column (a): comparison between ε_K and ε_R from the uniform variant of SILVAN (Sect. 4.2). Column (b): results for the non-uniform variant of SILVAN (Sect. 4.3). Column (c): ratios of the number of samples required by SILVAN and KADABRA to yield the required absolute approximations. In all plots, the legends show the name of the graph, an upper bound \tilde{D} to the vertex diameter, and $\log_{10}(\hat{f})$ (an estimate of $\max_v b(v)$).




Figure 2: (a) Sample sizes for obtaining an ε absolute approximation with the non-uniform variant of SILVAN (Sect. 4.3). Ratios between the running time of SILVAN and KADABRA for (b) the first 6 graphs and (c) the others.

some graphs, KADABRA gives a better bound. The difference between them strongly depends on \hat{f} ; when \hat{f} is small, SILVAN gives a better bound, in some cases by a large factor, while when \hat{f} is large (i.e., close to 0.5), the adaptive strategy of KADABRA, that allocates

more “probabilistic weight” to nodes that are more expensive to approximate, allows to derive a smaller bound.

In Figure 1, Column (b), we compare ε_K , from KADABRA, with ε_R computed by the non-uniform variant of SILVAN. For partitioning the nodes of V with SILVAN, we use a simplified version of the criteria described in Section 4.3; in particular, we create $t = \tilde{D}$ sets,

such that $t - 1$ sets contain only one node; such nodes correspond to the nodes having the $t - 1$ highest values of $\tilde{b}(v)$, that we estimate in the first phase. The last remaining set contains all other nodes. Then, we use this partition in the second phase, computing an approximation for each set. As discussed before, SILVAN uses, in the first phase, *the same sampled shortest paths* used by the adaptive strategy of KADABRA. We can see that, in all cases, $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{R}}$ is smaller than $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{K}}$. The difference between them greatly increases (i.e., in some cases by more than a factor 10) when \hat{f} is small. A potential cause of the performance gap for graphs with low values of \hat{f} may depend on the use of the VC-dimension based bound in the adaptive sampling analysis of KADABRA; such bound is indeed required for its correctness, but it is agnostic to any property of the underlying graph (apart from the vertex diameter) and thus results in overly conservative guarantees in such cases. This confirms the significance of SILVAN’s sharp variance-adaptive bounds. In addition, the fact that SILVAN obtains simultaneous approximations for *sets of nodes*, instead of performing a union bound over each individual node, results in sharper bounds.

Evaluation of SILVAN with Progressive Sampling. We now compare KADABRA and SILVAN w.r.t. the number of samples required to both algorithms to obtain the required ε -approximation, when SILVAN follows the progressive sampling schedule described by Algorithm 1. For this setting, we use exponentially decaying values of δ_i , such that $\delta_i = \delta/2^i$. Regarding the sampling schedule, we first identify a minimum number m_1 of samples before starting to evaluate the stopping condition. To do so, we perform a binary search to identify the minimum m_1 such that (1) is not larger than ε , estimating \hat{f} in the first phase of the algorithm and fixing \tilde{r} to a low value (i.e., in the order of $(\hat{f}/m_1)^{1/2}$). This gives a somewhat “optimistic” first guess of the number of samples to process for obtaining an ε -approximation. We then increase each m_i with a geometric progression: i.e., we set $m_i = 1.2 \cdot m_{i-1}$. To compare SILVAN with KADABRA, we run both algorithms in parallel, so that they process *the same sampled paths*, for different values of ε (chosen as described above); we stop the execution when both algorithms have converged, storing the number of iterations and the time they stop. We only considered the non-uniform variant of SILVAN (that partitions nodes as described above).

In Figure 1, Column (c), we show the ratios between the sample sizes at which SILVAN and KADABRA stop, and in Figure 2 (a) we report the actual values of the sample sizes for SILVAN. From Figure 1 we can see that in all cases, either SILVAN requires less samples to conclude, or it concludes after sampling approximately the same number of shortest paths of KADABRA. In addition, as the accuracy parameter ε decreases, the ratio between the samples sizes decreases, as SILVAN stops earlier than KADABRA. In many cases, the number of samples required by SILVAN is a *fraction* of the one required by KADABRA. These results are not surprising, given the more accurate supremum deviation computed by SILVAN (as shown by the previous experiment), and they confirm that the use of a progressive sampling approach does not degrade the advantage of the analysis at the core of SILVAN. Figure 2 (a) clearly shows that the number of samples required by SILVAN to obtain the desired absolute ε approximation varies significantly among different

graphs; this confirms that *data- and variance-dependent bounds* are essential to compute sharp approximations efficiently.

We now discuss how the reduction in the number of samples impacts the overall running times of SILVAN: in Figure 2 (b) and (c) we show the ratio between the time at which SILVAN and KADABRA converge. We can see that, in almost all cases, the running time roughly decreases linearly with the sample size. In fact, we observed that the time spent on sampling shortest paths is usually the dominating cost of the algorithms; therefore, reductions on the number of samples has a significant impact on the running times. This also reflects the capability of SILVAN to efficiently update all quantities required to compute the c-MCERA *incrementally* as shortest paths are sampled, incurring in a negligible computational overhead.

Furthermore, we observed that, in all cases, SILVAN terminates after evaluating the stopping condition a small number of times, always between 1 and 5. This is due to the fact that SILVAN successfully determines a minimum number of samples to process before starting the evaluation of the stopping condition, without wasting too many iterations (and thus, allocating its probabilistic budget via the confidence parameters δ_i) on non-promising samples sizes.

5.2 Top- k Approximation

We now present experiments on the task of computing the approximation given by Theorem 4.9 of the set of top- k most central nodes. This allows us to jointly evaluate SILVAN in: 1) computing a relative approximation with its progressive and non-uniform approach; 2) addressing the challenge of not knowing the value of the betweenness centrality of the k -th node in advance.

We remark that SILVAN is the first method that allows to approximate the top- k most central nodes with *relative* and *non-uniform* bounds, differently from previous methods that rely on uniform and additive approximations as a proxy [11, 44]; therefore we compare SILVAN with two variants of KADABRA, the best performing approach that allows to obtain approximations of comparable quality. The first, that we denote with K_k , is the top- k approximation proposed in [11]. We recall that such approximation, for a given k and ε , guarantees an additive approximation of the betweenness centrality of top- k nodes with accuracy ε ; however, the confidence intervals for some of the nodes can be wider than ε if the corresponding nodes can be ranked correctly with an accuracy larger than ε . Instead, SILVAN guarantees that all nodes are well estimated within a relative accuracy, governed by the parameter η . Therefore, we also compared our algorithm with a second variant of KADABRA, denoted by K_ε , that instead guarantees that all nodes are estimated with additive accuracy ε , without any accuracy relaxation (as done instead in the previous experiments). If ε is small enough, then the output of K_ε satisfies the same guarantees of SILVAN. For both K_k and K_ε , we set ε to $\tilde{b}(v_k)\eta((1-\eta)/(1+\eta))^2$, where $\tilde{b}(v_k)$ is the estimated value of the betweenness centrality of the k -th node by SILVAN. Such value of ε provides all guarantees of Theorem 4.9 (Section 4.5) to the output of K_ε (note that such guarantees may not be satisfied by the output of K_k , for the reasons discussed above).

We considered values of $k \in \{5, 10, 25\}$ and the parameter η for the relative approximation as $\eta \in \{0.25, 0.1, 0.05\}$. SILVAN

For ensuring the second guarantee of Thm. 4.9 for all $(v, \tilde{b}(v))$ in $\tilde{T\ddot{O}P}(k)$, we have: $\varepsilon \leq \eta b(v_k) ((1-\eta)/(1+\eta))^2 \leq \eta b(v)$, assuming $\tilde{b}(v_k) \approx b(v_k)$.




Figure 3: Number of samples required by SILVAN (S) and KADABRA (in two variants K_k and K_ϵ , see Section 5.2 for more details), to compute an approximation of the top- k most central nodes. Each row corresponds to a different value of $\eta \in \{0.25, 0.1, 0.05\}$, while each column to different values of $k \in \{5, 10, 25\}$.

partitions V according to the procedure described in Section 4.5, using the parameter $a = 1.5$. As in the previous experiments, both algorithms use the same number of samples for their first phases. For each graph and combination of parameters, we repeat the experiments 10 times; we report averages \pm stds. To speedup the overall experimental setup, we have only considered graphs for which the difference in performance between SILVAN and KADABRA in previous results was not larger than $10\times$, that resulted in excluding 2 of the total 12 graphs. For the remaining graphs, we interrupted KADABRA if its running time exceeded $10\times$ the running time of SILVAN, and stored a lower bound to the number of processed samples.

Figure 3 shows the number of samples required by SILVAN, K_k , and K_ϵ , to obtain the respective approximations, for different values of k and for η . From Figure 3 we can clearly see that in almost all cases, both K_k and K_ϵ require many more samples than SILVAN; in some cases, their difference is at least one order of magnitude, highlighting the advantage of our approach. In a few cases, we see

that the variant K_k of KADABRA finishes with fewer samples than SILVAN; this is due to the relaxed guarantees by KADABRA, as we discussed previously. This flexibility, however, does not result in the same advantage in almost all cases, in particular for higher values of k , or when stricter guarantees on the betweenness centrality of the nodes is needed (as for K_ϵ).

Then, we also investigated the quality of the output of KADABRA w.r.t. the output of SILVAN when using the same number of samples for approximating the top- k nodes. To do so, we ran KADABRA (in its variant K_k) to compute the k most central nodes, limiting its execution to the number of samples at which SILVAN stops. We observed that the confidence intervals on the betweenness centrality provided by SILVAN for the reported nodes are almost always tighter than the ones reported by KADABRA; consequently, the reported set of top- k nodes by KADABRA often contains a higher number of false positives, while the same amount of work is performed by both algorithms. For instance, for the graph *com-amazon*, $k = 10$, and $\eta = 0.1$, we observed over 10 runs that SILVAN always outputs 10

nodes, while the approximations given by KADABRA, on the same number of samples, always yield at least 16 nodes.

6 CONCLUSIONS

We introduced SILVAN, a novel progressive sampling algorithm to estimate the betweenness centrality of all nodes in a graph. SILVAN relies on recent bounds on supremum deviation of functions based on the c -MCERA, and on a novel estimation strategy that results in non-uniform approximation guarantees for different nodes. We present variants of SILVAN to obtain additive approximations, relative approximations, and approximations for the top- k betweenness centrality. Our experimental results show that SILVAN significantly outperforms state-of-the-art approaches for approximating betweenness centrality with the same guarantees.

There are multiple interesting directions for future work. For the problem of approximating the betweenness centrality we considered in this work, we believe the analysis of SILVAN can be easily extended to different estimators, such as the ones employed by ABRA [44] and by [15, 25, 29] thanks to the generality and flexibility of Rademacher averages and the MCERA. Furthermore, the application of our approach to *non-uniform sampling* of shortest paths, or pairs of nodes, may be useful for reducing the number of samples to approximate the betweenness centrality of certain subsets of the nodes (e.g., the k most central nodes).

While in this work we considered various approximations of the betweenness centrality in a static setting, recent works considered extending the problem to dynamic [5, 6, 27] and uncertain

graphs [46]. For the case of dynamic graphs, we note that the above mentioned methods [5, 6, 27] are based on [41] (or sampling procedures analogous to it) as an approximation subroutine to keep the betweenness centrality updated after edge insertions or removal. As discussed in Section 5 of [44], improvements on this component can only improve their overall performances. Therefore, the combination of SILVAN and the above mentioned methods is a promising direction to explore. [46] extends the definition of the betweenness centrality to uncertain graphs. We note that the authors propose to efficiently approximate this notion by sampling $O(\ln(|V|/\delta)/\epsilon^2)$ *most probably shortest paths* to obtain an additive ϵ -approximation with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$ (see Section 4 and Thm. 6). As shown in this and previous works, a union bound over $|V|$ events typically leads to very loose guarantees, in particular for large networks. Given the similarity of their and our sampling procedures, we believe that there is potential for SILVAN to provides much stronger trade-offs between the quality of the approximation and the number of samples to process, as we have shown in our experimental evaluation.

7 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported, in part, by MIUR of Italy, under PRIN Project n. 20174LF3T8 AHeAD and grant L. 232 (Dipartimenti di Eccellenza), and by the University of Padova under project “SID 2020: RATED-X”.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jac M Anthonisse. 1971. The rush in a directed graph. *Stichting Mathematisch Centrum. Mathematische Besliskunde* BN 9/71 (1971).
- [2] Peter L. Bartlett and Shahar Mendelson. 2002. Rademacher and Gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 3, Nov (2002), 463–482.
- [3] Elisabetta Bergamini, Michele Borassi, Pierluigi Crescenzi, Andrea Marino, and Henning Meyerhenke. 2019. Computing top-k closeness centrality faster in unweighted graphs. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 13, 5 (2019), 1–40.
- [4] Elisabetta Bergamini, Pierluigi Crescenzi, Gianlorenzo D’angelo, Henning Meyerhenke, Lorenzo Severini, and Yllka Velaj. 2018. Improving the betweenness centrality of a node by adding links. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)* 23 (2018), 1–32.
- [5] Elisabetta Bergamini and Henning Meyerhenke. 2015. Fully-dynamic approximation of betweenness centrality. In *Algorithms-ESA 2015*. Springer, 155–166.
- [6] Elisabetta Bergamini, Henning Meyerhenke, and Christian L Staudt. 2014. Approximating betweenness centrality in large evolving networks. In *2015 Proceedings of the Seventeenth Workshop on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX)*. SIAM, 133–146.
- [7] Rajendra Bhatia and Chandler Davis. 2000. A better bound on the variance. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 107, 4 (2000), 353–357.
- [8] Paolo Boldi, Marco Rosa, and Sebastiano Vigna. 2011. HyperANF: Approximating the neighbourhood function of very large graphs on a budget. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World Wide Web*. 625–634.
- [9] Paolo Boldi and Sebastiano Vigna. 2013. In-core computation of geometric centralities with hyperball: A hundred billion nodes and beyond. In *2013 IEEE 13th International Conference on Data Mining Workshops*. IEEE, 621–628.
- [10] Michele Borassi, Pierluigi Crescenzi, and Michel Habib. 2016. Into the square: On the complexity of some quadratic-time solvable problems. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 322 (2016), 51–67.
- [11] Michele Borassi and Emanuele Natale. 2019. KADABRA is an adaptive algorithm for betweenness via random approximation. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)* 24 (2019), 1–35.
- [12] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. 2013. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press.
- [13] Olivier Bousquet. 2002. A Bennett concentration inequality and its application to suprema of empirical processes. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* 334, 6 (2002), 495–500.
- [14] Ulrik Brandes. 2001. A faster algorithm for betweenness centrality. *Journal of mathematical sociology* 25, 2 (2001), 163–177.
- [15] Ulrik Brandes and Christian Pich. 2007. Centrality estimation in large networks. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* 17, 07 (2007), 2303–2318.
- [16] Matteo Ceccarello, Andrea Pietracaprina, Geppino Pucci, and Eli Upfal. 2020. Distributed Graph Diameter Approximation. *Algorithms* 13, 9 (2020), 216.
- [17] Shiri Chechik, Edith Cohen, and Haim Kaplan. 2015. Average distance queries through weighted samples in graphs and metric spaces: high scalability with tight statistical guarantees. In *APPROX/RANDOM*.
- [18] Corinna Cortes, Spencer Greenberg, and Mehryar Mohri. 2019. Relative deviation learning bounds and generalization with unbounded loss functions. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 85, 1 (2019), 45–70.
- [19] Pilu Crescenzi, Roberto Grossi, Michel Habib, Leonardo LANZI, and Andrea Marino. 2013. On computing the diameter of real-world undirected graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science* 514 (2013), 84–95.
- [20] Pierluigi Crescenzi, Roberto Grossi, Leonardo LANZI, and Andrea Marino. 2012. On computing the diameter of real-world directed (weighted) graphs. In *International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms*. Springer, 99–110.
- [21] Alane M de Lima, Murilo VG da Silva, and André L Vignatti. 2020. Estimating the Percolation Centrality of Large Networks through Pseudo-dimension Theory. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 1839–1847.
- [22] Dóra Erdős, Vatche Ishakian, Azer Bestavros, and Evimaria Terzi. 2015. A divide-and-conquer algorithm for betweenness centrality. In *Proceedings of the 2015 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM, 433–441.
- [23] Philippe Flajolet and G Nigel Martin. 1983. Probabilistic counting. In *24th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1983)*. IEEE, 76–82.
- [24] Linton C Freeman. 1977. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry* (1977), 35–41.
- [25] Robert Geisberger, Peter Sanders, and Dominik Schultes. 2008. Better approximation of betweenness centrality. In *2008 Proceedings of the Tenth Workshop on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX)*. SIAM, 90–100.
- [26] Sarel Har-Peled and Micha Sharir. 2011. Relative (p, ϵ) -approximations in geometry. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 45, 3 (2011), 462–496.
- [27] Takanori Hayashi, Takuya Akiba, and Yuichi Yoshida. 2015. Fully dynamic betweenness centrality maintenance on massive networks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 2 (2015), 48–59.
- [28] Vatche Ishakian, Dóra Erdős, Evimaria Terzi, and Azer Bestavros. 2012. A framework for the evaluation and management of network centrality. In *Proceedings of the 2012 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM, 427–438.
- [29] Riko Jacob, Dirk Koschützki, Katharina Anna Lehmann, Leon Peeters, and Dagmar Tenfelde-Podehl. 2005. Algorithms for centrality indices. In *Network Analysis*. Springer, 62–82.
- [30] Vladimir Koltchinskii and Dmitriy Panchenko. 2000. Rademacher processes and bounding the risk of function learning. In *High dimensional probability II*. Springer, 443–457.
- [31] Yi Li, Philip M Long, and Aravind Srinivasan. 2001. Improved bounds on the sample complexity of learning. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 62, 3 (2001), 516–527.
- [32] Clémence Magnien, Matthieu Latapy, and Michel Habib. 2009. Fast computation of empirically tight bounds for the diameter of massive graphs. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)* 13 (2009), 1–10.
- [33] Ahmad Mahmoody, Charalampos E Tsourakakis, and Eli Upfal. 2016. Scalable betweenness centrality maximization via sampling. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1765–1773.
- [34] Pascal Massart. 2000. Some applications of concentration inequalities to statistics. *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques* 9, 2 (2000), 245–303.
- [35] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. 2017. *Probability and computing: Randomization and probabilistic techniques in algorithms and data analysis*. Cambridge university press.
- [36] Mark Newman. 2018. *Networks*. Oxford university press.
- [37] Luca Oneto, Alessandro Ghio, Davide Anguita, and Sandro Ridella. 2013. An improved analysis of the Rademacher data-dependent bound using its self bounding property. *Neural Networks* 44 (2013), 107–111.
- [38] Leonardo Pellegrina. 2020. Sharper convergence bounds of Monte Carlo Rademacher Averages through Self-Bounding functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12103* (2020).
- [39] Leonardo Pellegrina, Cyrus Cousins, Fabio Vandin, and Matteo Riondato. 2020. MCRapper: Monte-Carlo Rademacher Averages for Poset Families and Approximate Pattern Mining. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 2165–2174.
- [40] David Pollard. 2012. *Convergence of stochastic processes*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [41] Matteo Riondato and Evgenios M. Kornaropoulos. 2016. Fast approximation of betweenness centrality through sampling. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 30, 2 (2016), 438–475.
- [42] Matteo Riondato and Eli Upfal. 2014. Efficient Discovery of Association Rules and Frequent Itemsets through Sampling with Tight Performance Guarantees. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Disc. from Data* 8, 4 (2014), 20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2629586>
- [43] Matteo Riondato and Eli Upfal. 2015. Mining Frequent Itemsets through Progressive Sampling with Rademacher Averages. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD ’15)*. ACM, 1005–1014.
- [44] Matteo Riondato and Eli Upfal. 2018. ABRA: Approximating Betweenness Centrality in Static and Dynamic Graphs with Rademacher Averages. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Disc. from Data* 12, 5 (2018), 61.
- [45] Matteo Riondato and Fabio Vandin. 2018. MiSoSouP: Mining Interesting Subgroups with Sampling and Pseudodimension. In *Proc. 24th ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. Knowl. Disc. and Data Mining (KDD ’18)*. ACM, 2130–2139.
- [46] Arkaprava Saha, Ruben Brokkelkamp, Yllka Velaj, Arijit Khan, and Francesco Bonchi. 2021. Shortest paths and centrality in uncertain networks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 7 (2021), 1188–1201.
- [47] Ahmet Erdem Sariyüce, Erik Saule, Kamer Kaya, and Ümit V Çatalyürek. 2013. Shattering and compressing networks for betweenness centrality. In *Proceedings of the 2013 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM, 686–694.
- [48] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. 2014. *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press.
- [49] Christian L. Staudt, Aleksejs Sazonovs, and Henning Meyerhenke. 2016. NetworkKit: A tool suite for large-scale complex network analysis. *Network Science* 4, 4 (2016), 508–530. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nws.2016.20>
- [50] V. N. Vapnik and A. Ya. Chervonenkis. 1971. On the Uniform Convergence of Relative Frequencies of Events to Their Probabilities. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 16, 2 (1971), 264. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1116025>
- [51] Yuichi Yoshida. 2014. Almost linear-time algorithms for adaptive betweenness centrality using hypergraph sketches. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 1416–1425.