

# Louvain-like Methods for Community Detection in Multi-Layer Networks

Sara Venturini\*, Andrea Cristofari†, Francesco Rinaldi‡, Francesco Tudisco§

**Abstract.** In many complex systems, entities interact with each other through complicated patterns that embed different relationships, thus generating networks with multiple levels and/or multiple types of edges. When trying to improve our understanding of those complex networks, it is of paramount importance to explicitly take the multiple layers of connectivity into account in the analysis. In this paper, we focus on detecting community structures in multi-layer networks, i.e., detecting groups of well-connected nodes shared among the layers, a very popular task that poses a lot of interesting questions and challenges. Most of the available algorithms in this context either reduce multi-layer networks to a single-layer network or try to extend algorithms for single-layer networks by using consensus clustering. Those approaches have anyway been criticized lately. They indeed ignore the connections among the different layers, hence giving low accuracy. To overcome these issues, we propose new community detection methods based on tailored Louvain-like strategies that simultaneously handle the multiple layers. We consider the informative case, where all layers show a community structure, and the noisy case, where some layers only add noise to the system. We report experiments on both artificial and real-world networks showing the effectiveness of the proposed strategies.

**Key words.** community detection, multi-layer networks, complex networks.

## 1 Introduction

Networks represented as graphs with nodes and edges have emerged as effective tools for modelling and analysing complex systems of interacting entities. In fact, graphs arise naturally in many disciplines, such as social networks [10], information networks [21], infrastructure networks [15], biological networks [8] and many others.

One of the most relevant issues of graphs representing real systems is the identification of communities, or clustering, i.e., the organization of vertices in clusters or modules. Although there is actually no consensus on its definition, a community usually refers to a group of nodes that are compactly connected with each other and sparsely connected with those nodes outside the group. Community detection in large networks is potentially very useful [10, 8, 12, 18] and it is a very hard problem that is not yet satisfactorily solved, despite the extensive studies in the literature.

While many community-detection and clustering algorithms have been developed over the recent years, most of these are designed for standard single-layer graphs. On the other hand, having one single graph is very often a oversimplifying assumption, which can lead to misleading models and results. Fortunato conducted a survey on this topic [14].

---

\*Department of Mathematics “Tullio Levi-Civita”, University of Padova, 35121 Padova, Italy (sara.venturini@math.unipd.it)

†Department of Mathematics “Tullio Levi-Civita”, University of Padova, 35121 Padova, Italy (andrea.cristofari@unipd.it)

‡Department of Mathematics “Tullio Levi-Civita”, University of Padova, 35121 Padova, Italy (rinaldi@math.unipd.it)

§School of Mathematics, Gran Sasso Science Institute, Italy, (francesco.tudisco@gssi.it)

A. Cristofari, F. Rinaldi and F. Tudisco contributed equally to this work.

Recent advances in the study of networked systems have shown that the interconnected world is composed of networks that are coupled to one another through different layers, where each layer represents one of many possible types of interactions. Multi-layer graphs arise naturally in diverse applications such as transportation networks [16], financial-asset markets [1], temporal dynamics [45, 46], semantic world clustering [40], multivideo face analysis [6], mobile phone networks [20], social balance [7], citation analysis [43], and many others.

Most of the current algorithms for community detection in multi-layer networks either reduce multi-layer networks into a single-layer network or extend the algorithms for single-layer networks by using consensus clustering. While these approaches perform well in the presence of well-clustered layers with communities that are well in agreement, they are criticized for their low accuracy in more challenging settings such as the case of noisy layers or poorly clustered ones, see e.g. [19, 42, 49, 54, 28].

In this paper, we propose two new strategies leading to multiple algorithms for community detection in multi-layer networks. The algorithms are based on the popular Louvain heuristic method for single-layer networks [3], which is a locally greedy modularity-increasing sampling process over the set of node partitions, formed of two phases: a community evaluation phase and a node aggregation one. See Section 3 for details. The somewhat natural extension of this method to the multi-layer case, already studied in the literature in e.g. [1], is to locally maximize a weighted average of the modularity of the layers during phase 1, instead of the modularity of a single layer. In Section 4.1, we suggest two variants that, in the selection criteria of the algorithm during phase 1, take into account the variance of modularity on the layers, in addition to the average. In Section 4.2, we present a more sophisticated filter-based type algorithm. Since the problem under analysis can be viewed as a multiobjective optimization problem, where one tries to optimize more than one objective function, we propose a technique to memorize and dynamically update a list of several solutions, according to a suitably developed Pareto search. We make use of different criteria for handling the list, that is, the modularity average over the layers and the convex combination of average and variance, thus getting two different approaches. Notice that these methods with unit length of the list correspond to the algorithms described before, respectively. Moreover, these algorithms coincide with the Louvain method on single layer graphs. An important feature of both the proposed methods is that, unlike many methods presented in the literature, they do not need to pre-assign the number of classes at the beginning. This is particularly useful as we usually do not have information about the community structure of a graph and one must make some a-priori (possibly unjustified) assumption about the number of the clusters.

In order to verify the performance and the robustness of the various techniques, in our experimental set-up we study multi-layer graphs in two settings: in the first one all the layers are informative, i.e. all layers contain information about the community structure, whereas in the second setting at least one of the layers is a *noisy layer*, which accounts for corrupted measurements. In Section 5.1, we provide extensive experiments generating artificial multi-layer networks by a multi-layer version of the Stochastic Block Model (SBM) [28], which show that our methods are competitive with those already proposed in the literature. Moreover, in Section 5.2, we provide additional experiments on several real world graphs which confirm our findings in the SBM.

## 2 Related work

In recent years, multi-view clustering has been a popular topic and many multi-view clustering algorithms have been developed from different technical perspectives. In the following we attempt to review and summarize some recent approaches.

Zeng et al. [50] proposed a pattern mining algorithm for finding closed quasi-cliques that appear on multiple layers with a frequency above a given threshold. A cross-graph quasi-clique is defined as a set of

vertices belonging to a maximal quasi-clique that appears on all layers [35].

Tang et al. [44] and Dong et al. [11] proposed graph clustering algorithms for multi-layer graphs based on matrix factorizations. The key point is to extract common factors from multiple graphs, based on which general clustering methods can be applied. Tang et al. [44] approximates adjacency matrices while Dong et al. [11] approximates graph Laplacian matrices. Liu et al. [25] proposed a non-negative matrix factorization based multi-view clustering algorithm where the factors representing clustering structures learnt from the multiple views are regularized toward a common consensus.

Another popular line of research tries to extend spectral clustering to multi-layer graphs. In general, these algorithms aim to define a graph operator that contains all the information of the multi-layer graph such that the eigenvectors corresponding to the smallest eigenvalues are informative about the clustering structure. These methods usually rely on some sort of “mean operator”, for example the Laplacian of the average adjacency matrix or the average Laplacian matrix [34]. Further examples are the work of Zhou and Burges [55], which developed a multi-view spectral clustering via generalizing the usual single view normalized cut to the multi-view case and tried to find a cut which is close to optimal on each layer, and the algorithm designed by Chen and Hero [9], that performs convex aggregation of layers based on signal-plus-noise models.

Zhan et al. [51], [52], [53] developed several multi-view graph learning approaches which are able to merge multiple graphs into a unified graph with the desired number of connected components. Other multi-view clustering approaches exploit the idea of maximizing clustering agreement. Zong et al. [56] introduced Weighted Multi-View Spectral Clustering, where the largest canonical angle is used to measure the difference between spectral clustering results of different views. Nie et al. [32] proposed a self-weighted scheme for fusing multiple graphs with the importance of each view considered, called Procrustes Analysis technique (AWP).

A common limitation to the proposed multi-view clustering methods is that they do not consider to deal with possibly noisy or corrupted data, because they focus on the consistency of multiple layers and do not consider the inconsistency. To address this issue, Xia et al. [48] proposed Robust Multi-view Spectral Clustering, a Markov chain method that aims to learn an intrinsic transition matrix from multiple views by restricting the transition matrix to be low-rank. This aspect has also been considered by Mercado et al. [28] [27], where they propose a Laplacian operator obtained by merging the Laplacians from different layers via a one-parameter family of nonlinear matrix power means. Recently, Liang et al. [24] proposed a multi-view graph learning framework, which simultaneously models multi-view consistency and multi-view inconsistency in a unified objective function.

Another line of work adopts Bayesian inference [47], in which certain hypotheses about connections between nodes are made to find the best fit of a model to the graph through the optimization of a suitable likelihood [36].

Bickel and Scheffer [2] extended the semi-supervised co-training approaches [4] to multi-view clustering. The basic idea of co-training is to iterate over all views and optimize an objective function in the next view using result obtained from the latter one. A co-training approach is proposed by Kumar and Daumé [22], where the algorithm aims to find a consistent clustering that agrees across the views under the main assumption that all the layers can be independently used for clustering. Under the same assumption, Kumar et al. [23] proposed Co-regularized Spectral Clustering (CoReg), where they concentrated on this approach under the notion of co-regularization, maximizing the agreement between different views.

Finally, some methods propose an extension of Newman’s modularity [30] and connected null models. For instance, Bazzi et al [1] proposed a multi-layer modularity-maximization method, especially tailored to the problem of identifying communities in multi-layer temporal networks, trying to find a trade-off between static community structure within layers and larger values of persistence across layers. This approach is related to our proposed strategy as it uses a cross-layer modularity function that is essentially based on a weighted arithmetic mean of the modularities of the single layers. A related approach is proposed

by Pramanik et al [38] where a weighted linear combination of the modularities of each layer is used to define a multi-layer modularity index. Their approach focuses on the case of two-layer networks with both cross and within layer connections and aims at detecting cross-layer and within-layer communities simultaneously. Mucha et al [29] generalize the Laplacian dynamics to derive null models for multi-layer networks. They obtain a multi-layer generalization of modularity where the coupling between layers is controlled using an additional parameter. Community detection on the multi-layer network then proceeds using computational heuristics available for single layer graphs. Pizzuti and Socievole [37] develop a genetic algorithm for community detection in multi-layer networks that makes use of a multiobjective optimization formulation. In particular, the proposed algorithmic scheme exploits the concept of Pareto dominance when creating the new populations at a given iteration, and returns a family of solutions that represent different trade-offs between the objectives at the end of the optimization process (the best solution is finally chosen using some tailored strategies).

### 3 The Louvain method for single layer graphs

In this work, we rely on the idea that a graph has a community structure if it is “different” enough from a random graph. A random graph should indeed not have a community structure, since any two nodes have the same probability to be adjacent. To this end, a *null model* is used as a term of comparison when checking whether a graph shows a community structure or not. This is a core concept in the definition of the *modularity*, a quality function that identifies a subgraph as a community if the number of edges inside it exceeds the expected number of internal edges that the same subgraph would have in the null model. The modularity function can be written as follows

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i,j} (A_{ij} - P_{ij}) \delta(C_i, C_j) \quad (1)$$

where the sum runs over all pairs of vertices,  $A$  is the adjacency matrix,  $m$  the total number of edges of the graph (or the sum of all their weights in the case of weighted networks),  $P_{ij}$  represents the expected number of edges between vertices  $i$  and  $j$  in the null model, and  $C_i$  is the community of node  $i$ . The function  $\delta$  yields one if vertices  $i$  and  $j$  are in the same community ( $C_i=C_j$ ), zero otherwise.

Even though several variations of the modularity and the null model have been proposed in the literature, the arguably most popular null model is the configuration model originally considered by Newman and Girvan in [30], where edges are linked at random, under the constraint that the expected degree of each vertex of the null model coincides with the actual degree of the corresponding node in the original graph [31]. With this choice of  $P$ , the modularity function reads

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i,j} \left( A_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2m} \right) \delta(C_i, C_j) \quad (2)$$

where  $k_i$  is the degree of the node  $i$  (the sum of all the edges incident to  $i$ ). With this model, communities are found via the maximization of  $Q$ . As this is known to be a NP-hard combinatorial optimization task [5], several algorithms have been proposed to approximately compute a modularity-based community assignment.

The *Louvain method*, introduced by Blondel et al. in [3], is one of the most popular and most effective methods for modularity maximization. This method is based on a greedy strategy that consists of two phases: initially, each vertex is a community and, in the first phase, the algorithm computes the gain, in terms of weighted modularity, obtained by including a node  $i$  in the community of every neighbour node  $j$ , then selecting the one with the largest increase in modularity, as long as it is positive. Once the first level

partition is obtained, in the second phase of the method, communities are replaced by supervertices. Two supervertices are connected if there is at least an edge between vertices of the corresponding communities, with the edge weight between the two supervertices being the sum of the edge weights between the corresponding communities. The whole procedure is repeated iteratively, until modularity cannot increase and the algorithm stops.

The Louvain heuristic is very popular for its simplicity and efficiency. Part of the algorithm’s efficiency results from the fact that the modularity can be calculated iteratively during the procedure. Only at the very beginning of phase 1, the method calculates the modularity from scratch.

To calculate the modularity, the algorithm uses the following formula, that is equivalent to the equation (2),

$$Q = \sum_{c \in C} \frac{|E(c)|}{m} - \left( \frac{\sum_{i \in N} k_i}{2m} \right)^2 \quad (3)$$

where  $C=(C_1, \dots, C_n)$  is the clustering assignment,  $m$  is the sum of weights of all the links in the network,  $|E(c)|$  is the sum of the weights of all the links between nodes in  $C$  and  $k_i$  is the degree of node  $i$ .

During the loop, the algorithm calculates the modularity gain in a cheap way. The gain  $\Delta Q1_i$ , obtained by moving a node  $i$  from its community  $c$ , can easily be computed via the formula

$$\Delta Q1_i = \frac{\sum_{tot} \cdot k_i}{2m^2} - \frac{k_i^2}{2m^2} - \frac{k_{i,in}}{m} \quad (4)$$

where  $\sum_{tot}$  is the sum of weights of the links incident to the nodes in  $c$ ,  $k_i$  is the degree of node  $i$ ,  $k_{i,in}$  is the sum of weights of the links from  $i$  to nodes in  $c$ .

Similarly, the following expression is used in order to evaluate the change of modularity  $\Delta Q2_{i \rightarrow j}$  when an isolated node  $i$  is moved into the community  $c$  of node  $j$

$$\Delta Q2_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{\sum_{i,in}}{m} - \frac{\sum_{tot} \cdot k_i}{2m^2} \quad (5)$$

where  $\sum_{i,in}$  is the sum of weights of the links inside community  $c$ .

Thus, if a node  $i$  changes community, the algorithm calculates the modularity of the new partition just by adding the gains obtained above to the initial modularity value, rather than calculating the function  $Q$  from scratch. In particular, note that these formulas to calculate the modularity gain can be easily extended to the weighted graph created in the second phase of the algorithm. Due to this fact, the Louvain heuristic is extremely fast.

## 4 Louvain-like Methods for Multiple Layers

In this Section, we present our two methods for community detection in multi-layer networks: the *Louvain Expansion* method and the *Louvain Multiobjective* method. They are both based on the above described Louvain method for single-layer networks and they do not need a preassigned number of classes. We now assume to have a so-called multiplex network: a multi-layer graph where all layers have the same nodes and there are no edges between nodes of different layers. Each layer is an undirected graph and just a single edge between nodes is allowed.

### 4.1 The Louvain Expansion Method

The idea behind the method is to define a suitable function  $F$  that combines the modularity score of the individual layers and thus assesses the “quality” of a partition across multiple layers. In particular, we consider two such functions  $F$ , which we describe next.

---

**Algorithm 1** Louvain Expansion Method

---

$G$  the initial multi-layer graph  
Set Terminate = false  
**repeat**  
  Put each node of  $G$  in its own community  
  **while** some nodes are moved **do**  
    **for all** node  $i$  of  $G$  **do**  
      place  $i$  in the community of one of its neighbors  $j$ , which maximizes the gain  $\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}$   
    **end for**  
  **end while**  
  **if** the new function value is higher than the initial **then**  
     $G =$  the network between communities of  $G$   
  **else**  
    Set Terminate=true  
  **end if**  
**until** (Terminate)

---

Similarly to the standard Louvain method, starting with a partition where each node represents a community, we proceed with a two-phase scheme. In the first phase, the algorithm picks one node at a time, following a given initial node ordering. This ordering may affect the performance of the method as will be further pointed out later on. For each node  $i$ , we compute the modularity gain  $\Delta Q1_i$  on each layer obtained by removing  $i$  from its community  $C_i$ . For every neighbour  $j$  of node  $i$  that has not already been considered, we also compute the modularity gain  $\Delta Q2_{i \rightarrow j}$  on each layer obtained by including  $i$  in the community  $C_j$  of node  $j$ , where we say that  $j$  is a neighbour of  $i$  if they are connected in at least one layer. Using these quantities, we calculate the gain  $\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}$  obtained from moving  $i$  from  $C_i$  to  $C_j$ , in a computational efficient way. Then, we put  $i$  in the community  $C_{j^*}$  which yields the largest gain  $\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j^*}$ , provided the latter is positive. The algorithm continues with the new partition (if any) and stops if the value of  $F$  cannot be improved.

The second phase is the same as for the original Louvain method on single-layer graphs (see Section 3). The whole procedure is repeated until no improvement can be found. The Louvain Expansion Method is summarized in Algorithm 1.

As mentioned earlier, the initial ordering of the nodes can affect the final performance. In particular, based on our computational experience, it seems that the ordering does not significantly affect the final value of the cost-function  $F$ , while has more impact on the computational time. We would like to notice that, even in the single layer case, this specific issue has not been properly investigated in the literature. In our experiments, we hence choose the ordering depending on the specific network setting we deal with. More specifically, we order the nodes according to the community size for the informative setting, while in the noisy setting, which requires more computational effort, we list the nodes in random order.

#### 4.1.1 Choices of $F$

It is reasonable to use a function  $F$  that includes the information of the multiple layers and whose variation  $\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}$  can be iteratively calculated in an efficient way.

The most intuitive idea to extend the Louvain heuristic from the single-layer to the multi-layer case is to consider as function  $F$  the average of the modularity values on the individual layers

$$M_Q = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^k Q_s}{k} \tag{6}$$

where  $k$  is the number of layers and  $Q_s$  is the modularity of layer  $s$ . The idea of considering a linear (possibly weighted) combination of the modularity functions of the single layers is relatively natural and has been considered for example in [1, 38]. The gain of this function can be calculated easily as follow

$$\Delta M_Q = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^k \Delta Q_s}{k} \quad (7)$$

where  $k$  is the number of layers and  $\Delta Q_s$  is the gain on modularity of layer  $s$ . We refer to this method as *Louvain Expansion Average* (EA).

While the average yields a reasonable overview of the graph community structure across the layers, it is well known that in many situations this may lead to oversimplification [28, 27]. For example, in the presence of noisy layers, linear averages over the multi-layer graph perform poorly [28]. To overcome this issue, we consider two functions that embeds the sample variance of the modularity on the layers:

$$F_- = (1 - \gamma)M_Q - \gamma V_Q \quad (8)$$

$$F_+ = (1 - \gamma)M_Q + \gamma V_Q \quad (9)$$

where  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  is a parameter,  $M_Q$  is the average of modularity on the layers as in (7), and  $V_Q$  is the variance of modularity on the layers which we compute as

$$V_Q = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^k (Q_s - M_Q)^2}{k - 1}. \quad (10)$$

The gain of both the functions can be calculated in an efficient way during the algorithm via the following updating formulas

$$\Delta F_- = (1 - \gamma)\Delta M_Q - \gamma \left( V_{\Delta Q} + \frac{2}{k-1} (Q - M_Q)^t (\Delta Q - \Delta M_Q) \right) \quad (11)$$

$$\Delta F_+ = (1 - \gamma)\Delta M_Q + \gamma \left( V_{\Delta Q} + \frac{2}{k-1} (Q - M_Q)^t (\Delta Q - \Delta M_Q) \right) \quad (12)$$

where  $k$  is the number of layers,  $Q$  is a vector whose  $s$ -th component is the initial modularity of layer  $s$ ,  $M_Q$  is the initial average of modularity on the layers,  $\Delta Q$  is a vector whose  $s$ -th component is the gain in modularity of layer  $s$ ,  $\Delta M_Q$  is the gain of the modularity average on the layers (this coincides with  $M_{\Delta Q}$ , the average of  $\Delta Q$ , as shown in equation (7)), and  $V_{\Delta Q}$  is the variance of  $\Delta Q$ , calculated as follows:

$$V_{\Delta Q} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^k (\Delta Q_s - \Delta M_Q)^2}{k - 1}. \quad (13)$$

Note that if we iteratively update  $\Delta Q_s$  we then are able to iteratively update both (11) and (12).

We refer to the method that uses the function  $F_-$  as *Louvain Expansion Variance Minus* (EVM) and to the method that uses the function  $F_+$  as *Louvain Expansion Variance Plus* (EVP). These two strategies enable us to take into account the variability of the modularity in the layers. We use EVM when dealing with the informative case (no noise in the layers). The rationale behind this choice is to obtain a trade-off between large modularity and sufficiently small variability in the layers (the larger the  $\gamma$ , the smaller the variance in the final solution), which is what an ideal solution would look like if the community structure of all layers is in agreement. When tackling noisy multi-layer networks, we instead use EVP. The idea in this case is to handle the noise by allowing for solutions with a good level of variability in the layers and a large enough modularity (a larger  $\gamma$  will get a larger variability in this case). All these methods coincide with the original Louvain algorithm if applied to single-layer graphs.

## 4.2 The Louvain Multiobjective Method

Our second family of Louvain-like methods is the *Louvain Multiobjective* method for community detection in multi-layer networks. This is a filter-type method that accounts for the multiobjective nature of the problem under analysis, i.e., the existence of more than one objective to optimize. The main idea behind this approach is to keep a list of partitions during the algorithm, each of them being preferable over the others with respect to a specific criterion.

More formally, we consider a vector  $Q=(Q_s)_{s=1,\dots,k}$  where  $k$  is the number of layers, and we want to maximize simultaneously all its entries. If there are no conflicts between the entries, the straightforward optimal solution of this multiobjective problem is obtained by solving  $k$  optimization problems separately (unfortunately this is usually not the case in real-world networks). In multiobjective optimization, there is not a unique way to define optimality, since there is no a-priori total order for  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , and each partial order ends up giving a different definition. Let us hence provide a well known definition of optimality, for a maximization problem, first proposed by Edgeworth in 1881 and later revised by Vilfredo Pareto in 1896 [33].

**Definition 4.1.** Given two vectors  $z^1$  and  $z^2 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ ,  $z^1$  dominates  $z^2$  according to Pareto, and we write  $z^1 \geq_P z^2$ , if

$$\begin{aligned} z_i^1 &\geq z_i^2 && \text{for each index } i = 1, \dots, k \text{ and} \\ z_j^1 &> z_j^2 && \text{for at least one index } j = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned}$$

This binary relation induces a partial order over  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . Thus we can give the definition of optimality according to Pareto.

**Definition 4.2.** A vector  $z^* \in \mathbb{R}^k$  is Pareto optimal if there is no other vector  $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$  such that  $z^* \leq_P z$ . Moreover, the Pareto front is the set of all Pareto optimal points.

Here, we still use a function  $F$  to assess the “quality” of a partition over several layers, but we also have a *filter*  $L$ , that is, a list of partitions with community vectors such that no one is dominated by the others. In the first phase, we initialize the method with the *node-based partition* (each node represents a community) and we insert such a partition in the filter  $L$ . Then we start a loop, and analyse each node in a given order (indexing of the nodes can again affect the performance of the algorithm). For every node  $i$  and for every partition in the filter, we compute the gain  $\Delta Q1_i$  on each layer and, for every neighbour node  $j$ , also the gain  $\Delta Q2_{i \rightarrow j}$  on each layer, where  $\Delta Q1_i$  and  $\Delta Q2_{i \rightarrow j}$  are defined as in the Louvain Expansion Method described in Subsection 4.1.

Using these quantities, we calculate the gain  $\Delta F_{i \rightarrow j}$  in a computationally efficient way and, if this value is positive, we include the new partition in the filter  $L$ . In particular, this happens if and only if the modularity vector  $Q$  related to the partition is not dominated by any other modularity vector we have with the partitions in  $L$ . Once the new partition is added to  $L$  we remove from  $L$  all the partitions whose modularity vectors are dominated by the new one.

To prevent the filter from getting too large, we also cut down  $L$  to a predefined length  $h$ , if necessary, by removing the worst partitions (with respect to the function  $F$ ). This operation is needed in order to ensure the method computational efficiency.

The first phase then ends when the filter stops changing. At this point, the method selects from  $L$  the best partition with respect to  $F$  and the second phase begins, which implements the same procedure as the one described above for the Louvain method on single-layer graphs (see Section 4.1).

The whole procedure is repeated until no improvement is found. The Louvain Multiobjective Method is summarized in Alg. 2.



---

**Algorithm 2** Louvain Multiobjective Method

---

```
G the initial multi-layer graph
L initialized with node-based partition
Set Terminate = false
repeat
  while L changes do
    for all node i of G do
      for all partition C in filter L do
        place i in every neighboring community which has a positive function F gain and put this
        new partition in filter L
      end for
    end for
    Cut the filter to length h
  end while
  Consider the partition in the filter L which maximizes the function F gain
  if L has changed then
    G = the network between communities of G
  else
    Set Terminate=true
  end if
until (Terminate)
```

---

The order of nodes can affect the final output of this method as well, and, in our experiments, we make the same choices reported in the previous section for the Louvain Expansion method.

We study three variants of the Louvain Multiobjective method, taking as function  $F$ : the modularity average  $M_Q$  described in (6), and the functions  $F_-$  and  $F_+$  defined in (8) and (9). We refer to these algorithms respectively as *Louvain Multiobjective Average* (MA), *Louvain Multiobjective Variance Minus* (MVM), *Louvain Multiobjective Variance Plus* (MVP).

As we have seen in Section 4.1, the modularity and the function values can be calculated in an iterative and easy way.

Note that this method coincides with the method described in Section 4.1 when the filter has a unit length. Therefore, it is equal to the original Louvain algorithm if applied to single-layer graphs.

## 5 Experiments

We implemented the methods described in Section 4 using `Matlab`. The codes of all the methods are available at the following link: <https://github.com/ArasVentu/Louvain-like-Methods-for-Community-Detection-in-Multi-Layer-Networks>.

We considered both synthetic and real-world networks, and performed extensive experiments to compare the proposed methods against four state-of-the-art multi-layer community detection baselines, namely: Co-Regularized Spectral Clustering (**CoReg**) (with parameter  $\lambda = 0.01$ ) [23], multi-view clustering via Adaptively Weighted Procrustes (**AWP**) [32], Multi-view Consensus Graph Clustering (**MCGC**) (with parameter  $\beta = 0.6$ ) [53], and The Power Mean Laplacian Multi-layer Method (**PM**) (with parameter  $p = -10$ ) [28]. Notably, all these algorithms require the user to specify the number of communities we look for a-priori. This is a potential drawback in practice, as we usually do not have information about the community structure of the graph and would have to make some (possibly unjustified) assumption

about the number of clusters.

One additional baseline method we compare with is the *Louvain Expansion Average* (**EA**), where we use the Louvain scheme to optimize the modularity average (6), as discussed in Section 4.1. Using the Louvain method for the (weighted) average of the modularity across the layers is a relatively established approach, used for example in [1, 38].

We evaluated the performances of the various algorithms through two values: the accuracy (AC) (we report the percentage of nodes placed in the right community) [53] and the Normalized Mutual Information (NMI) [41].

For all experiment data, we considered two settings: the informative case, i.e., all the layers are informative, and the noisy case, where some of the layers are just noise. For the informative case, we studied the models *Louvain Expansion Variance Minus* (**EVM**) (Section 4.1), *Louvain Multiobjective Average* (**MA**) and *Louvain Multiobjective Variance Minus* (**MVM**) (Section 4.2). For the noisy case, we studied the models *Louvain Expansion Variance Plus* (**EVP**) (Section 4.1), *Louvain Multiobjective Average* (**MA**) and *Louvain Multiobjective Variance Plus* (**MVP**) (Section 4.2).

In the definition of the function  $F$  in equation (8) and  $F_+$  in equation (9), we set  $\gamma = \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$  and we report the scores with the best parameter (i.e., the parameter achieving the highest NMI) found on each dataset. As for the Louvain Multiobjective models, we consider two possible filter lengths:  $h = \{2, 3\}$ , and we report the corresponding length right after the method name (e.g., MA2 stands for the Louvain Multiobjective Average method with list length  $h = 2$ ). In the noisy case, where both the communities ordering and the noise in the layers are randomized, we report the average scores over 100 runs.

## 5.1 Synthetic Networks

We consider here networks generated via the (multi-layer) Stochastic Block Model (SBM), a generative model for graphs with planted communities generated through the parameters  $p$  and  $q$ . These parameters represent the edge probabilities: given nodes  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , the probability of observing an edge between them is  $p$  (resp.  $q$ ), if  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  belong to the same (resp. different) cluster.

We set  $p > q$  in order to generate synthetic informative layers, while we simply let  $p = q$  for the noisy ones. More precisely, we created networks with 4 communities of 125 nodes each and with  $k = 2, 3$  layers, by fixing  $p = 0.1$  and varying the ratio  $p/q$  in the generation of the informative layers. In the noisy layers, we fixed  $p = q = 0.1$ . For each value of the pair  $(p, q)$  we sample 10 random instances and we report average scores. Results are shown in Figures 1 and 2, where we consider the following four settings: 1(a) two informative layers; 1(b) three informative layers; 2(a) two informative layers and one noisy layer; 2(b) two informative layers and two noise ones. The multiobjective approaches *MA/MV* overall perform best, with the variance-based one *MVM* or *MVP* being the best method overall. In general, the other methods proposed here still outperform the baselines in almost all the parameter settings, reaching very high accuracy and NMI even in the presence of two noisy layers (Fig. 2(b)). It is also interesting to notice that, while the community detection problem becomes easier when the ratio  $p/q$  grows, our proposed approaches still show performance advantages in that setting.

## 5.2 Real World Networks

We consider five real-world datasets frequently used for evaluation in multi-layer graph clustering: *3sources*, consisting of news articles covered by three different news sources [25]; *BBCSports* consisting of sports news articles from [17]; *Cora* scientific publications with 7 classes [26]; *Wikipedia*, a dataset of Wikipedia articles with ten classes [39] and the UCI multiple features digits dataset [13]. For each layer we build the corresponding adjacency matrix from the  $k$ -nearest neighbour graph with  $k = 10$  based on the Pearson

Table 1: Real-world datasets setting one. Average accuracy, NMI and performance ratio scores over 10 random initializations. All layers are informative. Best and second best values are highlighted with gray boxes.

	3sources		BBCSport		cora		UCI		Wikipedia		Perf. Ratios	
	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	$\rho_{Acc}$	$\rho_{NMI}$
EVM	0.876	0.789	0.833	0.798	0.617	0.537	0.882	0.921	0.548	0.520	0.955	0.967
MA2	0.858	0.749	0.899	0.825	0.407	0.434	0.753	0.862	0.525	0.521	0.863	0.912
MA3	0.876	0.789	0.596	0.731	0.425	0.428	0.876	0.910	0.558	0.546	0.844	0.917
MVM2	0.888	0.812	0.844	0.784	0.597	0.514	0.883	0.925	0.544	0.508	0.953	0.957
MVM3	0.888	0.812	0.915	0.851	0.603	0.502	0.883	0.925	0.530	0.504	0.965	0.967
EA	0.858	0.749	0.748	0.753	0.523	0.520	0.877	0.913	0.556	0.544	0.904	0.947
CoReg	0.651	0.658	0.858	0.617	0.530	0.380	0.958	0.911	0.522	0.445	0.889	0.805
AWP	0.686	0.662	0.616	0.722	0.534	0.293	0.869	0.891	0.462	0.332	0.805	0.753
MCGC	0.544	0.595	0.919	0.795	0.273	0.034	0.898	0.855	0.221	0.135	0.676	0.579
PM	0.734	0.707	0.778	0.690	0.551	0.456	0.876	0.879	0.569	0.560	0.896	0.896

Table 2: Real-world datasets setting two. Informative layers plus one noisy layer. Average accuracy, NMI and performance ratio scores over 10 random initializations and 10 random edge probabilities  $p \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5\}$  for the noisy layer. Best and second best values are highlighted with gray boxes.

	3sources		BBCSport		cora		UCI		Wikipedia		Perf. Ratios	
	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	$\rho_{Acc}$	$\rho_{NMI}$
EVP	0.703	0.649	0.825	0.797	0.541	0.517	0.880	0.916	0.577	0.556	0.965	0.989
MA2	0.692	0.609	0.790	0.761	0.551	0.519	0.881	0.920	0.558	0.518	0.951	0.956
MA3	0.683	0.612	0.789	0.758	0.549	0.519	0.881	0.921	0.559	0.518	0.948	0.957
MVP2	0.717	0.668	0.828	0.797	0.543	0.518	0.881	0.920	0.578	0.555	0.971	0.996
MVP3	0.730	0.677	0.817	0.792	0.543	0.520	0.881	0.919	0.579	0.556	0.972	0.998
EA	0.678	0.607	0.777	0.754	0.555	0.521	0.881	0.920	0.561	0.520	0.947	0.955
CoReg	0.652	0.650	0.849	0.753	0.407	0.191	0.957	0.912	0.435	0.324	0.875	0.769
AWP	0.658	0.602	0.737	0.593	0.411	0.123	0.924	0.897	0.410	0.266	0.837	0.664
MCGC	0.546	0.585	0.812	0.694	0.303	0.005	0.804	0.816	0.201	0.107	0.687	0.565
PM	0.714	0.658	0.730	0.645	0.548	0.444	0.876	0.880	0.568	0.556	0.944	0.918

Table 3: Real-world datasets setting three. One aggregated informative layer plus one noisy layer. Average accuracy, NMI and performance ratio scores over 10 random initializations and 10 random edge probabilities  $p \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5\}$  for the noisy layer. Best and second best values are highlighted with gray boxes.

	3sources		BBCSport		cora		UCI		Wikipedia		Perf. Ratios	
	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	Acc	NMI	$\rho_{Acc}$	$\rho_{NMI}$
EVP	0.655	0.575	0.886	0.799	0.550	0.432	0.869	0.903	0.556	0.526	0.965	0.954
MA2	0.348	0.217	0.664	0.555	0.541	0.418	0.853	0.890	0.431	0.361	0.775	0.721
MA3	0.332	0.207	0.659	0.550	0.537	0.416	0.858	0.893	0.427	0.359	0.768	0.716
MVP2	0.744	0.675	0.914	0.826	0.546	0.430	0.872	0.905	0.564	0.538	0.988	0.994
MVP3	0.754	0.689	0.914	0.828	0.544	0.431	0.873	0.906	0.566	0.540	0.991	1.000
EA	0.327	0.203	0.664	0.549	0.537	0.418	0.866	0.898	0.427	0.360	0.770	0.717
CoReg	0.566	0.436	0.608	0.338	0.435	0.190	0.761	0.642	0.446	0.305	0.768	0.551
AWP	0.549	0.416	0.644	0.376	0.444	0.179	0.750	0.622	0.439	0.292	0.770	0.540
MCGC	0.512	0.479	0.682	0.480	0.276	0.020	0.702	0.691	0.347	0.291	0.665	0.525
PM	0.512	0.363	0.729	0.658	0.569	0.414	0.834	0.828	0.457	0.360	0.848	0.772




Figure 1: The image is composed by two pairs (a) and (b) of line plots. They represent the average values of accuracy and NMI over 10 random networks sampled from SBM with equally distributed informative layers (2 layers (a) and 3 layers (b)), with four clusters, for  $p = 0.1$  and  $p/q$  equal to 2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 3.




Figure 2: The image is composed by two pairs (a) and (b) of line plots. They represent the average values of accuracy and NMI over 10 random networks sampled from SBM with both informative and noisy layers (two informative and one noisy in (a) and two informative and two noisy in (b)). The informative layers are equally distributed SBM graphs with four clusters,  $p = 0.1$  and  $p/q$  equal to 2.5, 2.8, 3, 3.3, 3.5. The noisy layers are SBM graphs with  $p = q = 0.1$ .

linear correlation between nodes, i.e. the higher the correlation the nearer the nodes are. In particular, *3sources* is a dataset with 169 nodes per layer, 3 layers, and 6 communities of size 56, 21, 11, 18, 51, 12; *BBCSports* is a dataset with 544 nodes per layer, 2 layers and 5 communities of size 62, 104, 193, 124, 61; *cora* is a dataset with 2708 nodes per layer, 2 layers and 7 communities of size 298, 418, 818, 426, 217, 180, 351; *UCI* is a dataset with 2000 nodes per layer, 6 layers and 10 communities of 200 nodes each; *Wikipedia* is a dataset with 693 nodes per layer, 2 layers and 10 communities of size 34, 88, 96, 85, 65, 58, 51, 41, 71, 104.

Given the ground truth community structure of the graphs, we analysed both the informative and the noisy case. For the noisy case we study two settings. In the first one, we added a noisy layer to the informative layers, whereas in the second setting we considered networks with 2 layers, where the first one is the graph obtained aggregating all the layers and the other one is just noise. The noisy layers are generated via uniform (Erdős–Rényi) random graphs with edge probability  $p \in \{0.01, 0.03, 0.05\}$ . For each value of  $p$ , and each dataset, we generated 10 random instances and for each instance we run our methods 10 times with different random initial community orderings.

In Tables 1–3 we report average accuracy and NMI scores over all the samples and all the random initializations. The best and second best values are highlighted with a gray box, with the best values

having a bold font. We further consider average performance ratio score values  $\rho_{Acc}$  and  $\rho_{NMI}$ , quantified as follows: for a given measure  $M_{a,d}$  (where  $M_{a,d}$  is either Acc or NMI obtained by algorithm  $a$  over the dataset  $d$ ), the *performance ratio* is  $r_{a,d} = M_{a,d} / \max\{M_{a,d} \text{ over all } a\}$ . The average performance ratios of each algorithm  $\rho_{Acc}$  and  $\rho_{NMI}$  (for accuracy and NMI, respectively) are then obtained averaging  $r_{a,d}$  over all the datasets  $d$ . The closer is the average performance ratio of an algorithm to 1, the better will be the overall performance of that algorithm.

In the last two columns of the Tables 1–3, we report the average performance ratios for all the tested algorithms. We can see that in many cases the proposed methods overcome the baselines. In particular, the methods that consider the variance in addition to the average of the modularity across the layers usually work better, with the multiobjective approaches *MVM* and *MVP* achieving best results in almost all the cases. This is in agreement with the more sophisticated Pareto-based strategy and is consistent with what observed in the SBM. Moreover, the last two columns highlight the robustness of the proposed methods with respect to noise. In fact, in the noisy case (Tables 2 and 3) the proposed methods — in particular the multiobjective ones — achieve very high performance ratios as well as overall high values of accuracy and NMI.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper, we presented new methods for community detection in multi-layer graphs that extend the Louvain heuristic method in two different ways. The first method that we proposed, called Louvain Expansion, combines the modularity average with the modularity variance, thus taking into account the variability of the modularity in the different layers. The second algorithm, called Louvain Multiobjective, is a more sophisticated filter-type method that maintains a list of suitably chosen modularity vectors at each iteration and updates the corresponding community assignments according to a tailored Pareto search. We considered different versions of these methods to better analyse two situations: the informative case, where each layer shows some community structure, and the noisy case, where some layers present a community structure and all the others are just noise. We provided extensive experiments on artificial networks using the Stochastic Block Model. In addition, we tested our methods on five real datasets from the literature. In both cases, we studied the informative and the noisy setting. The experimental results demonstrate that the proposed methods are competitive with state-of-the-art baselines. In particular, the multiobjective approach with the modularity variance shows best performance in almost all the cases.

## References

- [1] Marya Bazzi et al. “Community detection in temporal multilayer networks, with an application to correlation networks”. In: *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation* 14.1 (2016), pp. 1–41.
- [2] Steffen Bickel and Tobias Scheffer. “Multi-view clustering.” In: *ICDM*. Vol. 4. 2004. Citeseer. 2004, pp. 19–26.
- [3] Vincent D Blondel et al. “Fast unfolding of communities in large networks”. In: *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment* 2008.10 (2008), P10008.
- [4] Avrim Blum and Tom Mitchell. “Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training”. In: *Proceedings of the eleventh annual conference on Computational learning theory*. 1998, pp. 92–100.
- [5] Ulrik Brandes et al. “On modularity clustering”. In: *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering* 20.2 (2007), pp. 172–188.
- [6] Xiaochun Cao et al. “Constrained multi-view video face clustering”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 24.11 (2015), pp. 4381–4393.

- [7] Dorwin Cartwright and Frank Harary. “Structural balance: a generalization of Heider’s theory.” In: *Psychological review* 63.5 (1956), p. 277.
- [8] Jingchun Chen and Bo Yuan. “Detecting functional modules in the yeast protein–protein interaction network”. In: *Bioinformatics* 22.18 (2006), pp. 2283–2290.
- [9] Pin-Yu Chen and Alfred O Hero. “Multilayer spectral graph clustering via convex layer aggregation: Theory and algorithms”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks* 3.3 (2017), pp. 553–567.
- [10] James Samuel Coleman. *An Introduction to Mathematical Sociology*. Collier-Macmillan, London, UK, 1964.
- [11] Xiaowen Dong et al. “Clustering with multi-layer graphs: A spectral perspective”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 60.11 (2012), pp. 5820–5831.
- [12] Yon Dourisboure, Filippo Geraci, and Marco Pellegrini. “Extraction and classification of dense communities in the web”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World Wide Web*. 2007, pp. 461–470.
- [13] Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. *UCI Machine Learning Repository – Multiple Features Data Set*. 2017. URL: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Multiple+Features>.
- [14] Santo Fortunato. “Community detection in graphs”. In: *Physics reports* 486.3-5 (2010), pp. 75–174.
- [15] Riccardo Gallotti and Marc Barthelemy. “The multilayer temporal network of public transport in Great Britain”. In: *Scientific data* 2.1 (2015), pp. 1–8.
- [16] Riccardo Gallotti and Marc Barthelemy. “The multilayer temporal network of public transport in Great Britain”. In: *Scientific data* 2.1 (2015), pp. 1–8.
- [17] Derek Greene and Pádraig Cunningham. “A matrix factorization approach for integrating multiple data views”. In: *Joint European conference on machine learning and knowledge discovery in databases*. Springer. 2009, pp. 423–438.
- [18] Roger Guimera and Lués A Nunes Amaral. “Cartography of complex networks: modules and universal roles”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2005.02 (2005), P02001.
- [19] Jungeun Kim and Jae-Gil Lee. “Community detection in multi-layer graphs: A survey”. In: *ACM SIGMOD Record* 44.3 (2015), pp. 37–48.
- [20] Niko Kiuukkonen et al. “Towards rich mobile phone datasets: Lausanne data collection campaign”. In: *Proc. ICPS, Berlin* 68 (2010).
- [21] Balachander Krishnamurthy and Jia Wang. “On network-aware clustering of web clients”. In: *Proceedings of the conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communication*. 2000, pp. 97–110.
- [22] Abhishek Kumar and Hal Daumé. “A co-training approach for multi-view spectral clustering”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*. 2011, pp. 393–400.
- [23] Abhishek Kumar, Piyush Rai, and Hal Daume. “Co-regularized multi-view spectral clustering”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2011, pp. 1413–1421.
- [24] Youwei Liang et al. “Multi-view Graph Learning by Joint Modeling of Consistency and Inconsistency”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.10208* (2020).
- [25] Jialu Liu et al. “Multi-view clustering via joint nonnegative matrix factorization”. In: *Proceedings of the 2013 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM. 2013, pp. 252–260.

- [26] Andrew Kachites McCallum et al. “Automating the construction of internet portals with machine learning”. In: *Information Retrieval* 3.2 (2000), pp. 127–163.
- [27] Pedro Mercado, Francesco Tudisco, and Matthias Hein. “Generalized matrix means for semi-supervised learning with multilayer graphs”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2019, pp. 14877–14886.
- [28] Pedro Mercado et al. “The power mean Laplacian for multilayer graph clustering”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.00491* (2018).
- [29] Peter J Mucha et al. “Community structure in time-dependent, multiscale, and multiplex networks”. In: *science* 328.5980 (2010), pp. 876–878.
- [30] Mark EJ Newman. “Modularity and community structure in networks”. In: *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 103.23 (2006), pp. 8577–8582.
- [31] Mark EJ Newman and Michelle Girvan. “Finding and evaluating community structure in networks”. In: *Physical review E* 69.2 (2004), p. 026113.
- [32] Feiping Nie, Lai Tian, and Xuelong Li. “Multiview clustering via adaptively weighted procrustes”. In: *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2018, pp. 2022–2030.
- [33] Vilfredo Pareto. “Cours d’économie politique, Rouge”. In: *Lausanne, Switzerland* (1896).
- [34] Subhadeep Paul and Yuguo Chen. “Spectral and matrix factorization methods for consistent community detection in multi-layer networks”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 48.1 (2020), pp. 230–250.
- [35] Jian Pei, Daxin Jiang, and Aidong Zhang. “On mining cross-graph quasi-cliques”. In: *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery in data mining*. 2005, pp. 228–238.
- [36] Tiago P Peixoto. “Bayesian stochastic blockmodeling”. In: *Advances in network clustering and blockmodeling* (2019), pp. 289–332.
- [37] Clara Pizzuti and Annalisa Socievole. “Many-objective optimization for community detection in multi-layer networks”. In: *2017 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 411–418.
- [38] Soumajit Pramanik et al. “Discovering community structure in multilayer networks”. In: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 611–620.
- [39] Nikhil Rasiwasia et al. “A new approach to cross-modal multimedia retrieval”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2010, pp. 251–260.
- [40] Joao Sedoc et al. “Semantic word clusters using signed spectral clustering”. In: *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 2017, pp. 939–949.
- [41] Alexander Strehl and Joydeep Ghosh. “Cluster ensembles—a knowledge reuse framework for combining multiple partitions”. In: *Journal of machine learning research* 3.Dec (2002), pp. 583–617.
- [42] Shiliang Sun. “A survey of multi-view machine learning”. In: *Neural computing and applications* 23.7-8 (2013), pp. 2031–2038.
- [43] Wei Tang, Zhengdong Lu, and Inderjit S Dhillon. “Clustering with multiple graphs”. In: *2009 Ninth IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*. IEEE. 2009, pp. 1016–1021.

- [44] Wei Tang, Zhengdong Lu, and Inderjit S Dhillon. “Clustering with multiple graphs”. In: *2009 Ninth IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*. IEEE. 2009, pp. 1016–1021.
- [45] Dane Taylor, Rajmonda S Caceres, and Peter J Mucha. “Super-resolution community detection for layer-aggregated multilayer networks”. In: *Physical Review X* 7.3 (2017), p. 031056.
- [46] Dane Taylor et al. “Enhanced detectability of community structure in multilayer networks through layer aggregation”. In: *Physical review letters* 116.22 (2016), p. 228301.
- [47] Robert Winkler. *Introduction to Bayesian Inference and Decision*. Probabilistic Publishing, Gainesville, 2003.
- [48] Rongkai Xia et al. “Robust multi-view spectral clustering via low-rank and sparse decomposition”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*. Vol. 28. 1. 2014.
- [49] Chang Xu, Dacheng Tao, and Chao Xu. “A survey on multi-view learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1304.5634* (2013).
- [50] Zhiping Zeng et al. “Coherent closed quasi-clique discovery from large dense graph databases”. In: *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 2006, pp. 797–802.
- [51] Kun Zhan et al. “Graph learning for multiview clustering”. In: *IEEE transactions on cybernetics* 48.10 (2017), pp. 2887–2895.
- [52] Kun Zhan et al. “Graph structure fusion for multiview clustering”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 31.10 (2018), pp. 1984–1993.
- [53] Kun Zhan et al. “Multiview consensus graph clustering”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 28.3 (2018), pp. 1261–1270.
- [54] Jing Zhao et al. “Multi-view learning overview: Recent progress and new challenges”. In: *Information Fusion* 38 (2017), pp. 43–54.
- [55] Dengyong Zhou and Christopher JC Burges. “Spectral clustering and transductive learning with multiple views”. In: *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*. 2007, pp. 1159–1166.
- [56] Linlin Zong et al. “Weighted multi-view spectral clustering based on spectral perturbation”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 32. 1. 2018.