

# Anomalous Edge Detection in Edge Exchangeable Social Network Models

Rui Luo, Buddhika Nettasinghe, and Vikram Krishnamurthy, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper studies detecting anomalous edges in directed graphs that model social networks. We exploit edge exchangeability as a criterion for distinguishing anomalous edges from normal edges. Then we present an anomaly detector based on conformal prediction theory; this detector has a guaranteed upper bound for false positive rate. In numerical experiments, we show that the proposed algorithm achieves superior performance to baseline methods.

**Index Terms**—Edge exchangeable model, conformal prediction, anomaly detection, social networks.



## 1 INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of online social networks raises security concerns, including coordinated spam attacks [1], cyberbullies [2], and dissemination of misinformation [3]. The problem we address is: how do we spot such activities in a network? Specifically, we represent them as anomalous edges in a graph, which show significant deviations from normal connection patterns in the network. In this regard, we aim to develop algorithms to detect anomalous edges in social networks.

A number of novel graph-based approaches have been proposed for anomaly detection in networks, which account for the correlations of objects in networks [4]. Among the approaches focusing on detecting anomalous edges, some share a similar perspective with link prediction algorithms, using the proximity of adjacent nodes [5], [6] or factorization of the adjacency matrix [7], [8] as evidence of abnormal connections. Other approaches analyze anomalous edges by aggregating them into graph snapshots [9], [10]. One issue is that these graph- or snapshot-based approaches require high memory and often prohibitive time lag as well.

More recently, [11], [12], [13] have proposed to detect individually surprising edges in the edge stream which have superior memory and time efficiency. However, due to the non-i.i.d. nature of graph-structured data [14], they fail to obtain provable guarantees for these algorithms. MIDAS [15] develops a hypothesis testing framework and has shown guarantees on the false positive rate. However, it focuses on detecting micro-clusters of edges.

In this paper, we use edge exchangeability as a criterion for detecting anomalous edges in networks. We then propose an algorithm which guarantees the false positive rate

by combining edge exchangeability with conformal prediction. Conformal prediction generates set-valued predictions (the set covers the ground truth with high probability) and has been used successfully in several machine learning applications, including image classification [16] and anomalous trajectory detection [17]. Specifically, we fit an edge exchangeable model to the network data. Then, we construct an algorithm (Conformal detector) based on conformal prediction to detect anomalous edges which break exchangeability.

### Main Results and Organization:

(1) Section 2 reviews the edge exchangeable models and justifies that edge exchangeability captures the nature of many real-world networks.

(2) Section 3.1 presents the edge exchangeable model and related inference approach according to the mixture of Dirichlet network distribution (MDND) [18]. Section 3.2 gives the definition of anomalous edges regarding edge exchangeability. Section 3.3 proposes the anomalous edge detection algorithm (Conformal detector) based on conformal prediction.

(3) Section 4.1 presents testing edge exchangeability using the inductive conformal martingale [19]. We also verify that edge exchangeability is a valid criterion for detecting anomalous edges through experiments on the Enron email dataset. Section 4.2 presents numerical results that demonstrate the performance of the proposed Conformal detector in anomalous edge detection using synthetic data.

(4) Finally, the appendix proves that the proposed Conformal detector guarantees the upper bound of false positive rate (detecting normal edges as anomaly).

## 1.1 Related Work

Previous related works can be considered under three categories:

(1) *Anomalous edge detection in graphs*: Existing anomalous edge detection methods focus on the following three aspects.

- Graph compression: Chakrabarti [8] encodes an input graph by alternatively arranging the nodes into disjoint partitions and splitting the partitions; then spots the

- R. Luo is with the Sibley School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14850.  
E-mail: rl828@cornell.edu
- B. Nettasinghe and V. Krishnamurthy are with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14850.  
E-mail: {dwn26, vikramk}@cornell.edu
- This research was supported in part by the U. S. Army Research Office under grants W911NF-19-1-0365 and W911NF-21-1-0093, and the National Science Foundation under grant CCF-2112457.

anomalous edges whose removal reduces the total encoding cost significantly. Tong and Lin [7] factorize the adjacency matrix of the input graph and flag edges with high reconstruction error as anomalies. GOutlier [20] constructs a structural connectivity model of the input graph to define anomalous edges.

- Node and subgraph similarity: NetWalk [5] learns a dynamic node embedding which minimizes the pairwise distance of node embeddings along each walk and computes the abnormality of edges according to the Hadamard product of node embeddings. ODDBALL [6] extracts egonet-based (1-hop neighborhood around a node) features and spots anomalous edges according to abnormal pairwise correlation patterns. Shin et al. [9], Eswaran and Faloutsos [12] aggregate edges into graph snapshots and detect dense subgraphs with anomalous nodes and edges.
- Edge frequency: Ranshous et al. [21] proposed an edge probability function which scores each edge based on occurrence frequency, common neighbors and popularity of two endpoints. Spotlight [10] identifies edge anomalies as bursty occurrence which connect parts of the graph which are sparsely connected. MIDAS [15] proposes a probabilistic framework to detect microcluster anomalies (suddenly arriving of groups of suspiciously similar edges). F-FADE [13] uses a frequency-factorization technique to model the distributions of edge frequencies and flags edges with low likelihood of the observed frequency as anomaly.

(2) *Exchangeable graph models*: Vertex exchangeable random graph models assume that the distribution of a graph is invariant to the labeling of its vertices [22], [23], [24], [25]. An extensive list of vertex exchangeable random graph models can be found in [26]. A limitation of vertex exchangeable random graph models is that they yield dense graphs [26]. Edge exchangeable random graph models, on the other hand, are capable to produce sparse graphs and small-world behavior of real-world networks [27]. Several edge exchangeable models [18], [28], [29] have been proposed for modeling networks as exchangeable sequences of edges. These models assume that the distribution of a graph’s edge sequence is invariant to the order of the edges [28]. In addition, Caron and Fox [30] proposed to represent a network as an exchangeable point process and uses completely random measures to construct sparse graphs.

(3) *Conformal prediction*: Conformal prediction algorithms provide valid measures of confidence for individual predictions made by machine learning algorithms [31]. It is based on the assumption that the samples are probabilistically exchangeable [16], which is slightly weaker than i.i.d. assumption. Different machine learning algorithms have previously been proposed and investigated for conformal prediction, e.g., the k-nearest neighbours algorithm [32], SVM [32], and neural networks [33]. The computational efficiency of conformal prediction is considerably improved using a modification known as inductive conformal prediction [34], which avoids training the algorithm one time for each sample in the dataset. Conformal prediction has been used for testing exchangeability of a sequence of data [19], [35], [36], [37]. In addition, Laxhammar [17] applied conformal prediction in detecting anomalous trajectories in

TABLE 1  
Glossary of Symbols Used in This Article

Symbols	Description
$G$	the directed graph representing the network
$V$	the set of nodes
$E$	the set of edges
$N$	the number of edges in $E$
$e_n$	the edge in $E$ , $n = 1, \dots, N$
$e_{N+1}$	the new edge to be tested
$s_n$	the sender node of edge $e_n$
$r_n$	the receiver node of edge $e_n$
$A$	non-conformity measure (NCM) [16]
$\alpha_n$	the non-conformity score of edge $e_n$
$p_n$	the $p$ -value of edge $e_n$ being normal
$\epsilon$	the significance level
$\text{Anom}_n^\epsilon$	indicator of whether edge $e_n$ is anomalous or not at the significance level $\epsilon$
$c_n$	the community that edge $e_n$ belongs to
$A_{c_n}$	the distribution of sender nodes of edges in community $c_n$
$B_{c_n}$	the distribution of receiver nodes of edges in community $c_n$
$H$	the discrete base distribution for $A_{c_n}$ and $B_{c_n}$
$D$	the discrete distribution of community $c_n$
$\alpha, \tau, \gamma$	concentration parameters of $D, H,$ $A_{c_n}$ and $B_{c_n}$
$\underline{d}$	equality in distribution

surveillance applications; Ishimtsev et al. [38] proposed an anomaly detection algorithm for univariate time series by combining k-nearest neighbors algorithm with the conformal prediction framework.

## 2 EDGE EXCHANGEABLE SOCIAL NETWORK MODEL

In this section, we first introduce the edge exchangeable models and their connections with the vertex exchangeable models. We then justify how these models capture some important properties of real world social networks, including sparsity and power-law degree distribution. We further illustrate via several real world examples that edge exchangeability is a useful assumption in modeling social networks, which guides the definition of anomalous edges in Section 3.2 and the anomaly detection algorithm in Section 3.3.

### 2.1 Edge Exchangeable Model

Consider a directed graph  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_M\}$  is the node set with  $M$  nodes and  $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$  is the edge set with  $N$  edges. A sequence of random variables is (finitely) exchangeable if their joint distribution is invariant under permutations [39]. Exchangeability reflects the assumption that the variables do not depend on their indices although they may be dependent

among themselves. Exchangeability<sup>1</sup> is a weaker assumption than iid; iid variables are automatically exchangeable [40].

This paper deals with edge exchangeable networks. We now briefly discuss vertex exchangeable networks. In graphs, the *vertex exchangeability*, defined as follows, means that the distribution of the graph is invariant to relabelings of the vertices.

**Definition 1** (Vertex Exchangeability). Consider a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V = \{1, \dots, M\}$  and  $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_N\} \subseteq V \times V$ . Such networks can be expressed as an adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{y} = (y_{ij})_{i,j \in V}$  with

$$y_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & (i, j) \in E, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Let permutation  $\pi : V \rightarrow V$ . Relabeling vertices according to  $\pi$  leads to the adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{y}^\pi = (y_{\pi(i)\pi(j)})_{i,j \in V}$ . Then,  $G$  is vertex exchangeable if for every permutation  $\pi$ ,  $\mathbf{y}^\pi \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbf{y}$ . Here,  $\stackrel{d}{=}$  denotes equality in distribution, that is,

$$P(Y = \mathbf{y}) = P(Y = \mathbf{y}^\pi), \quad (2)$$

where  $Y = (Y_{ij})_{i,j \in V}$  is a random matrix defined on  $\{0, 1\}^{V \times V}$ .

The assumption of vertex exchangeability underlies many well-known network models, including the stochastic block model (SBM) [22], latent space model [23], infinite relational model (IRM) [24], latent feature relational model (LFRM) [25] and many others. However, they fall under the framework of Aldous-Hoover representation theorem [41], [42], which guarantees that these graphs are either empty or dense with probability one [43]. Such models cannot produce sparsity in real-world graphs.

In comparison, edge exchangeable networks considered in this paper (see also [18], [28], [29]) capture important properties of large-scale social networks such as sparsity, community structure and power law degree distributions. Roughly speaking, for an edge exchangeable graph, the joint distribution of the edge sequence is invariant to the order of the edges. We define this formally as follows:

**Definition 2** (Edge Exchangeability). Consider a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V = \{1, \dots, M\}$  and  $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_N\} \subseteq V \times V$ . Each edge is represented as a sender-receiver pair  $(s, r) \in V \times V$ . Let permutation  $\pi : \{1, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Then,  $G$  is edge exchangeable if for every permutation  $\pi$ , the edge sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_N)$  is exchangeable, i.e.,

$$(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N) \stackrel{d}{=} (e_{\pi(1)}, e_{\pi(2)}, \dots, e_{\pi(N)}), \quad (3)$$

for every permutation  $\pi$ . Here,  $\stackrel{d}{=}$  denotes equality in distribution, that is,

$$P(e_i = (s_i, t_i), i=1, \dots, N) = P(e_i = (s_{\pi(i)}, r_{\pi(i)}), i=1, \dots, N), \quad (4)$$

for every permutation  $\pi$ .

1. The simplest type of exchangeable process is sampling without replacement of an iid process [40].

## 2.2 Why Edge Exchangeability

In this subsection, we demonstrate how edge exchangeability accounts for the complex behavior of social networks. First, in situations where the focus is on the interactions between social network members, e.g., communications, collaborations, and relationships, it is reasonable to represent edges as the statistical units of the network [44]. Second, edge exchangeability assumes that the observed edges are a representative sample of the population of all edges [29]. In the phone call database example provided by Crane et al. [29], each phone call has the same probability to be sampled, leading to callers who make a large number of phone calls appearing in the database with a high frequency. In contrast, vertex exchangeability assumes that sampled vertices are representative of the population of all vertices, which neglects the different frequencies of callers in making phone calls. Another advantage is that edge exchangeable models suffice to model interactions driven by edge growth.

Although exchangeability often fails to hold for time series data due to the dependence structure in the data, exchangeability holds for networks where the distribution of edges is invariant under the addition of new edges<sup>2</sup>. We justify edge exchangeability in social networks via the following examples. In the first two examples, edges are sampled without replacement from a fixed distribution, and the permutation of the edges will not affect their joint distribution.

**Example 1. Online discussion thread:** A discussion thread gathers people interested in the same topics and their messages on such topics (e.g., sports, politics). In the thread, people have different roles such as opinion leaders, followers, and moderators, and they each have a regular pattern in participating in the discussion. If one person  $s$ 's post is commented by another person  $r$ ,  $s$  will have a directed edge to  $r$ , forming an ordered pair  $(s, r)$ . On the online thread, individuals develop a consistent pattern of interacting with each other. Following the definition in [29], we denote  $\mathcal{P}$  as a set of participants in the discussion thread. Now we define a distribution  $f = (f_e)_{e \in \text{fin}_2(\mathcal{P})}$  on  $\text{fin}_2(\mathcal{P})$ , where  $\text{fin}_2(\mathcal{P})$  is the set of all multisets of  $\mathcal{P}$  which has size 2,

$$P((s, r) = e | f) = f_e, \quad e \in \text{fin}_2(\mathcal{P}), \quad (5)$$

where

$$(f_e)_{e \in \text{fin}_2(\mathcal{P})} : f_e \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{e \in \text{fin}_2(\mathcal{P})} f_e = 1. \quad (6)$$

Let the edges  $(s_1, r_1), \dots, (s_n, r_n)$  be independent, identically distributed random multisets of size 2 drawn from (5). This generating mechanism results in an exchangeable edge sequence.

In addition to the above examples, Crane and Dempsey [29] and Williamson [18] have verified that the edge exchangeable model outperforms vertex exchangeable model counterparts (IRM, SBM) in predictive likelihood on several real world datasets.

2. I.e., new edges are sampled without replacement from the same distribution of existing edges.

On the other hand, anomalous edges will likely lie an abnormal distance from other edges in the population and therefore causing the edge sequence nonexchangeable. Regarding the Example 3 above, a situation where the new edges are anomalous and leading to nonexchangeable edge sequence is as follows.

**Example 2. (Continued from Example 1) Nonexchangeable online discussion thread:** A hacker  $h$  wants to attack the thread by spreading some fake news. He either joins several (trending) existing discussions by commenting about fake news to a post, or starts a discussion by posting fake news. The first action results in him having in-edges with people in the existing discussions, e.g.,  $(s, h)$ ; the second action results in him having out-edges with people deluded by the fake news, e.g.,  $(h, r)$ . Either action signifies an abnormal pattern where the edges are not representative samples of the edge population  $\text{fin}_2(\mathcal{P})$ . Thus if we permute the order of these edges in the existing edge sequence, the resulting edge sequence is nonexchangeable.

**Example 3. University email network [18]:** A university's email network records email communications among entities in the university. The email network follows a consistent communication pattern: administrators may send out a large number of group emails but receive a relatively small number of emails—that is, they often operate as the “sender” role but not the “receiver” role; faculties in collaboration may send and receive emails between each other on a regular basis—they operate as the “sender” role and the “receiver” role both at a moderate frequency. Each email from the email network,  $(s, r)$ , corresponds to an email from  $s$  to  $r$ . Denote  $P_S$  as a distribution of the sender and  $P_R$  as a distribution of the receiver. The emails  $(s_1, r_1), \dots, (s_n, r_n)$  are exchangeable as a sequence in the space of the joint distribution  $P_S \times P_R$ .

### 3 ANOMALOUS EDGE DETECTION

In this section, we use an edge exchangeable model to fit the social network edges, which is based on the mixture of Dirichlet network distribution (MDND) model proposed by Williamson [18]. We then define the anomalous edges regarding edge exchangeability. Further, we propose an algorithm for detecting the anomalous edges based on conformal prediction [32].

#### 3.1 Mixture of Dirichlet Network Distribution (MDND) Model

Consider a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V$  is the node set and  $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$  is the edge set with  $N$  edges. We adopt the mixture of Dirichlet network distribution (MDND) model of [18] to fit the network edges. Here, each edge is represented as a tuple  $e_n = (s_n, r_n), n = 1, \dots, N$ , where the nodes  $s_n, r_n$  denotes a sender-receiver pair. We define a community  $c_n \in \mathbb{N}^+$  which represents the topic<sup>3</sup> of the corresponding edge  $e_n$ .

3. Take the university email network in Example 3 (Section 2.2) as an example: each email is related to one topic such as course announcement, administrative notification, research project update, etc.

Our proposed model is described by the following hierarchical Bayesian framework:

$$\begin{aligned}
 D &:= (d_k, k \in \mathbb{N}) \sim \text{CRP}(\alpha) \\
 H &:= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i \delta_{\theta_i} \sim \text{CRP}(\gamma) \\
 A_k &:= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{k,i} \delta_{\theta_i} \sim \text{DP}(\tau, H), k \in \mathbb{N} \\
 B_k &:= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_{k,i} \delta_{\theta_i} \sim \text{DP}(\tau, H) \\
 c_n &\sim D, n = 1, \dots, N \\
 s_n &\sim A_{c_n} \\
 r_n &\sim B_{c_n} \\
 z_{ij} &= \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{I}(s_n = i, r_n = j)
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$\text{CRP}(\alpha)$  is a Chinese restaurant process [45] with concentration parameter  $\alpha$ .  $D$  is a sample from  $\text{CRP}(\alpha)$ , which models the distribution of the communities each edge resides.  $H$  is a sample from  $\text{CRP}(\gamma)$  which models the distribution of the node population.  $\text{DP}(\tau, H)$  is a Dirichlet process with base distribution  $H$  and concentration parameter  $\tau$ . The distribution of senders and receivers in community  $k$ ,  $A_k$  and  $B_k$ , are both sampled from  $\text{DP}(\tau, H)$  to ensure that they share the same set of nodes.

In a constructive sense, the MDND model generates the  $n$ th edge  $(s_n, r_n)$  as follows. As in Eq. (8), we first select a community  $c_n$  according to  $D$ . We then select a sender  $s_n$  and a receiver  $r_n$  according to the community-specific distribution  $A_{c_n}, B_{c_n}$ , identifying an edge  $(s_n, r_n)$ . The concentration parameters  $\alpha$  controls the size and number of communities;  $\gamma$  and  $\tau$  control the number of nodes in the network and the overlap between communities, respectively.

**Discussion of the MDND model:** As defined in Section 2.1, vertex exchangeable models such as the SBM [22] and IRM [24] assume a fixed node set and model the network by clustering the nodes. The edges are represented as nonzero-valued entries of the corresponding adjacency matrix. In contrast, our proposed MDND models the network as a sequence of edges, and cluster edges into communities, rather than the nodes. Each node can have multiple community assignments based on its associated edges. Further, by placing a nonparametric distribution over both the community assignments and the community-specific population of the senders/receivers, the MDND model can incorporate previously unseen nodes and is flexible for predicting unseen edges.

##### 3.1.1 Inference based on collapsed Gibbs sampler

Similar to the SBM [22], the MDND model assumes a latent community structure of the network. But instead of clustering nodes into blocks, the MDND model clusters edges into communities where edges with the same sender or receiver are more likely to join the same community. We

adopt the collapsed Gibbs sampler of [18] to infer which community each edge belongs to. Specifically, the collapsed Gibbs sampler samples the community assignment of the  $n$ th edge,  $c_n$ , from its conditional distribution with the remaining assignments  $c^{-n}$  fixed. Let  $\eta_k = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(c_i = k)$  be the number of edges associated with community  $k$  (this is defined in (9) below);  $m_{k,i}^{(1)}$  be the number of edges associated with community  $k$  that originate from node  $i$  (i.e., edges that  $i$  is the sender);  $m_{k,i}^{(2)}$  be the number of edges associated with community  $k$  that end at node  $i$  (i.e., edges that  $i$  is the receiver). We also use auxiliary count variables  $\rho_{k,i}^{(1)}$  and  $\rho_{k,i}^{(2)}$ , which denotes the probability mass on the node  $i$  associated with community  $k$ ; a probability vector  $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_J, \beta_u) \sim \text{Dir}(\rho_{\cdot,1}, \dots, \rho_{\cdot,J}, \gamma)$ , where  $\rho_{\cdot,i} = \sum_k \rho_{k,i}^{(1)} + \rho_{k,i}^{(2)}$ , and  $J$  is the number of existing nodes in  $G$ ; here  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_J$  correspond to the atoms of  $H$  that are associated with represented nodes, and  $\beta_u = \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} h_j$ .

Based on the notation above, the conditional distribution of the community assignment of the  $n$ th edge is given by:

$$P(c_n = k | s_n, r_n, c^{-n}, \beta) \propto \begin{cases} \eta_k^{-n} (m_{k,i}^{(1)-n} + \tau \beta_{s_n}) (m_{k,i}^{(2)-n} + \tau \beta_{r_n}) & \text{if } \eta_k^{-n} > 0 \\ \alpha \tau^2 \beta_{s_n} \beta_{r_n} & \text{if } \eta_k^{-n} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where  $-n$  excludes the value associated with the current observation.

Conditioned on the community assignments  $c$  for all  $N$  edges, we can compute the posterior predictive probability of a new edge  $e_{N+1}$ :

$$P(e_{N+1} = (s, r) | c, E, \beta) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\eta_k}{N+\alpha} \frac{m_{k,i}^{(1)} + \tau \beta_s}{\eta_k + \tau} \frac{m_{k,i}^{(2)} + \tau \beta_r}{\eta_k + \tau} + \frac{\alpha}{N+\alpha} \beta_s \beta_r & \text{if } s, r \leq J \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\eta_k}{N+\alpha} \frac{m_{k,i}^{(1)} + \tau \beta_s}{\eta_k + \tau} \beta_u + \frac{\alpha}{N+\alpha} \beta_s \beta_u & \text{if } s \leq J, r > J \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\eta_k}{N+\alpha} \beta_u \frac{m_{k,i}^{(2)} + \tau \beta_r}{\eta_k + \tau} + \frac{\alpha}{N+\alpha} \beta_u \beta_s & \text{if } r \leq J, s > J \\ \beta_u^2 & \text{if } r, s > J \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

We further assume gamma priors on the hyper parameters  $\alpha, \tau, \gamma$  and sample from their posterior distributions using Metropolis-Hastings as shown in Algorithm 1.

### 3.2 Definition of Anomalous Edges

In this subsection, we define an anomalous edge as an outlier<sup>4</sup> that is significantly different from the remaining edges which were generated to be edge-exchangeable.

**Definition 3.** An anomalous edge  $e_{N+1}$  is an edge which breaks the exchangeability of an edge sequence  $e_1, \dots, e_N$  if

$$(e_1, \dots, e_N) \stackrel{d}{\neq} (e_{\pi_1}, \dots, e_{\pi_N}), \quad (11)$$

for any permutation  $\pi : \{1, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, N\}$ , and

$$(e_1, \dots, e_{N+1}) \stackrel{d}{\neq} (e_{\pi_1^+}, \dots, e_{\pi_{N+1}^+}) \quad (12)$$

4. Hawkins defined [46] an outlier as follows: "An outlier is an observation which deviates so much from the other observations as to arouse suspicions that it was generated by a different mechanism."

for some permutation  $\pi^+ : \{1, \dots, N+1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, N+1\}$ .

Suppose an existing edge sequence  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N$  is constructed using the MDND model in Section 3.1, then the edge sequence is exchangeable, i.e.,

$$(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N) \stackrel{d}{=} (e_{\pi_1}, e_{\pi_2}, \dots, e_{\pi_N}), \quad (13)$$

According to Definition 3, an edge  $e_{N+1}$  is anomalous if it breaks edge exchangeability, i.e.,

$$(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{N+1}) \stackrel{d}{\neq} (e_{\pi_1}, e_{\pi_2}, \dots, e_{\pi_{N+1}}), \quad (14)$$

for some permutation  $\pi^+ : \{1, \dots, N+1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, N+1\}$ . In the next subsection, we demonstrate how we use such definition of anomalous edges to construct an anomaly detection algorithm.

### 3.3 Detecting Anomalous Edges with Conformal Prediction

The previous subsections gave a setup of the edge exchangeable model and associated definition of anomalous edges. In this subsection, we formulate the anomaly detection problem as a hypothesis test of the exchangeability assumption. We then propose an algorithm, Conformal detector, which has a guaranteed upper bound for false positive rate.

Our algorithm is based on conformal prediction [16]. Conformal prediction uses labeled training data to determine the confidence in new predictions, and outputs a prediction set which is guaranteed to contain the true label with a specified confidence level as long as the data is probabilistically exchangeable [47]. To this end, conformal prediction estimates  $p$ -values for each possible label for a new example. In our application, we have training edges which are labeled as normal edges, and we aim to use conformal prediction to determine the confidence that new edges are also normal. Specifically, the conformal detection algorithm we propose (Algorithm 1) detects whether an edge  $e_{N+1}$  is anomalous or not by using conformal prediction to estimate the  $p$ -value for the null hypothesis:

$$H_0 : e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{N+1} \text{ forms an exchangeable sequence.} \quad (15)$$

In order to estimate the  $p$ -values for the null hypothesis  $H_0$ , the *non-conformity measure* (NCM) is introduced [16] which measures how different an observation is relative to other observations. Formally, an NCM is a measurable function  $A(B, z)$  that returns a non-conformity score  $\alpha$  measuring how different an observation  $z$  is from the observations in the bag  $B$  (also known as multi-set).

Concretely, suppose the observations are real numbers, and denote  $\bar{z}_B$  as the average of the numbers in  $B$ . Then, an NCM measuring the absolute value of the difference between  $z$  and those in  $B$  can be represented as

$$A(B, z) = |\bar{z}_B - z| \quad (16)$$

In detecting anomalous edges, to measure how different an edge  $e_n$  is relative to other edges in the edge set  $E =$

$\{e_1, \dots, e_{N+1}\}$ , we define the NCM as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_n &= A(E \setminus \{e_n\}, e_n) \\ &= -P(e_n | E \setminus \{e_n\})\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

where  $P(e_n | E \setminus \{e_n\})$  denotes the posterior probability of edge  $e_n$  given other edges in the edge set  $E$ , which can be computed according to Eq. (10).

$\alpha_n$  in (17) constitutes the test statistic for our detector, which determines the corresponding  $p$ -value as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}p_n &= \frac{1}{N+1} |\{i = 1, \dots, N+1 \mid \alpha_n > \alpha_i\}| \\ &\quad + \frac{u}{N+1} |\{i = 1, \dots, N+1 \mid \alpha_n = \alpha_i\}|,\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

where  $u \sim \text{Unif}(0,1)$ . Given a significance level or an *anomaly threshold*,  $\epsilon$ , if  $p_n < \epsilon$ , then  $e_n$  is classified as an anomalous edge:  $\text{Anom}_n^\epsilon = 1$ . Otherwise,  $e_n$  is classified as normal:  $\text{Anom}_n^\epsilon = 0$ .

Note that we will need to fit the MDND model to compute the posterior in Eq. (10) for any  $E \setminus \{e_n\}, n = 1, \dots, N+1$ . To avoid such computation burden, we take advantage of the inductive conformal predictor [34]. We split<sup>5</sup> the existing edge set (excluding the new edge to be tested) into a training set  $E_{\text{train}}$  and a calibration set  $E_{\text{calib}}$ . We fit the MDND model based on  $E_{\text{train}}$  and compute the non-conformity scores for each observation in  $E_{\text{calib}}$ . The  $p$ -value of the new edge is computed by comparing its non-conformity score with the ones of  $E_{\text{calib}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}p_n &= \frac{1}{|E_{\text{calib}}| + 1} |\{i \in E_{\text{calib}} \cup \{N+1\} \mid \alpha_n > \alpha_i\}| \\ &\quad + \frac{u}{|E_{\text{calib}}| + 1} |\{i \in E_{\text{calib}} \cup \{N+1\} \mid \alpha_n = \alpha_i\}|,\end{aligned}\quad (19)$$

We present the complete anomaly detection algorithm (Conformal detector) in Algorithm 1. Below we demonstrate that Algorithm 1 has a false positive rate (detecting normal edges as anomaly) less than or equal to the given anomaly threshold  $\epsilon$ .

**Proposition 1.** Assume that  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{N+1}$  form a sequence of exchangeable random variables. For any choice of NCM  $A$ , the specified anomaly threshold  $\epsilon$  corresponds to an upper bound of the probability of the event that  $e_{N+1}$  is classified as an anomalous edge by Algorithm 1:

$$P(\text{Anom}_{N+1}^\epsilon = 1) \leq \epsilon \quad (20)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix.

## 4 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES OF ANOMALOUS EDGE DETECTION

In this section, we first verify on the publicly available Enron email dataset that anomalous edges are nonexchangeable. We then provide numerical results to illustrate how the proposed Conformal detector (Algorithm 1) can detect anomalous edges in real world social networks.

5. Due to the edge-exchangeability, the split can be done randomly.

### Algorithm 1 (Conformal detector) Anomalous edge detection based on inductive conformal prediction

**Input:** NCM  $A$ , anomaly threshold  $\epsilon$ , training edge set  $E_{\text{train}}$ , calibration edge set  $E_{\text{calib}}$ , and a new edge  $e_{N+1}$  to be tested.  
**Output:** Indicator variable  $\text{Anom}_{N+1}^\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$  with performance specified by Proposition 1.

- 1: Initialize community assignments  $c_1, \dots, c_{|E_{\text{train}}|}$  of edges in  $E_{\text{train}}$
- 2: **for** each epoch **do**  
  - ▷ Collapsed Gibbs sampling of edges' community assignments
- 3: **for**  $i \in \{1, \dots, |E_{\text{train}}|\}$  **do**
- 4: Sample the probability vector  $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_J, \beta_u) \sim \text{Dir}(\rho_{\cdot,1}, \dots, \rho_{\cdot,J}, \gamma)$
- 5: Select  $e_i = (s_i, r_i)$  from  $E_{\text{train}}$
- 6: Sample  $e_i$ 's community assignment from  $P(c_i | s_i, r_i, c^{-i}, \beta)$  in Eq. (9)
- 7: **end for**  
  - ▷ Sampling the concentration parameters using Metropolis-Hastings
- 8: Propose  $\alpha^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\alpha, \sigma^2)$  for some step size  $\sigma$
- 9: Set  $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha^*$  with probability  $\min(1, \frac{\text{Gamma}(\alpha^* | \alpha_0, \alpha_1) \prod_i p(c_i | \alpha^*, c^{-i})}{\text{Gamma}(\alpha | \alpha_0, \alpha_1) \prod_i p(c_i | \alpha, c^{-i})})$
- 10: Propose  $\tau^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\tau, \sigma^2)$  for some step size  $\sigma$
- 11: Set  $\tau \leftarrow \tau^*$  with probability  $\min(1, \frac{\text{Gamma}(\tau^* | \tau_0, \tau_1) \prod_i p(s_i, r_i | \tau^*, c^{-i}, E_{\text{train}} \setminus \{e_i\})}{\text{Gamma}(\tau | \tau_0, \tau_1) \prod_i p(s_i, r_i | \tau, c^{-i}, E_{\text{train}} \setminus \{e_i\})})$
- 12: Propose  $\gamma^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\gamma, \sigma^2)$  for some step size  $\sigma$
- 13: Set  $\gamma \leftarrow \gamma^*$  with probability  $\min(1, \frac{\text{Gamma}(\gamma^* | \gamma_0, \gamma_1) \text{Dirichlet}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_J, \beta_u | \rho_{\cdot,1}, \dots, \rho_{\cdot,J}, \gamma^*)}{\text{Gamma}(\gamma | \gamma_0, \gamma_1) \text{Dirichlet}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_J, \beta_u | \rho_{\cdot,1}, \dots, \rho_{\cdot,J}, \gamma)})$
- 14: **end for**  
  - ▷ Computing the non-conformity scores of the calibration edges
- 15: **for**  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $|E_{\text{calib}}|$  **do**
- 16: Compute  $\alpha_j = A(E_{\text{train}}, e_j) = -P(e_j | c, E_{\text{train}}, \beta)$  according to Eq. (10)
- 17: **end for**  
  - ▷ Computing the  $p$ -value that the testing edge is normal
- 18: Compute  $p_{N+1}$  according to Eq. (19)
- 19: **if**  $p_{N+1} < \epsilon$  **then**
- 20:  $\text{Anom}_{N+1}^\epsilon \leftarrow 1$
- 21: **else**
- 22:  $\text{Anom}_{N+1}^\epsilon \leftarrow 0$
- 23: **end if**

## 4.1 Testing Edge Exchangeability

### 4.1.1 Exchangeability Martingale

To test whether a sequence of edges are exchangeable, we resort to the exchangeability martingales [19], [35], [36], [37] which test the assumption of exchangeability online. The value of the exchangeability martingale reflects the strength of evidence against the exchangeability assumption. Specifically, an exchangeability martingale is a sequence of non-negative random variables  $S_1, S_2, \dots$  that keep the conditional expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}S_n &\geq 0 \\ \mathbb{E}(S_{n+1} | S_1, \dots, S_n) &= S_n,\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}$  refers to the expectation with respect to any exchangeable distribution on observations. According to Ville's inequality [48],

$$P(\exists n : S_n \geq C) \leq \frac{1}{C}, \forall C \geq 1, \quad (22)$$

it is unlikely that  $S_n$  takes large value. Therefore we can reject the exchangeability assumption if the final value of the martingale is large.

Given a sequence of  $p$ -values computed from Eq. (18), we consider a martingale of the form

$$S_n = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(p_i), n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (23)$$

where  $f_i(p)$  is called as a betting function which satisfies the following constraint:

$$\int_0^1 f_i(p) dp = 1, i = 1, 2, \dots \quad (24)$$

We can verify the martingale property under any exchangeable distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(S_{n+1} | S_1, \dots, S_n) &= \int_0^1 \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(p_i) \right\} f_{n+1}(p) dp \\ &= \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(p_i) \right\} \int_0^1 f_{n+1}(p) dp \\ &= \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(p_i) \right\} = S_n. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In the numerical example of Section 4.1.2, we use the mixture betting function [19], [36], i.e.,

$$f_i(p) = \int_0^1 \epsilon p^{\epsilon-1} d\epsilon. \quad (26)$$

This betting function has the advantage that its value does not depend on  $\epsilon$ .

The complete testing of edge exchangeability is shown in Algorithm 2.

#### 4.1.2 Exchangeability Analysis on Real-world Data

To verify that exchangeability is a useful criterion for detecting anomaly in real-world data, we test exchangeability on emails from the Enron dataset [49]. To avoid fitting the MDND model every time we receive a new observation, we use the inductive conformal martingale [19] which evaluates new observations based on some fixed training set. To be precise, for a given edge sequence, we partition the sequence into a training set and a testing set. We fit the MDND model on the training set, and compute the non-conformity scores and  $p$ -values of the testing set. We then compute the exchangeability martingale according to Eq. (21).

We test exchangeability on a mixture of normal emails during February 2000 (when Enron was in good standing) and anomalous emails during September 2001 (when the Enron scandal took place). We use 600 normal emails as training edges, 600 normal emails as calibration edges, 100 normal emails and 100 anomalous emails as testing edges. Figure 1 shows the  $p$ -values of the testing edges computed by Eq. (27). The  $p$ -values of normal edges are dispersed evenly in  $[0, 1]$ ; the  $p$ -values of anomalous edges

#### Algorithm 2 Testing edge exchangeability based on inductive conformal martingale

**Input:** Training edge set  $E_{\text{train}} = \{e_{-(M-1)}, \dots, e_{-(M-L)}\}$ , calibration edge set  $E_{\text{calib}} = \{e_{-(M-L-1)}, \dots, e_0\}$ , testing edges  $e_1, \dots, e_N$ , NCM  $A$ .

**Output:** Inductive conformal martingale  $(S_n)_{n=1, \dots, N}$ .

- 1: Fit the MDND model on  $E_{\text{train}}$ ;
- 2: **for**  $j = -(M-L-1), \dots, 0$  **do**
- 3:   Compute non-conformity score  $\alpha_j = A(E_{\text{train}}, e_j)$  according to Eq. (17)
- 4: **end for**
- 5: **for**  $n = 1, \dots, N$  **do**
- 6:   Observe new observation  $e_n$
- 7:   Compute non-conformity score  $\alpha_n = A(E_{\text{train}}, e_n)$ .
- 8:   Compute  $p$ -value

$$p_n = \frac{|\{j = -(M-L-1), \dots, 0 | \alpha_j > \alpha_n\}| + u}{L}, \quad (27)$$

where  $u \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$

- 9:   Compute  $S_n$  according to Eq. (23)
- 10: **end for**




Fig. 1. The  $p$ -values of a sequence of testing edges computed from Eq. (27). The green dashed vertical line divides the normal edges (100 normal emails during February 2000) and anomalous edges (100 anomalous emails during September 2001). The  $p$ -values of the normal edges are dispersed in  $[0, 1]$ ; the  $p$ -values of the anomalous edges are concentrated near 0, which indicates that anomalous edges significantly deviate from the distribution of normal emails.

are concentrated near 0. This indicates that the  $p$ -value based on conformal prediction is able to differentiate anomalous observations from existing data.

We compute the exchangeability martingale on the testing edges according to Algorithm 2. Figure 2 shows that the exchangeability martingale remains at a low level during the sequence of normal emails; it achieves a high level during the sequence of anomalous emails and therefore rejecting the null hypothesis of exchangeability. The result demonstrates that exchangeability is a valid criterion for distinguishing anomalous edges from normal edges.




Fig. 2. The growth of the exchangeability martingale (Eq. (23)) for a sequence of normal edges (100 normal emails during February 2000) and anomalous edges (100 anomalous emails during September 2001). The green dashed vertical line divides the normal edges and anomalous edges. The final martingale value is  $7.06 \times 10^{23}$ , which verifies that the edge sequence with anomalous edges is nonexchangeable.

## 4.2 Detecting Anomalous Edges

In this subsection, we implement Conformal detector (Algorithm 1) on synthetic network generated from the MDND model (Section 3.1). To create anomalous edges, we follow [4], [11] and inject artificial anomalous edges into the simulated network. Specifically, the anomalies are injected by sampling two nodes from a uniform distribution over the existing nodes and adding a directed edge between them. This generating mechanism opposes the MDND model, where edges are created in a “rich get richer” fashion<sup>6</sup>, and contradicts the edge exchangeability.

**Dataset.** We construct a network with 600 edges using the MDND model with parameters  $\alpha = \gamma = \tau = 5$ . We randomly partition the edges into a training set of 300 edges, a calibration set of 270 edges, and a testing set of 30 edges. We inject 30 anomalous edges according to the method discussed above.

**Baseline.** We use RHSS [11] (abbreviated based on the last names of authors) as baseline, which is an edge stream anomaly detector applicable to directed multigraphs. RHSS estimates the edge probabilities by combining three individual scores, i.e., sample, preferential attachment and homophily scores. We assign equal weighting coefficients to the individual scores.

**Evaluation metrics.** Both Conformal detector and RHSS detector output a score per edge (Conformal detector outputs a  $p$ -value; RHSS detector outputs an estimate of edge probabilities. Both are lower for more anomalous edges). We compute the precision and recall following the method outlined in [12]: sorting the edges in ascending order of their scores, we count the number of edges  $c_k$  flagged correctly as anomalous among the top  $k$  edges, for every cut-off rank  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $C$  be the total number of ground truth anomalies, we compute:  $\text{precision}@k = c_k/k$  and  $\text{recall}@k = c_k/C$ . In

<sup>6</sup> Dirichlet processes model data that tends to repeat previous values, as in the MDND model.




Fig. 3. The simulated edge exchangeable network and the injected anomalous edges as described in Section 4.2. The normal edges are blue; the anomalous edges are red. The node size is proportional to the logarithm of the node degree. The normal edges and the anomalous edges indicate different generating mechanism: the normal edges generated from the MDND model are exchangeable and exhibit a rich-get-richer property; the anomalous edges generated from uniformly random sampling of any pair of nodes contradict the edge exchangeability.

addition, we compute the true positive rate (proportion of anomalous edges correctly classified as anomalies) and the false positive rate (proportion of normal edges mistakenly classified as anomalies) for a range of threshold values. We also report AUC (area Under the ROC curve).

In comparing the performance on anomaly detection, we include the Conformal detector with true model parameter (ideal Conformal detector) as a reference, i.e., we feed the Conformal detector with the ground truth model parameters ( $\alpha = \gamma = \tau = 5$ ) without letting it estimate the model parameters via MCMC sampling (Algorithm 1).

Fig. 3 shows the synthetic network simulated from the MDND model. The normal edges are blue; the anomalous edges are red. The node size is proportional to the logarithm of the node degree. Fig. 4 shows the precision vs. recall curves. The performance of the Conformal detector is comparable to that of RHSS detector; the Conformal detector with true parameter achieves higher precision than the other two methods at each recall. Fig. 5 shows the ROC curve and the AUC computed. The Conformal detector slightly outperforms RHSS detector; the Conformal detector with true parameter outperforms both by a noticeable margin. Overall, the comparison result indicates that the Conformal detector is comparable with RHSS detector in anomalous edge detection. In addition, to narrow the gap between the Conformal detector with the ideal counterpart, we can improve mixing of MCMC by augmenting the sampler with split/merge moves [18], [50]. Moreover, the relatively small performance gap illustrates the robustness of the Conformal detector to misspecified models.




Fig. 4. The precision-recall curves of the Conformal detector (blue circle), RHSS detector (orange triangle), and the Conformal detector with true parameter (green star). The Conformal detector is comparable to RHSS detector; the Conformal detector with true parameter performs the best.




Fig. 5. The ROC curve of the Conformal detector (blue circle), RHSS detector (orange triangle), and the Conformal detector with true parameter (green star). The AUC (area under ROC curve) of each method is shown in the legend. The Conformal detector slightly outperforms RHSS detector in AUC.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND EXTENSIONS

**Conclusions:** This paper addressed detecting anomalous edges in social networks based on edge exchangeability. We motivated edge exchangeability in social networks via real-world examples. We proposed anomalous edge detection algorithm (Conformal detector) by combining conformal prediction with the edge exchangeable model. We proved that Conformal detector guarantees a false positive rate (flagging normal edges as anomaly) lower than a pre-specified threshold. In the numerical experiments, we verified that edge exchangeability is a valid criterion for distinguishing anomalous edges from normal edges using Enron email dataset. In addition, we demonstrated that the proposed Conformal detector achieves a comparable

anomaly detection performance to the baseline method on synthetic datasets.

**Limitations and Extensions:** There are several limitations of the proposed method that open up future research directions. Firstly, the assumption of edge exchangeability may not hold for real-world networks whose properties change over time as they expand. Recent works [51], [52] have incorporated distance-dependent Chinese restaurant process to model nonexchangeable edge sequence by preferentially assigning edges to communities that have been recently active. Secondly, although the validity of conformal prediction (e.g. false positive rate in the proposed Conformal detector algorithm) is guaranteed, the efficiency of conformal prediction (i.e., the prediction region of normal edges) depends on the non-conformity measure [16]. It is worthwhile to investigate cascades of predictors to improve the efficiency [53]. Finally, combining the proposed conformal prediction framework with graph neural networks or embedding methods remains an interesting future direction. However, conformal prediction crucially depends on the assumption of exchangeability which requires verification of exchangeability in the graph-structured data.

## 6 APPENDIX

### 6.1 Proof of Proposition 1

**Definition 4** (Rank, ascending). For a set of  $n$  real numbers  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , define the rank of  $x_i$  among  $X$  as

$$\text{rank}(x_i; X) = \begin{cases} |\{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : x_j \leq x_i\}| & \text{if all the elements in } X \text{ are distinct;} \\ |\{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : x_j + \xi U_j \leq x_i + \xi U_i\}| & \text{if some elements of } X \text{ are equal.} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

where  $\xi > 0$  is a small number such that

$$\xi \leq \min_{\forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : x_i \neq x_j} \frac{|x_i - x_j|}{2} \quad (29)$$

and  $U_1, \dots, U_n \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$  are iid uniform random variables. Because  $U_1, \dots, U_n$  are almost surely distinct,  $x_i + \xi U_i$  are also distinct. The addition of  $U_1, \dots, U_n$  breaks potential ties among the original sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .

**Theorem 1.** [54] If  $W_1, \dots, W_n$  are exchangeable random variables, then

$$P(\text{rank}(W_i; \{W_1, \dots, W_n\}) \leq m) = \frac{\lfloor m \rfloor}{n}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\text{rank}(W_i; \{W_1, \dots, W_n\})$  represents the rank of  $W_i$  among  $\{W_1, \dots, W_n\}$ ,  $\lfloor m \rfloor$  represents the largest integer smaller than or equal to  $m$ . Moreover, the random variable  $\text{rank}(W_i; \{W_1, \dots, W_n\})/n$  is a valid  $p$ -value, i.e.,

$$P(\text{rank}(W_i; \{W_1, \dots, W_n\})/n \leq \alpha) \leq \alpha \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (31)$$

**Theorem 2.** [54] Suppose  $W = (W_1, \dots, W_n) \in \mathcal{W}^n$  is a vector of exchangeable random variables. Fix a transformation  $G : \mathcal{W}^n \rightarrow (\mathcal{W}')^m$ . If for each permutation

$\bar{\pi} : \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$  there exists a permutation  $\underline{\pi} : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

$$\bar{\pi}G(w) = G(\underline{\pi}w), \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}^n, \quad (32)$$

then  $G(\cdot)$  preserves exchangeability of  $W$ .

**Proposition 1. (Section 3.3)** Assume that  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{N+1}$  form a sequence of exchangeable random variables. For any choice of NCM  $A$  (such as that defined in Eq. (17)), the specified anomaly threshold  $\epsilon$  corresponds to an upper bound of the probability of the event that  $e_{N+1}$  is classified as an anomalous edge by Algorithm 1:

$$P(\text{Anom}_{N+1}^\epsilon = 1) \leq \epsilon \quad (33)$$

**Proof.** Let  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{N+1} \in \mathcal{E}$  where  $\mathcal{E}$  represents the set of all possible edges. For any permutation  $\pi : \{1, \dots, N+1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, N+1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi \left( A(E_{N+1} \setminus \{e_1\}, e_1), \dots, A(E_{N+1} \setminus \{e_{N+1}\}, e_{N+1}) \right) \\ &= \left( A(E_{N+1} \setminus \{e_{\pi_1}\}, e_{\pi_1}), \dots, \right. \\ & \left. A(E_{N+1} \setminus \{e_{\pi_{N+1}}\}, e_{\pi_{N+1}}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Theorem 2 indicates that  $A : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a transformation which preserves exchangeability. Thus  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N+1}$  are real-valued exchangeable random variables.

The right hand side of Eq. (18) is the rank of  $\alpha_{N+1}$  among  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N+1}\}$ . According to Theorem 2, the  $p$ -value constructed from Eq. (18) is valid, i.e.,  $p_{N+1}$  is distributed uniformly on  $[0, 1]$  when  $e_1, \dots, e_{N+1} \in \mathcal{E}$  be exchangeable random variables. This implies that  $P(\text{Anom}_{N+1}^\epsilon = 1 \mid e_{N+1} \text{ is normal})$ , i.e., the false alarm rate of Algorithm 1, is less than or equal to  $\epsilon$  at any specified anomaly threshold  $\epsilon$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported in part by the U. S. Army Research Office under grants W911NF-19-1-0365 and W911NF-21-1-0093, and the National Science Foundation under grant CCF-2112457.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Wagner, S. Mitter, C. Körner, and M. Strohmaier, "When social bots attack: Modeling susceptibility of users in online social networks." in # MSM, 2012, pp. 41–48.
- [2] P. Bindu and P. S. Thilagam, "Mining social networks for anomalies: Methods and challenges," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 68, pp. 213–229, 2016.
- [3] N. P. Nguyen, G. Yan, M. T. Thai, and S. Eidenbenz, "Containment of misinformation spread in online social networks," in *Proceedings of the 4th Annual ACM Web Science Conference*, 2012, pp. 213–222.
- [4] L. Akoglu, H. Tong, and D. Koutra, "Graph based anomaly detection and description: a survey," *Data mining and knowledge discovery*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 626–688, 2015.
- [5] W. Yu, W. Cheng, C. C. Aggarwal, K. Zhang, H. Chen, and W. Wang, "Netwalk: A flexible deep embedding approach for anomaly detection in dynamic networks," in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2018, pp. 2672–2681.
- [6] L. Akoglu, M. McGlohon, and C. Faloutsos, "Oddball: Spotting anomalies in weighted graphs," in *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Springer, 2010, pp. 410–421.
- [7] H. Tong and C.-Y. Lin, "Non-negative residual matrix factorization with application to graph anomaly detection," in *Proceedings of the 2011 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM, 2011, pp. 143–153.
- [8] D. Chakrabarti, "Autopart: Parameter-free graph partitioning and outlier detection," in *European Conference on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*. Springer, 2004, pp. 112–124.
- [9] K. Shin, T. Eliassi-Rad, and C. Faloutsos, "Patterns and anomalies in k-cores of real-world graphs with applications," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 677–710, 2018.
- [10] D. Eswaran, C. Faloutsos, S. Guha, and N. Mishra, "Spotlight: Detecting anomalies in streaming graphs," in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2018, pp. 1378–1386.
- [11] S. Ranshous, S. Shen, D. Koutra, S. Harenberg, C. Faloutsos, and N. F. Samatova, "Anomaly detection in dynamic networks: a survey," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 223–247, 2015.
- [12] D. Eswaran and C. Faloutsos, "Sedanspot: Detecting anomalies in edge streams," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 953–958.
- [13] Y.-Y. Chang, P. Li, R. Susic, M. Afifi, M. Schweighauser, and J. Leskovec, "F-fade: Frequency factorization for anomaly detection in edge streams," in *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 2021, pp. 589–597.
- [14] A. Bojchevski, J. Klicpera, and S. Günnemann, "Efficient robustness certificates for discrete data: Sparsity-aware randomized smoothing for graphs, images and more," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1003–1013.
- [15] S. Bhatia, B. Hooi, M. Yoon, K. Shin, and C. Faloutsos, "Midas: Microcluster-based detector of anomalies in edge streams," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 04, 2020, pp. 3242–3249.
- [16] G. Shafer and V. Vovk, "A tutorial on conformal prediction." *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2008.
- [17] R. Laxhammar and G. Falkman, "Conformal prediction for distribution-independent anomaly detection in streaming vessel data," in *Proceedings of the first international workshop on novel data stream pattern mining techniques*, 2010, pp. 47–55.
- [18] S. A. Williamson, "Nonparametric network models for link prediction," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 7102–7121, 2016.
- [19] D. Volkhonskiy, E. Burnaev, I. Nouretdinov, A. Gammerman, and V. Vovk, "Inductive conformal martingales for change-point detection," in *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction and Applications*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 132–153.
- [20] C. C. Aggarwal, Y. Zhao, and S. Y. Philip, "Outlier detection in graph streams," in *2011 IEEE 27th international conference on data engineering*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 399–409.
- [21] S. Ranshous, S. Harenberg, K. Sharma, and N. F. Samatova, "A scalable approach for outlier detection in edge streams using sketch-based approximations," in *Proceedings of the 2016 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM, 2016, pp. 189–197.
- [22] Y. J. Wang and G. Y. Wong, "Stochastic blockmodels for directed graphs," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 82, no. 397, pp. 8–19, 1987.
- [23] P. D. Hoff, A. E. Raftery, and M. S. Handcock, "Latent space approaches to social network analysis," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 97, no. 460, pp. 1090–1098, 2002.
- [24] C. Kemp, J. B. Tenenbaum, T. L. Griffiths, T. Yamada, and N. Ueda, "Learning systems of concepts with an infinite relational model," in *AAAI*, vol. 3, 2006, p. 5.
- [25] K. Miller, M. Jordan, and T. Griffiths, "Nonparametric latent feature models for link prediction," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 22, pp. 1276–1284, 2009.
- [26] J. Lloyd, P. Orbanz, Z. Ghahramani, and D. M. Roy, "Random function priors for exchangeable arrays with applications to graphs and relational data," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 25, pp. 998–1006, 2012.
- [27] S. Janson, "On edge exchangeable random graphs," *Journal of statistical physics*, vol. 173, no. 3, pp. 448–484, 2018.
- [28] D. Cai, T. Campbell, and T. Broderick, "Edge-exchangeable graphs and sparsity," in *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016, pp. 4249–4257.
- [29] H. Crane and W. Dempsey, "Edge exchangeable models for interaction networks," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 113, no. 523, pp. 1311–1326, 2018.

- [30] F. Caron and E. B. Fox, "Sparse graphs using exchangeable random measures," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical Methodology*, vol. 79, no. 5, p. 1295, 2017.
- [31] A. Gammerman and V. Vovk, "Hedging predictions in machine learning," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 151–163, 2007.
- [32] V. Vovk, A. Gammerman, and G. Shafer, *Algorithmic learning in a random world*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [33] H. Papadopoulos, V. Vovk, and A. Gammerman, "Conformal prediction with neural networks," in *19th IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI 2007)*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2007, pp. 388–395.
- [34] H. Papadopoulos, *Inductive conformal prediction: Theory and application to neural networks*. INTECH Open Access Publisher Rijeka, 2008.
- [35] V. Vovk, I. Nourtdinov, and A. Gammerman, "Testing exchangeability on-line," in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, 2003, pp. 768–775.
- [36] V. Fedorova, A. Gammerman, I. Nourtdinov, and V. Vovk, "Plug-in martingales for testing exchangeability on-line," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.3251*, 2012.
- [37] F. Cai and X. Koutsoukos, "Real-time out-of-distribution detection in learning-enabled cyber-physical systems," in *2020 ACM/IEEE 11th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPs)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 174–183.
- [38] V. Ishimtsev, A. Bernstein, E. Burnaev, and I. Nazarov, "Conformal  $k$ -nn anomaly detector for univariate data streams," in *Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction and Applications*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 213–227.
- [39] M. Niepert and P. Domingos, "Exchangeable variable models," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2014, pp. 271–279.
- [40] P. Orbanz and Y. W. Teh, "Bayesian nonparametric models." *Encyclopedia of machine learning*, vol. 1, 2010.
- [41] D. J. Aldous, "Representations for partially exchangeable arrays of random variables," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 581–598, 1981.
- [42] D. N. Hoover, "Relations on probability spaces and arrays of random variables," *Preprint, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ*, vol. 2, 1979.
- [43] P. Orbanz and D. M. Roy, "Bayesian models of graphs, arrays and other exchangeable random structures," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 437–461, 2014.
- [44] H. Crane, *Probabilistic foundations of statistical network analysis*. CRC Press, 2018.
- [45] D. M. Blei, T. L. Griffiths, M. I. Jordan, J. B. Tenenbaum *et al.*, "Hierarchical topic models and the nested chinese restaurant process." in *NIPS*, vol. 16, 2003.
- [46] D. M. Hawkins, *Identification of outliers*. Springer, 1980, vol. 11.
- [47] G. Zeni, M. Fontana, and S. Vantini, "Conformal prediction: a unified review of theory and new challenges," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.07972*, 2020.
- [48] J. Ville, "Etude critique de la notion de collectif," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc*, vol. 45, no. 11, p. 824, 1939.
- [49] J. Shetty and J. Adibi, "The enron email dataset database schema and brief statistical report," *Information sciences institute technical report, University of Southern California*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 120–128, 2004.
- [50] S. Jain and R. M. Neal, "A split-merge markov chain monte carlo procedure for the dirichlet process mixture model," *Journal of computational and Graphical Statistics*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 158–182, 2004.
- [51] E. Ghaleb, H. Mahyar, R. Grosu, G. W. Taylor, and S. A. Williamson, "A nonparametric bayesian model for sparse dynamic multigraphs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05098*, 2019.
- [52] —, "Sequential edge clustering in temporal multigraphs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11724*, 2019.
- [53] A. Fisch, T. Schuster, T. Jaakkola, and R. Barzilay, "Efficient conformal prediction via cascaded inference with expanded admission," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03114*, 2020.
- [54] A. K. Kuchibhotla, "Exchangeability, conformal prediction, and rank tests," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.06095*, 2020.