

Large network community detection by fast label propagation

Vincent A. Traag¹ and Lovro Šubelj²

¹*Leiden University, Centre for Science and Technology Studies, Leiden, The Netherlands*

²*University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Computer and Information Science, Ljubljana, Slovenia*

Many networks exhibit some community structure. There exists a wide variety of approaches to detect communities in networks, each offering different interpretations and associated algorithms. For large networks, there is the additional requirement of speed. In this context, the so-called label propagation algorithm (LPA) was proposed, which runs in near linear time. In partitions uncovered by LPA, each node is ensured to have most links to its assigned community. We here propose a fast variant of LPA (FLPA) that is based on processing a queue of nodes whose neighbourhood recently changed. We test FLPA exhaustively on benchmark networks and empirical networks, finding that it runs up to 700 times faster than LPA. In partitions found by FLPA, we prove that each node is again guaranteed to have most links to its assigned community. Our results show that FLPA is generally preferable to LPA.

Keywords: complex networks, community detection, label propagation

INTRODUCTION

Networks are relevant in various scientific fields, ranging from social networks in sociology to metabolic networks in biology. There are various techniques to try to improve our understanding of networks. One such technique is to cluster the nodes of a network, such that nodes within a cluster are relatively densely connected while they are relatively sparsely connected between clusters. There is a wide variety of clustering approaches to networks, such as modularity¹ and stochastic block models² and approaches based on dynamical processes on networks³, such as random walks. Sometimes, a similar approach can be solved in various ways. For example, when modularity was first proposed, it used a cutting approach based on betweenness¹. New algorithms were continuously proposed, either improving the speed of the algorithm or the quality of the partition as determined by modularity. This includes a fast greedy approach⁴, a slower simulated annealing approach⁵, a faster algorithm based on extremal optimisation⁶, a fast hierarchical multi-level method, known as the Louvain algorithm⁷ which was most recently improved upon in the Leiden algorithm⁸. Most of these algorithm can also optimise different quality functions, such as the Constant Potts Model⁹.

A technique that takes a heuristic approach is the label propagation algorithm (LPA)¹⁰. Its foremost focus is on speed, trying to find clusters in as little time as possible. Simply put, LPA works by iteratively updating the label of each node to a label that is most common among its neighbours. We here propose a fast variant of LPA (FLPA), which is able to run hundreds of times faster than LPA. This allows to cluster even larger networks in even less time. We consider this to be useful as a first initial look at a network, although other methods are arguably more robust and preferable¹¹. The results of LPA are only local minima of a global quality function for which the optimum is simply placing all nodes into a single community¹². Other quality functions may be

more informative of any structure in the network.

We first briefly review LPA and introduce the fast variant FLPA in the next section. We then go on to demonstrate FLPA on both synthetic networks and empirical networks.

LABEL PROPAGATION ALGORITHM

We now introduce the label propagation algorithm (LPA)¹⁰ more formally. For a more detailed review of label propagation algorithms, we refer the reader to literature reviews^{11,13}.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected multigraph with nodes V and edges E , where there are $n = |V|$ nodes and $m = |E|$ edges. Let A_{ij} be the adjacency matrix of graph G , such that $A_{ij} = 1$ if and only if i and j are connected (i.e. $(i, j) \in E$) and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The implementation of LPA is quite straightforward. Let c_i be the label of node $i \in V$. Typically, each node is initially labelled differently, i.e. $c_i = i$ for all $i \in V$. At each step, we take a random $i \in V$ and change its label to the majority in its neighbourhood. In more detail, we do the following. We count how many neighbours have label c as $n_c = \sum_{j \in V} A_{ij} \delta(c_j, c)$, where $\delta(c_j, c)$ is the Kronecker delta function such that $\delta(c_j, c) = 1$ if $c_j = c$ and 0 otherwise. We then consider the set of most frequent labels $\{c\} = \operatorname{argmax}_c n_c$. We randomly sample from the set of most frequent labels $\{c\}$ a label c^* , where each c^* has equal probability and update the label $c_i = c^*$. We iterate these steps over all nodes in V . After having iterated over all nodes, we check whether all labels are among most frequent (i.e. maximal). If any label is not maximal, we perform another iteration over all nodes, until all labels are maximal. This algorithm is summarised in Algorithm 1.

This version of the label propagation is also referred to as the asynchronous implementation of label propagation¹⁰. The synchronous implementation of label propagation showed potential problems with (near)

bipartite networks and some other networks, resulting in oscillations of labels. We therefore do not consider the synchronous implementation, and limit the discussion to the asynchronous implementation.

After LPA terminates, it is guaranteed that the label c_i of each node $i \in V$ is maximal. That is, $n_{c_i} = \max_c \sum_{j \in V} A_{ij} \delta(c_j, c)$. This is trivial to prove, since LPA continues to process nodes until all labels are maximal. In the original introduction of LPA¹⁰, they observed that this is close to the definition of “communities in the strong sense” as introduced by Ref.¹⁴.

The overall time complexity of a single iteration over all nodes in the LPA is $O(m)$. The number of iterations necessary before convergence is not known theoretically. It was observed that generally only a few iterations suffice to have most labels consistent with their final labelling¹⁰. However, there are no clear results for the overall time complexity of LPA.

Retention strategy

LPA stops iterating whenever the labels of all nodes are maximal. The original implementation of LPA¹⁰ simply considered always updating the label with a randomly selected maximal label. Later, a so-called retention strategy was suggested: update the label only if it is not maximal¹⁵. This has one great benefit: we can simply keep track of whether a label was updated during the iteration, and if so, we continue iterating over all nodes. This means it is not necessary to check for maximal labels after an iteration over all nodes, making the implementation more efficient. The retention strategy is summarised in Algorithm 2.

In addition, this retention strategy introduces more stability, because it does not continuously sample from competing maximal labels for a single node like the original LPA does. LPA sometimes shows the appearance of a “giant” cluster^{10,16} which might be related to the quality function which it implicitly optimises¹². Indeed, merging neighbouring clusters does not alter the label maximality, so that any arbitrary combination of clusters in principle will still meet the original stopping criteria. The retention strategy might prevent the method from finding such “giant” clusters¹⁵.

Some empirical observations in the literature noted that we can expect roughly $1.03m^{0.23}$ iterations for the retention strategy¹⁷. This leads to an overall time complexity of about $O(m^{1.2})$ for the retention strategy.

Fast label propagation algorithm

We now introduce the fast label propagation algorithm (FLPA). It is based on the same principle that is used for the fast local move in the Leiden algorithm⁸. Similar to the LPA, each node $i \in V$ has an associated label c_i , and we use a similar majority update rule. However,

instead of checking after an iteration whether all labels are maximal, or by considering whether labels are updated, as done in the retention strategy, we maintain an explicit queue of nodes Q that should be considered. If c_i of node i is changed, we append some of its neighbours $N_i = \{j \mid (i, j) \in E\}$ to the queue. In particular, we add each neighbour $j \in N_i$ to the queue that has a label different from the *new* label of i , $c_j \neq c_i$ and does not yet belong to the queue $j \notin Q$. At each step, we pop the node from the beginning of the queue, and we continue to process all nodes until the queue is empty. Hence, instead of iterating over *all* nodes if a label is changed, we only consider nodes in whose neighbourhood a label changed. This greatly reduces the number of nodes that we consider, making the algorithm even faster. The algorithm is summarised in Algorithm 3.

A node $i \in V$ that is not in the queue will have its label c_i as its maximal label. That is, $n_{c_i} = \max_c \sum_{j \in V} A_{ij} \delta(c_j, c)$. This clearly holds when node i was processed. If node i is currently not part of the queue, we can discern two cases. In the first case, no labels in its neighbourhood have changed at all. In this case, the label c_i continues to be the maximal label. In the second case, the label of a neighbour $j \in N_i$ changed. It must then hold that $c_j = c_i$, since otherwise i should have been added to the queue. In that case, the number of labels in the neighbourhood of i that equals c_i increased. If n_{c_i} was maximal prior to node j changing its label, it continues to be maximal. Hence, c_i continues to be the maximal label as long as node i is not part of the queue. If the queue is empty, the label c_i of each node i is guaranteed to be the maximal label, similar to LPA.

Earlier literature also suggested a speedup of LPA in a similar fashion^{18,19}. However, they seem to have taken a slightly more complicated approach, either introducing additional heuristics or requiring the algorithm to check whether a neighbour might be updated or not. Our approach is easier to implement, and seems to result in even greater speedups.

RESULTS

We ran benchmarks on five different types of synthetic networks and on seven different empirical networks. In addition to comparing LPA, its retention alternative, and FLPA, we also compare to the Leiden algorithm, which is one of the fastest available algorithms⁸. We use the Leiden algorithm to optimise for modularity. We compare both the speed and the resulting partitions of LPA, its retention alternative, and FLPA.

We first discuss the results for the synthetic networks²⁰. We then discuss the results for some empirical networks. We report averages and standard deviations of 2000 runs.




FIG. 1. Algorithm runtime for synthetic networks with increasing number of nodes n and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 10$. (top) Erdős-Rényi random graphs, Barabási-Albert scale-free graphs, forest fire graphs with burning probability 0.5 and two-dimensional geometric graphs with connection radius $\sqrt{\langle k \rangle / (\pi n)}$. (bottom) Stochastic block model graphs with 100 groups and mixing parameter μ . Results are averages over 2000 runs of the algorithms and error bars show standard deviations.




FIG. 2. (left) Largest cluster size for Erdős-Rényi random graphs and (right) the number of clusters for stochastic block model graphs with 100 groups and mixing parameter $\mu = 0.1$. Results are averages over 2000 runs of the algorithms and error bars show standard deviations.

Synthetic networks

As is clear, for all networks FLPA is always faster than LPA. For the largest networks with 100 000 nodes, FLPA is somewhere between 3–10 times faster than LPA. On Erdős-Rényi (ER) graphs, LPA is only about twice as slow as FLPA, which is comparable to the runtime of the Leiden algorithm. On two-dimensional geometric graphs, LPA is even 3–4 times slower than the Leiden algorithm, which in turn is still about 3–4 times as slow as FLPA. For a stochastic block model (SBM) of 100 groups and a mixing parameter of $\mu = 0.6$ with average degree of $\langle k \rangle = 10$, LPA is again about twice as slow as FLPA, which is again about 1.5 times faster than the Leiden algorithm. The overall scaling of both LPA and FLPA seems to be near linear, although there might be some small super-linear factors.

The comparison between FLPA and the retention vari-

ant of LPA is more complex. For some networks, the retention strategy alternative is faster, while for other networks FLPA is faster. However, in cases when the retention strategy is faster, it typically fails to perform well. For instance, in ER graphs, both LPA and FLPA find a single large cluster (Fig. 2 left), as expected based on earlier literature¹⁰, but the retention strategy simply stops almost immediately, finding a partition that closely resembles the singleton partition of each node in its own cluster. In SBM graphs, both LPA and FLPA typically find partitions that are close to the planted partition, while the retention strategy finds many small clusters within each group of the planted partition (Fig. 2 right). This is understandable, since every group is essentially an ER graph internally. In short, the retention strategy is faster simply because it stops very soon after having found some very small community structure.

We also compare the differences across partitions that are detected by the different algorithms (Fig. 3 top) based on the variation of information (VI)²¹. The VI of an algorithm with itself denotes the average VI of two runs of the same algorithm on the exact same graph. We can interpret this self-VI as a measure of stability: larger VI values suggest that partitions differ quite a bit from run to run, indicating a lower stability, while lower VI values suggest that partitions are quite similar from run to run, indicating a higher stability. For ER graphs, there is essentially no variation within and between LPA and FLPA, because they always find a single large cluster. The retention strategy, as explained earlier, typically finds some structure within ER graphs, which can also differ quite a bit from run to run. The Leiden algorithm also shows quite different results from run to run, and also finds some structure within ER graphs, which is a known result for




FIG. 3. Distance between partitions of (top) synthetic networks with $n = 10^5$ nodes and (bottom) empirical networks over 2000 runs of the algorithms.

modularity²². For both the forest fire model and the two-dimensional geometric model, the three variants of LPA find relatively comparable structures, which differs from the partitions from the Leiden algorithm. The stability of the partitions in the two-dimensional geometric graph of the three LPA variants is similar to the stability of the Leiden algorithm. Finally, on the SBM, the retention strategy seems to be unable to find any meaningful partition. As explained earlier, each group in the SBM is similar to an ER graph, where the retention strategy also finds very small substructures, which hence also shows up in the SBM results. In contrast, both LPA and FLPA are able to find relatively stable partitions that are similar to each other, and similar to the results of the Leiden algorithm, as they all detect the planted partition of the SBM.

Empirical networks

We now discuss the results of the empirical networks. We tested the algorithms on seven different empirical networks. They vary in size, ranging from 317 080 nodes and 1 049 866 edges for the smallest network (*com-dblp*), up to 6 297 539 nodes and 16 057 711 edges (*bitcoin*) or 4 847 571 nodes and 68 993 773 edges (*livejournal*). FLPA is between 30–700 times faster than LPA (Table I) and between 4–15 times faster than the retention strategy. For the largest network (*bitcoin*), LPA takes over 45 min on average, while FLPA is finished in 37 s. LPA is by far the slowest on the *us-patents* network, where it takes over 7 h, while FLPA is finished in 38 s. This may be partly due to LPA finding a much coarser partition: the largest cluster covers more than 38% of the nodes, and it finds about over 6 times fewer clusters than the re-

tention alternative, and over 3 times fewer clusters than FLPA. This conforms to the general pattern that LPA finds the least clusters, FLPA finds more clusters while the retention strategy finds even more clusters. There is no a priori reason to prefer larger over smaller clusters, so we cannot say whether a method would be preferable over the other based on this observation.

The partitions of most empirical networks themselves are similar between the three variants of LPA (Fig. 3). Moreover, they differ similarly from the results of the Leiden algorithm. The Leiden algorithm shows greater VI than (F)LPA for the *livejournal* and *twitter-sample* networks. This might be related to the community sizes that Leiden finds, since we use it to optimise modularity, which suffers from a resolution limit²³. The resolution limit might lead the method to aggregate several clusters together, which may be somewhat arbitrary. Indeed, the Leiden algorithm using modularity typically finds an order of magnitude fewer clusters than LPA. As already noted earlier, for the *us-patents* network there is a larger difference between LPA and the retention variant and FLPA.

DISCUSSION

Detecting communities in networks is a frequent task in network analysis. Label propagation is one of the fastest algorithms available. It may be useful to get an initial first look at a network. We here suggested a faster variant of label propagation. Fast label propagation runs up to 700 times faster than the original label propagation. Additionally, the same guarantees continue to hold, and results from both algorithms are largely comparable. When using label propagation, we believe our fast vari-

TABLE I. Speedup of fast label propagation for empirical networks. Results are averages over 2000 runs of the algorithms (1986 runs for the bitcoin network).

| Network | Nodes | Edges | Algorithm | Clusters | Largest | Time (s) | Speedup |
|----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------------------------|----------------|
| com-dblp | 317 080 | 1 049 866 | LPA | 22 048 | 20.1% | 185.0 ± 105.0 | $188.5 \times$ |
| | | | retention | 46 380 | 2.1% | 10.6 ± 6.0 | $10.8 \times$ |
| | | | FLPA | 32 329 | 2.7% | 1.0 ± 0.4 | |
| roadnet-ca | 1 965 206 | 5 533 214 | LPA | 219 392 | 0.0% | 940.4 ± 341.8 | $161.8 \times$ |
| | | | retention | 610 087 | 0.0% | 23.2 ± 8.6 | $4.0 \times$ |
| | | | FLPA | 341 773 | 0.0% | 5.8 ± 1.9 | |
| us-patents | 3 774 768 | 16 522 438 | LPA | 53 337 | 38.3% | $26 704.4 \pm 12 100.4$ | $705.2 \times$ |
| | | | retention | 359 233 | 1.4% | 601.8 ± 273.4 | $15.9 \times$ |
| | | | FLPA | 183 476 | 1.8% | 37.9 ± 12.3 | |
| foursquare | 3 935 215 | 22 809 624 | LPA | 73 805 | 6.2% | 977.3 ± 357.3 | $63.8 \times$ |
| | | | retention | 77 352 | 5.3% | 117.6 ± 41.3 | $7.7 \times$ |
| | | | FLPA | 76 028 | 5.8% | 15.3 ± 4.7 | |
| livejournal | 4 847 571 | 68 993 773 | LPA | 59 742 | 69.4% | $2 248.1 \pm 1 259.9$ | $30.2 \times$ |
| | | | retention | 149 555 | 60.5% | 959.6 ± 477.0 | $12.9 \times$ |
| | | | FLPA | 93 501 | 65.5% | 74.4 ± 26.3 | |
| twitter-sample | 5 384 162 | 16 011 444 | LPA | 16 011 | 55.1% | $1 343.5 \pm 544.6$ | $93.0 \times$ |
| | | | retention | 20 651 | 47.5% | 92.8 ± 38.9 | $6.4 \times$ |
| | | | FLPA | 18 560 | 51.8% | 14.5 ± 4.9 | |
| bitcoin | 6 297 539 | 16 057 711 | LPA | 42 388 | 50.9% | $2 937.7 \pm 1 077.3$ | $80.3 \times$ |
| | | | retention | 1 059 801 | 10.7% | 597.1 ± 522.6 | $16.3 \times$ |
| | | | FLPA | 247 404 | 24.3% | 36.6 ± 13.0 | |

ant will bring benefits at no additional costs. Although label propagation may be useful to get a first look at a network, other methods may be likely to provide more accurate results. It was also used to effectively and efficiently compress the Facebook graph²⁴ to calculate its four degrees of separation²⁵. At the same time, label propagation is quite similar to majority opinion simulations²⁶. The suggested speedup might also be relevant in the context of such applications.

METHODS

Algorithm implementation

We have implemented FLPA in C in `igraph` and made it available in its Python interface `python-igraph`. The C source code can be found in <https://github.com/vtraag/python-igraph/tree/flpa>, while the Python interface can be found in <https://github.com/vtraag/igraph/tree/flpa>. We compared FLPA to the existing implementation of LPA in `(python-)igraph`. All results were run on Dell PowerEdge M620 computing nodes using Intel E5-2697 CPUs.

Empirical networks

Empirical networks from Table I are part of the Netzschleuder repository and can be downloaded from <https://networks.skewed.de>. All networks have been reduced to their largest connected component. The `com-dblp` is a co-authorship network extracted from

Require: undirected multigraph $G(V, E)$

Ensure: node clustering $C = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^n$

```

1:  $C \leftarrow \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$ 
2: while  $C$  not maximal do
3:   for  $i \in \text{shuffle } V$  do
4:      $\{c\} \leftarrow \text{argsmax}_c \sum_{j \in V} A_{ij} \delta(c_j, c)$ 
5:      $c_i \leftarrow \text{random}_c\{c\}$ 
6:   end for
7: end while
8: return  $C$ 

```

ALGORITHM 1. Label propagation algorithm (LPA).

Require: undirected multigraph $G(V, E)$

Ensure: node clustering $C = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^n$

```

1:  $C \leftarrow \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$ 
2: while  $C$  changed do
3:   for  $i \in \text{shuffle } V$  do
4:      $\{c\} \leftarrow \text{argsmax}_c \sum_{j \in V} A_{ij} \delta(c_j, c)$ 
5:     if  $c_i \notin \{c\}$  then
6:        $c_i \leftarrow \text{random}_c\{c\}$ 
7:     end if
8:   end for
9: end while
10: return  $C$ 

```

ALGORITHM 2. Label propagation algorithm with retention.

the DBLP database in 2012²⁷, the `roadnet-ca` is the road network of California²⁸, the `us-patents` is the U.S. patent citation network from 1975 to 1999²⁹, the `foursquare` network represents check-in events on Foursquare from April 2012 to September 2013³⁰, the

Require: undirected multigraph $G(V, E)$

Ensure: node clustering $C = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^n$

```

1:  $C \leftarrow \{1, 2, 3 \dots n\}$ 
2:  $Q \leftarrow \text{shuffle } V$ 
3: while  $Q$  not empty do
4:    $i \leftarrow \text{pop } Q$ 
5:    $\{c\} \leftarrow \text{argmax}_c \sum_{j \in V} A_{ij} \delta(c_j, c)$ 
6:    $c \leftarrow \text{random}_c \{c\}$ 
7:   if  $c_i \neq c$  then
8:      $c_i \leftarrow c$ 
9:     for  $j \in N_i : c_j \neq c \wedge j \notin Q$  do
10:       $j \rightarrow \text{push } Q$ 
11:   end for
12: end if
13: end while
14: return  $C$ 

```

ALGORITHM 3. Fast label propagation algorithm (FLPA).

livejournal is an online social network of the LiveJournal members in 2006³¹, the twitter-sample is a sample of the Twitter follower network extracted in 2012³², and the bitcoin is a network of Bitcoin transactions from January 2009 to April 2013³³.

- ¹M. E. J. Newman and M. Girvan, “Finding and evaluating community structure in networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 026113 (2004).
- ²T. P. Peixoto, “Bayesian stochastic blockmodeling,” in *Advances in Network Clustering and Blockmodeling*, Computational and Quantitative Social Science, edited by P. Doreian, V. Batagelj, and A. Ferligoj (Wiley, New York, 2020) 1st ed., pp. 281–324.
- ³M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, “An information-theoretic framework for resolving community structure in complex networks,” *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 7327–7331 (2007).
- ⁴A. Clauset, M. E. J. Newman, and C. Moore, “Finding community structure in very large networks,” *Physical Review E* **70**, 066111 (2004).
- ⁵J. Reichardt and S. Bornholdt, “Statistical mechanics of community detection,” *Physical Review E* **74**, 016110 (2006).
- ⁶J. Duch and A. Arenas, “Community detection in complex networks using extremal optimization,” *Physical Review E* **72**, 027104 (2005).
- ⁷V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre, “Fast unfolding of communities in large networks,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **P10008** (2008).
- ⁸V. A. Traag, L. Waltman, and N. J. Van Eck, “From Louvain to Leiden: Guaranteeing well-connected communities,” *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 5233 (2019).
- ⁹V. A. Traag, P. Van Dooren, and Y. Nesterov, “Narrow scope for resolution-limit-free community detection,” *Physical Review E* **84**, 016114 (2011).
- ¹⁰U. N. Raghavan, R. Albert, and S. Kumara, “Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 036106 (2007).
- ¹¹L. Šubelj, “Label propagation for clustering,” in *Advances in Network Clustering and Blockmodeling*, Computational and Quantitative Social Science, edited by P. Doreian, V. Batagelj, and A. Ferligoj (Wiley, New York, 2020) 1st ed., pp. 121–150.
- ¹²G. Tibély and J. Kertész, “On the equivalence of the label propagation method of community detection and a potts model approach,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **387**, 4982–4984 (2008).
- ¹³S. E. Garza and S. E. Schaeffer, “Community detection with the label propagation algorithm: A survey,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **534**, 122058 (2019).

- ¹⁴F. Radicchi, C. Castellano, F. Cecconi, V. Loreto, and D. Parisi, “Defining and identifying communities in networks,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **101**, 2658–2663 (2004).
- ¹⁵M. J. Barber and J. W. Clark, “Detecting network communities by propagating labels under constraints,” *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 026129 (2009).
- ¹⁶I. X. Y. Leung, P. Hui, P. Liò, and J. Crowcroft, “Towards real-time community detection in large networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 066107 (2009).
- ¹⁷L. Šubelj and M. Bajec, “Unfolding communities in large complex networks: Combining defensive and offensive label propagation for core extraction,” *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 036103 (2011).
- ¹⁸J. Xie and B. K. Szymanski, “Community detection using a neighborhood strength driven label propagation algorithm,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Workshop on Network Science* (West Point, NY, USA, 2011) pp. 188–195.
- ¹⁹M. Tasgin and H. O. Bingol, “Community detection using boundary nodes in complex networks,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **513**, 315–324 (2019).
- ²⁰M. E. J. Newman, *Networks*, 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2018).
- ²¹M. Meilă, “Comparing clusterings: An information based distance,” *J. Multivar. Anal.* **98**, 873–895 (2007).
- ²²R. Guimerà, M. Sales-Pardo, and L. Amaral, “Modularity from fluctuations in random graphs and complex networks,” *Physical Review E* **70**, 025101 (2004).
- ²³S. Fortunato and M. Barthélemy, “Resolution limit in community detection,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **104**, 36 (2007).
- ²⁴P. Boldi, M. Rosa, M. Santini, and S. Vigna, “Layered label propagation: A multiresolution coordinate-free ordering for compressing social networks,” in *Proceedings of the International World Wide Web Conference* (Hyderabad, India, 2011) pp. 587–596.
- ²⁵L. Backstrom, P. Boldi, M. Rosa, J. Ugander, and S. Vigna, “Four degrees of separation,” in *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Web Science* (Evanston, IL, USA, 2012) pp. 45–54.
- ²⁶R. Lambiotte and M. Ausloos, “Coexistence of opposite opinions in a network with communities,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2007**, P08026 (2007).
- ²⁷J. Yang and J. Leskovec, “Defining and evaluating network communities based on ground-truth,” in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Workshop on Mining Data Semantics* (Beijing, China, 2012) pp. 1–8.
- ²⁸J. Leskovec, K. J. Lang, A. Dasgupta, and M. W. Mahoney, “Community structure in large networks: Natural cluster sizes and the absence of large well-defined clusters,” *Internet Math.* **6**, 29–123 (2009).
- ²⁹B. H. Hall, A. B. Jaffe, and M. Tratjenberg, “The NBER patent citation data file: Lessons, insights and methodological tools,” *Tech. Rep.* (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2001).
- ³⁰D. Yang, D. Zhang, L. Chen, and B. Qu, “Nationtelescope: Monitoring and visualizing large-scale collective behavior in LBSNs,” *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* **55**, 170–180 (2015).
- ³¹L. Backstrom, D. Huttenlocher, J. Kleinberg, and X. Lan, “Group formation in large social networks: Membership, growth, and evolution,” in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2006) p. 44–54.
- ³²D. Kagan, Y. Elovichi, and M. Fire, “Generic anomalous vertices detection utilizing a link prediction algorithm,” *Social Network Analysis and Mining* **8**, 27 (2018).
- ³³M. Fire and C. Guestrin, “The rise and fall of network stars: Analyzing 2.5 million graphs to reveal how high-degree vertices emerge over time,” *Information Processing & Management* **57**, 102041 (2020).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been supported in part by Slovenian Research Agency ARRS under the program P5-0168. We gratefully acknowledge use of the Shark cluster of the LUMC for computation time.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

V.T. conceived the experiments, V.T. and L.Š. designed the algorithms, V.T. and L.Š. analysed the results, V.T. wrote the manuscript. Both authors reviewed the manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The code generated during the current study is available in the `igraph` library, <https://github.com/vtraag/igraph/tree/flpa>. The datasets analysed during the current study are available in the Netzschleuder repository, <https://networks.skewed.de>.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.