Topics in Network Models

MSU, Sepember, 2012

Peter Bickel

Statistics Dept. UC Berkeley

(Joint work with S. Bhattacharyya UC Berkeley, A. Chen Google, D.

Choi UC Berkeley, E. Levina U. Mich and P. Sarkar UC Berkeley)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Outline

- 1 Networks: Examples, References
- 2 Some statistical questions
- 3 A nonparametric model for infinite networks.
- 4 Asymptotic theory for $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$, $\lambda_n = \text{Average degree}$.
- 5 Results of B. and Chen (2009) on block models.
- $\emph{6}$ Consequences for maximum likelihood and variational likelihood.

7 Count statistics, bootstrap and $\lambda_n = O(1)$.

I.Identifying Networks and II. Working With Given Ones

 I Given vectors of measurements X_i, for example, given gene expression sequence nearby binding site information, physical (epigenetic information), protein assays etc. Determine dependency/causal relation between genes.

Tools: Gaussian graphical models, clustering etc.

II Given a network of relations (edges) identify higher level structures, clusters, like pathways in genomics. In practice, both can be done simultaneously. Focus on the models for II, in the simplest case of unlabelled graphs.

Example: Social Network



Figure: Facebook Network for Caltech with 769 nodes and average degree 43.

Example: Bio Network



Figure: Transcription network of E. Coli with 423 nodes and average degree 2.45.

Example: Collaboration Network



Figure: Collaboration Network in Arxiv for High Energy Physics with 8638 nodes and average degree 5.743.

References on Networks

Books

- 1. (Phys/CS) M.E.J. Newman (2010) Networks: An introduction. Oxford
- 2. (Stat) Eric D. Kolaczyk (2009) Statistical Analysis of Network Data
- (Soc. Science/CS) David Easley and Jon Kleinberg (2010) Networks, crowds and markets: Reasoning about a highly connected world. Cambridge University Press
- (Soc. Science) K. Faust and S. Wasserman (1994) Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- (Prob/CS) Fan Chung, Linyuan Lu (2004) Complex graphs and networks. CBMS # 107 AMS

Papers

- (Prob/Math) Bela Bollobas, Svante Janson, Oliver Riordan (2007) The Phase Transition in Random Graphs. Random Structures and Algorithms, 31 (1) 3-122
- (Prob/Math) Oliviera RI (2010): Concentration of Adjacency Matrix and Graph Laplacian for Graphs with Independent Edges. Arxiv 0911.0600.
- (Stat) Celisse, Daudin and Pierre (2011): Consistency of ML in Block Models. Arxiv
- (Stat) Daudin, Picard and Robin (2008): A Mixture Model for Random Graphs. J. Stat. Comp.
- (Stat) Chaudhuri, K., Chung F., Tsiatis A. (2012). Spectral Clustering of Graphs with General Degrees in the Extended Planted Partition Model. JMLR.
- (Stat) Liben-Nowell, D., and Kleinberg, J., (2007). Link Prediction Problem for Social Networks. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology.

Our works

- B. and A. Chen (2009) A nonparametric view of network models and Newman-Girvan and other modularities, PNAS
- B., E. Levina and A. Chen (2011) Method of Moments Estimation For Networks, Ann. Stat.
- 3. B. and D. Choi (2012) , Arxiv.

Questions

Focus

(i) Community identification for block models (simple and degree-corrected).

Other

- (ii) Link Prediction: Predicting edges between nodes based on partially observed graph. (Liben-Nowell and Kleinberg (2007)), Zhao and Levina (2012).
- (iii) Model selection: Number of blocks.
- (iv) Testing stochastic identity of graphs (networks) using count statistics (motifs) (Wasserman and Faust (1994)).
- (v) Error bars on descriptive statistics, eg. homophily.
- (vi) Model incorporating edge identification errors.
- (vii) Directed graphs: graphs with additional edge and vertex information.

э

Erdős-Rényi and Block Models (Holland, Laskey and Leinhardt 1983)

- Graph on *n* vertices is **equivalent** to $A_{n \times n}$ adjacency matrix.
- Probability on S_n = {all n × n symmetric 0-1 matrices}. (For undirected graphs)
- **E-R:** $A_{ij} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} Ber(p)$.
- H-L-L: K "communities"
 - $c_a \equiv \mathbf{1}[\text{vertex } i \in a]$
 - $\mathbf{c} \sim \mathcal{M}(n, (\pi_1, ..., \pi_K))$
 - Given c, A_{ij} are independent and

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{ij}=1|c_i=a,c_j=b) = rac{w_{ab}}{\pi_a\pi_b}.$$

where, $\sum_{a,b} w_{ab} = 1$ and $w_{ab} = w_{ba}$.

Nonparametric Asymptotic Model for Unlabeled Graphs

Given: P on ∞ graphs

Aldous/Hoover (1983)

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathsf{A}_{ij}:i,j\geq 1) = \mathcal{L}(\mathsf{A}_{\pi_i,\pi_j}:i,j\geq 1),$$

for all permutations $\pi \iff$

$$\exists \quad g: [0,1]^4 o \{0,1\} ext{ such that } A_{ij} \ = \ g(lpha, \xi_i, \xi_j, \eta_{ij}),$$

where

 α, ξ_i, η_{ij} , all $i, j \ge i$, i.i.d. $\mathcal{U}(0, 1), g(\alpha, u, v, w) = g(\alpha, v, u, w),$ $\eta_{ij} = \eta_{ji}.$

Ergodic Models

 $\mathcal L$ is an ergodic probability iff for g with g(u, v, w) = g(v, u, w) $\forall (u, v, w)$,

$$A_{ij} = g(\xi_i, \xi_j, \eta_{ij}).$$

 ${\mathcal L}$ is determined by

$$h(u,v) \equiv \mathbb{P}(A_{ij}=1|\xi_i=u,\xi_j=v), \ h(u,v)=h(v,u).$$

Notes:

- Equivalent: Hoff, Raftery, Handcock (2002). JASA
- More general: Bollobas, Riordan, Janson (2007). Random Structures and Algorithms

"Parametrization" of NP Model

- *h* is not uniquely defined.
- $h(\varphi(u), \varphi(v))$, where φ is measure-preserving, gives same model.
- Property CAN holds If there exists h_{CAN} such that

$$au(z) \equiv \int_0^1 h_{CAN}(z,u) du = \mathbb{P}[A_{ij} = 1 | \xi_i = z]$$

٠	
	~
•	-

(a) monotonically non-decreasing and

- (b) If $F(\cdot)$ is CDF of $\tau(\xi)$, $w(F\tau(\xi_1), F\tau(\xi_2)) \sim w(\xi_1, \xi_2)$.
- If τ is strictly increasing, such an h_{CAN} always exists.
- ξ_i could be replaced by any continuous variables or vectors but there is no natural unique representation.

Asymptotic Approximation

• $h_n(u,v) = \rho_n w_n(u,v)$

• $\rho_n = \mathbb{P}[\mathsf{Edge}]$

• $w(u, v)dudv = \mathbb{P}[\xi_1 \in [u, u + du], \xi_2 \in [v, v + dv] | \mathsf{Edge}]$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

•
$$w_n(u, v) = \min \{w(u, v), \rho_n^{-1}\}$$

• Average Degree
$$= \frac{E(D_+)}{n} \equiv \lambda_n \equiv \rho_n(n-1).$$

•
$$\lambda_n$$
 ranges from $O(1)$ to $O(n)$.

Examples of models

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

(I) Block models:

$$h_{CAN}(u,v) \equiv F_{ab} \equiv \frac{w_{ab}}{\pi_a \pi_b} \text{ on } I_a \times I_b, \ |I_a| = \pi_a, \ a = 1, \dots, K.$$

Degree-Corrected: (Karrer and Newman (2010))

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{ij} = 1 | c_i = a, c_j = b, \theta_i, \theta_j) = \theta_i \theta_j F_{ab}$$

 θ_i is independent of **c**, $\mathbb{P}[\theta_i = \lambda_j] = \rho_j$, $\sum_{j=1}^J \rho_j 1$.

Parametric sub model of M = KJ block model.

Not to be considered

(II) Preferential Attachment: (De Solla-Price (1965))

(Asymptotic version, w not bounded)

$$w(u,v) = \frac{\tau(u)}{\int_u^1 \tau(s)ds} \mathbf{1}(u \le v) + \frac{\tau(v)}{\int_v^1 \tau(s)ds} \mathbf{1}(v \le u)$$

$$\tau(u) = \int_0^1 h(u, v) dv$$

Dynamically defined, $\tau(u) \sim (1-u)^{-1/2}$ is equivalent to power law of degree distribution $F \equiv \tau^{-1}$.

Two Questions

(I) (a) Estimate π, λ, ρ, F.
(b) Classify vertex i by its community.
(II) Given i, j construct ŵ(ξ_i, ξ_j) (ŵ is an estimate of w) to predict whether A_{jj} = 1.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

3 Regimes

(a) If
$$\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$$
, equivalent to,
 $\mathbb{P}[\text{there exists an isolated point}] \to 0.$

(b) If $\lambda_n \to \infty$, full identifiability of w.

(c) If $\lambda_n = O(1)$, phase boundaries and partial identifiability of w.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Block Models: Community Identification and Maximize Modularities

- Newman-Girvan modularity (Phys. Rev. E, 2004) $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, \cdots, e_n)$: $e_i \in \{1, \cdots, K\}$ (community labels)
- The modularity function:

$$Q_N(\mathbf{e}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\frac{O_{kk}(\mathbf{e},A)}{D_+} - \left(\frac{D_k(\mathbf{e})}{D_+} \right)^2 \right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} O_{ab}(\mathbf{e}, A) &= \sum_{i,j} A_{ij} \mathbf{1}(e_i = a, e_j = b) \\ &= (\# \text{ of edges between } a \text{ and } b) \quad a \neq b \\ &= 2 \times (\# \text{ of edges between members of } a), \quad a = b \\ D_k(\mathbf{e}) &= \sum_{l=1}^K O_{kl}(\mathbf{e}, A) \\ &= \text{ sum of degrees of nodes in } k \\ D_+ &= \sum_{k=1}^K D_k(\mathbf{e}) = 2 \times (\# \text{ of edges between all nodes }) \end{aligned}$$



- Given **e** estimate parameters and plug into block model likelihood.
- Always consistent for classification and efficient estimation.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Global Consistency

Theorem 1

If population version of F is "consistent" and $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$, then $\limsup_n \lambda_n^{-1} \log \mathbb{P} \left[\hat{\mathbf{c}} \neq \mathbf{c} \right] \le -s_Q$, with $s_Q > 0$.

Extension to $F_n \approx F$ requires simple condition. See also Snijders and Nowicki (1997) J. of Classification.

Basic Approach to Proof

General Modularity: Data and population

• Given Q_n : $K \times K$ positive matrices $\times K$ simplex $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$.

•
$$Q_n(\mathbf{e}, A) = F_n\left(\frac{O(\mathbf{e}, A)}{\mu_n}, \frac{D_+}{\mu_n}, f(\mathbf{e})\right).$$

 $O(\mathbf{e}, A) \equiv ||o_{ab}(\mathbf{e})||, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{e}) \equiv (f_1(\mathbf{e}), \dots, f_K(\mathbf{e}))^T, f_j(\mathbf{e}) \equiv \frac{n_j}{n}.$
 $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \equiv \arg \max Q_n(\mathbf{e}, A).$
 $\mu_n = E(D_+) = (n-1)\lambda_n.$

• NG: $F_n \equiv F$.

 Population: Replace random vectors by expectations under block model

Corollary

Under the given conditions if

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{a} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}(\hat{c}_{i} = a) \equiv \frac{\hat{n}_{a}}{n}, \\ \hat{W} &= \frac{O(\hat{c}, A)}{D_{+}}, \end{aligned}$$

then if $S = \Delta^{-1} W \Delta^{-1}$, where, $\Delta = \text{Diag}(\pi)$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\pi} - \pi) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \pi^D - \pi\pi^T),$$
$$\sqrt{n\lambda_n}(\hat{S} - S) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma(\pi, W))$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

These are efficient.

Maximum Likelihood, Variational Likelihood for Block Models

(B. and Choi (2012) Arxiv, Celisse et. al. (2011) Arxiv)

Complete data likelihood for block data

$$f(\mathbf{z}, A, \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \pi_{z_i} \prod_{i \le j} \left(\rho S_{z_i z_j} \right)^{A_{ij}} \left(1 - \rho S_{z_i z_j} \right)^{1 - A_{ij}}$$

$$\mathbb{P}[z_i = a] = \pi_a$$
 and z_1, \ldots, z_n i.i.d.

Graph likelihood ratio

$$\frac{g}{g_0}(A,\theta) = \mathbb{E}_0\left(\frac{f}{f_0}(\mathbf{z},A,\theta) \mid A\right)$$

where, $f_0 \equiv f(\mathbf{z}, A, \theta_0)$, $g_0 \equiv g(A, \theta_0)$ and $\theta \equiv (\rho, \pi, S)^T$. < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Variational Likelihood (Daudin et. al. (2009))

Define,

$$q(\mathbf{z},\tau)\equiv\prod_{i=1}^n\tau_i(z_i)$$

$$f_{V\!AR}(\mathsf{z}, A, heta) = q(\mathsf{z}, au(A, heta), heta)g(A, heta)$$

$$au(A, heta) = rg\min_{ au} D\left(q(\mathbf{z}, au) \mid f(\mathbf{z}|A, heta)
ight)$$

where, $D(f_1|f_2) = \int \left(\log \frac{f_1}{f_2}\right) f_1 d\mu$.

Notation:

- $\hat{\hat{ heta}}$: Complete Data likelihood estimator,
- $\hat{\theta}$: Graph Likelihood estimator,
- $\hat{\theta}_{VAR}$: Variational Likelihood estimator.

Theorem

Theorem (B. and Choi)

If $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$, there exists E such that $\sup_{\theta} \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(\bar{E}|A) \xrightarrow{P_0} 0$ such that (a)

$$rac{g}{g_0}(A, heta)\mathbf{1}_E(\mathsf{z},A) = rac{f}{f_0}(\mathsf{z},A)(1+o_\mathbb{P}(1))\mathbf{1}_E(\mathsf{z},A)$$

(b) The same holds for f_{VAR}/f_{0,VAR}
(c) f_{VAR} can be used for consistent classification.

Consequence of Theorem

Hence,

- $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\pi} \hat{\pi}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$
- $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\pi} \hat{\pi}_{VAR}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$
- $\sqrt{n\lambda_n}(\hat{\hat{S}}-\hat{S})=o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$
- $\sqrt{n\lambda_n}(\hat{\hat{S}}-\hat{S}_{VAR})=o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$
- $\sqrt{n\lambda_n}(\frac{\hat{\rho}}{\rho}-1)=O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$

•
$$\hat{\rho} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} D_i, \ D_i = \sum_j A_{ij}$$

Concentration Results and Consequences in Regimes (a) and (b)

Theorem (B., Levina and Chen (2012)), (Channarond, Daudin, Robin (2012))

(i) If
$$\lambda_n \to \infty$$

 $\left| \frac{D_i}{\overline{D}} - \tau(\xi_i) \right| = O_P(\lambda^{-1/2})$
(ii) If $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$
 $\max_i \left| \frac{D_i}{\overline{D}} - \tau(\xi_i) \right| = o_P(1)$

Statistical Consequences of (ii)

(Channarond, Daudin, Robin (2011, Arxiv))

- Let us suppose that the block model has the Property CAN with parameters, (π, W, ρ) , where, $W_{ab} = \mathbb{P}[i \in a, j \in b | ij \text{ is an Edge}]$.
- Algorithm: Apply k-means to $\left\{\frac{D_i}{D}\right\} \ 1 \le i \le n$.
- If $\lambda_n \to \infty$ and $\hat{C}_1, \dots, \hat{C}_k$ are the resulting clusters and $\hat{\pi}_j \equiv \frac{|\hat{C}_j|}{n}$. (i) $\hat{\pi}_j \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \pi_j$, for $j = 1, \dots, k$. (ii) $\frac{\bar{D}}{\lambda_n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1$ (iii) $\hat{W}_{ab} \equiv \frac{2\{\# \text{ of edges between } \hat{C}_a \text{ and } \hat{C}_b\}}{n\lambda_n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} W_{ab}$
- The algorithm does not perform well compared to spectral methods.

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Other methods which work well for block models under regime (a)

- 1. Spectral Clustering: Rohe et. al.(2011), McSherry (1993), Dasgupta, Hopcroft and McSherry (2004), Chaudhuri, Chung and Tsiatis (2012) develop methods which classify perfectly for $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$ (CCT (2012).
- Pseudo-likelihood (with a good starting point). (Chen, Arash Amini, Levina and B (2012))
- Methods based on empirical distribution of geodesic distances. (Bhattacharyya and B (2012))

Count statistics

- Another approach works broadly even for $\lambda_n = O(1)$ regime.
- **Count statistics** are normalized subgraph counts and smooth functions of them.
- The subgraph count, T(R), for subgraph corresponding to edge set R is -

$$T(R) = \sum_{S \text{ subgraph of } G} \mathbf{1}(S \sim (V_R, R)) / C(R, n)$$

where, $C(R, n) \equiv \#$ of all possible subgraphs of type R of G_n .

• Example:

(a) Total number of triangles in a graph is an example of count statistic.
 (b) Homophily := # of Δ's # of V's is an example of smooth function of count statistics.

$O(1) \leq \lambda_n \leq O(n)$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Note that,

•
$$\rho_n \rightarrow 0, T(R) \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

But,

• If
$$|R| = p$$
, $\frac{\mathbb{E}(T(R))}{\hat{\rho}^p}$ stabilizes.

Theorem on Moment Estimate

Theorem 1

I. In dense case, if p, R are fixed

$$\sqrt{n}(T(R) - \mathbb{E}(T(R))) \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(R, P))$$

II. In general non-dense case conclusion of *I*. applies to $\frac{I(R)}{\hat{\rho}^p}$ where |R| = p and $\hat{\rho} \equiv \frac{\bar{D}}{n}$, if *R* is acyclic. Else result depends on λ_n .

The $\lambda_n = O(1)$ Regime

• Major difficulty: For $\rho = \frac{\lambda_n}{n}$,

 $\mathbb{E}[\# \text{ of isolated points}] \sim ne^{-\lambda_n}.$

We expect isolated points to correspond to special ranges of ξ.
 Example: For block models, π_a small and W_{ab} small for all b.

Theorem (Decelle et. al. (2011)), (Mossel, Neeman and Sly (2012))

For particular ranges of (π, W, λ_n) block models can not be distinguished from Erdos-Renyi models. This includes but is not limited to $\lambda_n \leq 1$.

Consequence (Bickel, Chen and Levina (2011))

For all λ_n regimes, block models with fixed K if $\mathbf{1}, Q\mathbf{1}, \dots, Q^{k-1}\mathbf{1}$ are linearly independent with $Q_{ij} \equiv \frac{W_{ij}}{\pi_i}$,

- π is estimable at rate $n^{-1/2}$.
- S is estimable at rate $(n\lambda_n)^{-1/2}$
- $\bar{D} = \lambda_n (1 + O_{\mathbb{P}}((n\lambda_n)^{-1/2}))$

(all $\lambda_n > 0$).

Identifiability

The independence condition implies

- 1. 1 is not an eigenvector of W.
- 2. Block models with $\pi_1 = \cdots = \pi_K$ are not identifiable by acyclic count statistics.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

A Computational Issue

- Computing T(R) for R complex and $\sigma^2(T, R)$ is non-trivial.
- Possible methods: Estimates counts using
 - (a) Naive Monte Carlo (Sets of m out of n vertices).
 - (b) Weighted sampling of edges (Kashtan et. al. (2004)).
 - (c) Combination of above two methods (Bhattacharyya and B (2012)).

Discussion

- Count statistics computation needs "bootstrap". (S. Bhattacharyya (2012))
- Simulations and real data applications available but much needed.
- Block models: In theory
 - $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$ and τ satisfying Property CAN are well-understood. $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \to \infty$ is same as if the class memberships are known. Fast algorithms being developed in this regime.
 - $\lambda_n \to \infty$ but $\frac{\lambda_n}{\log n} \not\to \infty$ consistent but not \sqrt{n} -consistent estimation possible
 - $\lambda_n = O(1)$ very subtle.
- Many statistical extensions needed: covariates, dynamics etc.
- If λ_n → ∞ should be able to formulate minimax result for estimation of w(ξ₁, ξ₂) or more generally w(z₁, z₂) for "sparse" situations under smoothness conditions on w(·, ·).