

MODEL-BASED CLUSTERING OF LARGE NETWORKS

BY DUY QUANG VU AND DAVID R. HUNTER AND MICHAEL SCHWEINBERGER

We describe a network clustering framework, based on finite mixture models, that can be applied to discrete-valued networks with hundreds of thousands of nodes and billions of edge variables. Relative to other recent model-based clustering work for networks, we introduce a more flexible modeling framework, improve the variational-approximation estimation algorithm, discuss and implement standard error estimation via a parametric bootstrap approach, and apply these methods to much larger datasets than those seen elsewhere in the literature. The more flexible modeling framework is achieved through introducing novel parameterizations of the model, giving varying degrees of parsimony, using exponential family models whose structure may be exploited in various theoretical and algorithmic ways. The algorithms, which we show how to adapt to the more complicated optimization requirements introduced by the constraints imposed by the novel parameterizations we propose, are based on variational generalized EM algorithms, where the E-steps are augmented by a minorization-maximization (MM) idea. The bootstrapped standard error estimates are based on an efficient Monte Carlo network simulation idea. Last, we demonstrate the usefulness of the model-based clustering framework by applying it to a discrete-valued network with more than 131,000 nodes and 17 billion edge variables.

1. Introduction. According to [Fisher \(1922, p. 311\)](#), “the object of statistical methods is the reduction of data.” The reduction of data is imperative in the case of discrete-valued networks that may have hundreds of thousands of nodes and billions of edge variables. The collection of such large networks is becoming more and more common, thanks to electronic devices such as cameras and computers. Of special interest is the identification of influential subsets of nodes and high-density regions of the network with an eye to break down the large network into smaller, more manageable components. These smaller, more manageable components may be studied by more advanced statistical models, such as advanced exponential family models (e.g., [Frank and Strauss, 1986](#); [Strauss and Ikeda, 1990](#); [Wasserman and Pattison, 1996](#); [Snijders et al., 2006](#); [Hunter and Handcock, 2006](#)).

An example is given by signed networks, such as trust networks, which arise in World Wide Web applications. Users of internet-based exchange networks are invited to classify other users as either -1 (untrustworthy) or $+1$ (trustworthy). Trust networks can be used to protect users and enhance collaboration among users ([Kunegis et al., 2009](#); [Massa and Avesani, 2007a](#)). A second example is the spread of infectious disease through populations by way of contacts among individuals ([Britton and O’Neill, 2002](#); [Groendyke et al., 2011](#)). In such applications, it may be of interest to identify potential super-spreaders—i.e., individuals who are in contact with many other individuals and who could therefore spread the disease to many others—and dense regions of the network through which disease could spread rapidly.

The current article advances the model-based clustering of large networks in at least four ways.

Keywords and phrases: social networks, stochastic block models, finite mixture models, EM algorithms, generalized EM algorithms, variational EM algorithms, MM algorithms

First, we introduce a simple and flexible statistical framework for parameterizing models based on statistical exponential families (e.g., [Barndorff-Nielsen, 1978](#)) that advances existing model-based clustering techniques. Model-based clustering of networks was pioneered by [Snijders and Nowicki \(1997\)](#). The simple, unconstrained parameterizations employed by [Snijders and Nowicki \(1997\)](#) and others (e.g., [Nowicki and Snijders, 2001](#); [Airoldi et al., 2008](#); [Daudin et al., 2008](#); [Zanghi et al., 2010](#); [Mariadassou et al., 2010](#)) make sense when networks are small, undirected, and binary, and when there are no covariates. In general, though, such parameterizations may be unappealing from both a scientific point of view and a statistical point of view, as they may result in non-parsimonious models with hundreds or thousands of parameters. An important advantage of the statistical framework we introduce here is that it gives researchers a choice: They can choose interesting features of the data, specify a model capturing those features, and cluster nodes based on the specified model. The resulting models are therefore both parsimonious and scientifically interesting.

Second, we introduce approximate maximum likelihood estimates of parameters based on novel variational generalized EM (GEM) algorithms, which take advantage of minorization-maximization (MM) algorithms ([Hunter and Lange, 2004](#)) and have computational advantages. In the presence of parameter constraints, we facilitate computations by exploiting the properties of exponential families (e.g., [Barndorff-Nielsen, 1978](#)). In applications to sparse networks, the running time of the variational GEM algorithm is $O(n)$, whereas conventional variational EM algorithms (e.g., [Airoldi et al., 2008](#); [Daudin et al., 2008](#); [Zanghi et al., 2010](#); [Mariadassou et al., 2010](#)) have running time $O(n^2)$. In addition, we sketch how the variational GEM algorithm can be extended to obtain approximate Bayesian estimates.

Third, we introduce bootstrap standard errors to quantify the uncertainty about the approximate maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters, whereas other work has ignored the uncertainty about the approximate maximum likelihood estimates. To facilitate these bootstrap procedures, we introduce Monte Carlo simulation algorithms that generate sparse networks in much less time than conventional Monte Carlo simulation algorithms. In fact, without the more efficient Monte Carlo simulation algorithms, obtaining bootstrap standard errors would be infeasible.

Finally, while model-based clustering has been limited to fewer than 13,000 nodes and 85 million edge variables (see the largest data set handled to date, [Zanghi et al., 2010](#)), we demonstrate that we can handle directed, non-binary networks with more than 131,000 nodes and 17 billion edge variables.

The paper is structured as follows: Model-based clustering based on finite mixture models is introduced in Section 2. Approximate maximum likelihood and Bayesian estimation are discussed in Sections 3 and 4, respectively, and an algorithm for Monte Carlo simulation of large networks is described in Section 5. The application to the discrete-valued network with more than 131,000 nodes and 17 billion edges variables is presented in Section 6.

2. Models for large, discrete-valued networks. We consider n nodes, indexed by integers $1, \dots, n$, and edges y_{ij} between pairs of nodes i and j , where y_{ij} can take values in a finite set of M elements. By convention, $y_{ii} = 0$ for all i , where 0 signifies “no relationship.” We consider the set of all edges y_{ij} to be a discrete-valued network, which we denote by $\mathbf{y}$, and we let $\mathcal{Y}$ denote the set of possible values of $\mathbf{y}$. Special cases of interest are (a) undirected binary networks $\mathbf{y}$, where $y_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ is subject to the linear constraint $y_{ij} = y_{ji}$ for all $i < j$; (b) directed binary networks $\mathbf{y}$, where $y_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all i, j ; and (c) directed signed networks $\mathbf{y}$, where $y_{ij} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ for all i, j .

A general approach to modeling discrete-valued networks is based on exponential families of

distributions (Besag, 1974; Frank and Strauss, 1986):

$$(2.1) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \exp[\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the vector of canonical parameters and $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the vector of canonical statistics depending on a matrix $\mathbf{x}$ of covariates, measured on the nodes or the pairs of nodes, and the network $\mathbf{y}$, and $\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is given by

$$(2.2) \quad \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log \sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp[\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')], \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

and ensures that $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ sums to 1.

A number of exponential family models have been proposed (e.g., Holland and Leinhardt, 1981; Frank and Strauss, 1986; Wasserman and Pattison, 1996; Snijders et al., 2006; Hunter and Handcock, 2006). In general, though, exponential family models are not scalable: the computing time to evaluate the likelihood function is $\exp(N \log M)$, where $N = n(n-1)/2$ in the case of undirected edges and $N = n(n-1)$ in the case of directed edges, which necessitates time-consuming estimation algorithms (e.g., Snijders, 2002; Hunter and Handcock, 2006; Møller et al., 2006; Koskinen et al., 2010; Caimo and Friel, 2011).

We therefore restrict attention to scalable exponential family models, which are characterized by dyadic independence:

$$(2.3) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i < j}^n P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d_{ij} | \mathbf{x}),$$

where $D_{ij} \equiv D_{ij}(\mathbf{Y})$ corresponds to Y_{ij} in the case of undirected edges and (Y_{ij}, Y_{ji}) in the case of directed edges.

Dyadic independence has at least three advantages: (a) it facilitates estimation, because the computing time to evaluate the likelihood function scales linearly with N ; (b) it facilitates simulation, because dyads are independent; and (c) by design it bypasses the so-called model degeneracy problem: if N is large, some exponential family models without dyadic independence tend to be ill-defined and impractical for modeling networks (Strauss, 1986; Handcock, 2003; Schweinberger, 2011).

A disadvantage is that most exponential families with dyadic independence are either simplistic (e.g., models with identically distributed edges, Erdős and Rényi, 1959; Gilbert, 1959) or non-parsimonious (e.g., the p_1 model with $O(n)$ parameters, Holland and Leinhardt, 1981).

We therefore assume that the probability mass function has a K -component mixture form as follows:

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} P_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) P_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \prod_{i < j}^n P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d_{ij} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) P_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Z}$ denotes the membership indicators $\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n$ with distributions

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbf{Z}_i | \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Multinomial}(1; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K)$$

and $\mathcal{Z}$ denotes the support of $\mathbf{Z}$. In some applications, it may be desired to model the membership indicators $\mathbf{Z}_i$ as functions of $\mathbf{x}$ by using multinomial logit or probit models with $\mathbf{Z}_i$ as the outcome variables and $\mathbf{x}$ as predictors (e.g., [Tallberg, 2005](#)). We do not elaborate on such models here, but the variational GEM algorithms discussed in Sections 3 and 4 could be adapted to such models.

Mixture models represent a reasonable compromise between model parsimony, model complexity, and computational complexity. In particular, the assumption of conditional dyadic independence does *not* imply marginal dyadic independence, which means that the mixture model of Equation (2.4) captures some degree of dependence among the dyads. We give two specific examples of mixture models below.

Example 1. The p_1 model of [Holland and Leinhardt \(1981\)](#) for directed, binary-valued networks may be modified using a mixture model. The original p_1 models the sequence of in-degrees (number of incoming edges of nodes) and out-degrees (number of outgoing edges of nodes) as well as reciprocated edges, postulating that the dyads are independent and that the dyadic probabilities are of the form

$$(2.6) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d_{ij}) = \exp [(\alpha_i + \beta_j) y_{ij} + (\alpha_j + \beta_i) y_{ji} + \rho y_{ij} y_{ji} - \psi_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})],$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \rho)$ and $\exp\{-\psi_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}$ is a normalizing constant. A drawback of this model is that it requires $2n + 1$ parameters. Here, we show how to extend it to a mixture model that is applicable to both directed and undirected networks as well as discrete-valued networks, that is much more parsimonious, and that allows identification of influential nodes who dominate the network.

Observe that the dyadic probabilities of Equation (2.6) are of the form

$$(2.7) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d_{ij}) \propto \exp[\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1(d_{ij}) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2i}^\top \mathbf{g}_2(d_{ij}) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2j}^\top \mathbf{g}_2(d_{ij})].$$

A mixture model modification of the p_1 model postulates that conditional on $\mathbf{Z}$, the dyadic probabilities are independent and of the form

$$(2.8) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d_{ij} \mid Z_{ik} = Z_{jl} = 1) \propto \exp[\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1(d_{ij}) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2k}^\top \mathbf{g}_2(d_{ij}) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2l}^\top \mathbf{g}_2(d_{ij})],$$

where the parameter vectors $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{2k}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{2l}$ depend on the components k and l to which the nodes i and j belong, respectively. The mixture model version of the p_1 model is therefore much more parsimonious provided $K \ll n$ and was proposed by [Schweinberger et al. \(2011\)](#) in the case of undirected, binary-valued networks. Here, the probabilities of Equations (2.7) and (2.8) are applicable to both undirected and directed networks as well as discrete-valued networks, because the functions $\mathbf{g}_1$ and $\mathbf{g}_2$ may be customized to fit the situation and may even depend on covariates $\mathbf{x}$, though we have suppressed this possibility in the notation. Finally, the mixture model version of the p_1 model admits model-based clustering of nodes based on indegrees or outdegrees or both. A small number of nodes with high indegree or outdegree or both is considered to be influential: If the corresponding nodes were to be removed, the network structure would be impacted.

Example 2. The mixture model of [Nowicki and Snijders \(2001\)](#) assumes that, conditional on $\mathbf{Z}$, the dyads are independent and the conditional dyadic probabilities are of the form

$$(2.9) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(D_{ij} = d \mid Z_{ik} = Z_{jl} = 1) = \pi_{d;kl}.$$

In other words, conditional on $\mathbf{Z}$, the dyad probabilities are constant across dyads and do not depend on covariates. It is straightforward to add covariates by writing the conditional dyad probabilities in canonical form:

$$(2.10) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d_{ij} \mid \mathbf{x}, Z_{ik} = Z_{jl} = 1) \propto \exp [\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^\top \mathbf{g}_1(\mathbf{x}, d_{ij}) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{kl}^\top \mathbf{g}_2(\mathbf{x}, d_{ij})],$$

where the canonical statistic vectors $\mathbf{g}_1(\mathbf{x}, d_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{g}_2(\mathbf{x}, d_{ij})$ may depend on the covariates $\mathbf{x}$. If the canonical parameter vectors $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{kl}$ are constrained by the linear constraints $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{kl} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_l$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_l$ are parameter vectors of the same dimension as $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{kl}$, then the mixture model version of the p_1 model arises. In other words, the mixture model version of the p_1 model can be viewed as a constrained version of the [Nowicki and Snijders \(2001\)](#) model. While the constrained version can be used to cluster nodes based on degree, the unconstrained version can be used to identify, for instance, high-density regions of the network, corresponding to subsets of nodes with large numbers of within-subset edges. These regions may then be studied individually in more detail by using more advanced statistical models such as exponential family models without dyadic independence as proposed by, for example, [Holland and Leinhardt \(1981\)](#), [Frank and Strauss \(1986\)](#), [Strauss and Ikeda \(1990\)](#), [Wasserman and Pattison \(1996\)](#), [Snijders et al. \(2006\)](#), or [Hunter and Handcock \(2006\)](#).

Other examples. Other mixture models for networks have been proposed by [Tallberg \(2005\)](#), [Handcock et al. \(2007\)](#), and [Airoldi et al. \(2008\)](#). However, these models scale less well to large networks, so we confine attention here to Examples 1 and 2.

3. Approximate maximum likelihood estimation. A standard approach to maximum likelihood estimation of finite mixture models is based on the classical EM algorithm, taking the complete data to be $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$, where $\mathbf{Z}$ is unobserved ([Dempster et al., 1977](#)). However, the E-step of an EM algorithm requires the computation of the conditional expectation of the complete data log likelihood function under the distribution of $\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{Y}$, which is intractable even in the simplest possible cases ([Daudin et al., 2008](#)).

As an alternative, we consider so-called variational EM algorithms, which can be considered to be generalizations of EM algorithms. The basic idea of variational EM algorithms is to construct a tractable lower bound on the intractable log likelihood function and maximize the tractable lower bound, which gives rise to approximate maximum likelihood estimates. In recent work, [Celisse et al. \(2011\)](#) have shown that approximate maximum likelihood estimators along these lines are—at least in the absence of parameter constraints—consistent estimators.

We assume that all modeling of $\mathbf{Y}$ can be conditional on covariates $\mathbf{x}$ and define

$$\pi_{d;ij,kl,\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d \mid Z_{ik} = Z_{jl} = 1, \mathbf{x}).$$

However, for ease of presentation, we drop the notational dependence of $\pi_{d;ij,kl,\mathbf{x}}$ on $i, j, \mathbf{x}$ and make the homogeneity assumption

$$(3.1) \quad \pi_{d;ij,kl,\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_{d;kl}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \text{ for all } i, j, \mathbf{x},$$

which is satisfied by the models in Examples 1 and 2. Exponential parameterizations of $\pi_{d;kl}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, as in Equations (2.6) and (2.10), may or may not be convenient. An attractive property of the variational EM algorithm proposed here is that it can handle all possible parameterizations of $\pi_{d;kl}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In some cases (e.g., Example 1), exponential parameterizations are more advantageous than others, while in other cases (e.g., Example 2), the reverse holds.

3.1. *Variational EM algorithm.* Let $A(\mathbf{z}) \equiv P(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})$ be an auxiliary distribution with support $\mathcal{Z}$. Using Jensen's inequality, the log likelihood function can be bounded below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) &= \log \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})}{A(\mathbf{z})} A(\mathbf{z}) \\
 (3.2) \quad &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[\log \frac{P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})}{A(\mathbf{z})} \right] A(\mathbf{z}) \\
 &= E_A[\log P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})] - E_A[\log A(\mathbf{Z})].
 \end{aligned}$$

Some choices of $A(\mathbf{z})$ give rise to better lower bounds than others. To see which choice gives rise to the best lower bound, observe that the difference between the log likelihood function and the lower bound is equal to the Kullback-Leibler divergence from $A(\mathbf{z})$ to $P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\log P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) - \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[\log \frac{P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})}{A(\mathbf{z})} \right] A(\mathbf{z}) \\
 (3.3) \quad &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} [\log P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})] A(\mathbf{z}) - \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[\log \frac{P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})}{A(\mathbf{z})} \right] A(\mathbf{z}) \\
 &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[\log \frac{A(\mathbf{z})}{P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})} \right] A(\mathbf{z}).
 \end{aligned}$$

If the choice of $A(\mathbf{z})$ were unconstrained in the sense that we could choose from the set of all distributions with support $\mathcal{Z}$, then the best lower bound is obtained by the choice $A(\mathbf{z}) = P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$, which reduces the Kullback-Leibler divergence to 0 and makes the lower bound tight. If the optimal choice is intractable, as is the case here, then it is convenient to constrain the choice to a subset of tractable choices and substitute a choice which, within the subset of tractable choices, is as close as possible to the optimal choice in terms of Kullback-Leibler divergence. A natural subset of tractable choices is given by introducing the auxiliary parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and setting

$$(3.4) \quad A(\mathbf{z}) = P_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{\alpha_i}(\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{z}_i),$$

where the marginal auxiliary distributions $P_{\alpha_i}(\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{z}_i)$ are Multinomial($1; \alpha_{i1}, \dots, \alpha_{iK}$). In this case, the lower bound may be written

$$\begin{aligned}
 LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) &= E_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}[\log P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})] - E_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}[\log P_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{Z})] \\
 (3.5) \quad &= \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl} \log \pi_{d_{ij}; kl}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{ik} (\log \gamma_k - \log \alpha_{ik}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Because Equation (3.4) assumes independence, the Kullback-Leibler divergence between $P_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})$ and $P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$, and thus the tightness of the lower bound, is determined by the dependence of the random variables $\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n$ conditional on $\mathbf{Y}$. If the random variables $\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n$ are independent conditional on $\mathbf{Y}$, then, for each i , there exists α_i such that $P_{\alpha_i}(\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{z}_i) = P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{z}_i | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$, which reduces the Kullback-Leibler divergence to 0 and makes the lower

bound tight. In general, the random variables $\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n$ are not independent conditional on $\mathbf{Y}$ and the Kullback-Leibler divergence (3.3) is thus positive.

Approximate maximum likelihood estimates of γ and θ can be obtained by maximizing the lower bound in (3.2) using variational EM algorithms of the following form, where t is the iteration number:

E-STEP: Letting $\gamma^{(t)}$ and $\theta^{(t)}$ denote the current values of γ and θ , maximize $LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha)$ with respect to α . Let $\alpha^{(t+1)} = \alpha^{(t+1)}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)})$ denote the optimal value of α and compute $E_{\alpha^{(t+1)}}[\log P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})]$.
M-STEP: Maximize $E_{\alpha^{(t+1)}}[\log P_{\gamma, \theta}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})]$ with respect to γ and θ , which is equivalent to maximizing $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha^{(t+1)})$ with respect to γ and θ .

The method ensures that the lower bound is non-decreasing in the iteration number:

$$\begin{aligned} (3.6) \quad LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha^{(t)}) &\leq LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha^{(t+1)}) \\ (3.7) \quad &\leq LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t+1)}, \theta^{(t+1)}; \alpha^{(t+1)}), \end{aligned}$$

where inequalities (3.6) and (3.7) follow from the E-step and M-step, respectively.

It is instructive to compare the variational EM algorithm to the classical EM algorithm as applied to finite mixture models. The E-step of the variational EM algorithm minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence between $A(\mathbf{z})$ and $P_{\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$. If the choice of $A(\mathbf{z})$ were unconstrained, then the optimal choice would be $A(\mathbf{z}) = P_{\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}}(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$. Therefore, in the unconstrained case, the E-step of the variational EM algorithm reduces to the E-step of the classical EM algorithm, so the classical EM algorithm can be considered to be the optimal variational EM algorithm.

3.1.1. Generalized E-step: An MM algorithm. To implement the E-step, we exploit the fact that the lower bound is non-decreasing as long as the E-step and M-step increase the lower bound. In other words, we do not need to maximize the lower bound in the E-step and M-step. Indeed, increasing rather than maximizing the lower bound in the E-step and M-step may have computational advantages when n is large. A variational EM algorithm that increases rather than maximizes the lower bound resembles a generalized EM (Dempster et al., 1977) and may therefore be called a variational generalized EM, or variational GEM, algorithm.

Direct maximization of $LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha)$ is computationally unattractive: Equation (3.5) shows that the lower bound depends on the products $\alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl}$ and therefore fixed-point updates of α_{ik} along the lines of Daudin et al. (2008) would depend on all other α_{jl} . Although we did not undertake a comprehensive comparison of algorithms using full maximization at each E-step via the fixed-point updates with our variational GEM idea, anecdotal evidence suggests that for smaller networks (with a few thousand nodes), the fixed-point approach works well, often faster in terms of total computing time than GEM. However, for large networks such as the ePinions dataset of Section 6, the advantage appears to go to GEM, with the fixed-point method failing to finish in the eight-day window allotted on the computing cluster we used and using the algorithmic settings we used, with a maximum of 100 fixed-point iterations for every E-step.

To separate the parameters of the maximization problem, we increase $LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha)$ via an

MM algorithm (Hunter and Lange, 2004) by introducing the surrogate function

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.8) \quad Q_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha^{(t)}, \alpha) &= \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \left(\alpha_{ik}^2 \frac{\alpha_{jl}^{(t)}}{2\alpha_{ik}^{(t)}} + \alpha_{jl}^2 \frac{\alpha_{ik}^{(t)}}{2\alpha_{jl}^{(t)}} \right) \log \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta^{(t)}) \\
 &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{ik} \left(\log \gamma_k^{(t)} - \log \alpha_{ik}^{(t)} - \frac{\alpha_{ik}}{\alpha_{ik}^{(t)}} + 1 \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

which we show in Appendix A to have the following two properties:

$$(3.9) \quad Q_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}, \alpha^{(t)}; \alpha) \leq LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha) \quad \text{for all } \alpha,$$

$$(3.10) \quad Q_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}, \alpha^{(t)}; \alpha^{(t)}) = LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha^{(t)}).$$

In the language of MM algorithms, conditions (3.9) and (3.10) establish that $Q_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}, \alpha^{(t)}; \alpha)$ is a *minorizer* of $LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha)$ at $\alpha^{(t)}$. The theory of MM algorithms implies that maximizing the minorizer with respect to α forces $LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha)$ uphill (Hunter and Lange, 2004). This maximization, involving nK separate univariate quadratic functions under the constraints $\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{ik} = 1$ for each i , may be accomplished quickly using the method described by Stefanov (2004). In particular, it is much easier to update α by maximizing the Q_{ML} function, which completely separates the α parameters into the sum of functions of the individual α_{ik} , than by maximizing the LB_{ML} function when n is large. We therefore arrive at the following replacement for the E-step:

GENERALIZED E-STEP: For $i = 1, \dots, n$, increase $Q_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}, \alpha^{(t)}; \alpha)$ as a function of α_i subject to $\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{ik} = 1$. Let $\alpha_i^{(t+1)}$ denote the new value of α_i .

3.1.2. *More on the M-step.* To maximize $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha^{(t+1)})$ in the M-step, examination of Equation (3.5) shows that maximization with respect to γ and θ may be accomplished separately. In fact, for γ , there is a simple, closed-form solution:

$$(3.11) \quad \gamma_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ik}^{(t+1)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Concerning θ , if there are no constraints on $\pi(\theta)$ other than $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \pi_{d;kl}(\theta) = 1$, it is preferable to maximize with respect to $\pi = \pi(\theta)$ rather than θ , because there are closed-form expressions for $\pi^{(t+1)}$ but not for $\theta^{(t+1)}$. Maximization with respect to π is accomplished by setting

$$(3.12) \quad \pi_{d;kl}^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i < j}^n \alpha_{ik}^{(t+1)} \alpha_{jl}^{(t+1)} I(D_{ij} = d)}{\sum_{i < j}^n \alpha_{ik}^{(t+1)} \alpha_{jl}^{(t+1)}}, \quad d \in \mathcal{D}, \quad k, l = 1, \dots, K.$$

Remark 1. If the homogeneity assumption (3.1) does not hold, then closed-form expressions for π may not be available. In some cases, e.g., in the presence of categorical covariates, closed form expressions for π are available, but the dimension of π , and thus computing time, increases with the number of categories.

Remark 2. If Equations (2.1) and (2.3) hold, then the exponential parametrization $\pi(\theta)$ may be inverted to obtain an approximate maximum likelihood estimate of θ after the approximate MLE of π is found using the variational GEM algorithm. One method for accomplishing this inversion exploits the convex duality of exponential families (Barndorff-Nielsen, 1978; Wainwright and Jordan, 2008) and is explained in Appendix B.

Remark 3. If, in addition to the constraint $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \pi_{d;kl}(\theta) = 1$, additional constraints on π are present, the maximization with respect to π may either decrease or increase computing time. Linear constraints on π can be enforced by Lagrange multipliers and reduce the dimension of π and thus computing time. Non-linear constraints on π , as in Example 1, may not admit closed form updates of π and thus may require iterative methods. If so, and if the non-linear constraints stem from exponential family parameterizations of $\pi(\theta)$ with natural parameter vector θ as in Example 1, it is convenient to translate the constrained maximization problem into an unconstrained maximization problem by maximizing $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha^{(t+1)})$ with respect to θ and exploit the fact that $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha^{(t+1)})$ is a concave function of θ owing to the exponential family membership of $\pi_{d;kl}(\theta)$ (Barndorff-Nielsen, 1978, p. 150). We show in Appendix C how the exponential family parameterization can be used to derive the gradient and Hessian of the lower bound of $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha^{(t+1)})$ with respect to θ , which we exploit in Section 6 using a Newton-Raphson algorithm.

3.2. Standard errors. Although we maximize the lower bound $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ of the log likelihood function to obtain approximate maximum likelihood estimates, standard errors of the approximate maximum likelihood estimates $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\theta}$ based on the curvature of the lower bound $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ may be too small. The reason is that even when the lower bound is close to the log likelihood function, the lower bound may be more curved than the log likelihood function (Wang and Titterton, 2005); indeed, the higher curvature helps ensure that $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ is a lower bound of the log likelihood function $\log P_{\gamma, \theta}(Y = y)$ in the first place. As an alternative, we approximate the standard errors of the approximate maximum likelihood estimates of γ and θ by a parametric bootstrap method (Efron, 1979) that can be described as follows:

- (1) Given the approximate maximum likelihood estimates of γ and θ , sample N data sets.
- (2) For each data set, compute the approximate maximum likelihood estimates of γ and θ .

In addition to fast maximum likelihood algorithms, the parametric bootstrap method requires fast simulation algorithms. We propose such an algorithm in Section 5.

3.3. Starting and Stopping. As usual with EM-like algorithms, it is a good idea to use multiple different starting values with the variational EM due to the existence of distinct local maxima. We find it easiest to use random starts in which we assign the values of $\alpha^{(0)}$ and then commence with an M-step. This results in values $\gamma^{(0)}$ and $\theta^{(0)}$, then the algorithm continues with the first E-step, and so on. The initial $\alpha_{ik}^{(0)}$ are chosen independently uniformly randomly on $(0, 1)$, then each $\alpha_i^{(0)}$ is multiplied by a normalizing constant chosen so that the elements of $\alpha_i^{(0)}$ sum to one for every i .

The numerical experiments of Section 6 used 100 random restarts each. Ideally, more restarts would be used, yet the size of the datasets with which we work makes every run somewhat expensive. We chose the number 100 because we were able to parallelize on a fairly large scale, essentially running 100 separate copies of the algorithm. Larger numbers of runs, such as 1000, would have forced longer run times since we would have had to run some of the trials in series rather than in parallel.

As a convergence criterion, we stop the algorithm as soon as

$$\frac{|LB_{ML}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t+1)}) - LB_{ML}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})|}{LB_{ML}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t+1)})} < 10^{-10}.$$

The convergence criterion is based on the relative change of the objective function rather than the absolute change, because (1) even small changes in the parameter values can result in large changes of the objective function, and (2) the objective function is a lower bound of the log likelihood, and small absolute changes of the objective function may not be worth the computational effort.

4. Approximate Bayesian estimation. The key to Bayesian model estimation and model selection is the marginal likelihood, defined as

$$(4.1) \quad P(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\Gamma} \int_{\Theta} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} P_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{\theta},$$

where $p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the prior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. To ensure that the marginal likelihood is well-defined, we assume that the prior distribution is proper, which is common practice in mixture modeling (McLachlan and Peel, 2000, Chapter 4). A lower bound on the log marginal likelihood can be derived by introducing an auxiliary distribution with support $\mathcal{Z} \times \Gamma \times \Theta$, where Γ is the parameter space of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and Θ is the parameter space of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. A natural choice of auxiliary distributions is given by

$$(4.2) \quad A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \left[\prod_{i=1}^n P_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{Z}, i}}(\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{z}_i) \right] p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \left[\prod_{i=1}^L p_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \right],$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ denotes the set of auxiliary parameters corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{Z}} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{Z}, 1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{Z}, n})$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$.

A lower bound on the log marginal likelihood can be derived by Jensen's inequality:

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \log P(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) &= \log \int_{\Gamma} \int_{\Theta} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{P_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ &\geq E_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}[\log P_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})] - E_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}[\log A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})], \end{aligned}$$

where the expectations are taken with respect to the auxiliary distribution $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

We denote the right-hand side of (4.3) by $LB_B(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{Z}})$. By an argument along the lines of (3.3), one can show that the difference between the log marginal likelihood and $LB_B(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{Z}})$ is equal to the Kullback-Leibler divergence from the auxiliary distribution $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ to the posterior distribution $P(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &\log P(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) - \int_{\Gamma} \int_{\Theta} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[\log \frac{P_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \right] A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ &= \int_{\Gamma} \int_{\Theta} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \left[\log \frac{A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{P(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})} \right] A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

The Kullback-Leibler divergence between the auxiliary distribution and the posterior distribution can be minimized by a variational GEM algorithm as follows, where t is the iteration number:

GENERALIZED E-STEP: Letting $\alpha_\gamma^{(t)}$ and $\alpha_\theta^{(t)}$ denote the current values of α_γ and α_θ , increase $LB_B(\alpha_\gamma^{(t)}, \alpha_\theta^{(t)}; \alpha_Z)$ with respect to α_Z . Let $\alpha_Z^{(t+1)}$ denote the new value of α_Z .

GENERALIZED M-STEP: Choose new values $\alpha_\gamma^{(t+1)}$ and $\alpha_\theta^{(t+1)}$ that increase $LB_B(\alpha_\gamma, \alpha_\theta; \alpha_Z^{(t+1)})$ with respect to α_γ and α_θ .

By construction, iteration t of a variational GEM algorithm increases the lower bound $LB_B(\alpha_\gamma, \alpha_\theta; \alpha_Z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} (4.5) \quad LB_B(\alpha_\gamma^{(t)}, \alpha_\theta^{(t)}; \alpha_Z^{(t)}) &\leq LB_B(\alpha_\gamma^{(t)}, \alpha_\theta^{(t)}; \alpha_Z^{(t+1)}) \\ (4.6) \quad &\leq LB_B(\alpha_\gamma^{(t+1)}, \alpha_\theta^{(t+1)}; \alpha_Z^{(t+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

A variational GEM algorithm addresses two problems at the same time: It approximates the marginal likelihood as well as the posterior distribution. Therefore, it tackles Bayesian model estimation and model selection at the same time.

Variational GEM algorithms for approximate Bayesian inference are only slightly more complicated to implement than the variational GEM algorithms for approximate maximum likelihood estimation presented in Section 3. To understand the difference, we examine the analogue of Equation (3.5):

$$\begin{aligned} (4.7) \quad LB_B(\alpha_\gamma, \alpha_\theta; \alpha_Z) &= \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{Z,ik} \alpha_{Z,jl} E_\alpha[\log \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta)] + E_\alpha[\log P_\gamma(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z})] \\ &+ E_\alpha[\log p(\gamma, \theta)] - E_\alpha[\log A(\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}, \gamma, \theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

If the prior distributions of γ and θ are given by independent Dirichlet and Gaussian distributions and the auxiliary distributions of $\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n$, γ , and θ are given by independent Multinomial, Dirichlet, and Gaussian distributions, respectively, then the expectations on the right-hand side of (4.7) are tractable, with the possible exception of the expectations $E_\alpha[\log \pi_{d;kl}(\theta)]$. Whether the expectations are tractable depends on the parameterization of $\pi_{d;kl}(\theta)$. Under the exponential parameterization

$$(4.8) \quad \pi_{d;kl}(\theta) = \exp \left\{ \theta^\top \mathbf{g}(d) - \log \sum_{d' \in \mathcal{D}} \exp \left[\theta^\top \mathbf{g}(d') \right] \right\},$$

the expectations can be written as

$$(4.9) \quad E_\alpha[\log \pi_{d;kl}(\theta)] = E_\alpha[\theta]^\top \mathbf{g}(d) - E_\alpha \left\{ \log \sum_{d' \in \mathcal{D}} \exp \left[\theta^\top \mathbf{g}(d') \right] \right\}$$

and are intractable. We are not aware of parameterizations under which the expectations are tractable. We therefore use exponential parameterizations and deal with the intractable nature of the resulting expectations by invoking Jensen's inequality:

$$(4.10) \quad E_\alpha[\log \pi_{d;kl}(\theta)] \geq E_\alpha[\theta]^\top \mathbf{g}(d) - \log \sum_{d' \in \mathcal{D}} E_\alpha \left\{ \exp \left[\theta^\top \mathbf{g}(d') \right] \right\}.$$

The expectations on the right-hand side of (4.10) are expectations of independent log-normal random variables, which are tractable. We may obtain a looser, yet tractable, lower bound by replacing the intractable expectation $E_\alpha[\log \pi_{d;kl}(\theta)]$ in Equation (4.7) by the right side of Equation (4.10).

To save space, we do not address the specific numerical techniques that may be used to implement the variational GEM algorithm here. In short, the generalized E-step is based on an MM algorithm along the lines of Section 3.1.1. In the generalized M-step, numerical gradient-based methods may be used. A detailed treatment of this Bayesian estimation method, using a more complicated prior distribution, may be found in Schweinberger et al. (2011).

5. Monte Carlo simulation. Monte Carlo simulation of large, discrete-valued networks serves at least three purposes:

- (a) to generate simulated data to be used in simulation studies;
- (b) to approximate standard errors of the approximate maximum likelihood estimates by parametric bootstrap;
- (c) to assess model goodness-of-fit by simulation.

A crude Monte Carlo approach is based on sampling $\mathbf{Z}$ by cycling through all n nodes and sampling $D_{ij} | \mathbf{Z}$ by cycling through all $n(n-1)/2$ dyads. However, the running time of such an algorithm is $O(n^2)$, which is too slow to be useful in practice, because each of these goals listed above tends to require numerous simulated datasets.

We propose Monte Carlo simulation algorithms that exploit the intrinsic sparsity of discrete-valued networks. Discrete-valued networks tend to be sparse in the sense that one element of $\mathcal{D}$ dominates all other elements of $\mathcal{D}$. An example is given by directed, binary-valued networks, where $\mathcal{D} = \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0), (1,1)\}$ is the sample space of dyads and $(0,0) \in \mathcal{D}$ tends to dominate all other elements of $\mathcal{D}$.

Assume there exists an element b of $\mathcal{D}$, called the baseline, that dominates the other elements of $\mathcal{D}$ in the sense that $\pi_{b;kl} \gg 1 - \pi_{b;kl}$ for all j and k . The Monte Carlo simulation algorithm exploiting the sparsity of large, discrete-valued networks can be described as follows:

- (1) Sample $\mathbf{Z}$ by sampling $\mathbf{M} \sim \text{Multinomial}(n; \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K)$ and assigning nodes $1, \dots, M_1$ to component 1, nodes $M_1 + 1, \dots, M_1 + M_2$ to component 2, etc.
- (2) Sample $\mathbf{Y} | \mathbf{Z}$ as follows: For each $1 \leq k \leq l \leq K$,
 - (a) generate $S_{kl} \sim \text{Binomial}(N_{kl}, 1 - \pi_{b;kl})$, where N_{kl} is the number of pairs of nodes belonging to components k and l ;
 - (b) sample S_{kl} pairs of nodes $i < j$ with replacement from among the N_{kl} by rejection sampling;
 - (c) for each $i < j$ belonging to the pair of components k and l , sample D_{ij} according to the probabilities $\pi_{d;kl}/(1 - \pi_{b;kl})$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $d \neq b$.

6. Application. We demonstrate the simplicity and flexibility of the model-based clustering framework introduced above by applying it to a data set with more than 131,000 nodes and 17 billion edge variables. We consider both constrained and unconstrained network model-based clustering and compare them to traditional model-based clustering.

The data were collected by maintainers of the website epinions.com, which allows users to review goods and services. Massa and Avesani (2007b) collected data on $n = 131,827$ users. Readers of the reviews at epinions.com face uncertainty because the number of reviewers is large and almost all reviewers are unknown; it is not clear which reviewers users should trust. It is, therefore, desirable to obtain an indication of users' trustworthiness based on evaluations by other users. The website collects such data by allowing any user i to evaluate any other user j as either untrustworthy, coded

as $y_{ij} = -1$, or trustworthy, coded as $y_{ij} = +1$. Most values of y_{ij} will be zero, indicating that i has not evaluated j . The resulting network includes $N = n(n-1)$, or more than 17 billion, edge variables.

To address the problem of trustworthiness, we employ the model-based clustering framework introduced above by allowing cluster membership to determine the value of the parameter corresponding to the “excess” statistics

$$e_i(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{j \neq i}^n y_{ji},$$

equal to the number of positive ratings received by user i in excess of the number of negative ratings, a natural measure of this user’s individual trustworthiness. A model that captures individual trustworthiness along with reciprocity is given by

$$(6.1) \quad P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(D_{ij} = d_{ij} \mid Z_{ik} = Z_{jl} = 1) \propto \exp \left[\theta^- y_{ij}^- + \theta^+ y_{ij}^+ + \theta^- y_{ji}^- + \theta^+ y_{ji}^+ \right. \\ \left. + \theta_k^\Delta y_{ji} + \theta_l^\Delta y_{ij} + \theta^{--} y_{ij}^- y_{ji}^- + \theta^{++} y_{ij}^+ y_{ji}^+ \right],$$

where $y_{ij}^- = I(y_{ij} = -1)$ and $y_{ij}^+ = I(y_{ij} = 1)$ are indicators of negative and positive edges, respectively. The parameters in model (6.1) are not identifiable, because $y_{ij} = y_{ij}^+ - y_{ij}^-$ and $y_{ji} = y_{ji}^+ - y_{ji}^-$. We therefore constrain the positive edge parameter θ^+ to be 0. Exploiting the flexibility afforded by this modeling framework, model (6.1) assumes in the interest of model parsimony that the propensities to form negative and positive edges and to reciprocate negative and positive edges do not vary across categories.

We assume that the number of categories is five, a choice motivated by the fact that many internet-based companies and websites, such as amazon.com, google.com, and netflix.com, let reviewers award 1 to 5 stars to products, services, and service providers.

For the sake of comparison, we also consider two alternative model-based clustering methods for the same dataset. One is a univariate method based on the assumption that the individual excesses are independently sampled from a mixture of normal densities. Traditional univariate approaches like this are less suitable than network-based clustering approaches for at least two reasons. First, the individual excesses are not independent, because the individual excesses are functions of edges and edges may be dependent owing to reciprocity (and other forms of dependence, not modeled here), which decades of research (e.g., [Davis, 1968](#); [Holland and Leinhardt, 1981](#)) have shown to be important in shaping social networks. Traditional model-based clustering methods, by construction, assume that the individual excesses are independent and are therefore less suitable than network model-based clustering methods, which are capable of taking dependence into account. Second, the topology of networks may be of interest, in which case an approach that ignores this topology is less suitable than network-based clustering methods; in particular, the normal-mixture-model parameter estimates do not reveal anything about the network structure, whereas the parameters in our network model are directly interpretable. The five-component mixture-of-normal model that we consider here assumes that the individual excesses $e_i(\mathbf{y})$ are independent random variables sampled from a distribution with density

$$(6.2) \quad f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^5 \lambda_j \frac{1}{\sigma_j} \phi \left(\frac{x - \mu_j}{\sigma_j} \right),$$




FIG 1. (a) Trace plot of the lower bound $LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha^{(t)})$ of the log likelihood function and (b) cluster-specific excess parameters θ_k^Δ , using 100 runs with random starting values

where λ_j , μ_j , and σ_j are component-specific mixing proportions, means, and standard deviations, respectively, and $\phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal density.

The other alternative clustering method we consider is the unconstrained network model of Equation (2.9). With five components, this model comprises four mixing parameters $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4$ in addition to the $\pi_{d;kl}$ parameters, of which there are 105: There are nine types of dyads d whenever $k \neq l$, contributing $8\binom{5}{2} = 80$ parameters, and six types of dyads d whenever $k = l$, contributing an additional $5(5) = 25$.

We used a variational GEM algorithm to estimate the network model (6.1), where the M-step was executed by a Newton-Raphson algorithm using the gradient and Hessian derived in Appendix C with a maximum of 100 iterations. It stopped earlier if the largest absolute value of the gradient vector was less than 10^{-10} . By contrast, the unconstrained network model (2.9) employs a variational GEM algorithm using the exact M-step update (3.12). The variational GEM algorithm stopped when either the relative change in the objective function was less than 10^{-10} or 6000 iterations were performed. For the unconstrained model, most runs required the full 6000 iterations. To estimate the normal mixture model (6.2), we used the R package `mixtools` (Benaglia et al., 2009).

To diagnose convergence of the algorithm for fitting model (6.1), we present the trace plot of the lower bound of the log likelihood function $LB_{ML}(\gamma^{(t)}, \theta^{(t)}; \alpha^{(t)})$ in Figure 1(a) and the trace plot of the cluster-specific excess parameters θ_k^Δ in Figure 1(b). Both figures are based on 100 runs, where the starting values were obtained by the procedure described in Section 3.3. The results suggest that all 100 runs seem to converge to roughly the same solution. This fact is somewhat remarkable, since many variational algorithms appear very sensitive to their starting values, converging to multiple distinct local optima (e.g., Daudin et al., 2010; Salter-Townshend and Murphy, 2010). For instance, the 100 runs for the unconstrained network model (2.9) produced essentially a unique set of values for each set of random starting values. Similarly, the normal mixture model algorithm produced many different local maxima, even after we tried to correct for label-switching by choosing random starting values fairly tightly clustered by their mean values.

Figure 2 shows the observed excesses $e_1(\mathbf{y}), \dots, e_n(\mathbf{y})$ grouped by clusters for the best solutions, as measured by likelihood or approximate likelihood, found for each clustering method. It appears




FIG 2. Observed values of excess trust $e_i(\mathbf{y})$, grouped by highest-probability component of i , for (a) parsimonious network mixture model (6.1) with 8 parameters, (b) normal mixture model (6.2) with 14 parameters, and (c) unconstrained network mixture model (2.9) with 109 parameters.

that the clustering based on the parsimonious network model is superior to the clusterings for the other two models, which are similar to each other. In addition, if we use a normal mixture model in which the variances are restricted to be constant across components, the results are even worse, with one large cluster and multiple clusters with few nodes. In Figure 3, we “ground truth” the clustering solutions using external information: The average rating of each article, categorized by the most likely category assigned to its author. Again, the parsimonious 8-parameter network mixture model seems to be superior to both the normal mixture model and the unconstrained 109-parameter network mixture model; in fact, the latter does not even preserve the correct ordering of the categories by median average rating.

The numerical results of our estimation algorithm are shown in Table 1. The 95% confidence intervals reported in that table are obtained by simulating 500 networks using the method of Section 5 and the parameter estimates obtained via our algorithm. For each network, we then ran our algorithm for 1000 iterations starting at the M-step, where the α parameters were initialized to reflect the “true” component to which each node was assigned by the simulation algorithm by setting $\alpha_{ik} = 10^{-10}$ for k not equal to the true component and $\alpha_{ik} = 1 - 4 \times 10^{-10}$ otherwise. This was done to eliminate the so-called label-switching problem, which is rooted in the invariance of the likelihood function to switching the labels of the 5 components and which can affect bootstrap samples in the same way it can affect Markov chain Monte Carlo samples from the posterior of




FIG 3. Average ratings of 659,290 articles, grouped according to the highest-probability category of the article’s author, for (a) parsimonious network mixture model (6.1) with 8 parameters, (b) normal mixture model (6.2) with 14 parameters, and (c) unconstrained network mixture model (2.9) with 109 parameters. The ordering of the five categories, which is the same as in Figure 2, indicates that the unconstrained network mixture model does not even preserve the correct ordering of the median average ratings.

finite mixture models (Stephens, 2000). The sample 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles form the confidence intervals shown. In addition, we give density estimates of the five trustworthiness bootstrap samples in Figure 4.

While we are encouraged by the fact that bootstrapping is at all feasible for problems of this size, there are aspects of our investigation that will need to be addressed with further research. First, the bootstrapping is so time-consuming that we were forced to rely on computing clusters with multiple computing nodes to generate a bootstrap sample in reasonable time. Future work could focus on more efficient bootstrapping. Some work on efficient bootstrapping was done by Kleiner et al. (2011), but it is restricted to simple models and not applicable here.

Second, when the variational GEM algorithm is initialized at random locations, it may converge to local maxima whose $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ values are inferior to the solutions attained when the algorithm is initialized at the “true” values used to simulate the networks. While it is not surprising that variational GEM algorithms converge to local maxima, it is surprising that the issue shows up in some of the simulated data sets but not in the observed data set. One possible explanation is that the structure of the observed data set is clear-cut, but that the components of the estimated model are not sufficiently separated. Therefore, the estimated model may place non-negligible probability

Parameter	Statistic	Parameter Estimate	Confidence Interval
Negative edges	$\sum_{ij} y_{ij}^-$	-24.020	(-24.029, -24.012)
Positive edges	$\sum_{ij} y_{ij}^+$	0	—
Negative reciprocity	$\sum_{ij} y_{ij}^- y_{ji}^-$	8.660	(8.614, 8.699)
Positive reciprocity	$\sum_{ij} y_{ij}^+ y_{ji}^+$	9.899	(9.891, 9.907)
Cluster 1 Trustworthiness	$\sum_i e_i(\mathbf{y}) Z_{i1}$	-6.256	(-6.260, -6.251)
Cluster 2 Trustworthiness	$\sum_i e_i(\mathbf{y}) Z_{i2}$	-7.658	(-7.662, -7.653)
Cluster 3 Trustworthiness	$\sum_i e_i(\mathbf{y}) Z_{i3}$	-9.343	(-9.348, -9.337)
Cluster 4 Trustworthiness	$\sum_i e_i(\mathbf{y}) Z_{i4}$	-11.914	(-11.919, -11.908)
Cluster 5 Trustworthiness	$\sum_i e_i(\mathbf{y}) Z_{i5}$	-15.212	(-15.225, -15.200)

TABLE 1

95% Confidence intervals based on parametric bootstrap using 500 simulated networks, with 1000 iterations for each network. The statistic $\sum_i e_i(\mathbf{y}) Z_{ik}$ equals $\sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} y_{ji} Z_{ik}$, where $Z_{ik} = 1$ if user i is a member of cluster k and $Z_{ik} = 0$ otherwise.




FIG 4. Kernel density estimates of the five bootstrap samples of the trustworthiness parameters, shifted so that each component's estimated parameter value (shown in the legend) equals zero.

mass on networks where two or more subsets of nodes are hard to distinguish and the variational GEM algorithm may be attracted to local maxima.

Third, some groups of confidence intervals, such as the first four trustworthiness parameter intervals, have more or less the same width. We do not have a fully satisfying explanation for this, but note that, for a given partition of the set of nodes, the number of units carrying information about the component-specific excess parameter depends on the size of component as well as the sizes of all other components, and the width of the confidence intervals may depend on the magnitude of the component-specific excess parameter.

In summary, we find that the clustering framework we introduce here provides useful results for a very large network. Most importantly, the sensible application of statistical modeling ideas, which reduces the unconstrained 109-parameter model to a constrained 8-parameter model, produces vastly superior results in terms of interpretability, numerical stability, and predictive performance.

7. Discussion. The model-based clustering framework outlined here represents several advances. An attention to standard statistical modeling ideas relevant in the network context im-

proves model parsimony and interpretability relative to fully unconstrained clustering models while also suggesting a viable method for assessing precision of estimates obtained. Algorithmically, our advances allow us to apply a variational EM idea, recently applied to network clustering models in numerous publications (e.g., [Nowicki and Snijders, 2001](#); [Airoldi et al., 2008](#); [Daudin et al., 2008](#); [Zanghi et al., 2010](#); [Mariadassou et al., 2010](#)), to networks far larger than any that have been considered to date. We have applied our methods to networks with over a hundred thousand nodes and signed edges, indicating how they extend to categorical-valued edges generally or models that incorporate other covariate information. In practice, these methods could have myriad uses, from identifying high-density regions of large networks to selecting among competing models for a single network to testing specific network effects of scientific interest when clustering is present.

To achieve these advances, we have focused exclusively on models exhibiting dyadic independence conditional on the cluster memberships of nodes. It is important to remember that these models are *not* dyadic independence models overall, since the clustering itself introduces dependence. However, to more fully capture network effects such as transitivity, more complicated models may be needed, such as the latent space models of [Hoff et al. \(2002\)](#), [Schweinberger and Snijders \(2003\)](#), or [Handcock et al. \(2007\)](#). A major drawback of latent space models is that they tend to be less scalable than the models considered here. An example is given by the variational Bayesian algorithm developed by [Salter-Townshend and Murphy \(2010\)](#) to estimate the latent space model of [Handcock et al. \(2007\)](#). The running time of the algorithm is $O(n^2)$ and it has therefore not been applied to networks with more than $n = 300$ nodes and $N = 89,700$ edge variables. In contrast, the running time of the variational GEM algorithm proposed here is $O(n)$ in the constrained and $O(f(n))$ in the unconstrained version of the [Nowicki and Snijders \(2001\)](#) model, where $f(n)$ is the number of edge variables whose value is not equal to the baseline value. It is worth noting that $f(n)$ is $O(n)$ in the case of sparse graphs and therefore the running time of the variational GEM algorithm is $O(n)$ in the case of sparse graphs. Indeed, even in the presence of the covariates (which are not considered by [Salter-Townshend and Murphy, 2010](#)), the running time of the variational GEM algorithm is $O(C^2n)$ provided the covariates are categorical with C categories. We have demonstrated that the variational GEM algorithm can be applied to networks with more than $n = 131,000$ nodes and $N = 17$ billion edge variables.

While the running time of $O(n)$ shows that the variational GEM algorithm scales well with n , in practice, the “G” in “GEM” is an important contributor to the speed of the variational GEM algorithm: Merely increasing the lower bound using an MM algorithm rather than actually maximizing it using a fixed-point algorithm along the lines of [Daudin et al. \(2008\)](#) appears to save much computing time for large networks, though an exhaustive comparison of these two methods is a topic for further investigation.

An additional increase in speed might be gained by exploiting acceleration methods such as quasi-Newton methods ([Press et al., 2002](#), Section 10.7), which have shown promise in the case of MM algorithms ([Hunter and Lange, 2004](#)) and might accelerate the MM algorithm in the E-step of the variational GEM algorithm. However, application of these method is complicated in the current modeling framework because of the exceptionally large number of auxiliary parameters introduced by the variational augmentation.

We have neglected here the problem of selecting the number of clusters. [Daudin et al. \(2008\)](#) propose making this selection based on the so-called ICL criterion, but it is not known how the ICL criterion behaves when the intractable incomplete-data log likelihood function in the ICL criterion is replaced by a variational-method lower bound. In our experience, the magnitude of the changes in the maximum lower bound value achieved with multiple random starting parameters

at least as large as the magnitude of the penalization imposed on the log-likelihood by the ICL criterion; thus, we were unsuccessful in obtaining reliable ICL-based results for very large networks. More investigation of this question, and of the selection of the number of clusters general, seems warranted.

By demonstrating that scientifically interesting clustering models can be applied to very large networks by extending the variational-method ideas developed for network datasets recently in the statistical literature, we hope to encourage further investigation of the possibilities of these and related clustering methods.

Acknowledgments. This work is supported by the Office of Naval Research (ONR grant N00014-08-1-1015) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH grant 1R01GM083603). We are grateful to Paolo Massa and Kasper Souren of trustlet.org for sharing the `epinion.com` data.

APPENDIX A: OBTAINING A MINORIZER OF THE LOWER BOUND

The lower bound $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ of the log likelihood function can be written as

$$(A.1) \quad LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha) = \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl} \log \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{ik} (\log \gamma_k - \log \alpha_{ik}).$$

Since $\log \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta) < 0$ for all θ , the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality (Hunter and Lange, 2004) implies that

$$(A.2) \quad \alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl} \log \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta) \geq \left(\alpha_{ik}^2 \frac{\hat{\alpha}_{jl}}{2 \hat{\alpha}_{ik}} + \alpha_{jl}^2 \frac{\hat{\alpha}_{ik}}{2 \hat{\alpha}_{jl}} \right) \log \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta)$$

with equality if $\alpha_{ik} = \hat{\alpha}_{ik}$ and $\alpha_{jl} = \hat{\alpha}_{jl}$. In addition, using the concave nature of the logarithm,

$$(A.3) \quad -\log \alpha_{ik} \geq -\log \hat{\alpha}_{ik} - \frac{\alpha_{ik}}{\hat{\alpha}_{ik}} + 1$$

with equality if $\alpha_{ik} = \hat{\alpha}_{ik}$. Therefore, function $Q_{ML}(\gamma, \theta, \alpha; \hat{\alpha})$ as defined in (3.8) possesses properties (3.9) and (3.10).

APPENDIX B: CONVEX DUALITY OF EXPONENTIAL FAMILIES

We show how closed form expressions of θ in terms of π can be obtained by exploiting the convex duality of exponential families. Let

$$(B.1) \quad \psi^*(\mu) = \sup_{\theta} \left\{ \theta^\top \mu - \psi(\theta) \right\}$$

be the Legendre-Fenchel transform of $\psi(\theta)$, where $\mu \equiv \mu(\theta) = E_{\theta}[g(Y)]$ is the mean-value parameter vector and the subscripts k and l have been dropped. By Barndorff-Nielsen (1978, p. 140) and Wainwright and Jordan (2008, pp. 67–68), the Legendre-Fenchel transform of $\psi(\theta)$ is self-inverse and thus $\psi(\theta)$ can be written as

$$(B.2) \quad \psi(\theta) = \sup_{\mu} \left\{ \theta^\top \mu - \psi^*(\mu) \right\} = \sup_{\pi} \left\{ \theta^\top \mu(\pi) - \psi^*(\mu(\pi)) \right\},$$

where $\mu(\pi) = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} g(d) \pi_d$ and $\psi^*(\mu(\pi)) = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \pi_d \log \pi_d$. Therefore, closed-form expressions of θ in terms of π may be found by maximizing $\theta^\top \mu(\pi) - \psi^*(\mu(\pi))$ with respect to π .

APPENDIX C: GRADIENT AND HESSIAN OF LOWER BOUND

We are interested in the gradient and Hessian of the lower bound $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ of the log likelihood function with respect to parameter vector θ .

The lower bound $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ can be written as

$$(C.1) \quad LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha) = \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl} \log \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{ik} (\log \gamma_k - \log \alpha_{ik}).$$

The two examples of models considered in Section 2 assume that the conditional dyad probabilities $\pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta)$ take the form

$$(C.2) \quad \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta) = \exp[\eta_{kl}(\theta)^\top \mathbf{g}(d_{ij}) - \psi_{kl}(\theta)],$$

where $\eta_{kl}(\theta) = \mathbf{A}_{kl} \theta$ is a linear function of parameter vector θ and $\mathbf{A}_{kl}$ is a matrix of suitable order depending on components k and l . It is convenient to absorb the matrix $\mathbf{A}_{kl}$ into the statistic vector $\mathbf{g}(d_{ij})$ and write

$$(C.3) \quad \pi_{d_{ij};kl}(\theta) = \exp[\theta^\top \mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(d_{ij}) - \psi_{kl}(\theta)],$$

where $\mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(d_{ij}) = \mathbf{A}_{kl}^\top \mathbf{g}(d_{ij})$. Thus $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ can be written as

$$(C.4) \quad LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha) = \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl} [\theta^\top \mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(d_{ij}) - \psi_{kl}(\theta)] + \text{const},$$

where “const” denotes terms which do not depend on θ and

$$(C.5) \quad \psi_{kl}(\theta) = \log \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \exp[\theta^\top \mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(d)].$$

Since the lower bound $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ is a weighted sum of exponential family log-probabilities, it is straightforward to obtain the gradient and Hessian of $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ with respect to θ , which are given by

$$(C.6) \quad \nabla_\theta LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha) = \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl} \{ \mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(d_{ij}) - E_\theta[\mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(D_{ij})] \}$$

and

$$(C.7) \quad \nabla_\theta^2 LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha) = - \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{ik} \alpha_{jl} E_\theta[\mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(D_{ij}) \mathbf{g}_{kl}^*(D_{ij})^\top],$$

respectively.

In other words, the gradient and Hessian of $LB_{ML}(\gamma, \theta; \alpha)$ with respect to θ are weighted sums of expectations—the means, variances, and covariances of statistics. Since the sample space of dyads $\mathcal{D}$ is finite and, more often than not, small, these expectations may be computed by complete enumeration of all possible values of $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and their probabilities.

References.

- Airoldi, E., Blei, D., Fienberg, S., and Xing, E. (2008), “Mixed Membership Stochastic Blockmodels,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9, 1981–2014.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. (1978), *Information and Exponential Families in Statistical Theory*, New York: Wiley.
- Benaglia, T., Chauveau, D., Hunter, D. R., and Young, D. (2009), “mixtools: An R Package for Analyzing Finite Mixture Models,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 32, 1–29.
- Besag, J. (1974), “Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 36, 192–225.
- Britton, T., and O’Neill, P. D. (2002), “Statistical Inference for Stochastic Epidemics in Populations With Network Structure,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 29, 375–390.
- Caimo, A., and Friel, N. (2011), “Bayesian inference for exponential random graph models,” *Social Networks*, 33, 41–55.
- Celisse, A., Daudin, J.-J., and Pierre, L. (2011), “Consistency of maximum-likelihood and variational estimators in the Stochastic Block Model,” Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1105.3288.pdf>.
- Daudin, J. J., Picard, F., and Robin, S. (2008), “A mixture model for random graphs,” *Statistics and Computing*, 18, 173–183.
- Daudin, J.-J., Pierre, L., and Vacher, C. (2010), “Model for Heterogeneous Random Networks Using Continuous Latent Variables and an Application to a TreeFungus Network,” *Biometrics*, 66, 1043–1051.
- Davis, J. A. (1968), “Statistical analysis of pair relationships: Symmetry, subjective consistency, and reciprocity,” *Sociometry*, 31, 102–119.
- Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., and Rubin, R. B. (1977), “Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM-algorithm,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Section B*, 39, 1–38.
- Efron, B. (1979), “Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jackknife,” *Annals of Statistics*, 7, 1–26.
- Erdős, P., and Rényi, A. (1959), “On Random Graphs,” *Publicationes Mathematicae*, 6, 290–297.
- Fisher, R. A. (1922), “On the mathematical foundations of theoretical statistics,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series A*, 222, 309–368.
- Frank, O., and Strauss, D. (1986), “Markov graphs,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81, 832–842.
- Gilbert, E. N. (1959), “Random graphs,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 1141–1144.
- Groendyke, C., Welch, D., and Hunter, D. R. (2011), “Bayesian inference for contact networks given epidemic data,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, to appear.
- Handcock, M. (2003), “Assessing degeneracy in statistical models of social networks,” Tech. rep., Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, University of Washington, <http://www.csss.washington.edu/Papers>.
- Handcock, M. S., Raftery, A. E., and Tantrum, J. M. (2007), “Model-Based Clustering for Social Networks,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. A*, 170, 301–354, with discussion.
- Hoff, P. D., Raftery, A. E., and Handcock, M. S. (2002), “Latent Space Approaches to Social Network Analysis,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97, 1090–1098.
- Holland, P. W., and Leinhardt, S. (1981), “An Exponential Family Of Probability Distributions For Directed Graphs,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 76, 33–65.
- Hunter, D., and Lange, K. (2004), “A Tutorial on MM Algorithms,” *The American Statistician*, 58, 30–38.
- Hunter, D. R., and Handcock, M. S. (2006), “Inference in curved exponential family models for networks,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15, 565–583.
- Kleiner, A., Talwalkar, A., Sarkar, P., and Jordan, M. (2011), “A Scalable Bootstrap for Massive Data,” *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1112.5016*.
- Koskinen, J. H., Robins, G. L., and Pattison, P. E. (2010), “Analysing exponential random graph (p-star) models with missing data using Bayesian data augmentation,” *Statistical Methodology*, 7, 366–384.
- Kunegis, J., Lommatzsch, A., and Bauckhage, C. (2009), “The slashdot zoo: mining a social network with negative edges,” in *WWW ’09: Proceedings of the 18th international conference on World wide web*, New York, NY, USA: ACM, pp. 741–750.
- Mariadassou, M., Robin, S., and Vacher, C. (2010), “Uncovering latent structure in valued graphs: A variational approach,” *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 715–742.
- Massa, P., and Avesani, P. (2007a), “Trust metrics on controversial users: balancing between tyranny of the majority and echo chambers,” *International Journal on Semantic Web and Information Systems*.
- (2007b), “Trust metrics on controversial users: balancing between tyranny of the majority and echo chambers,” *International Journal on Semantic Web and Information Systems*.
- McLachlan, G., and Peel, D. (2000), *Finite mixture models*, Wiley-Interscience.
- Møller, J., Pettitt, A. N., Reeves, R., and Berthelsen, K. K. (2006), “An efficient Markov chain Monte Carlo method

- for distributions with intractable normalising constants,” *Biometrika*, 93, 451–458.
- Nowicki, K., and Snijders, T. A. B. (2001), “Estimation and Prediction for Stochastic Blockstructures,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 1077–1087.
- Press, W. H., Teukolsky, S. A., Vetterling, W. T., and Flannery, B. P. (2002), *Numerical Recipes in C++. The Art of Scientific Computing*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed.
- Salter-Townshend, M., and Murphy, T. (2010), “Variational Bayesian Inference for the Latent Position Cluster Model,” in *NIPS Networks Workshop*.
- Schweinberger, M. (2011), “Instability, Sensitivity, and Degeneracy of Discrete Exponential Families,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 1361–1370.
- Schweinberger, M., Petrescu-Prahova, M., and Vu, D. Q. (2011), “Disaster Response on September 11, 2001 Through the Lens of Statistical Network Analysis,” Tech. rep., Department of Statistics, Pennsylvania State University.
- Schweinberger, M., and Snijders, T. A. B. (2003), “Settings in Social Networks: A Measurement Model,” in *Sociological Methodology*, ed. Stolzenberg, R. M., Boston & Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Vol. 33, Chap. 10, pp. 307–341.
- Snijders, T. A. B. (2002), “Markov chain Monte Carlo Estimation of exponential random graph models,” *Journal of Social Structure*, 3, 1–40.
- Snijders, T. A. B., and Nowicki, K. (1997), “Estimation and Prediction for Stochastic Blockmodels for Graphs with Latent Block Structure,” *Journal of Classification*, 14, 75–100.
- Snijders, T. A. B., Pattison, P. E., Robins, G. L., and Handcock, M. S. (2006), “New specifications for exponential random graph models,” *Sociological Methodology*, 36, 99–153.
- Stefanov, S. M. (2004), “Convex quadratic minimization subject to a linear constraint and box constraints,” *Appl Math Res Express*, 2004, 17–42.
- Stephens, M. (2000), “Dealing with label-switching in mixture models,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 62, 795–809.
- Strauss, D. (1986), “On a general class of models for interaction,” *SIAM Review*, 28, 513–527.
- Strauss, D., and Ikeda, M. (1990), “Pseudolikelihood estimation for social networks,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 85, 204–212.
- Tallberg, C. (2005), “A Bayesian approach to modeling stochastic blockstructures with covariates,” *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 29, 1–23.
- Wainwright, M. J., and Jordan, M. I. (2008), “Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference,” *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 1, 1–305.
- Wang, B., and Titterton, D. M. (2005), “Inadequacy of interval estimates corresponding to variational Bayesian approximations,” in *Proceedings of the Tenth International Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Citeseer, pp. 373–380.
- Wasserman, S., and Pattison, P. (1996), “Logit Models and Logistic Regression for Social Networks: I. An Introduction to Markov Graphs and p^* ,” *Psychometrika*, 61, 401–425.
- Zanghi, H., Picard, F., Miele, V., and Ambroise, C. (2010), “Strategies for online inference of model-based clustering in large and growing networks,” *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4, 687–714.