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Abstract

Constrained clustering has been well-studied in the unsupervised learning society. However, how to encode constraints into community detection process of the complex social networks remains a challenging problem. In this paper, we propose a semi-supervised learning framework for community structure detection. This framework implicitly encodes the must-link and cannot-link constraints by modifying the adjacency matrix of the network, which can also be regarded as the de-noising process of the consensus matrix of the community structures. Our proposed method gives consideration to both the topology and the functions (background information) of the complex network, which improves the interpretability of the results. The comparisons performed on both the synthetic benchmarks and the real-world networks show that the proposed framework can significantly improve the detection performance with few constraints, which makes it an attractive methodology in the analysis of complex social networks.
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1. Introduction

Evidences have shown that there are often modules or community structures in complex social networks ([1]). For example, community structure could be a set of proteins that have similar functions in a protein-protein interaction (PPI) network, or a group of fans that like visiting similar kind of music web pages, or a club in university, etc. Though there is still no standard and clear definition of community structure, we may regard a community structure in social networks as a set of nodes that have similar link-
pattern, or in other words, these nodes have similar preference and connect to the other nodes in a similar way (2). The most common and widely studied community structure is the subgraph that is densely interconnected but loosely connected with the rest of the graph. Meanwhile, there are also other types of community structures. Discovering the community structures in complex social networks is very important for revealing the organization and the functions of the network, such as understanding how the units in some systems communicate with each other and work together, or learning how the new ideas or diseases spread in a group of persons (3), etc.

How to detect the community structures has thus become a hot research topic, and many interesting models and algorithms have been developed and achieved good results. But all of these methods are in essence kind of unsupervised learning, meaning that they only make use of the network topology information. However, in many real applications, we also have some background information that could be useful in detecting the structures. How to combine the information to guide the detecting process is an interesting problem that is worthy of working on.

In this paper, we give a semi-supervised framework to incorporate prior information into community structure detection. Under the proposed methodology, one can easily provide pairwise constraints on a few nodes in the network, specifying whether they must or cannot be in the same community structure, based on the background information and domain knowledge. For example, the nodes that have similar functions should be must-link, or the nodes that have different opinions should be cannot-link. The framework implicitly encodes the must-link and cannot-link constraints by modifying the adjacency matrix of the network, which can also be regarded as the denoising process of the consensus matrix of the community structures. The experimental results show the effectiveness of the proposed work.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Sect. 2 discusses how to incorporate the prior information to guide the community structure detection process, and briefly reviews nonnegative matrix factorization (NMF) and spectral clustering, which are applied for the detection, Sect. 3 gives the experimental results based on simulations and real world datasets, and finally Sect. 4 is the conclusion and the prospect of future work.
2. Semi-supervised learning for community structure detection

In this section, we give our semi-supervised framework for community structure detection. Firstly, we introduce the definition of the adjacency matrix $A^{[0]}$ of an undirected and unweighted simple graph $G$ with $n$ nodes:

$$A^{[0]}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \sim j \\ 0, & \text{if } i = j \text{ or } i \not\sim j, \end{cases}$$

where $i \sim j$ means there is an edge between node $i$ and $j$, and $i \not\sim j$ means there is no edge between them. Here $A^{[0]}$ is $n \times n$ and symmetric.

Note that the diagonal elements of $A^{[0]}$ are all zeros, but these zeros are obviously different from the ones at the off-diagonal positions which mean there are no connections between the nodes. Hence we here set the diagonal elements of $A^{[0]}$ to 1. The revised adjacency matrix is denoted by $A^{[1]}$.

Another variation of $A^{[0]}$ is its complementary matrix $C[A] = 1 - A^{[0]}$.

2.1. Incorporating prior knowledge into adjacency matrix

In many real applications, we often have some background information that can be used for community structure detection. Specifically, we consider the following two types of pairwise constraints:

- **Must-Link constraints** $C_{ML}$: $(i, j) \in C_{ML}$ means that the two nodes $i$ and $j$ must belong to the same community structure,

- **Cannot-Link constraints** $C_{CL}$: $(i, j) \in C_{CL}$ means that the two nodes $i$ and $j$ cannot belong to the same community structure.

We incorporate the constraints $C_{ML}$ and $C_{CL}$ into the adjacency matrix $A^{[0]}$ (or $A^{[1]}$) to get a new matrix $B$ as follows:

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } (i, j) \in C_{ML} \\ 0, & \text{if } (i, j) \in C_{CL} \\ A^{[0]}_{ij}, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(1)

where $\alpha$ is some positive constant.

As one can see, if we set $\alpha$ to 1, and for all the pairs of nodes, we know whether they should belong to $C_{ML}$ or $C_{CL}$, in other words, we know very well the community structures in the graph, the adjacency matrix will reduce to the standard consensus matrix, whose $(i, j)th$ element means whether node
and node \( j \) are in the same community structure, 1 means yes and 0 means no. Hence from the point of view of consensus matrix, incorporating prior knowledge can be regarded as the de-noising process.

We denote by type I the formula (1) if \( \alpha = 1 \), and type II if \( \alpha = 2 \).

After incorporating background information into the adjacency matrix, we then apply nonnegative matrix factorization (NMF) and spectral clustering, which are of the most common and widely-used models in unsupervised learning, for community structure detection.

### 2.2. Nonnegative matrix factorization (NMF, [4, 5, 6])

NMF can be expressed as follows: given a nonnegative objective matrix \( X \) of size \( n \times m \), columns of which are samples and rows are features, we try to find two nonnegative matrices \( F \) of size \( n \times k \) and \( G \) of size \( m \times k \) such that: \( X \approx FG^T \). This problem is often formulated as the following nonlinear programming:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{F,G} & \quad J(X \| FG^T) \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad F \geq 0, G \geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( J(X \| FG^T) \) is some cost function that measures the dissimilarity between \( X \) and \( FG^T \), and \( \geq \) means that \( F \) and \( G \) should not have negative entries. The most popular algorithms designed for NMF are multiplicative update rules. The objective matrix \( X \) for NMF can be selected as \( B \).

In ref. [4], it has been shown that the diffusion-kernel-based similarity matrix \( SK \) was the best choice for the objective matrix \( X \) among all the candidates, hence we also tested \( SK \) in this paper (see subsection 3.3).

---

1 Definition of diffusion kernel \( K \) and the similarity matrix \( SK \) ([5, 8]):

\[
K = \lim_{k \to \infty} (1 + \frac{\beta L}{n})^n = expm(\beta L),
\]

where \( L \) is the opposite Laplacian of \( A^{[0]} \):

\[
L_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } i \sim j \\
-d_i & \text{if } i = j \\
0 & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

And

\[
SK_{ij} = \frac{K_{ij}}{\sqrt{K_{ii}K_{jj}}}
\]

We set \( \beta = 0.2 \) in this paper. Note that there is a MATLAB command “expm” for the exponential of a matrix.
The community structures of the network can be obtained from $G$: node
$i$ is of community $k$ if $G_{ik}$ is the largest element in the $i$th row of $G$.

1) Standard NMF with least squares error: If $J(X\|FG^T)$ is selected as the
least squares error: $J(X\|FG^T) = \|X - FG^T\|_F^2$, the algorithm of multi-
licative update rules can be summarized in Algorithm 1.

\begin{algorithm}
\caption{Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (Least Squares Error)}
\begin{algorithmic}[1]
\Input{$X$, iter} \% In this paper, the iteration number $iter$ is set to 100.
\Output{$F, G$}.
\For{$t = 1 : iter$}
\State $F_{ik} := F_{ik} \frac{(XG)_{ik}}{(FG^T)_{ik}}$
\State $G_{ik} := G_{ik} \frac{(X^TF)_{ik}}{(GF^TF)_{ik}}$
\EndFor
\end{algorithmic}
\end{algorithm}

2) Standard NMF with K-L divergence: If $J(X\|FG^T)$ is selected as the
KL divergence: $J(X\|FG^T) = \sum_{i,j} [X_{ij} \log \frac{X_{ij}}{(FG^T)_{ij}} - X_{ij} + (FG^T)_{ij}]$, the
corresponding update rules of $F$ and $G$ are:
\[
F_{ik} := \frac{F_{ik}}{\sum_j G_{jk}} \sum_j \frac{X_{ij}}{(FG)_{ij}} G_{jk};
\]
\[
G_{jk} := \frac{G_{jk}}{\sum_i F_{ik}} \sum_i \frac{X_{ij}}{(FG)_{ij}} F_{ik};
\]

3) Symmetric NMF (SNMF): There is a variant of NMF for semi-supervised
clustering, whose objective function can be formulated as: $\|X - GSG^T\|_F^2$.
The update rules of $G$ and $S$ are [6]:
\[
G_{ik} := G_{ik} \frac{(XGS)_{ik}}{(GSG^TGS)_{ik}},
\]
\[
S_{ik} := S_{ik} \frac{(G^T XG)_{ik}}{(G^T GSG^T G)_{ik}}.
\]
2.3. Spectral Clustering (\cite{9})

Spectral clustering is very powerful in its simplicity and effectiveness, which can be summarized in Algorithm 2. Note that there are many variations of the standard one, and the detailed analysis can be found in ref. [10, 11].

\textbf{Algorithm 2} Spectral Clustering
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Input:} $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$
  \item \textbf{Output:} Community Label $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ of the $n$ nodes
  \item 1: $L = D^{1/2}BD^{1/2}$, where $D$ is the diagonal matrix with the element $D_{ii} = \sum_j B_{ij}$.
  \item 2: Forming the matrix $X = [x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, where $x_i, i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$ are the top $k$ eigenvectors of $L$.
  \item 3: Normalizing $X$ so that rows of $X$ have the same $L_2$ norm: $X_{ij} = X_{ij}/(\sum_j X_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$.
  \item 4: Clustering rows of $X$ into $k$ clusters by K-means.
  \item 5: $Y_i = j$ if the $i$th row is assigned to cluster $j$.
\end{itemize}

2.4. An illustrative example

We close this section by an illustrative example as follows: we try to detect the community structures in an undirected and unweighted network with 128 nodes. Hence there are $128 \times (128-1)/2$ pairs of nodes. The network has 4 communities with 32 nodes each. The heatmap of the corresponding adjacency matrix $A^{[1]}$ is shown as the leftmost in Fig. 1. If we have prior knowledge about the network structure so that we can determine a percentage of pairs of nodes as must-link or cannot-link, we can incorporate them into $A^{[1]}$. As one can see in Fig. 1, the adjacency matrix becomes more and more clear as the percentage of pairs constrained increases, and finally reduces to the standard consensus matrix of the community structures.

3. Experimental Results

In this section, we empirically demonstrated the effectiveness of our proposed semi-supervised framework for the community structure detection problem by applying NMF and spectral clustering with the de-noised consensus matrices to several well-studied networks.
3.1. Data Description

We used both synthetic and real-world networks to test the effectiveness of our methods. The details of these datasets are as follows:

1) GN (Girvan & Newman, [1]): Maybe the most widely used benchmarks are GN networks. The network has 128 nodes which are divided into four non-overlap communities with 32 nodes each. The degree of each node is $Z_{in} + Z_{out} = 16$, in other words, each node averagely has exactly 16 edges which randomly connect $Z_{in}$ nodes in its own community and $Z_{out}$ nodes in other communities. As one can see, with the increasing $Z_{out}$, the community structures will become less clear and the problem more challenging.

2) LFR (Lancichinetti, Fortunato & Radicchi, [12]): Indeed, in most of the real applications, the community structures are more complicated than GN networks. The size of the network might be larger, or the numbers of the nodes in different communities might not be identical, or different nodes might have different positions, i.e., some are superstars or hubs and should have higher degrees while the others are leaves. The LFR benchmark networks are thus proposed to address these problems. In LFR networks, both the degree and the community size distributions are power laws, with exponents $\gamma$ and $\beta$, which is more practical. Each node has a fraction $1 - \mu$ of its links with the nodes in its own community and a fraction $\mu$ with the other ones. Here $\mu$ is called the mixing parameter.

We set the parameters of the LFR network as follows: the number of nodes was 1000, the average degree of the nodes was 20, the maximum degree was 50, the exponent of the degree distribution $\gamma$ was 2 and that of the
community size distribution $\beta$ was 1, and the range of mixing parameter $\mu$ was from 0.1 to 0.8. The communities were non-overlapped.

3) Karate ([13]): this dataset contains the network of friendships between 34 members of a karate club at an American university. This club was by chance split into two smaller ones due to the divergence of opinions about the club fees.

4) Football ([1]): this dataset contains the network of American football games (not soccer) between Division IA colleges during regular season Fall 2000. There are 115 nodes representing the football teams while an edge means there was a game between the teams connected by the edge. The teams were divided into 12 conferences, and all teams except few (mainly in two conferences) played against the ones in the same conference more frequently than those in other conferences.

3.2. Assess Standards

In our experiments, the normalized mutual information (NMI, [14]) was used as the standard to evaluate the community structure detection performance. The value can be formulated as follows:

$$NMI(M_1, M_2) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_{ij} \log \frac{n_{ij}n}{n_i^{(1)}n_j^{(2)}}}{\sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i^{(1)} \log \frac{n_i^{(1)}}{n}\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} n_j^{(2)} \log \frac{n_j^{(2)}}{n}\right)}}$$

where $M_1$ is the ground-truth cluster label and $M_2$ is the computed cluster label, $k$ is the community number, $n$ is the number of nodes, $n_{ij}$ is the number of nodes in the ground-truth cluster $i$ that are assigned to the computed cluster $j$, $n_i^{(1)}$ is the number of nodes in the ground-truth cluster $i$ and $n_j^{(2)}$ is the number of nodes in the computed cluster $j$, log is the natural logarithm.

Compared with simply counting the number of misclassified nodes, NMI is more informative, especially suitable for imbalanced datasets (i.e., the numbers of the nodes in different communities are not identical). For example, in a four-sample toy data, the ground-truth cluster label could be 1, 1, 1, 2. The computed cluster labels of two different models were 1, 1, 1, 1 and 1, 1, 2, 2 respectively. In other words, the smaller cluster was masked and not detected by the first model, hence the second model should be better though it
also had one sample mis-clustered. But the accuracy (number of misclassified nodes divided by the number of nodes in the graph) results of these two models were all 75%, which was misleading. On the other hand, the NMI under this case was 0 (the numerator of NMI was: $3 \log \frac{3 \cdot 4}{3 \cdot 4} + 1 \cdot \log \frac{1 \cdot 4}{1 \cdot 4} = 0$) and 34.56% respectively, which was relatively more reasonable and informative.

In subsection 3.5, we also used the modularity function $Q$ ([15, 16]) as the standard to determine the best community number $k$. The function can be defined as follows:

$$Q = \sum_{C_k} \frac{L(V_{C_k}, V_{C_k})}{L(V, V)} - \left( \frac{L(V_{C_k}, V)}{L(V, V)} \right)^2,$$

where $C_k$ is the $k$th community in the graph, $L(V_1, V_2) = \sum_{i \in V_1, j \in V_2, i \neq j} a_{ij}$, and $a_{ij}$ is the element of $A^{[0]}$.

The larger the values of NMI and Q score, the better the graph partitioning results.

### 3.3. Performance of NMF based on Different Similarity Measures

In this subsection, we compared the clustering performance of NMF-based models with different similarity measures including $A^{[0]}$, $A^{[1]}$, $C^{[A]}$ and $SK$. Fig. 2 shows the NMI results on the GN networks and the LFR networks, from which one can observe that: i) The averaged NMI results decrease with the increasing $\text{Zout}$ for GN networks and the increasing $\mu$ for LFR networks; ii) There is no single winner, but $A^{[1]}$ is a competitive one. Note that getting the diffusion kernel is time consuming for large scale networks, hence we used $A^{[1]}$ for the NMF-based models in the following experiments.

### 3.4. Results Analysis

In this subsection, we systematically compared the results of NMI obtained by the models on the artificial datasets and the karate network with prior knowledge available. For an undirected network with $n$ nodes, there are totally $n(n - 1)/2$ node pairs available. We randomly picked out some pairs of nodes, and determined whether they belonged to $C_{ML}$ or $C_{CL}$: if the two nodes had the same community label, they were must-link, otherwise, they were cannot-link. The results were averages of ten trails and given in Figures 3 and Table 1. From these figures and table, one can observe that: i) The trends of all the models are generally identical and the values of the
Figure 2: Comparison of four similarity measures on datasets GN and LFR. “LSE” means least squares error, “KL” means K-L divergence, “SNMF” means symmetric NMF.
averaged NMI increase with the increasing percentage of pairs constrained; ii) for synthetic datasets: GN and LFR, the type II framework always gets better, and the spectral clustering is better than the NMF-based models, especially for the LFR datasets; iii) for the karate network, NMF with least squares error performs better. In summary, our proposed semi-supervised framework did greatly enhance the results of community structure detection by benefitting from the user provided background information.

Figure 3: Averaged NMI of different models for different percentages of node pairs constrained on GN datasets. The black horizontal line is the best NMI result that had ever got by NMF\_LSE, NMF\_KL, SNMF and the spectral clustering with no prior knowledge available. Means of “LSE”, “KL” and “SNMF” are identical with that in Fig. 2.

Table 1: Averaged NMI of different models given different percentages of node pairs constrained under the type II on the karate dataset. “P” means percentage of node pairs constrained. Means of “LSE”, “KL” and “SNMF” are identical with that in Fig. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Models</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NMF_LSE</td>
<td>99.84%</td>
<td>98.86%</td>
<td>99.67%</td>
<td>99.84%</td>
<td>99.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>NMF_KL</td>
<td>73.38%</td>
<td>73.44%</td>
<td>82.86%</td>
<td>85.18%</td>
<td>89.24%</td>
<td>89.14%</td>
<td>98.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>SNMF</td>
<td>59.53%</td>
<td>51.50%</td>
<td>54.06%</td>
<td>60.96%</td>
<td>53.74%</td>
<td>57.91%</td>
<td>56.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Spectral Clustering</td>
<td>90.19%</td>
<td>90.19%</td>
<td>95.10%</td>
<td>96.73%</td>
<td>95.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. A Case Study: College Football Network

In this subsection, we used the college football network to do a case study, and saw the partitioning results of NMF\_LSE and spectral clustering given different percentages of pairs constrained. The teams were separated into 12
conferences, and most of them played against the ones in the same conference more frequently. However, the teams 37, 43, 81, 83, 91 (in conference IA Independents), 12, 25, 51, 60, 64, 70, 98 (in conference Sunbelt), 111, 29 and 59 played more frequently against the ones in other conferences. Table 2 lists the basic information about these teams, from which one can observe that three out of five teams in IA Independents never played against the ones in the same conference and the other two teams played only once.

Firstly, we tried to determine the community number \( k \). We compared the values of modularity function \( Q \) at different \( k \), and the function achieved its peak value at \( k = 11 \). By combining the results of \( Q \) values in Table 3 with the information in Table 2, we set the community number \( k = 11 \) and the teams in IA Independents would be assigned to the other eleven conferences based on the outputs of NMF and spectral clustering. Hence there were \( 115 - 5 = 110 \) teams with ground-truth conference labels and totally \( 110 \times (110 - 1)/2 = 5995 \) team pairs available. We randomly selected some pairs as constraints: if the two teams of the pair were in the same conference, they were must-link (ML), otherwise, they were cannot-link (CL).

Figure 5 gives the resulting partitions of NMF and spectral clustering corresponding to different percentages of pairs constrained. When given no prior knowledge constrained, there were 5 ~ 6 abnormal teams mis-clustered: teams 29, 60, 64, 98, 111 with NMF and teams 29, 59, 60, 64, 98, 111 with spectral clustering; But after randomly given 5 percent of pairs constrained,
the results were significantly improved and only two abnormal teams were mis-clustered: teams 29 and 111. Finally, when given 20 percent, there was only one team mis-clustered: team 59. From these results, one can see that: 1) NMF and spectral clustering are really good enough in that only some abnormal teams are not correctly clustered; 2) our semi-supervised clustering framework does take the background information and domain knowledge into consideration, which makes the partitioning results more explainable.

Table 2: Basic information about the abnormal teams that played more frequently against the ones in the other conferences. “T” means the team id, “F” means the times that the team played against the other ones in the same conference or in the other conferences, “S” means the same conference, “O” means the other conferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Values of averaged Q functions of NMF, LSE and spectral clustering. The range of the community number $k$ that we have tried is 8 ~ 12. The peak values were achieved at $k = 11$. Meaning of “LSE” is identical with that in Fig. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Community Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMF, LSE</td>
<td>0.5770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectral Clustering</td>
<td>0.5932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. How to give the prior knowledge: randomly or based-on-rule

Finally, we present an interesting problem: how to select the prior information and incorporate them into the models? To the best of our knowledge, in practice, the most widely used method is to randomly select some pairs of samples or nodes and manually determine whether they are must-link or cannot-link based on the domain knowledge. But are there any better methods to select the pairs that can either reduce the workload or improve the clustering performance, or both? Indeed, for a large scale network, a very small percentage of pairs may still mean a huge workload. In this subsection, we attempted to introduce a new rule-based method to address this problem. Firstly, We computed the hamming distances between all pairs of
Figure 5: Comparison of the results of NMF and spectral clustering corresponding to different percentages of pairs constrained. (a): Real grouping in football dataset. There are 12 conferences of 8-12 teams (nodes) each. (b), (c): Outputs of NMF and spectral clustering respectively without any prior knowledge. (d): Outputs of NMF and spectral clustering corresponding to 5 percent of pairs constrained. (e), (f): Outputs of NMF and spectral clustering respectively, corresponding to 20 percent of pairs constrained.
the nodes (rows of $A^{[1]}$), and sorted the distances to find the largest and the smallest ones (this step can be finished by programming calculation, not manually). Then we manually decided whether the selected pairs were must-link or cannot-link and incorporated them into the clustering process. The results on GN datasets are shown in Fig. 6 from which one can observe that our preliminary results are not good enough compared with that in subsection 3.4. Hence we leave the problem open and believe that it deserves further study.

Figure 6: Averaged NMI of different models for different percentages of node pairs constrained under the type II on GN datasets. The prior knowledge are given based on rule. Means of The black horizontal line, “LSE”, “KL” and “SNMF” are identical with that in Fig. 3

4. Conclusions and Future work

In this paper, we have introduced a semi-supervised community structure detection framework for complex social network analysis. The framework adds the supervision of pairwise must-link and cannot-link constraints into the adjacency matrix, which can be regarded as de-noising of the consensus matrix of community structures. The experiments on both the synthetic and real-world networks have demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed framework. In summary, it can combine the network’s functions (background information and domain knowledge) with its topology, making the community structure detection more effective and the results more practical.

We would like to close this paper by raising two interesting problems. Firstly, as we have mentioned in subsection 3.6 are there any better methods that can be used for selecting the constraints? A good attempt is the work in
ref. [17], which selected the constraints based on various similarity measures, not randomly. Secondly, the proposed framework is very flexible, and can be naturally combined with the models in ref. [18, 19, 20]. Researches on these models are our future working directions.
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