
A Tractable Fully Bayesian Method for the Stochastic Block Model

Kohei Hayashi
Takuya Konishi

National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan
 Kawarabayashi Large Graph Project, ERATO, JST

HAYASHI.KOHEI@GMAIL.COM
 TAKUYA-KO@NII.AC.JP

Tatsuro Kawamoto

Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan

KAWAMOTO@SP.DIS.TITECH.AC.JP

Abstract

The stochastic block model (SBM) is a generative model revealing macroscopic structures in graphs. Bayesian methods are used for (i) cluster assignment inference and (ii) model selection for the number of clusters. In this paper, we study the behavior of Bayesian inference in the SBM in the large sample limit. Combining variational approximation and Laplace’s method, a consistent criterion of the fully marginalized log-likelihood is established. Based on that, we derive a tractable algorithm that solves tasks (i) and (ii) concurrently, obviating the need for an outer loop to check all model candidates. Our empirical and theoretical results demonstrate that our method is scalable in computation, accurate in approximation, and concise in model selection.

1. Introduction

Graph clustering has two goals: to detect densely connected subgraphs and to detect structurally homogeneous subgraphs. While the former often optimizes an objective function, the latter infers the latent variables and the parameters of a generative model, for example, the *stochastic block model (SBM)*. Despite its simplicity, the SBM is flexible enough to express a range of structures hidden in real graphs (Leger et al., 2014, Section 2.1), and while many variants of the SBM have been proposed, the more complex models do not always perform better (Peixoto, 2015). In this study, we therefore focus on the most fundamental version of the SBM.

To uncover the underlying block structures, we need to know the cluster assignments of the SBM, which can be in-

ferred, in a principled way, using Bayesian methods (Nowicki & Snijders, 2001; Hastings, 2006; Newman & Leicht, 2007; Hofman & Wiggins, 2008; Daudin et al., 2008; Mariadassou et al., 2010; Decelle et al., 2011; Latouche et al., 2012). Incorporating with prior knowledge, Bayesian methods evaluate the uncertainty of cluster assignments as posterior probabilities.

There are two types of Bayesian method: those that deal with the uncertainty of both cluster assignments and model parameters and those that deal with the uncertainty of cluster assignments only. In this study, we distinguish between them and refer to the former as *full Bayes* and the latter as *partial Bayes*. Full Bayes involves intractable integrals and hence approximation is necessary. Monte Carlo sampling (Nowicki & Snijders, 2001) approximates these integrals numerically. Variational Bayesian (VB) methods (Latouche et al., 2012) introduce the mean-field approximation and solve the integrals as an optimization problem. Despite having less legitimacy, partial Bayes is often favored in practice because of its tractability. Newman & Leicht (2007) developed the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm. Daudin et al. (2008) introduced variational EM, which uses the mean-field approximation for posterior inference. Belief propagation (BP) is an alternative approach for posterior inference that retains the correlation information among the cluster assignments and hence makes inference more accurate than the mean-field approach (Decelle et al., 2011).

Bayesian inference can also be used to determine the number of clusters (Daudin et al., 2008; Decelle et al., 2011; Latouche et al., 2012), which we denote by K . Among all the model candidates $1, \dots, K_{\max}$, Bayesian theory selects the one that achieves the maximum marginal likelihood (Schwarz, 1978). Unfortunately, partial Bayesian methods are inadequate for this task. Because partial Bayes does not take into account the uncertainty of the model parameters, it overestimates the model complexity. To ad-

dress this problem, Daudin et al. (2008) proposed an information criterion that is, under some conditions, *consistent*, meaning that it will select the same model as the maximum marginal likelihood in the large sample limit. Fully Bayesian methods like those proposed by Nowicki & Snijders (2001) and Latouche et al. (2012) have also been used. These methods, however, share the same problem: scalability. To obtain the maximum, we need to compute the marginal likelihood for all model candidates. This implies that the model selection task is up to K_{\max} times time-consuming than the cluster assignment inference task.

Although the SBM has been well analyzed in the *dense* case, interest has recently turned to *sparse* graphs, in which the number of edges grows only linearly with the number of nodes. For example, a person’s Facebook friends do not increase as the total number of Facebook users increases. The analysis of sparse graphs is more realistic, but is theoretically challenging because the block structure will be indistinguishable in the large sample limit (Reichardt & Leone, 2008; Decelle et al., 2011; Krzakala et al., 2013; Kawamoto & Kabashima, 2015). Despite its importance, theoretical development of sparse graphs has been limited compared to their dense counterparts. In particular, no consistent model selection method for sparse graphs has yet been established.

In the machine learning community, *factorized asymptotic Bayesian (FAB) inference* (Fujimaki & Morinaga, 2012; Hayashi et al., 2015) has recently been developed, which approximates fully Bayesian inference for various latent variable models. The FAB method provides both an asymptotic expansion of the marginal likelihood, termed the *factorized information criterion (FIC)*, and a tractable algorithm to obtain it. It has a distinctive regularization effect that eliminates unnecessary model components in the course of the inference; by initializing the model as K_{\max} , the FAB algorithm converges at some $K \leq K_{\max}$, and K can then be used as the selected model.

In this paper, we present an FAB framework for the SBM with the following appealing features:

- Accurate** Our approximation is consistent for both dense and sparse graphs.
- Tractable** Our algorithm employs EM-like alternating maximization, which is written in closed form.
- Scalable** K is automatically selected during posterior inference, eliminating the outer loop for $1, \dots, K_{\max}$.
- Concise** The selected K is small yet maintaining the same prediction accuracy as more complex models.
- No hyperparameters** All the parameters are estimated.

Our main contributions, which have not been addressed in previous FAB studies, are as follows.

- For sparse graphs, the original FAB approximation is

invalid because of model singularity. To avoid this, we analyze the effects of such cases exactly (Section 3).

- We evaluate the asymptotic expansion of the joint marginal likelihood more rigorously, which improves the error rate (Section 3.2) and yields interpretable regularization terms (Section 4.3).
- We derive a new BP rule for full Bayes (Section 4.2).

Notation Throughout this paper, we denote by $x \approx y$ the relation such that $x = y + O(1/N)$, where N denotes the number of nodes.

2. Background

2.1. SBM

Let \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{E} be the sets of $N = |\mathcal{V}|$ nodes and $M = |\mathcal{E}|$ edges, respectively. The graph $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ can have self-edges so that there are $\binom{N+1}{2} = N(N+1)/2$ possible edges. In the SBM, each node belongs to one of K clusters, and each edge is assigned to one of $K(K+1)/2$ biclusters. For example, edge ij is assigned to bicluster kl if node i belongs to cluster k and node j belongs to cluster l . Let us denote by \mathbf{X} the adjacency matrix, by \mathbf{z}_i the 1-of- K coding vector representing the cluster assignment of node i , by $\mathbf{\Pi}$ the $K \times K$ affinity matrix that specifies the probability that a pair of nodes to be connected, and by γ the proportion of cluster assignments ($\sum_k \gamma_k = 1$). Then, the joint log-likelihood of the SBM can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma, K) &= \sum_{ik} z_{ik} \ln \gamma_k \\ &+ \sum_{i \leq j} \sum_{kl} z_{ik} z_{jl} (\ln \pi_{kl}^{x_{ij}} + \ln(1 - \pi_{kl})^{1-x_{ij}}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

For brevity, we omit K from the notation when it is obvious from the context.

2.2. EM Algorithm

By following a Bayesian manner, we marginalize \mathbf{Z} out from the likelihood. The naive marginalization requires all combinations of \mathbf{Z} to be computed, which is computationally infeasible. Instead, we consider its variational form,

$$\ln p(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{q}}[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma)] + H(\tilde{q}) + \text{KL}(\tilde{q} \| \tilde{p}), \quad (2)$$

where \tilde{q} is any distribution over \mathbf{Z} , $H(q) = -\mathbb{E}_q[\ln q(\mathbf{Z})]$ is the entropy, $\text{KL}(q \| p) = \mathbb{E}_q[\ln q(\mathbf{Z})/p(\mathbf{Z})]$ is the KL divergence, and

$$\tilde{p}(\mathbf{Z}) = p(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma) = \frac{p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma)}{\sum_{\mathbf{Z}} p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma)} \quad (3)$$

is the posterior.

The EM algorithm can be used to obtain the posterior $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{Z})$ and the maximum likelihood estimators by iterating two steps called the E-step and the M-step (Newman & Leicht, 2007). Let

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \mathbf{z}_i, \quad \overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top} = \frac{1}{N^2} \left(\sum_{ij} x_{ij} \mathbf{z}_i \mathbf{z}_j^\top + \text{diag} \left(\sum_i x_{ii} \mathbf{z}_i \right) \right)$$

be the sufficient statistics. Here, \bar{z}_k represents the empirical proportion of nodes assigned to cluster k and $\overline{z z_{kl}}$, the kl -th element of $\overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top}$, represents the empirical average of edges assigned to bicluster kl . In the E-step, we update \bar{q} by minimizing the KL divergence with the old estimators of $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and γ . Then, in the M-step, we maximize $\mathbb{E}_{\bar{q}}[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma)]$ with respect to $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and γ , which are obtained in closed form.

Proposition 1. $\mathbb{E}_{\bar{q}}[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma)]$ has a unique maximum at $\gamma = \hat{\gamma}(\bar{q}) \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\bar{q}}[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]$. Also, for $\{(k, l) \mid \mathbb{E}_{\bar{q}}[\bar{z}_k] \mathbb{E}_{\bar{q}}[\bar{z}_l] > 0\}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\bar{q}}[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{\Pi}, \gamma)]$ has a unique maximum at $\pi_{kl} = \hat{\pi}_{kl}(\bar{p})$ where, by denoting \div the element-wise division,

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}(q) \equiv \mathbb{E}_q[\overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top}] \div \left(\mathbb{E}_q[\bar{\mathbf{z}}] \mathbb{E}_q[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]^\top + \frac{1}{N} \text{diag}(\mathbb{E}_q[\bar{\mathbf{z}}]) \right).$$

2.3. BP

The E-step requires $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{Z})$ to be computed, but its normalizing constant is computationally infeasible. One solution is to restrict the class of $q(\mathbf{Z})$. For example, Latouche et al. (2012) proposed a variational EM approach that approximates $q(\mathbf{Z})$ from the mean-field expression $q(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_i q(\mathbf{z}_i)$. However, because $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}$ are mutually dependent in the true posterior, this may cause a huge approximation error.

BP is an alternative approach to obtaining $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{Z})$ (Decelle et al., 2011). BP aggregates local marginal information as “message” and computes marginalization efficiently by exploiting the graphical structure of a probabilistic model. For $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, the message is given as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{j \rightarrow i} \propto \exp(\ln \gamma + \mathbf{a}_j + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}_j \setminus i} \ln \mathbf{\Pi} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{s \rightarrow j}) \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_j = \{s \mid (s, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is the set of the neighbors of node j and $\mathbf{a}_{jk} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}_j} \ln(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{\Pi} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{s \rightarrow j})_k$ is the log-factor of the unconnected nodes. The sum-product rule then gives the marginal expectations as

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_j] \propto \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{j \rightarrow i} * \mathbf{\Pi} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{i \rightarrow j}, \quad (5a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_i \mathbf{z}_j \mid x_{ij} = 1] \propto \mathbf{\Pi} * \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{j \rightarrow i} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{i \rightarrow j})^\top \quad (5b)$$

where $*$ denotes the Hadamard product. Note that the graphical model of the SBM has many loops. Thus, BP on the SBM does not converge to the exact posterior. Nevertheless, in many cases, BP gives a better inference than variational approaches using the mean-field approximation (Decelle et al., 2011).

2.4. Inference on a Sparse Graph

When a graph is dense, the inference of \mathbf{Z} is relatively easy. We say a graph is dense if there exists a constant a such that $a < \pi_{kl} < 1 - a$ for all k and l , meaning that $M = \Theta(N^2)$. Celisse et al. (2012) show that, if a graph is dense and assuming some minor conditions, $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{Z})$ converges almost surely to the indicator of true cluster assignments for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the uncertainty of the posterior of \mathbf{Z} decreases as N increases, i.e., the posterior becomes as a point estimator at the large sample limit.

In contrast, the inference problem becomes more difficult in a sparse graph (Reichardt & Leone, 2008; Decelle et al., 2011). We say a graph is sparse when $\pi_{kl} = \Theta(1/N)$ for all k and l . In this case, π_{kl} approaches zero as N increases, and the uncertainty of \mathbf{Z} remains even as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Accurate inference of the posterior is thus more important than the case of dense graphs, which motivates the use of BP.

Sparseness also confers a computational advantage on BP. For a dense graph, the updating of all the BP messages requires $O(N^3 K^2)$ —there are $O(N^2)$ messages for each node, each message requires $O(K^2)$, and all nodes must be updated in a single sweep. To reduce the computational burden, Decelle et al. (2011) proposed an efficient approximation of \mathbf{a}_j for a sparse graph as, by using the fact that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{s \rightarrow j} \approx \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_s]$,

$$\mathbf{a}_j \approx - \sum_{s \notin \mathcal{V}_j} \mathbf{\Pi} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{s \rightarrow j} \approx - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_s] \equiv \tilde{\mathbf{a}}. \quad (6)$$

The vector $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ is node-independent, allowing the computation of unconnected nodes in (4) to be omitted. In this approach, the messages from unconnected nodes are replaced by an external field. Therefore, in sparse graphs, the complexity is reduced to $O(MK^2)$, because there are M edges and $O(1)$ neighbors for each node.

3. Asymptotic Evaluation of Marginals

Hereafter, for mathematical convenience, we employ the exponential-family representation of the SBM(1):

$$\begin{aligned} \ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\eta}) &= \sum_{i \leq j} \sum_{kl} z_{ik} z_{jl} (x_{ij} \theta_{kl} - \psi(\theta_{kl})) \\ &\quad + \sum_i \left(\sum_{k < K} z_{ik} \eta_k - \phi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in (-\infty, \infty)^{K-1}$ is the natural parameter of γ and $\phi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \ln(1 + \sum_{k < K} e^{\eta_k})$ is the cumulant generating function of the multinomial distribution. Similarly, $\theta_{kl} \in (-\infty, \infty)$ is the natural parameter of π_{kl} and $\psi(x) = \ln(1 + \exp(x))$ is the cumulant generating function of the Bernoulli distribution.

Note that, while the parametrization is different, both (1) and (7) represent the same probabilistic model. Indeed,

there is a one-to-one mapping from one parametrization to the other. For example, the derivative of the cumulant generating function is the mapping from the natural parameter to the original parameter, e.g., $\psi'(\theta_{kl}) = \pi_{kl}$ where $\psi'(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function. Also, $\phi'(\cdot)$ is the softmax function.

3.1. Asymptotic Joint Marginal

Our main goal is to obtain the fully marginalized log-likelihood. Using the exponential-family representation, this is written as

$$\ln p(\mathbf{X}) = \ln \sum_{\mathbf{Z}} \int p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \Theta, \eta) p(\Theta) p(\eta) d\Theta d\eta \quad (8)$$

where $p(\Theta)$ and $p(\eta)$ are the prior distributions of the parameters. The marginalization with respect to Θ and η has no analytical solution in general. Also, the computational infeasibility of \mathbf{Z} discussed in Section 2.2 still remains. We first resolve this issue of infeasibility by using the variational form. As analogous to (2), the full marginal (8) is rewritten as

$$\ln p(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E}_q[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})] + H(q) + \text{KL}(q \| p^*) \quad (9)$$

where $p^*(\mathbf{Z}) \equiv p(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{X})$ is the marginalized posterior in which, in contrast to \tilde{p} , the parameters are marginalized out.

In (9), the joint marginal

$$p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = \int p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \Theta, \eta) p(\Theta) p(\eta) d\Theta d\eta$$

still contains the intractable integrals with respect to Θ and η . However, the joint marginal is more manageable than the full marginal (8). In the joint marginal, \mathbf{Z} is *not latent but rather is regarded as given*. That is, when evaluating $p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$, we can focus on a specific cluster assignments determined by \mathbf{Z} , i.e., the uncertainty of \mathbf{Z} is completely excluded. In addition, as shown in Proposition 1, $p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \Theta, \eta)$ has a unique maximum if there is no empty cluster (i.e., $\forall_k \bar{z}_k > 0$). In this situation, $p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \Theta, \eta)$ has a single peak and its main contribution to the integral is made by the neighbor of the peak; the contribution of the other part diminishes asymptotically. For this type of integral, *Laplace's method* gives a very accurate approximation.

Lemma 2 (Laplace's method (Wong, 2001)). *Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be infinitely differentiable functions on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$. Suppose the integral $I \equiv \ln \int_{\mathcal{X}} \exp(-Nf(\mathbf{x}))g(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}$ converges absolutely for sufficiently large N . If f has a unique maximum at $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ that is an interior point of \mathcal{X} and the Hessian matrix $\nabla\nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is positive definite, then*

$$I \approx -Nf(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \ln g(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\nabla\nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})| - \frac{D}{2} \ln \frac{N}{2\pi}.$$

Letting $Nf(\mathbf{x}) = -\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \Theta, \eta)$ and $g(\mathbf{x}) = p(\Theta)p(\eta)$ with $\mathbf{x} = \{\Theta, \eta\}$, the joint marginal is approximated by Lemma 2. Before the approximation, however, we have to check the conditions of Laplace's method carefully, especially about 1) the regularity of the Hessian matrix and 2) the interiority of the maximum. Although these conditions are satisfied for most instances of \mathbf{Z} , they are sometimes violated. For example, as Proposition 1 suggests, if cluster k is empty (i.e., $\bar{z}_k = 0$), the joint likelihood takes the same value with any $\{\theta_{kl} | k \leq l \leq K\}$ and $\{\theta_{lk} | 1 \leq l < k\}$, i.e., the Hessian matrix becomes singular. Moreover, if no edge belongs to bicluster kl ($\bar{z}_{kl} = 0$), the maximum occurs at $\theta_{kl} \rightarrow -\infty$, which is an endpoint and condition 2) is violated. In particular, the case of $\theta_{kl} \rightarrow -\infty$ is equivalent to the case of $\pi_{kl} \rightarrow 0$ and thus is critical for sparse graphs.

For the violated cases, we evaluate the integral exactly. Combining this with the result of Laplace's method, we obtain an asymptotic expansion of $\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$, which is the main contribution of this paper. The proof is shown in Appendix.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $K = O(1)$ and $p(\Theta)p(\eta)$ is infinitely differentiable. Given \mathbf{Z} , let $\mathcal{S} = \{k | \bar{z}_k > 0\}$ be the set of the non-empty clusters and $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S} \setminus K$; let $M_* = N^2 \min_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{z}_k^2$ be the minimum size of the non-empty clusters. We define the indicator function for non-empty clusters as $\delta_k = \mathbb{I}(\bar{z}_k > 0)$ and denote by $K_{\mathbf{z}} = \sum_k \delta_k$ the number of non-empty clusters. We use a similar notation for non-empty biclusters as $\Delta_{kl} = \mathbb{I}(\bar{z}_{kl} > 0)$ and $K_{\bar{z}\bar{z}} = \sum_{k \leq l} \delta_k \delta_l \Delta_{kl}$. Then, we have*

$$\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{Z}) + C + O(\min(N, M_*)^{-1}), \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{Z}) \equiv \ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta}) - R_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) - R_2(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top}) - \ell_N,$$

$$R_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \delta_k \ln \bar{z}_k,$$

$$R_2(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top}) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \leq l} \delta_k \delta_l \Delta_{kl} \ln \bar{z}_{kl} (1 - \hat{\pi}_{kl}),$$

$$\ell_N \equiv \frac{K_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}} - 1}{2} \ln N + \frac{K_{\bar{z}\bar{z}}}{4} \ln \frac{N(N+1)}{2},$$

$$C \equiv \ln p(\hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{S}}) + \ln p(\hat{\eta}_{\mathcal{S}})$$

$$+ \sum_{k \leq l} \delta_k \delta_l (1 - \Delta_{kl}) P_{kl} + Q_{\mathcal{S}'} + \text{const},$$

$$P_{kl} \equiv \ln \int \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{\theta_{kl}}} \right)^{\bar{M}_{kl}} p(\Theta_{\setminus \mathcal{S}} | \hat{\theta}_{kl}) d\Theta_{\setminus \mathcal{S}},$$

$$Q_{\mathcal{S}} \equiv \ln \int \left(\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{l \notin \mathcal{S}} e^{\eta_l - \ln \hat{\alpha}}} \right)^N p(\eta_{\setminus \mathcal{S}} | \hat{\eta}_{\mathcal{S}}) d\eta_{\setminus \mathcal{S}},$$

where $\bar{M}_{kl} = \frac{N^2}{2} \bar{z}_k (\bar{z}_l + \frac{\mathbb{I}(k=l)}{N})$ and $\hat{\alpha} = 1 + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} e^{\hat{\eta}_k}$.

The result of Theorem 3 is fairly intuitive and interpretable. Marginalization over non-empty clusters $\{k|\bar{z}_k > 0\}$ and biclusters $\{(k, l)|\bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl} > 0\}$ provides a BIC-like “maximum likelihood + penalty” term as $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{Z})$. Since $\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}|\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta})$ is the maximum likelihood, it monotonically increases as K increases. In contrast, the value of ℓ_N decreases on the order of $\ln N$ as the number of non-empty clusters increases, which penalizes model complexity. R_1 and R_2 , resulting from the Hessian matrix, represent additional model complexity, where BIC does not have such term. These effects are discussed in detail in Section 4.3.

The contribution of empty (bi)clusters is separated from the main term and appear as P_{kl} and Q_S , which place an extra penalty on model redundancy. The integrand of P_{kl} is the \bar{M}_{kl} -th power of the sigmoid function and the prior density, where \bar{M}_{kl} roughly represents the proportion of bicluster kl . Because the \bar{M}_{kl} -th power of the sigmoid function has a change point at $\theta = -\ln \bar{M}_{kl}$, it can be approximated by a step function where the step point is $-\ln \bar{M}_{kl}$. This approximates P_{kl} as the log cumulative distribution of the prior: $P_{kl} \simeq \ln \Pr(\theta_{kl} \sim p(\theta_{kl}|\hat{\Theta}_{\setminus S}) < -\ln \bar{M}_{kl})$. Because the logarithm of a cumulative distribution is non-positive, it decreases the likelihood depending on the choice of the priors. A similar observation holds for Q_S .

3.2. Asymptotic Marginal Likelihood

By substituting (10) into (9) and setting $q = p^*$, we obtain the approximation of $\ln p(\mathbf{X})$, which we refer to as the *fully factorized information criterion*:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{F}^2\text{IC}(K) = & \mathbb{E}_{p^*}[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta}, K) - R_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & - R_2(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^\top) - \ell_N + C] + H(p^*). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Corollary 4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3,*

$$\ln p(\mathbf{X}|K) = \text{F}^2\text{IC}(K) + O(1).$$

*In addition, if **A1** p^* satisfies $\Pr(\bar{z}_k \neq 0 \cap \bar{z}_k = o(N^{-\frac{1}{2}})) = O(N^{-1})$ for all k ,*

$$\ln p(\mathbf{X}|K) \approx \text{F}^2\text{IC}(K).$$

Corollary 4 shows that F^2IC is consistent with the marginal log-likelihood. In addition, if **A1** is satisfied, i.e., if the almost-empty clusters having $o(\sqrt{N})$ nodes are rarely generated by the marginal posterior, the approximation becomes more accurate and the error decreases as $O(N^{-1})$.

4. Posterior Inference and Model Selection

4.1. Lower Bound of F^2IC

Computing F^2IC is a nontrivial task due to four challenges:

- 1) evaluation of $\{P_{kl}\}$ and Q_S ,
- 2) estimation of $\hat{\Theta}$ and $\hat{\eta}$,
- 3) inference of $p^*(\mathbf{Z})$, and
- 4) computation of $\mathbb{E}_{p^*}[\cdot]$ in R_1, R_2 , and ℓ_n .

To avoid 1), we employ the (improper) uniform priors for Θ and η . If $N < \infty$ and $|\hat{\eta}_k| < \infty$ for all non-empty clusters, then $\{P_{kl}\}$ and Q_S with the uniform priors lose their dependency on N and become $P_{kl} = \ln \frac{1}{2}$ and $Q_S = |\mathcal{S}| \ln \frac{1}{2}$. Also, $\ln p(\hat{\Theta})$ and $\ln p(\hat{\eta})$ become constants. We therefore ignore C in (10) as a constant.

Difficulties 2)–4) are bypassed them by constructing a tractable lower bound of F^2IC .

For 2), because the average of maxima is greater than or equal to the maximum of the average,

$$\mathbb{E}_q[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta})] \geq \mathbb{E}_q[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \bar{\Theta}, \bar{\eta})] \quad (12)$$

holds for any $q(\mathbf{Z})$, where

$$\{\bar{\Theta}, \bar{\eta}\} = \underset{\Theta, \eta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbb{E}_q[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \Theta, \eta)]$$

is the global maximizers having closed-form solutions:

$$\bar{\theta}_{kl} = (\psi')^{-1}(\hat{\pi}_{kl}(q)), \quad \bar{\eta}_k = (\phi')^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}_k(q)). \quad (13)$$

$(\psi')^{-1}$ is the logit function and $(\phi')^{-1}$ is the inverse softmax function.

For 3), to obtain $p^*(\mathbf{Z})$, we again use Theorem 3. Because $p^*(\mathbf{Z}) = p(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X}) \propto p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$, collecting the \mathbf{Z} -related terms in (10) gives $p^*(\mathbf{Z}) = q^*(\mathbf{Z})(1 + O(\min(N, M_*)^{-1}))$ where

$$q^*(\mathbf{Z}) \propto p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta}) e^{-R_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) - R_2(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^\top) - \ell_N + C}. \quad (14)$$

We then use q^* instead of p^* . Note that because of the nonnegativity of the KL divergence, $\text{F}^2\text{IC}(p^*) \geq \text{F}^2\text{IC}(q)$ holds for any $q(\mathbf{Z})$, and using q^* gives a lower bound.

For 4), we obtain lower bounds using Jensen’s inequality. For R_1 , we use a lower bound of $-\mathbb{E}[\delta_k \ln \bar{z}_k] \geq -\mathbb{E}[\ln(\bar{z}_k + \frac{1}{N})] \geq -\ln(\mathbb{E}\bar{z}_k + \frac{1}{N})$. For R_2 , because $\hat{\pi}_{kl} = \Theta(N^{-1})$ for a sparse graph¹, $\ln \bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl}(1 - \hat{\pi}_{kl}) = \ln \bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl} + \Theta(N^{-1})$ and the effect of $(1 - \hat{\pi}_{kl})$ is negligible. Also, $-\mathbb{E}[\delta_k \delta_l \Delta_{kl} \ln \bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl}] \geq -\ln(\mathbb{E}\bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl} + \frac{1}{N^2})$. A similar lower bound holds for ℓ_N .

By combining these, we obtain the lower bound of F^2IC as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_q[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \bar{\Theta}, \bar{\eta})] - \tilde{R}_1(\mathbb{E}_q \bar{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{R}_2(\mathbb{E}_q \bar{\mathbf{z}\bar{\mathbf{z}}^\top}) \\ & - \tilde{\ell}_N + H(q), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

¹Constructing a lower bound for a dense graph is also possible.

where $\tilde{R}_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \ln(\bar{z}_k + \frac{1}{N})$, $\tilde{R}_2(\overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k < l} \ln(\overline{z_k z_l} + \frac{1}{N^2})$, and $\tilde{\ell}_N = \frac{K-1}{2} \ln N + \frac{K(K+1)}{4} \ln \frac{N(N+1)}{2}$.

4.2. Inference of $q(\mathbf{Z})$

Similarly to the EM algorithm, we need to optimize q in (15) that tightens the lower bound. For that purpose, we derive a new BP rule.

Substituting the above approximations ($R_1 \simeq \tilde{R}_1, R_2 \simeq \tilde{R}_2, \ell_N \simeq \tilde{\ell}_N$) to (14), the sum-product rule defines a message for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ as

$$\mu^{j \rightarrow i} \propto \exp(\ln \bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{a}_j + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}_j \setminus i} \ln \bar{\Pi} \mu^{s \rightarrow j} - \lambda_j), \quad (16)$$

$$\lambda_{jk} = \ln \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\exp(\tilde{R}_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \tilde{R}_2(\overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top})) | z_{jk} = 1], \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[f(\mathbf{Z})] = \sum_{\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{V}_j}} f(\mathbf{Z}) \prod_{s \neq j} \mu^{s \rightarrow j}(\mathbf{z}_j)$ denotes the expectation by the joint message except node j .

Because the log-expectation-exponential in λ_j is intractable, we need to approximate it. The key fact is that each message is normalized, and $\prod_{s \neq j} \mu^{s \rightarrow j}(\mathbf{z}_j)$ can be seen as the probabilities of $\{\mathbf{z}_s\}_{s \neq j}$. By using this, we obtain that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\exp(\tilde{R}_1(\bar{\mathbf{z}})) | z_{jk} = 1] \simeq \exp(\tilde{R}_1(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\bar{\mathbf{z}} | z_{jk} = 1]))$, which is written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \ln(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\bar{z}_k | z_{jk} = 1] + \frac{1}{N}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l \neq k} \ln(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\bar{z}_l | z_{jl} = 0] + \frac{1}{N}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{N \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\bar{z}_k | z_{jk} = 1] + 1}{N \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\bar{z}_k | z_{jk} = 0] + 1} + b. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $b = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^K \ln(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\bar{z}_l | z_{jl} = 0] + \frac{1}{N})$ does not depend on k so that we ignore it as a constant. Also, in a sparse graph, recall that $\mu^{s \rightarrow j}(\mathbf{z}_s) \approx \mathbb{E}_q[\mathbf{z}_s]$ for $j \notin \mathcal{V}_s$ (Section 2.4). Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\bar{\mathbf{z}}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[\sum_{s \neq j} \mathbf{z}_s] + \mathbf{z}_j}{N} \approx \frac{N \bar{\gamma} - \mathbb{E}_q[\mathbf{z}_j] + \mathbf{z}_j}{N}.$$

Similar approximation can be used for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{V}_j}[R_2(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top})]$.

Back-substituting these into (17), we obtain an approximate BP message as

$$\mu^{j \rightarrow i} \propto \exp(\ln \bar{\gamma} + \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_j + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}_j \setminus i} \ln \bar{\Pi} \mu^{s \rightarrow j} - \tilde{\lambda}_j). \quad (18)$$

Here, $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ corresponds to the F^2IC penalty terms defined as

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{jk} = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{[\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{V}_j}]_k + 1}{[\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{V}_j}]_k} \quad (19a)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_l \ln \frac{[\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{V}_j}]_{kl} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}_j} \mathbb{E}_q[z_{sl}]}{[\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{V}_j}]_{kl}}, \quad (19b)$$

Algorithm 1 FABBP(γ, Π)

repeat

for randomly choosing $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ **do**

Update $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{z}_i$ and $\mu^{i \rightarrow j}$ by (18)

$\delta^i = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{z}_i^{\text{new}} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{z}_i^{\text{old}}$, $\delta^{i \rightarrow j} = \mu_{\text{new}}^{i \rightarrow j} - \mu_{\text{old}}^{i \rightarrow j}$

$\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \mathbf{h} + \delta^i$

$\mathbb{E}\bar{\mathbf{z}} \leftarrow \mathbb{E}\bar{\mathbf{z}} + \delta^i / N$

$\mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top} \leftarrow \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top} + \Pi * \delta^{i \rightarrow j} (\mu^{j \rightarrow i})^\top / N^2$

if $\mathbb{E}\bar{z}_k < 0.1/N$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$ **then**

Remove cluster k and $K \leftarrow K - 1$

end if

end for

until $\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} |\delta^{i \rightarrow j}| / M < 10^{-2}$

return $q = \{\mathbb{E}\bar{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbb{E}\overline{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top}\}$

Algorithm 2 The F^2AB algorithm of the SBM.

Initialize $K = K_{\text{max}}$ and $\mu^{i \rightarrow j}$ for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ randomly

Initialize Π by the spectral method (Rohe et al., 2011)

repeat

$q \leftarrow \text{FABBP}(\gamma, \Pi)$

$\gamma \leftarrow \hat{\gamma}(q)$ and $\Pi \leftarrow \hat{\Pi}(q)$

until $\max_{kl} |\pi_{kl}^{\text{old}} - \pi_{kl}^{\text{new}}| < 10^{-8}$

where $\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{V}_j} = N \bar{\gamma}_k - \mathbb{E}_q[\mathbf{z}_j] + \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{V}_j} = N^2 \bar{\gamma} \bar{\gamma}^\top - \mathbb{E}_q[\mathbf{z}_j] \mathbb{E}_q[\sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}_j} \mathbf{z}_s]^\top + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$. These expectations can be computed in the same way as (5).

We refer to the inference algorithm using this messages as *FABBP* (Algorithm 1). Thanks to the approximation for sparse graphs, the time complexity of FABBP is $O(MK^2)$, as in the original BP. In accordance with F^2IC , we refer to the alternating update of $q(\mathbf{Z})$ and $\{\bar{\Theta}, \bar{\eta}\}$ as the *F^2AB algorithm* (Algorithm 2).

4.3. Penalization Effect of R_1 and R_2

In F^2IC (11), the marginalization with respect to Θ and η induces additional terms R_1 and R_2 via Laplace's method. Their effects are inherited in FABBP as $\tilde{\lambda}$, which does not exist in the original BP message (4). In fact, $\tilde{\lambda}$ diminishes the size of redundant clusters. For example, consider the effect of R_1 , which appears as (19a). When $\bar{\gamma}_k = \Omega(1)$, $\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{V}_j} \approx N \bar{\gamma}_k$. This simplifies (19a) to

$$\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{V}_j} + 1}{[\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{V}_j}]_k} \simeq \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{N \bar{\gamma}_k} \right). \quad (20)$$

This suggests that, if $\Omega(N)$ nodes are assigned to cluster k , $1/N \bar{\gamma}_k \rightarrow 0$ and (20) goes to zero, i.e., R_1 penalizes nothing. In contrast, if cluster k has only a few nodes, $1/N \bar{\gamma}_k$ remains a constant, and R_1 reduces the message proportion of cluster k (Figure 1).

Remarkably, R_2 has a different penalization effect that




Figure 1. Penalization effect of R_1 .

complements that of R_1 . As in (20), (19b) can be approximated as

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_l \ln \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{s \in \mathcal{V}_j} \mathbb{E}_q[z_{sl}]}{N^2 \bar{\gamma}_k \bar{\gamma}_l} \right). \quad (21)$$

Unlike the case of R_1 , two cluster sizes $\bar{\gamma}_k$ and $\bar{\gamma}_l$ appear in the denominator together. Because the product $\bar{\gamma}_k \bar{\gamma}_l$ represents the proportion of bicluster kl , R_2 penalizes each cluster if it has many small (low-proportional) biclusters. Thus, R_2 evaluates the redundancy of clusters in a more fine-grained way than R_1 does—the R_1 penalty depends on cluster proportions, whereas the R_2 penalty depends on bicluster proportions.

These penalization affect all the BP messages, and redundant clusters disappear in the FABBP iterations. For this reason, it is not necessary to compute the F²IC lower bound for model selection; if the initial model K_{\max} is sufficiently large, the FABBP algorithm will automatically determine an adequate K .

5. Related Work

Bayesian Methods Nowicki & Snijders (2001) employed a Monte Carlo method for Bayesian inference. Although it is accurate, their method cannot handle graphs larger than a few hundred nodes. To deal with large graphs, the VB method using the EM algorithm is often used (Newman & Leicht, 2007; Hofman & Wiggins, 2008; Daudin et al., 2008; Latouche et al., 2012). One of the standard approaches is to update the latent variables and model parameters iteratively using the uninformative priors (Hofman & Wiggins, 2008; Latouche et al., 2012; Mariadassou et al., 2010). An alternative approach is to use BP for the cluster assignment inference (Hastings, 2006; Decelle et al., 2011).

Bayesian nonparametric methods provide an alternative way of determining K (Antoniak, 1974; Griffiths & Ghahramani, 2011). Kemp et al. (2006) proposed the infinite relational model (IRM), which extends the SBM to handle an infinite number of clusters. In a way similar to FAB, K is automatically determined during the learning process. However, Miller & Harrison (2013) proved that

the Dirichlet process mixtures (DPMs)—the Bayesian non-parametric extension of mixture models—overestimate K . Because the IRM is closely related to the DPM, the IRM may be inconsistent.

Model Selection In partial Bayesian methods, a few information criteria have been proposed. Peixoto (2012; 2013) used a criterion based on the minimum description length principle. Decelle et al. (2011) proposed a BP-based framework that determines K from the Bethe free energy.

Next, for comparison with F²IC, we introduce four fully Bayesian information criteria.

Daudin et al. (2008) adapted the *integrated classification likelihood (ICL)* criterion (Biernacki et al., 2000) to the SBM, defined as

$$\text{ICL} = \ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{p}} \mathbf{Z} | \hat{\Theta}(\tilde{p}), \hat{\eta}(\tilde{p})) - \tilde{\ell}_N, \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{\ell}_N$ is as defined in Section 4.1. There are three main differences with F²IC: ICL 1) uses \tilde{p} instead of p^* and does not have 2) the entropy H and 3) the penalties R_1 , R_2 , and C . 1) and 2) are reasonable for a dense graph because, as discussed in Section 2.4, \tilde{p} converges to a point estimator, which means that $p^* \rightarrow \tilde{p}$ and $H(\tilde{p}) \rightarrow 0$ at $N \rightarrow \infty$. Also, 3) can be ignorable as a constant and hence ICL is consistent asymptotically equivalent to $\ln p(\mathbf{X}|K)$, if the following strong condition holds: **A2**) the probability that the posterior generates empty (bi)clusters is zero.² In contrast, when a graph is sparse, $H(\tilde{p}) = O(N)$ and the consistency no longer holds.

Latouche et al. (2012) proposed a non-asymptotic counterpart of ICL that replaces the marginal likelihood with its VB lower bound. However, the error caused by the mean-field approximation is not asymptotically negligible and consistency does not hold.

Fujimaki & Morinaga (2012) proposed the original formulation of FIC for mixture models. Because the SBM is a mixture model, the FIC can be imported into the SBM. This is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FIC} = & \mathbb{E}_{p^*} [\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta}) - \frac{K(K+1)}{2} R_1(\bar{z})] \\ & - \tilde{\ell}_N + H(p^*). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

FIC is similar to F²IC in having the penalty term R_1 . This eliminates unnecessary clusters, in the same way as F²IC, during posterior inference. However, FIC ignores the Hessian term in Laplace’s method, which omits R_2 from the formulation. This makes the approximation error larger and the regularization effect weaker than F²IC (we confirm this empirically in the next section.) Crucially, FIC

²A2 is a strong version of A1.

Table 1. Summary of fully Bayesian model selection on SBM. “Accuracy” shows asymptotic error against $p(\mathbf{X})$. “One-Pass” indicates whether model selection is one pass or not. Note that ICL is consistent but its asymptotic rate is unknown.

Methods	Accuracy (with/without A2)		One-Pass
	Dense	Sparse	
ICL (22)	Consistent/-	$O(N)$ /-	
cICL (24)	$O(1)$ /-	$O(1)$ /-	
VB (Latouche et al.)	-/-	-/-	
FIC (23)	$O(1)$ /-	$O(1)$ /-	✓
F ² IC (11)	$O(\frac{1}{N})/O(1)$	$O(\frac{1}{N})/O(1)$	✓

does not take into account the case of empty (bi)clusters in Laplace’s method. Although, like ICL, this is justifiable when **A2** is satisfied, consistency does not hold for sparse graphs. Finally, FIC is computed by VB-based optimization; BP inference like FABBP (Algorithm 2) has not been addressed.

For ICL (22), if we add the entropy and move the expectation to the outside, the criterion corresponds to the simplified version of FIC called *BICEM* (Hayashi et al., 2015). We refer to this as *corrected ICL* (*cICL*):

$$cICL = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{p}}[\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} | \hat{\Theta}(\tilde{p}), \hat{\eta}(\tilde{p}))] - \tilde{\ell}_N + H(\tilde{p}). \quad (24)$$

Under **A2**, cICL is asymptotically equivalent to the full marginal for both dense and sparse graphs. Nevertheless, cICL essentially differs from F²IC in that cICL uses the unmarginalized posterior (3). Therefore, cICL does not have an automatic model selection mechanism and the outer loop for all model candidates is needed.

Table 1 compares the above methods with F²IC. It can be seen that F²IC is the most accurate method and the only consistent criterion for sparse graphs without any special conditions like **A2**.

Finally, we discuss a few studies that have addressed the scalability issue of model selection. Yang & Zhao (2015) proposed a simultaneous framework of inference and model selection by simplifying the parameterization of the SBM. Liu et al. (2015) developed an FAB framework for the factorial graph model that assumes a low-rank structure in edge probabilities while allowing cluster overlapping. However, their models are essentially different, and their approaches are not applicable to the SBM.

6. Experiments

Following six methods were used in experiments: ICL and cICL with BP inference, VB and FAB with the mean-field approximation, FIC+BP, and F²AB. FIC+BP was the method whose objective is the original FIC (23) yet the inference was done by FABBP. All of these were implemented in Python and $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}$ were initialized using the




Figure 2. Synthetic data experiment: results. (Top) Means and standard deviations of selected number of clusters with 10 different random seeds. (Bottom) Means runtimes.

Table 2. Real network experiment: data.

Data	N	M
football (Girvan & Newman, 2002)	114	1224
euroroad (vSubelj & Bajec, 2011)	1174	2834
propro (Jeong et al., 2001)	1868	4406
netscience (Newman, 2006)	1460	5484
email (Guimer et al., 2003)	1133	10902
names (Konec, 2015a)	1773	18262
uniq (Konec, 2015c)	1858	25068
usairport (Konec, 2015b)	1574	34430

spectral method (Rohe et al., 2011). The model candidates of ICL, cICL, and VB were set to $\{1, \dots, K_{\max}\}$. All the hyperparameters of VB were set to $1/2$ as suggested by Latouche et al. (2012).

Synthetic Data First, we investigated whether the selected number of clusters K coincided with one planted using synthetic data. We set $K = 4$ as the planted value, and true $\mathbf{\Pi}$ as $\pi_{kl} = 1/N$ for $k \neq l$ and $\pi_{kk} = 20/N$ as a sparse graph. We then generated data with $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}(1, 1, 1, 1)$, i.e. all of the clusters were the same size. We set $K_{\max} = 20$. The results (Figure 2) show clearly that FIC+BP and F²AB outperformed the other methods. ICL consistently underestimated K , as noted in Section 5. The performances of cICL and VB were unstable; they detected K correctly in most cases but produced a few very inaccurate estimations. While the performances of FIC+BP and F²AB were similar, F²AB provided more accurate and stable detection, especially when N was small.

Table 3. Real network experiment: results. Means (and standard deviations) of selected number of clusters and testing errors with 5 different random seeds. “nNPLL” indicates negative NPLL (smaller is better.) Results that were significantly better in one-sided t -test with 95% confidence are indicated by bold font.

	email	euroroad	football	names	netscience	propro	uniq	usairport	
Selected K	cICL	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	VB	24.8	5.1	13	40.9	21.33	28.8	39.1	
	IRM	319.99	220.02	27.77	406.18	340.95	353.69	497.07	
	FAB	13.1	7.8	10.9	12.5	16.5	3.5	16	
	FIC+BP	25.11	11.44	11.3	21.5	18.5	10	16.86	
	F ² AB	7.25	4.43	5.75	6	6.62	2.62	8.71	
nNPLL $\times 10^2$	cICL	N/A	N/A	14.49 \pm 0.75	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	VB	7.28 \pm 0.58	4.27 \pm 1.15	30.57 \pm 0.79	6.89 \pm 0.66	3.96 \pm 0.67	5.69 \pm 11.52	10.97 \pm 0.98	17 \pm 2.03
	IRM	6.93 \pm 0.04	2.4 \pm 0.02	11.3 \pm 0.15	5.28 \pm 0.02	3.65 \pm 0.02	2.4 \pm 0.02	5.82 \pm 0.02	4.81 \pm 0.01
	FAB	9.61 \pm 0.55	1.75 \pm 0.13	26.47 \pm 0.53	13.75 \pm 1.78	9.62 \pm 1.67	1.67 \pm 0.14	11.28 \pm 0.41	27.46 \pm 2.04
	FIC+BP	3.84 \pm 0.15	1.65 \pm 0.05	9.97 \pm 0.3	3.16 \pm 1.58	1.09 \pm 0.06	1.13 \pm 0.03	4.97 \pm 3.39	52.69 \pm 15.14
	F ² AB	3.85 \pm 0.11	0.95 \pm 0.03	8.99 \pm 1.01	3.18 \pm 0.09	1.21 \pm 0.11	1.03 \pm 0.33	3.43 \pm 0.11	67.02 \pm 12.65

Real Networks We also investigated the performance using eight real networks (Table 2). Instead of ICL, we added the IRM with collapsed Gibbs sampling (Liu, 1994). For IRM, we used the same hyperparameter setting as VB. We set $K_{\max} = \max\{20, \sqrt{N}\}$. To measure the generalization error, we randomly masked 1% of all edges as missing and these were not used in the training (during the training, these missings were imputed by each algorithm.) After model selection, we evaluated the normalized predictive log-likelihood (NPLL), which is the PLL divided by $N(N+1)/2$, for those missing values. The results in Table 3 show that cICL exceeded 48 hours for most data sets, whose results are not shown. In terms of prediction, FIC+BP and F²AB were significantly better than the others in five data sets. In addition, F²AB selected the smallest K for all except “usairport” data set.

Discussion In the real data experiment, the difference among FAB, FIC+BP, and F²AB highlights the significance of our contributions in FABBP and F²IC. As shown, FIC+BP outperformed FAB for the seven data sets in prediction. Because their objective function was the same, the outperformance was attributed to the BP inference. Also, yet the prediction performance was equivalent, F²AB selected 2–4 times smaller K than FIC+BP. In this case, because the inference methods were the same, the difference had to come from the difference of the objective functions, or more specifically, the penalty term R_2 . This supports the distinctiveness of R_2 discussed in Section 4.3.

Selecting a parsimonious model is a fascinating nature of our approach that fits the principle of Occam’s Razor. If K is too small (e.g. $K = 1$), the model cannot describe data well, and the generalization error will be increased. In contrast, if K is too large (e.g. $K = O(100)$), the generalization error can be small but interpreting its result is difficult. As shown in the above experiments, our method resolved this trade-off in the most successful way. Indeed,

F²AB achieved the best prediction performance with the smallest K in most of the real data sets.

A major theoretical limitation of the F²AB algorithm is the lack of consistency. Although F²IC is consistent, the F²AB algorithm does not have such guarantee due to the use of BP and the lower bound. Nevertheless, the F²AB algorithm empirically selected better models than the other methods. This is plausibly because of the following two reasons. First, because the number of message loops is smaller in a sparse graph, FABBP might closely converge to the true marginal posterior. Second, the F²AB algorithm started the inference from K_{\max} , which was usually very large. This might expand a possible search space and avoid getting stuck in local maxima.

Acknowledgments

KH was supported by MEXT KAKENHI 15K16055. TK was supported by JSPS KAKENHI 26011023.

References

- Antoniak, Charles E. Mixtures of dirichlet processes with applications to bayesian nonparametric problems. *Annals of Statistics*, 2(6), 1974.
- Biernacki, Christophe, Celeux, Gilles, and Govaert, Gérard. Assessing a mixture model for clustering with the integrated completed likelihood. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 22(7):719–725, 2000.
- Celisse, Alain, Daudin, Jean-Jacques, and Pierre, Laurent. Consistency of maximum-likelihood and variational estimators in the stochastic block model. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 6:1847–1899, 2012.
- Daudin, J. J., Picard, F., and Robin, S. A mixture model for random graphs. *Statistics and Computing*, 18(2):173–183, 2008.

- Decelle, Aurelien, Krzakala, Florent, Moore, Christopher, and Zdeborová, Lenka. Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications. *Phys. Rev. E*, 84:066106, 2011.
- Fujimaki, Ryohei and Morinaga, Satoshi. Factorized asymptotic bayesian inference for mixture modeling. In *AISTATS*, 2012.
- Girvan, M. and Newman, M. E. J. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(12):7821–7826, 2002.
- Griffiths, Thomas L. and Ghahramani, Zoubin. The Indian buffet process: An introduction and review. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:11851224, 2011.
- Guimer, Roger, Danon, Leon, Daz-Guilera, Albert, Giralt, Francesc, and Arenas, Alex. Self-similar community structure in a network of human interactions. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68(6):065103, 2003.
- Hastings, M. B. Community detection as an inference problem. *Phys. Rev. E*, 74:035102, 2006.
- Hayashi, Kohei, Maeda, Shin-ishi, and Fujimaki, Ryohei. Rebuilding factorized information criterion: Asymptotically accurate marginal likelihood. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2015.
- Hofman, Jake M. and Wiggins, Chris H. Bayesian approach to network modularity. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(25):258701, 2008.
- Jeong, H., Mason, S.P., Barabasi, A.L., and Oltvai, Z.N. Lethality and centrality in protein networks. *Nature*, 411:41–42, 2001.
- Kawamoto, Tatsuro and Kabashima, Yoshiyuki. Limitations in the spectral method for graph partitioning: Detectability threshold and localization of eigenvectors. *Phys. Rev. E*, 91:062803, Jun 2015. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.91.062803.
- Kemp, Charles, Tenenbaum, Joshua B., Griffiths, Thomas L., Yamada, Takeshi, and Ueda, Naonori. Learning systems of concepts with an infinite relational model. In *Proceedings of the 21st National Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 1, AAAI'06*, 2006.
- Konect. King james network dataset – KONECT, 2015a.
- Konect. Us airports network dataset – KONECT, 2015b.
- Konect. Hamsterster friendships network dataset – KONECT, 2015c.
- Krzakala, Florent, Moore, Christopher, Mossel, Elchanan, Neeman, Joe, Sly, Allan, Zdeborová, Lenka, and Zhang, Pan. Spectral redemption in clustering sparse networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 110(52):20935–40, December 2013. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1312486110.
- Latouche, Pierre, Birmel, Etienne, and Ambroise, Christophe. Variational bayesian inference and complexity control for stochastic block models. *Statistical Modelling, SAGE Publications*, 12(1):93–115, 2012.
- Leger, Jean-Benoist, Vacher, Corinne, and Daudin, Jean-Jacques. Detection of structurally homogeneous subsets in graphs. *Statistics and Computing*, 24(5):675–692, 2014.
- Liu, Chunchen, Feng, Lu, Fujimaki, Ryohei, and Muraoka, Yusuke. Scalable model selection for large-scale factorial relational models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2015.
- Liu, Jun S. The collapsed Gibbs sampler in Bayesian computations with application to a gene regulation problem. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(427):958–966, 1994.
- Mariadassou, Mahendra, Robin, Stphane, and Vacher, Corinne. Uncovering latent structure in valued graphs: A variational approach. *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 4(2):715–742, 2010.
- Miller, Jeffrey W and Harrison, Matthew T. A simple example of dirichlet process mixture inconsistency for the number of components. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, 2013.
- Newman, M. E. J. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Phys. Rev. E*, 74:036104, 2006.
- Newman, MEJ and Leicht, EA. Mixture models and exploratory analysis in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(23):9564, 2007.
- Nowicki, Krzysztof and Snijders, Tom A. B. Estimation and prediction for stochastic blockstructures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(455):1077–1087, 2001.
- Peixoto, Tiago P. Entropy of stochastic blockmodel ensembles. *Phys. Rev. E*, 85(5):056122, 2012.
- Peixoto, Tiago P. Parsimonious module inference in large networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:148701, 2013.
- Peixoto, Tiago P. Model selection and hypothesis testing for large-scale network models with overlapping groups. *Phys. Rev. X*, 5:011033, 2015.

Reichardt, Jörg and Leone, Michele. (un)detectable cluster structure in sparse networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 101:078701, 2008.

Rohe, Karl, Chatterjee, Sourav, and Yu, Bin. Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(4):1878–1915, 2011.

Schwarz, Gideon. Estimating the Dimension of a Model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(2):461–464, 1978.

vSubelj, Lovro and Bajec, Marko. Robust network community detection using balanced propagation. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 81(3):353–362, 2011.

Wong, R. *Asymptotic Approximation of Integrals (Classics in Applied Mathematics)*. SIAM: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2001.

Yang, Bo and Zhao, Xuehua. On the scalable learning of stochastic blockmodel. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.

A. Proof of Theorem 3

We first derive the Hessian matrix of the log-likelihood.

Proposition 5. *The Hessian matrix of the negative maximum log-likelihood $-\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \mid \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta})$ is given as a block diagonal matrix $\mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{F}_\Theta & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{F}_\eta \end{pmatrix}$. The submatrix \mathbf{F}_Θ is diagonal having $K(K+1)/2$ elements, where each element corresponds to the second derivative with respect to θ_{kl} for $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $k \leq l \leq K$. Its diagonal element is given as*

$$\bar{M}_{kl} \hat{\pi}_{kk} (1 - \hat{\pi}_{kk}) \quad (25)$$

where \bar{M}_{kl} is defined in Theorem 3. Another submatrix \mathbf{F}_η is given as

$$\mathbf{F}_\eta = N(\text{diag}(\hat{\gamma}_{\setminus K}) - \gamma_{\setminus K} \hat{\gamma}_{\setminus K}^\top), \quad (26)$$

where $\gamma_{\setminus K} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{K-1})^\top$.

Proof. Since Θ and η have no interaction in $\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \mid \Theta, \eta)$, the off-diagonal elements of \mathbf{F} are zero. Now we check the Hessian w.r.t. Θ , which is

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_{kl}^2} \left\{ -\binom{N+1}{2}^{-1} \ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \mid \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta}) \right\} \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{2}{N(N+1)} \sum_{i \leq j} z_{ik} z_{jl} \psi''(\hat{\theta}_{kl}) \quad (28)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N(N+1)} \left(\sum_{i,j} z_{ik} z_{jl} \psi''(\hat{\theta}_{kl}) + \sum_i z_{ik} z_{il} \psi''(\hat{\theta}_{kl}) \right) \quad (29)$$

$$= \frac{N}{N+1} (\bar{z}_k \bar{z}_l + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_i z_{ik} z_{il}) \psi''(\hat{\theta}_{kl}). \quad (30)$$

Since \mathbf{z}_i is 1-of- K -coded, $\sum_i z_{ik} z_{il} = 0$ for $k \neq l$ and $\sum_i z_{ik} z_{ik} = \sum_i z_{ik} = N \bar{z}_k$. Also, since $\psi'(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function, its derivatives is written as

$$\psi''(\hat{\theta}_{kl}) = \psi'(\hat{\theta}_{kl})(1 - \psi'(\hat{\theta}_{kl})) \quad (31)$$

$$= \hat{\pi}_{kl}(1 - \hat{\pi}_{kl}) \quad (32)$$

By substituting these, we obtain Eq. (25). For η ,

$$\nabla_\eta \nabla_\eta \frac{-\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \mid \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\eta})}{N} = \nabla_\eta \nabla_\eta \phi(\hat{\eta}) \quad (33)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \phi(\hat{\eta})}{\partial \eta_k} = \phi'_k(\hat{\eta}) \equiv \frac{e^{\hat{\eta}_k}}{1 + \sum_{p < K} e^{\hat{\eta}_p}}, \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi(\hat{\eta})}{\partial \eta_k \partial \eta_l} = \frac{\partial \phi'_k(\hat{\eta})}{\partial \eta_l} \quad (35)$$

$$= \mathbb{I}(k = l) \frac{e^{\hat{\eta}_k}}{1 + \sum_{p < K} e^{\hat{\eta}_p}} - \frac{e^{\hat{\eta}_k} e^{\hat{\eta}_l}}{(1 + \sum_{p < K} e^{\hat{\eta}_p})^2} \quad (36)$$

$$= \mathbb{I}(k = l) \phi'_k(\hat{\eta}) - \phi'_k(\hat{\eta}) \phi'_l(\hat{\eta}) \quad (37)$$

$$= \mathbb{I}(k = l) \hat{\gamma}_k - \hat{\gamma}_k \hat{\gamma}_l. \quad (38)$$

This yields Eq. (26). □

We then consider the joint marginal. We see that the marginalization is divided into into two parts:

$$\ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = \ln \int p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \mid \Theta, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\Theta) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\Theta d\boldsymbol{\eta} \quad (39)$$

$$= \ln \int p(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{Z}, \Theta) p(\Theta) d\Theta + \ln \int p(\mathbf{Z} \mid \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta}. \quad (40)$$

The first term can further be broken down into the marginals with respect to $\{\theta_{kl}\}$, which is evaluated by the next lemma.

Lemma 6. Let $\Theta_{\setminus kl} = \{\theta_{ij} \mid i \neq k \wedge j \neq l\}$. Then,

$$\ln \int p(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{z}_l, \theta_{kl}) p(\Theta) d\theta_{kl} = \ln p(\Theta_{\setminus kl}) \quad (41)$$

$$+ \begin{cases} P_{kl} & \text{if } \bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl}, \bar{z}_k, \bar{z}_l > 0 \\ P_{kl} & \text{if } \bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl} = 0 \text{ and } \bar{z}_k, \bar{z}_l > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \bar{z}_k = 0 \text{ or } \bar{z}_l = 0 \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

P_{kl} and \bar{M}_{kl} are defined in Theorem 3.

Proof. For the integral, there are three cases we have to consider.

Case 1: $\bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl}, \bar{z}_k, \bar{z}_l > 0$

In this case, $-\infty < \hat{\theta}_{kl} < \infty$ and $\psi''(\hat{\theta}_{kl}) > 0$, meaning the conditions for Laplace's method are satisfied. We then use Laplace's method and obtain the result.

Case 2: $\bar{z}\bar{z}_{kl} = 0$ and $\bar{z}_k, \bar{z}_l > 0$

In this case, the maximum occurs at the endpoint $\hat{\theta}_{kl} \rightarrow -\infty$, and we cannot use Laplace's method. We then leave it as an exact expression of the integral, which is P_{kl} .

Case 3: $\bar{z}_k = 0$ or $\bar{z}_l = 0$

In this case, $p(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{z}_l, \theta_{kl}) = 1$ and the integral boils down the marginalization of the prior $\int p(\Theta) d\theta_{kl} = p(\Theta_{\setminus kl})$. \square

The second term of (40) is evaluated as the next lemma.

Lemma 7. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{k \mid \bar{z}_k > 0\} \setminus K$. Then,

$$\ln \int p(\mathbf{Z} \mid \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} \approx N \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{z}_k \hat{\eta}_k - N \phi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{\mathcal{S}}) + \ln p(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{\mathcal{S}}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \ln \bar{z}_k - \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{2} \ln \frac{N}{2\pi} + Q_{\mathcal{S}}(N) \quad (43)$$

where $Q_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ are defined in Theorem 3.

Proof. By denoting $\alpha = 1 + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} e^{\eta_k}$, $\beta = 1 + \sum_{l \notin \mathcal{S}} e^{\eta_l - \ln \alpha}$ and using the relation $\frac{e^x}{a} = e^{x - \ln a}$, we have

$$\ln \int p(\mathbf{Z} \mid \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} = \ln \int \exp\left(N \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{z}_k \hat{\eta}_k\right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} e^{\hat{\eta}_k} + \sum_{l \notin \mathcal{S}} e^{\eta_l}}\right)^N p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} \quad (44)$$

$$= \ln \int \exp\left(N \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{z}_k \hat{\eta}_k\right) \left(\frac{1}{\alpha\beta}\right)^N p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) d\boldsymbol{\eta} \quad (45)$$

By using change of variable $\xi_l = \eta_l - \ln \alpha$ for $l \notin \mathcal{S}$, we can rewrite this as

$$\ln \int \exp\left(N \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{z}_k \hat{\eta}_k\right) \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^N \left(\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{l \notin \mathcal{S}} e^{\xi_l}}\right)^N p(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mathcal{S}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\setminus \mathcal{S}} + \ln \alpha) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mathcal{S}} d\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\setminus \mathcal{S}}. \quad (46)$$

In (46), the marginal w.r.t. η_S approximated by Laplace's method as

$$\mathcal{L} \equiv N \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{z}_k \hat{\eta}_k - N \phi(\hat{\eta}_S) + \ln p(\hat{\eta}_S) - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\mathbf{F}_S| - \frac{|S|}{2} \ln \frac{N}{2\pi} \quad (47)$$

where

$$\ln |\mathbf{F}_S| = \ln |\nabla_{\hat{\eta}_S} \nabla_{\hat{\eta}_S} \phi(\boldsymbol{\eta})| \quad (48)$$

$$= \ln(1 - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{\gamma}_s) + \ln \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{\gamma}_s \quad (49)$$

$$= \ln \hat{\gamma}_K + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{\gamma}_s \quad (50)$$

$$= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S} \cup K} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_s. \quad (51)$$

Then, (46) is rewritten as

$$(46) \approx \mathcal{L} + \ln \int \left(\frac{1}{1 + \sum_{l \notin \mathcal{S}} e^{\xi_l}} \right)^N p(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\setminus \mathcal{S}} + \ln \hat{\alpha} | \hat{\eta}_S) d\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\setminus \mathcal{S}} \quad (52)$$

$$\approx \mathcal{L} + Q_S(N). \quad (53)$$

□

Combining Lemmas 6 and 7 gives (10).