Using bootstrap for statistical inference on random graphs

Mary E. Thompson,* Lilia Leticia Ramirez Ramirez,† Vyacheslav Lyubchich,‡ and Yulia R. Gel§

(Dated: March 13, 2014)

In this paper, we propose new nonparametric approach to network inference that may be viewed as a fusion of block sampling procedures for temporally and spatially dependent processes with the classical network methodology. We develop estimation and uncertainty quantification procedures for network mean degree using a "patchwork" sample and nonparametric bootstrap, under the assumption of unknown degree distribution. We investigate asymptotic properties of the proposed patchwork bootstrap procedure and present cross-validation methodology for selecting an optimal patch size. We validate the new patchwork bootstrap on simulated networks with short and long tailed mean degree distributions, and revisit the Erdös collaboration data to illustrate the proposed methodology.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 02.10.Ox, 02.50.Tt, 02.70.Uu

arXiv:1402.3647v2 [stat.AP] 12 Mar 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

With the explosive growth of online social networking and recent advances on modeling of massive and complex datasets, there exists a strong need to develop new statistical and computational methods for network analysis. Motivating areas of research vary from spread of computer viruses and infectious diseases to media propagation and dynamics of toxic financial assets (e.g., see [1–6]).

As a result, proposed parametric network models range from the classical light-tailed Erdös-Rényi and Poissonian graphs to power law models and models whose degree sequence tends to some limiting distribution of various shapes (see [7–9] and references therein). Among such approaches are the configuration model [10], the preferential attachment model [11–14], the generalized random graph (GRG) model [12, 15], and a family of block models, including degree corrected models [16–18]. Other parametric approaches include an extensive class of latent variable models [19, 20] and a well-investigated class of exponential random graph models (ERGMs) on finite-dimensional networks (see an overview by [21]). Relative tractability of ERGMs is attractive for many random network studies, but in practice ERGMs suffer from a variety of limitations, e.g. yielding an inadequate fit to real data, being nearly degenerative and applicable only to networks of finite order [22, 23].

Given the challenging and nontrivial task of parametric model specification, nonparametric or at least semiparametric network inference is especially appealing, but the literature on these procedures is still very scarce. Recently [24] proposed a nonparametric approach of fitting network models, which constrains the graph degree as the number of vertices goes to infinity and uses method of moments, interpreting the moments as empirical or theoretical frequencies of certain patterns in an observed network of possibly infinite order, including but not limited to triangles and stars. This methodology is applicable to a general class of networks, including nonparametric and (semi)parametric network specifications, but the method suffers from complexity in obtaining variances of moment estimates.

As an alternative, it appears natural to follow a bootstrap path and develop a resampling-based data-driven inference for random networks, without imposing restrictive conditions on network degree distribution and model specification. The classical bootstrap of Efron [25] was suggested for i.i.d. data and then modified to time series and spatial processes [26–28]. Intuitively, we can borrow the resampling ideas developed for dependent processes and adapt them to networks. Indeed, we can view a random graph as a mathematical object representing a hybrid of time and space dependent processes, with a natural metric induced by a shortest path between two vertices. In this framework, the methods of block sampling and subsampling that are applicable to a wide range of dependent processes without imposing restrictive model assumptions are particularly attractive.

II. RANDOM GRAPHS PRELIMINARIES

Typically, a complete description of a network and its topology is infeasible. As an alternative, it is conventional to study the local description of a complex network, in terms of numbers of edges incident to specific vertices or such quantities as local clustering coefficients. These local features are intrinsically probabilistic, which leads us to consider random graphs as a model for complex networks, where a random graph is a graph whose properties are determined in some random way [29].

Formally, a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a mathematical object that consists of a set of vertices, $V(G)$, and a set of edges, $E(G)$. The number of vertices, $|V(G)|$, is the order; the

* methomps@uwaterloo.ca; University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada

† lilialeticia.ramirez@itam.mx; The author thanks Asociación Mexicana de Cultura A.C. for providing financial support.; Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico (ITAM), Mexico

‡ vlyubchi@uwaterloo.ca; University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada

§ ygl@uwaterloo.ca; University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada

number of edges, $|E(G)|$, is the size of G. The distance $d(u,v)$ is the minimum number of edges in a connected path from u to v in G, and $e_{uv} \in E$ denotes the edge connecting the two adjacent vertices $u, v \in G$. In this paper, we focus on the graphs that are undirected ($e_{uv} = e_{vu}$) and loopless ($u \neq v \; \forall e_{uv} \in E$).

The k-th order neighborhood of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is defined by

$$N_k[v, G] = \big\{u \in V(G) : d(v,u) \leq k\big\}.$$

The degree of a vertex v, $d(v)$, is the number of edges incident to v. If we arrange all vertex degrees $d(v)$ in non-decreasing order, we obtain the degree sequence of a graph G. We can quantify the graph connectivity, i.e. the extent to which vertex v is connected to other vertices within G, by considering the probability that the degree $d(v)$ of a randomly selected vertex v is k. This leads to the degree distribution of a graph, which is especially interesting as a descriptor for large graphs [7]. The joint degree distributions are the distributions of the degrees of randomly selected pairs and, more generally, k-tuples of vertices, conditional on the pattern of edges among them.

The simplest model for a random graph is the Erdös-Rényi graph with a binomial degree distribution, which corresponds to taking n vertices, and connecting any pair of distinct vertices with a fixed probability p, so that

$$f(k) = C_{n-1}^k p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k} \sim \lambda^k e^{-\lambda}/k!.$$

In the limiting case of $n \to \infty$ this leads to the Poisson random graph model with $\lambda = (n-1)p$.

In the Erdös-Rényi model vertices with degrees that are much higher than the mean degree are exponentially rare: vertex degrees are generally similar, what leads to graph homogeneity. However, many naturally occurring complex networks, e.g. the world-wide web, exhibit a fat-tailed degree distribution, proportional to a power law $k^{-\tau}$ with $\tau > 1$. Such networks are called scale-free and are characterized by the presence of some vertices with a high degree, or graph heterogeneity. A degree distribution that resembles a distribution for a scale-free network is the polylogarithmic, or Gutenberg-Richter law distribution [3, 30]:

$$f(k) = k^{-\delta} e^{-k/\lambda}/Li_\delta(e^{-1/\lambda}),$$
$$Li_\delta(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z^j/j^\delta,$$

which is skewed and tends to the power law distribution as $\lambda \to \infty$, but has the property that all its moments are finite $\forall \delta \in [1, \infty)$ and $\forall \lambda \in (0, \infty)$.

In many practical applications, e.g. Internet networks, it is impossible to distinguish the light Poisson and heavy tailed power law degree sequences with any reasonable confidence [31, 32]. The effects on inference derived from hypothesizing one distribution vs. another can be quite profound, as in the case of most currently available imputation methods for missing network data [21, 33]. Thus, it is tempting to opt for a data-driven inference, without imposing restrictive conditions on the network degree distribution.

III. "PATCHWORK" SAMPLING AND BOOTSTRAP ON RANDOM GRAPHS

In this paper we propose a new data-driven approach to inference on random graphs, namely a "patchwork" sampling design and bootstrap, while extending the ideas of block sampling to random graphs. Let G be a hypothetical (generally never fully observed) undirected random graph, whose order is finite but unknown, with degree distribution $F = \{f(k), k \geq 0\}$; and let G_n be its observed realization of order n with the degree distribution $F_n = \{f^{(n)}(k), 0 \leq k \leq n\}$, in the sense that as $n \to \infty$, the degree distribution and joint degree distribution of G_n approach the degree distribution of G. If K is the degree of G, then its independent realizations $k_1, k_2, \ldots k_n$ form the degree sequence. The graph G_n can be a realization of G, with labeled vertices and having this degree sequence, e.g. generated by a random graph algorithm such as the Molloy-Reed procedure [34].

Suppose that we are interested in the population mean degree of G, $\mu(G)$. Our goal is to assess the bias and uncertainty of estimation of the population statistic $\mu(G)$ using a sample from G_n and the bootstrap distribution of the sample statistic.

Thus we elaborate a sampling and bootstrap scheme. In the next sections we present the implemented "patchwork" sampling, the proposed mean estimates and the bootstrap procedure. In addition, we discuss the general asymptotic properties of the mean degree estimate.

A. Labelled Snowball with Multiple Inclusions

The algorithm to construct a Labelled Snowball sample with Multiple Inclusions (LSMI) with m ($m < n$) seeds and d waves proceeds as follows (see Algorithm 1).

1. Sample randomly without replacement m distinct vertices — seeds. They form the zero wave of LSMI, since each seed originates a "patch".

2. Construct a "patch" around each seed:

   (a) Select all vertices that are directly connected to the seed. This is the *first wave of non-seeds* for the seed.

   (b) Remove all edges that were used at the previous step.

   (c) Select all immediate neighbors of the first wave of non-seeds for the seed, using the remaining edges. We call them the *second wave*

of non-seeds for the seed. We obtain some new non-seeds, and some non-seeds can have multiple classification.

(d) Remove all edges that were used at the previous step.

(e) Select all immediate neighbors of the second wave of non-seeds for the seed, using the remaining edges. We call them the *third wave of non-seeds* for the seed. Again, we obtain some new non-seeds, and some non-seeds can have multiple classification.

(f) Repeat removing the used edges and selecting immediate neighbors up to the d-th wave.

3. Join together the m "patches". The waves emanating from different seeds may overlap. Therefore, some vertices might appear in the LSMI multiple times and bear different labels (e.g., be a seed in one "patch", and a second degree neighbor in another "patch").

Algorithm 1: Labeled Snowball with Multiple Inclusions

Data: graph G_n (Fig. 1(a)); number of seeds m, $m < n$; number of waves d.
Result: sample of m seeds with d waves around each seed.
$seed$ = randomly sample without replacement m vertices from G_n (zero wave of the LSMI, Fig. 1(b))
for $j = 1, \ldots, m$ **do**
  start with original G_n and $seed_j$
  for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ **do**
    $wave_i$ = select all immediate neighbors using the existing edges (Figs. 1(c), 1(e) and 1(g))
    remove the used edges (Figs. 1(d), 1(f) and 1(h))
  end
  $patch_j$ = join the current $seed_j$ and all $wave_i$ keeping the repeated elements
end
join all m patches

This algorithm results in a sample of vertices that is a union of the m sampled patches, each having one of the seeds as its origin. The whole LSMI sample can be viewed as a representative subgraph or subnetwork for the graph realization G_n. Since variability from one representative subnetwork to another is typically high, in the later sections we generate sets of T LSMIs to better infer the topology of G_n. We confine attention to inference about the mean degree of the graph, and thus the data from the LSMI considered in the paper consist of the set of vertices together with their multiplicities of appearing in each wave, and the degree of each of the vertices.

Remark 1. The LSMI design may be viewed as a fusion of classical snowball sampling, induced subgraph sampling and star sampling [7, 35].

B. The Mean Degree Estimator

Before we proceed to the second step of our "patchwork" bootstrap algorithm, we discuss how we can estimate the mean degree in a subnetwork, generated according to the LSMI design. The natural idea here is to adapt the Horvitz-Thompson estimator to the proposed LSMI design [7, 36].

Suppose a patch is formed from a seed selected at random from G_n. Then for any fixed vertex i: its probability of inclusion as the seed is $1/n$; as a first-wave non-seed is k_i/n; as a second-wave non-seed is approximately $1/n$ times the sum of the "excess degrees" of its neighbors (though not exactly, since some of the neighbors of its neighbors may coincide). If a vertex is a seed or a first-wave non-seed in the patch, its inclusion probability as such is observed. If it is a second wave non-seed in the patch, its approximate inclusion probability as a second wave non-seed is observed if and only if the degrees of its neighbours are seen, as occurs if $d \geq 3$.

There are two natural frameworks for inference. In what we might call the *single-phase* inference framework, borrowing terminology from sampling theory:

- The object of inference would be the single network G_n with the degree sequence $\{k_1, \ldots, k_n\}$.
- We would wish to estimate the mean degree of G_n, from a probability sample (LSMI) of its vertices.
- If n is large, the degree sequence distribution would be close to that of K.

We would make an additional assumption that if n is large the empirical joint degree distributions in G_n of connected and unconnected vertices is close to those of Newman's and Andersson's "branching process approximation" [37] (an assumption sufficient for a "network Law of Large Numbers" to hold).

However, our framework is closer to what we might call the *two-phase conditional* inference framework, in which

- The object of inference is the expectation $E(K) = \mu(G)$ for the hypothetical graph G.
- The graph G_n is randomly selected from a "superpopulation" of realizations of G having the same degree sequence. We wish to estimate $E(K)$ from a probability sample (LSMI) on G_n.
- In the compound model of generation of G_n followed by the LSMI sample, inclusion probabilities of vertices are functions of their own degrees only, because they are averaged over possible selections of G_n from the superpopulation, all having the same set of degrees.

In the *single-phase framework*, an approximately unbiased estimate from the non-seeds of patch q of the mean

degree $E_n(K)$ of G_n would be $(1-p_0)A_{NSq}/B_{NSq}$ where

$$A_{NSq} = \sum_{w=1}^{d} a_w \sum_{j \in \text{wave } w \text{ of } q} \frac{k_j}{p_{jw}},$$
$$B_{NSq} = \sum_{w=1}^{d} a_w \sum_{j \in \text{wave } w \text{ of } q} \frac{1}{p_{jw}},$$

$p_0 = f(0)$, the a_w are constants summing to 1, and p_{jw} is the inclusion probability of j as a wave w non-seed ($w > 0$) for a single patch. We make the proposal, thinking in terms of the inclusion probabilities in the two-phase conditional framework, that p_{jw} can be replaced by $\gamma_w k_j$ for a constant γ_w.

Does the proposal for approximating inclusion probabilities contribute to bias? Taking also $a_w = \gamma_w$ means the expectation of A_{NSq} is

$$E\left[\sum_{w=1}^{d} \frac{1}{(\sum_{v=1}^{d} \gamma_v)} \sum_{j \in \text{wave } w \text{ of } q} 1_j\right] = \frac{1}{(\sum_{v=1}^{d} \gamma_v)} \sum_{w=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} p_{jw}.$$

The expectation of B_{NSq} is

$$E\left[\sum_{w=1}^{d} \frac{1}{(\sum_{v=1}^{d} \gamma_v)} \sum_{j \in \text{wave } w \text{ of } q} \frac{1}{k_j}\right] = \frac{1}{(\sum_{v=1}^{d} \gamma_v)} \sum_{w=1}^{d} \sum_{j:k_j>0} \frac{p_{jw}}{k_j}.$$

It is straightforward to show that for $d = 2$, the expectation of the numerator divided by the expectation of the denominator is approximately $E_n(K)$, assuming the branching process approximation. For $\sum_{j=1}^{n} p_{j1} = E_n(K)$ and $\sum_{j:k_j>0} p_{j1}/k_j = 1 - p_0$; moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} p_{j2} \simeq E_n(K)E_n(K_T);$$
$$\sum_{j:k_j>0} \frac{p_{j2}}{k_j} \simeq (1-p_0)E_n(K_T),$$

where K_T represents the *excess degree* (or degree minus 1) of a vertex with degree at least 1. Computations for higher d would proceed similarly.

The sources of bias are in the places we make approximations — the ratio estimation, the extent to which first neighbours of a randomly selected vertex are connected, and the departure of the averages in G_n of the degrees and the "sum [average] of excess degrees of first neighbours" from their limiting values under the assumed network Law of Large Numbers. Thus we expect the bias to be larger: the smaller the network, the heavier the tail of the degree distribution, and the larger the number of waves, (since the connections among non-seeds other than through paths from the seed will then be more frequent).

We apply the same principle to estimation from the full LSMI or "patchwork" sample. Let $\{d_s\}$ be the degrees of the sampled seeds; $\{d_{ns}\}$ be the degrees of non-seeds; $|\{d_s\}|$ be the number of sampled seeds; and $\hat{p_0}$ be the relative frequency of zeros in the set $\{d_s\}$. Then the estimated degree distribution from the sampled seeds and non-seeds is

$$\hat{f}(0) = \hat{p}_0 \tag{1}$$
$$\hat{f}(k) = \frac{|\{d_s = k\}| + (1-\hat{p}_0)\hat{E}(K)|\{d_{ns} = k\}|k^{-1}}{|\{d_s\}| + \hat{E}(K)\sum_{k\geq 1}|\{d_{ns} = k\}|k^{-1}},$$

for $k = 1, \ldots$. Here $\hat{E}(K)$ is the estimated mean degree based on $\{d_s\}$:

$$\hat{E}(K) = \sum_{k\geq 0} k\frac{|\{d_s = k\}|}{|\{d_s\}|}. \tag{2}$$

Then, the corresponding estimator of the mean degree, $\hat{\mu}$ is given by

$$\tilde{E}(K) = \sum_{k\geq 0} k\hat{f}(k) \tag{3}$$
$$= \frac{|\{d_s\}|\hat{E}(K) + (1-\hat{p}_0)\hat{E}(K)|\{d_{ns}\}|}{|\{d_s\}| + \hat{E}(K)\sum_{k\geq 1}|\{d_{ns} = k\}|k^{-1}},$$

where the expectation of its numerator is approximately

$$|\{d_s\}|E(K) + (1-p_0)E(K)|\{d_s\}|E(K),$$

while the expectation of its denominator is approximately

$$|\{d_s\}| + E(K)|\{d_s\}|(1-p_0).$$

Alternatively, the estimator of mean degree can be written in the form:

$$\frac{\frac{1}{m}\sum_{q=1}^{m} A_{Sq} + C(1-\hat{p}_0)\frac{1}{m}\sum_{q=1}^{m} A_{NSq}}{\frac{1}{m}\sum_{q=1}^{m} B_{Sq} + C\frac{1}{m}\sum_{q=1}^{m} B_{NSq}},$$

where A_{Sq} and A_{NSq} are estimators of the total of degrees from the degrees of the seed and the non-seeds of patch q, respectively, and B_{Sq} and B_{NSq} are corresponding estimators of the graph order from the seeds and the non-seeds of patch q. C is an arbitrary combination factor.

C. Bootstrap Procedure

Now we are ready to perform the second step in our "patchwork" sampling and bootstrap algorithm, namely resampling within a set of sampled "patches".

We used two different resampling schemes. These are *Weighted* or *Non-Weighted* resampling within each set of sampled "patches" and they comprise the following steps:

- Bootstrapping seeds. We randomly sample $|\{d_s\}|$ seeds with replacement and estimate the respective mean degree according to (2).

- Bootstrapping non-seeds. Since in the original sample, non-seeds are always selected by following one of its edges, the probability of their selections is proportional to $kf(k)$, where $f(k)$ is the degree distribution of G. The bootstrapping of these elements is done under two different approaches.

  – In a *non-weighted selection*, the elements in $\{d_{ns}\}$ are randomly sampled with replacement. Hence, according to (1), the *estimated distribution* base on the b-th bootstrap sample is given by

$$\hat{f}^*_{NWb}(0) = \hat{p}^*_0,$$
$$\hat{f}^*_{NWb}(k) = \frac{|\{d^*_s = k\}| + (1 - \hat{p^*_0})\hat{E}(K)|\{d^*_{ns} = k\}|k^{-1}}{|\{d^*_s\}| + \hat{E}(K)\sum_{k\geq 1}|\{d^*_{ns} = k\}|k^{-1}},$$

  where $k > 0$ and $\hat{E}(K)$ is defined by (2).

  – Alternatively, in a *weighted selection*, the elements in $\{d_{ns}\}$ are sampled with replacement with probability proportional to its reciprocal value. Then the bootstrap distribution is

$$\hat{f}^*_{Wb}(0) = \hat{p}^*_0,$$
$$\hat{f}^*_{Wb}(k) = \frac{|\{d^*_s = k\}| + (1 - \hat{p^*_0})|\{d^*_{ns} = k\}|}{|\{d^*_s\}| + |\{d^*_{ns}\}|}.$$

Finally, by plugging-in $\hat{f}^*_{NWb}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{f}^*_{Wb}(\cdot)$ into (3), we calculate the non-weighted and weighted versions of the bootstrap resample estimate of mean degree, with results $\hat{\mu}^{*,b}_{NW}$ and $\hat{\mu}^{*,b}_{W}$, respectively.

We perform B bootstrap replications within one LSMI to construct the bootstrap distribution of the mean degree statistic, i.e. $\{\hat{\mu}^{*,1}_{NW}, \ldots, \hat{\mu}^{*,B}_{NW}\}$ and $\{\hat{\mu}^{*,1}_{W}, \ldots, \hat{\mu}^{*,B}_{W}\}$. Since the variability among LSMIs is typically high, we cannot assume that one LSMI provides a good approximation to the observed realization G_n. Hence, we obtain T LSMIs, which result in $T \times B$ number of bootstrap estimates, and T bootstrap distributions of the mean degree. We average the bootstrapped distributions over T, and construct confidence intervals for the population statistic $\mu(G)$ or the realized graph statistic $\mu(G_n)$.

D. Asymptotic Properties

From the discussion at the end of Part B of this section, the estimator of mean degree from a single LSMI is essentially a ratio estimator, and its error has a linearized approximation of the form

$$\frac{1}{m}\sum_{q=1}^{m} Z_q,$$

where it can be seen from calculations like those in Part B that the terms Z_q have mean approximately 0 under the branching process approximation. The terms are nearly i.i.d. because the centres of the patches have been taken with simple random sampling, the design being very close to simple random with replacement when the order of the graph is large compared to m.

Consistency of the estimator follows in an asymptotic framework in which the bias of Z_q tends to 0 as the order of the graph increases, and the variance of the estimator decreases with increasing sample size. The simplest such framework is one where the order of the graph increases faster than the number of seeds selected (for fixed number of waves and fixed degree distribution with finite moments). The single-phase framework is one such, especially if the number of waves is 0 or 1; the two-phase conditional framework is another, for a general fixed number of waves.

Asymptotic normality can be established for the estimator using a (single-phase) framework with regularity conditions analogous to those of the Erdös-Rényi finite population sampling central limit theorem [38], or in the two-phase conditional framework. Here also, both the number of seeds selected and the order of the graph must increase, for fixed number of waves and fixed degree distribution.

The bootstrap proposed here is not just the resampling of terms Z_q, and thus theory analogous to that for bootstrapping dependent data in time series will have to be developed for its theoretical justification. Under the assumptions made for consistency and asymptotic normality, we conjecture that the bootstrap intervals for mean degree will be valid asymptotically for a single LSMI.

IV. CROSS-VALIDATION PROCEDURE TO CHOOSE A SEED-WAVE COMBINATION

As with the moving block bootstrap and tile bootstrap in time series and random fields respectively [28], the performance of the proposed "patchwork" sampling and bootstrap combination may be sensitive to the combination of the number of seeds and number of waves. Thus the choice of a suitable combination is crucial for reliability of the derived inference. In applications where samples may be obtained readily, to ensure stability of the obtained results we propose a design-estimation strategy which is based not just on a single LSMI sample but on a set of JT independent LSMI samples, or T independent LSMI samples for each of J choices of numbers of seeds and waves (seed-wave choices).

Let $\hat{\mu}^{j*}$, $1 \leq j \leq J$, be the set of B bootstrap replications of the T sample-specific estimators of mean degree from the j-th seed-wave combination obtained from the

graph realization G_n, i.e.

$$\hat{\mu}^{j*} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{1,[1]} & \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{1,[2]} & \cdots & \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{1,[B]} \\ \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{2,[1]} & \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{2,[2]} & \cdots & \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{2,[B]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{T,[1]} & \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{T,[2]} & \cdots & \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{T,[B]} \end{pmatrix}.$$

To draw inference on the unobserved population mean degree $\mu(G)$, we can employ a combination of Efron's bootstrap confidence intervals (CI) based on quantiles

$$CI^j_t = \left(\hat{\mu}^{j*}_{(t,[B\alpha/2])}, \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{(t,[B(1-\alpha/2)])}\right), \qquad (4)$$

$t = 1, \ldots, T$, for each seed-wave combination j, $j = 1, \ldots, J$.

If the bootstrap means for a given seed-wave combination were normally distributed, an appropriate combination of the T confidence intervals to produce a single one would be

$$\bar{M} \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} W_t^2}{T}\right)},$$

where M_t is the centre of CI^j_t, $\bar{M}$ is the average of the M_t's, and W_t is half the width of CI^j_t.

In fact, simulations show that for degree distributions of even moderate skewness, this combination tends to have coverage probabilities lower than the nominal ones. A combination that works better for our purposes in the cross-validation method is

$$\bar{M} \pm \frac{C}{\sqrt{T}} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} W_t^2}{T}\right)},$$

where C is an inflation (combination) factor of about 2 or 3.

Fig. 2 illustrates performance of the "patchwork" bootstrap in terms of coverages of 95%-confidence interval, yielded by different seed-wave combinations, varying graph orders and two different mean degree distributions. As expected, the obtained results noticeably depend on seed-wave combinations. In particular, combinations with smaller number of waves have 100% coverage, greater than the declared confidence level. With an increase of waves, as the bias of the estimator increases and its standard error decreases, the true coverages become lower than the declared levels. Coverages delivered by combinations with higher numbers of seeds tend to decay faster (because the biases due to the finiteness of the graph are larger), e.g. for polylogarithmic and zero-truncated Poisson graphs with 1,000 vertices, coverage for 100 seeds falls from 100% for 1 wave to up to 20-30% for 5 waves. Furthermore, dynamics of the confidence interval calibration depends more on the graph order (see the right and left panels of Fig. 2) than on the degree distribution (see the upper and lower panels of Fig. 2). However, in all cases it appears that there exists a seed-wave combination that delivers a coverage close to the declared 95% level, and such a combination is not unique.

To select the "optimal" seed-wave combination given the observed graph, we propose a data-driven method, based on a cross-validation (CV) argument. While in general the CV procedure can be extended to a case when each set of J LSMI samples is allowed to produce its own optimal seed-wave combination, here we focus only on a case when all T independent LSMI samples in one set share the same optimal seed-wave combination.

Our CV procedure is defined as follows. For each seed-wave combination $j = 1, \ldots, J$:

- select T_1, $T_1 \leq T$, LSMI samples from the T LSMI samples by simple random sampling with replacement N times, and for each LSMI sample carry out B bootstrap samples;
- for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, N$, construct a combined bootstrap confidence interval CI^j_ℓ by the method

$$\bar{M} \pm \frac{C}{\sqrt{T_1}} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_1} W_t^2}{T_1}\right)}.$$

Then choose a proxy set V_{proxy} of vertices selected by simple random sampling from G_n and compute its mean degree $\tilde{\mu}_{proxy} = \sum_{k \geq 0, s \in V_{proxy}} k \times |\{d_s = k\}|/|\{d_s\}|$; for each $j = 1, \ldots J$ calculate the coverage for $\tilde{\mu}_{proxy}$, i.e. count how many times from N, the intervals CI^j_ℓ contain $\tilde{\mu}_{proxy}$.

Select a seed-wave combination that yields a coverage closest to the declared $(1-\alpha)$-level (see [39], on the discussion of loss function for CI selection), i.e.

$$j_{opt} = \arg \min_{j=1,\ldots,J} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} 1_{(\tilde{\mu}_{proxy} \in CI^j_\ell)} - (1-\alpha) \right|.$$

Then construct a combined confidence interval in the same manner for the set of T LSMI samples corresponding to j_{opt}, but replace CI^j_t of (4) with

$$CI^{j_{opt}}_t = \left(\hat{\mu}^{j_{opt}**}_{(t,[B\alpha/2])}, \hat{\mu}^{j_{opt}**}_{(t,[B(1-\alpha/2)])}\right), \qquad (5)$$

where for $t = 1, \ldots, T$ and $b = 1, \ldots B$, $\hat{\mu}^{j_{opt}**}_{t,b}$ is $\hat{\mu}^{j_{opt}*}_{t,b}$ plus the degree of a randomly selected (without replacement) seed from the proxy set, centered and multiplied by $\sqrt{(1/\nu) + (1/n)}$, where ν is the size of the proxy set. This random perturbation of the (j_{opt}, t, b)-th bootstrap mean is designed to account for the facts that the mean of the proxy set differs from $\mu(G_n)$, and that this in turn differs from $\mu(G)$. Intervals for Fig. 2 also contain this random part since they are obtained during the CV procedure with $\nu = 2,000$.

Remark 2. While the classical CV argument suggests that preferably $V_{proxy} \bigcap V_{seeds} = \emptyset$, our simulations indicate that if $V_{proxy} \bigcap V_{seeds} \neq \emptyset$ or even $V_{proxy} \subset V_{seeds}$,

difference in delivered performance is typically negligible, both in terms of calibration and sharpness. This allows us to minimize the amount of required information, which is critical for applications where additional sampling is either impossible or expensive.

Remark 3. As an alternative, we can develop a similar type of CV argument for inference on the mean degree of G_n rather than on the mean degree of G. Since the results are found to be very similar, we do not present them here.

V. SIMULATION STUDY

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the newly proposed "patchwork" bootstrap procedure for inference on mean degree of a random graph. We consider graph orders from 1,000 to 10,000 and two different distributions for mean degree: polylogarithmic ($\mu = 2.42$) and zero-truncated Poisson ($\mu = 2.31$).

We found that empirical coverage of bootstrap intervals for the mean degree noticeably depends on the graph order; therefore we consider a sliding window of potential seed-wave combinations, with the number of seeds increasing with the number of vertices in the graph. As Fig. 2 indicates, the seed-wave combinations yield relatively well calibrated confidence intervals for the 95% confidence level we have considered, and precision is higher for larger graphs (compare left and right panels of Fig. 2).

Table I shows that the coverage probabilities of bootstrap intervals for optimal seed-wave combinations selected by the cross-validation procedure are close to the declared 95% level for all considered graph orders and degree distributions.

TABLE I. Average coverage of 95% bootstrap confidence intervals for the mean degree, for the optimal seed-wave combination, selected in each Monte Carlo simulation using cross-validation. Considered 36 combinations for each graph order: waves from 0 to 5 for all n; seeds 3, 5, 7, 10, 20, 50 for n=1,000; 7, 10, 20, 50, 100, 120 for n=2,000; 10, 20, 50, 100, 120, 130 for n=3,000; 20, 50, 100, 120, 130, 150 for n=5,000; 50, 100, 120, 130, 150, 200 for n=10,000. Number of LSMI samples T=25, with B=500 bootstrap resamples per each. Combination factor C=2. Cross-validation is based on T_1=25, N=100 and V_{proxy} of 2,000 seeds. Number of Monte Carlo simulations is 100.

Distribution	μ	Graph order n				
		1,000	2,000	3,000	5,000	10,000
zero-truncated Poisson(2)	2.31	0.93	0.95	0.96	0.97	0.97
polylogarithmic(0.1,2)	2.42	0.90	0.94	0.93	0.95	0.95

We ran an extensive simulation study and evaluated other possible forms for bootstrap confidence intervals (CI) based on B bootstrap means for each of T LSMI and J seed-wave combinations, $j = 1, \ldots, J$. In particular, we considered

- the "pooled" Efron's quantiled-based CI that is constructed using the sample quantiles of the combined set of $T \times B$ bootstrap means

$$CI^j = \left(\hat{\mu}^{j*}_{[BT\alpha/2]}, \hat{\mu}^{j*}_{[BT(1-\alpha/2)]}\right);$$

- the "sorted" Efron's quantiled-based CI that is constructed by averaging sample quantiles yielded by each LSMI over T

$$CI^j = \left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\hat{\mu}^{j*}_{(t,[B\alpha/2])}, \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\hat{\mu}^{j*}_{(t,[B(1-\alpha/2)])}\right);$$

- the "unsorted" Efron's quantiled-based CI that is constructed by averaging unsorted bootstrap means over T and then calculating the sample quantiles of these averages

$$CI^j = \left(\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\hat{\mu}_t^{j*}\right)_{[B\alpha/2]}, \left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\hat{\mu}_t^{j*}\right)_{[B(1-\alpha/2)]}\right).$$

Since for the considered simulation scenarios the performance of these alternative confidence intervals is either comparable to or worse than the performance of CI (5), we omit these numerical results for brevity.

VI. CASE STUDY

To illustrate our approach, we consider the Erdös collaboration network of mathematical scientists,[1] which is one of the largest publicly available social networks [3, 40–42]. The Erdös collaboration network is initiated by one of the most productive mathematicians of all times, Paul Erdös, whose Erdös number is 0. All co-authors of Erdös have Erdös number 1, while those who have a joint paper with an immediate co-author of Erdös have Erdös number 2, and so on. If there exists no chain of co-authors leading from Erdös to a person, such person has an Erdös number ∞. In our study we consider a collaboration graph updated in late 2010, where the vertices are researchers appearing in the Mathematical Reviews (MR) database of the American Mathematical Society, and two vertices are connected by an edge if MR has a record of a joint publication (paper, book etc)

[1] The Erdös data are kindly provided by Jerry Grossman, Oakland University, http://www.oakland.edu/enp/.

in which both of the corresponding researchers are co-authors, regardless of whether there are other co-authors in this publication. Our database contains 208,200 vertices, with degrees from 1 to 502 and the Erdös number ranging from 0 (Paul Erdös himself) to 15. The average number of connections (co-authors) per individual in this database is 4.43.

Our study is motivated by the results of [40] who viewed the Erdös network as a prototype of evolving networks, and in particular, their findings on the increasing degree distribution of the Erdös network over the years. We undertake a different but complementary analysis of these data by exploring whether there exists any difference in degree distribution of the two groups of researchers. We define the groups by "seniority" or the magnitude of the Erdös number, i.e. authors with the Erdös number from 1 to 4 and those with the Erdös number from 5 to 7. We can approximately view the first group as a group of more established "senior" researchers and the second group as a set of more "junior" researchers. Certainly, "seniority" is defined here very loosely as the first group might contain a substantial number of authors in the beginning of their career but whose supervisors or collaborators are well-established mathematicians with low Erdös numbers. Vice versa, the second group might include more senior researchers from other disciplines who just recently started collaborating with their more quantitatively-oriented colleagues. Nevertheless, we can argue that on average researchers with lower Erdös numbers tend to be more senior than their colleagues with higher Erdös number.

To construct the two subnetworks, we delete Paul Erdös himself, which lowers the degrees of the surrounding immediate vertices (his co-authors) and creates 7 artificially isolated vertices, which correspond to 0.01% of the "senior" group order. These isolated vertices (co-authors of Paul Erdös who have no other co-authors in the MR database) are also omitted from further study. We also split these two subnetworks in such a way that there exist no links between them: we delete connections between the co-authors with Erdös numbers 4 and 5, 7 and 8; lower degrees of corresponding vertices, and omit 28,261 resulting artificially created isolated vertices (i.e. 25.96% of the "junior" group order). In the final data set, the first group, of "senior" researchers, contains 94,766 vertices, with degrees 1–253 and mean degree of 5.53. The second group, of "junior" researchers, has a comparable order of 80,607 vertices, with degrees 1–62 and mean degree of 2.44.

Given the discussion that nowadays there exists a trend from individualistic toward more collaborative research [41], we are interested to test the hypothesis that the average number of co-authors among "senior" and "junior" researchers is relatively the same, or loosely speaking, that "senior" and "junior" researchers tend to branch out similarly in their collaborations. To assess this hypothesis, we employ our "patchwork" sampling and bootstrap method to each subnetwork.

We apply the Labeled Snowball with Multiple Inclusions (LSMI) sampling algorithm $T = 25$ times, and each time we try 3, 5, 7, 10, 20, 50, and 100 seeds, with a range of waves from 0 to 3 ($J = 28$). Then, in each of the 25 LSMI samples, we perform $B = 500$ bootstrap replications. As a result, we obtain 25 bootstrapped distributions for a population mean degree, and can construct the bootstrap confidence intervals with the pre-defined confidence level, as described in Section IV. Notice that these intervals are available for each analyzed seed-wave combination, thus we still face a challenging task to select an "optimal" combination.

We perform the cross-validation procedure with $V_{proxy} \subset V_{seeds}$ to minimize the amount of required information (see Remark 2). That is, first we sample without replacement 100 vertices, which were used as seeds in the T LSMI samples, 20 times ($\nu = 2,000$) and average their degrees to obtain a proxy value for the mean degree. Then, for each seed-wave combination we calculate the empirical coverage for proxy by counting the number of times the combined bootstrap confidence intervals contain the proxy value over $N = 100$ resamples with $T_1 = 25$. We select the seed-wave combination delivering coverage closest to the declared 95% confidence level: 20 seeds and 1 wave in the "senior" group; 20 seeds and 2 waves in the group of "junior" researchers (Table II).

TABLE II. The estimated mean degrees $\hat{\mu}$ with the respective 95% bootstrap confidence intervals for the two groups of researchers, i.e. with the Erdös number from 1 to 4 and 5 to 7. Considered 28 seed-wave combinations: waves from 0 to 3, seeds 3, 5, 7, 10, 20, 50 and 100. Number of LSMI samples T=25, with B=500 bootstrap resamples per each. Combination factor C=3. Cross-validation is based on T_1=25, N=100 and V_{proxy} of 2,000 seeds.

Subnetwork of researchers based on Erdös number	Network order n	$\hat{\mu}$	Optimal combination		95% confidence bounds for the mean degree μ	
			seed	wave	lower	upper
1 to 4	94,766	5.53	20	1	5.10	6.91
5 to 7	80,607	2.44	20	2	2.27	2.65

As Table II indicates, the obtained 95% confidence intervals for the two groups of researchers do not overlap, and we can conclude that the average degree in these two groups is indeed different, with the "junior" group tending to collaborate and branch out substantially less than the "senior" group.

These findings can be explained, for example, by hypothesizing that researchers at earlier stages of their careers are yet to establish their circle of collaborators. Also, given that nowadays there appear increasingly more interdisciplinary collaborations between mathematicians and other researchers, and some fields such as science and engineering are historically more collaborative in their publications, we might expect to see more branching out

in a "junior" group, away from the journals covered by MR.


VII. DISCUSSION

In order to do inference on the degree distribution of a graph G based on a realized graph G_n in this work we propose a "patchwork" sampling and bootstrap procedure, along with the estimators, for which we describe their general asymptotic properties.


As depicted on Fig. 2, the selection of seed-wave combination depends on the actual degree distribution and the order of the graph, which is typically unknown in practice. Here we introduce a cross-validation methodology enabling us to choose an optimal seed-wave combination without information on the actual degree distribution.

We implement the estimation process to perform inference for a real network. From the case study we can identify significant differences in the connectivity characteristics (degree distribution) for the two subnetworks of researchers.

[1] A. L. Barabási and E. Bonabeau, Scientific American , 50 (2003).
[2] N. Sonnerat and A. Vetta, Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics **34**, 107 (2009).
[3] M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, Physical Review E **64**, 026118 (2001).
[4] J. P. Gleeson, T. Hurd, S. Melnik, and A. Hackett, in *Advances in Network Analysis and its Applications*, Mathematics in Industry, Vol. 18, edited by E. Kranakis (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013) pp. 27–56.
[5] L. L. Ramírez-Ramírez and M. E. Thompson, Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability , 1 (2013).
[6] G. E. Potter, M. S. Handcock, I. M. Longini, and M. E. Halloran, The Annals of Applied Statistics **6**, 1 (2012).
[7] E. D. Kolaczyk, *Statistical Analysis of Network Data: Methods and Models* (Springer, 2009).
[8] R. Van der Hofstad, Random Structures and Algorithms (2012).
[9] M. E. J. Newman, *Networks: an introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2010).
[10] F. Chung and L. Lu, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **99**, 15879 (2002).
[11] A. L. Barabási and R. Albert, Science **286**, 509 (1999).
[12] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan, Random Structures and Algorithms **31**, 3 (2007).
[13] A. D. Flaxman, A. M. Frieze, and J. Vera, Internet Mathematics **3**, 187 (2006).
[14] A. D. Flaxman, A. M. Frieze, and J. Vera, Internet Mathematics **4**, 87 (2007).
[15] A. Broder, R. Kumar, F. Maghoul, P. Raghavan, S. Rajagopalan, R. Stata, A. Tomkins, and J. Wiener, Computer Networks **33**, 309 (2000).
[16] P. W. Holland, K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt, Social Net **5**, 109 (1983).
[17] K. Nowicki and T. A. B. Snijders, Journal of the American Statistical Association **96**, 1077 (2001).
[18] B. Karrer and M. E. J. Newman, Physical Review E **83**, 016107 (2011).
[19] P. D. Hoff, A. E. Raftery, and M. S. Handcock, Journal of the American Statistical Association **97**, 1090 (2002).
[20] M. S. Handcock, A. E. Raftery, and J. M. Tantrum, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society) **170**, 301 (2007).
[21] T. A. B. Snijders, Annual Review of Sociology **37**, 129 (2011).
[22] S. Chatterjee, P. Diaconis, and A. Sly, The Annals of Applied Probability **21**, 1400 (2011).
[23] C. R. Shalizi and A. Rinaldo, The Annals of Statistics **41**, 508 (2013).
[24] P. J. Bickel, A. Chen, and E. Levina, Annals of Statistics **39**, 38 (2011).
[25] B. Efron, Annals of Statistics. **7**, 1 (1979).
[26] P. Hall, J. L. Horowitz, and B. Y. Jing, Biometrika **82**, 561 (1995).
[27] P. Bühlmann, Statistical Science **17**, 52 (2002).
[28] D. N. Politis, Statistical Science **18**, 219 (2003).
[29] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs* (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
[30] M. E. J. Newman, Physical Review E **66**, 016128 (2002).
[31] D. Achlioptas, D. Kempe, A. Clauset, and C. Moore, in *In ACM STOC* (2005) pp. 694–703.
[32] A. Clauset and C. Moore, Physical Review Letters **94**, 018701 (2005).
[33] M. S. Handcock and K. J. Gile, The Annals of Applied Statistics **4**, 5 (2010).
[34] M. Molloy and B. Reed, Random Structures and Algorithms **6**, 2 (1995).
[35] O. Frank, "The SAGE handbook of social network analysis," (Sage Publications, London, UK, 2011) Chap. Survey Sampling in Networks, pp. 389–403.
[36] O. Frank, Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference **1**, 235 (1977).
[37] H. Andersson, Annals of Applied Probability **8**, 1331 (1998).
[38] M. E. Thompson, *Theory of Sample Surveys* (CRC Press, 1997).
[39] W.-Y. Loh, Statistica Sinica **1**, 477 (1991).
[40] A. L. Barabási, H. Jeong, Z. Néda, E. Ravasz, A. Schubert, and T. Vicsek, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **311**, 590 (2002).
[41] M. E. J. Newman and M. Girvan, Physical Review E **69**, 026113 (2004).
[42] A. Clauset, C. R. Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman, SIAM review **51**, 661 (2009).



(a)Original graph G_{23} (b)Select the seed — wave 0 (c)Select immediate neighbors — wave 1 (d)Remove used edges



(e)Select immediate neighbors — wave 2 (f)Remove used edges (g)Select immediate neighbors — wave 3 (h)Remove used edges

FIG. 1. (Color online) The Labeled Snowball with Multiple Inclusions (LSMI) algorithm. Graph G_{23}, number of seeds m=1, number of waves d=3. The final LSMI (h) contains 19 elements: all colored vertices, the vertices in double color are included twice, since they appear both in second and third waves.




FIG. 2. (Color online) Coverage of the population mean degree for 95% bootstrap confidence intervals, delivered by 36 seed-wave combinations, for graphs of order 1,000 and 10,000 with zero-truncated Poisson and polylogarithmic mean degree distributions. Number of LSMI samples T=25, with B=500 bootstrap resamples per each. Combination factor C=2. Number of Monte Carlo simulations is 100.