

# Accelerating Dynamic Graph Clustering on GPU Architectures with cuGraph

Nelson Aloysio Reis de Almeida Passos<sup>1,2</sup>[0000-0003-1869-2976], Emanuele Carlini<sup>2</sup>[0000-0003-3643-5404], and Salvatore Trani<sup>2</sup>[0000-0001-6541-9409]

<sup>1</sup> University of Pisa, Dept. of Computer Science, 56127 Pisa PI, Italy

<sup>2</sup> National Research Council, 56124 Pisa PI, Italy

`nelson.reis@phd.unipi.it`  
`emanuele.carlini@isti.cnr.it`  
`salvatore.trani@isti.cnr.it`

**Abstract.** This work addresses community detection in temporal networks through GPU-accelerated extensions of spectral clustering and modularity-based algorithms originally designed for static graphs. Based on the NVIDIA RAPIDS ecosystem, the proposed framework enables the characterization and tracking of communities in snapshot-based dynamic graphs by Leiden greedy optimization, with support for multi-GPU execution via Dask-based workload distribution, or eigendecomposition of a Bethe-Hessian matrix encoding temporal dependencies. Our approach achieves substantial speedups over CPU-based execution while preserving compatibility with existing graph analytics pipelines. We demonstrate its applicability on real-world temporal network datasets, facilitating exploratory analysis of structural network properties over time. Such capabilities are relevant across several application domains, such as epidemic spreading, financial systems, cybersecurity, and trajectory and mobility analysis. We release our implementation as free and open-source software, including Python bindings through the NetworkX-Temporal<sup>3</sup> library for ease of use and zero-code integration with existing codebases.

**Keywords:** temporal networks, community detection, GPU computing

## 1 Introduction

Community detection or node clustering is a fundamental task in network science that seeks to identify groups of nodes with functional similarity or shared characteristics, with applications in several domains. The identification of functional modules in cell structures, the detection of botnets and malicious actors in computer networks, and the discovery of users in social media platforms with shared political or cultural interests are just a few examples of its many applications in real-world networks. Among the many techniques employed for this task, there are inference-based statistical models relying on sampling and optimization strategies, such as Markov-Chain Monte Carlo and simulated

---

<sup>3</sup>Available at: <https://www.networkx-temporal.org> (To be updated upon acceptance).

annealing; matrix factorization based on eigendecomposition or random walk sampling; heuristic-based algorithms optimizing some sort of ‘quality’ function; and more recently, neural models that map nodes to a real-dimensional (latent) space, where distances encodes some sort of similarity. Each method provide its own advantages and trade-offs, and their applicability is expected to be highly dependent on the specific context and requirements of the problem at hand [9,31].

By allowing edges and nodes to change over time, dynamic graphs offer a powerful mathematical framework for the analysis of non-Euclidean relational data, where individual elements (nodes) and their connections (edges) may fluctuate in response to external stimuli, internal dynamics, or other factors. This enables the modeling of evolving relationships and interactions, which is crucial for studying real-world phenomena such as information diffusion, epidemics spreading, financial fraud, and real-time traffic analysis. This additional flexibility, however, also brings additional burdens, including for the definition of communities themselves (i.e., their identity) and the algorithmic implementations for their detection, which must now account for their temporal dimension and associated dependencies [17] to ensure analytical tractability and scalability.

In this work, we address the challenge of efficiently managing the increased complexity arising from time dependency in two algorithms for node clustering in temporal graphs, ensuring their scalability and performance through GPU-based (graphics processing units) implementations. The analysis of large-scale networks exemplifies an area where GPUs deliver superior performance-to-cost ratio compared to traditional CPU-bound operations, which has become increasingly common and cost-effective over the last decade, motivating the presented research. We focus on two specific techniques defined by matricial operations on the adjacency matrix of a temporal network: clustering by eigendecomposition of a (temporal) supra-adjacency matrix, based on graph spectra [6]; and optimizing modularity, based on the maximization of the homonymous ‘quality’ function that measures the density of connections within communities compared to a null model [25], i.e., a random (‘configuration’) graph with the same degree distribution as the observed network [5]. Our specific contributions are that we:

- Extend two algorithm implementations relying on the open-source NVIDIA cuGraph library [27] as the computational backend for GPU acceleration;
- Show that both techniques allow for the characterization and tracking of temporal node sets, by Leiden optimization [24,42] or eigendecomposition of a symmetric real matrix [37,12] encoding temporal dependencies; and
- Integrate our implementations into the open-source NetworkX-Temporal library [29], enhancing its functionality and promoting user accessibility through zero-code integration with existing data processing workflows.

The remainder of this paper is as follows. Section 2 discusses related work on static and temporal community detection. Section 3 details our methodology, including the algorithms we extend and their temporal formulations. Section 4 presents experimental results on several real-world datasets. This work concludes by summarizing our contributions, limitations, and future work directions.

## 2 Background & Related Work

Community detection is a fundamental task in network science that seeks to identify groups of nodes with shared characteristics or functional similarity, although the definition, identification, and tracking of communities in temporal graphs remains an open problem. The most common definition of community is that of a group of nodes with dense internal connections compared to connections to other groups, therefore understood as an *assortative* structure. Based on an assumption of homophily — ‘birds of a feather flock together’ [23] — it posits that nodes with similar features or connectivity patterns are more likely to belong to a same group, and is the prevailing definition in tasks such as social network analysis, where individuals with similar interests or characteristics tend to form communities. Meanwhile, other systems may exhibit different characteristics, such as hierarchical (e.g., nested communities), disassortative (bipartite, core-periphery) or overlapping (mixed-membership) structures, which call for alternative strategies and definitions outside the scope of this work [9,11].

This work focuses on modularity optimization and spectral clustering, two algorithms widely adopted for community detection in static graphs and extensible to the temporal domain and suitable for GPU-based implementations. Both are commonly employed due to their relative ease of implementation, strong empirical performance, and compatibility with sparse matrices, and traditionally rely on CPU-bound implementations designed for static graphs. Other solutions include divisive strategies for iterative edge removal, such as edge betweenness centrality [13]; statistical physics approaches formulating community detection as an energy minimization problem, including Ising- and Potts-based models [35,39]; inferential models based on, e.g., stochastic block modeling [30,7]; information-theoretic techniques, such as Infomap [36]; propagation-based methods that iteratively diffuse labels or beliefs across local neighborhoods [34,21]; non-negative matrix factorization [16] and matrix decomposition by random walk sampling [32,8]; graph embedding methods to obtain low-dimensional node representations, also based on walk sampling [46]; hybrid and ensemble approaches combining multiple strategies [44]; and more recent deep (multilayer) neural network-based models with strong empirical performance that approximate (‘learn’) a function mapping nodes  $\mathcal{V}$  of a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  into a real,  $d$ -dimensional (latent) space where distances encode some sort of similarity based on the system structure (topology) defined by edges  $\mathcal{E}$  and high-dimensional attribute features  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e.,  $f(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{X})$  — either end-to-end differentiable or, much more frequently, subsequently clustered using conventional methods such as  $k$ -means [40].

This work focuses instead on non-attributed, large-scale dynamic graph data. Although several works have been extended to the temporal domain [17,43,19], commonly by segmenting the network into slices (snapshots) and employing strategies like inter-slice couplings or embedding alignment procedures, they often rely on expensive CPU-bound operations, such as repeated eigendecompositions or orthogonal matrix alignment, which hinder their applicability to large-scale or rapidly changing networks with strict latency requirements, including real-time traffic analysis, social network monitoring, and cybersecurity applications.

### 3 Methodology & Implementation

This section details the algorithms we extend and their temporal formulations, including the mathematical definitions of spectral clustering and modularity optimization, as well as their extensions to temporal graphs through supra-graph constructions and multislice formulations, which allow for the simultaneous characterization and identity-preserving tracking of communities across time.

#### 3.1 Spectral Clustering

Spectral clustering relies on the eigendecomposition of graph operators to obtain low-dimensional node embeddings that capture the global structure of the network. Specifically, spectral methods cluster vertices by eigendecomposition of the normalized Laplacian  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$ , where  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$  is the graph Laplacian,  $\mathbf{D}$  is the degree matrix, and  $\mathbf{A}$  is the adjacency matrix. The  $k$  leading eigenvectors of  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$  form a matrix  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ , where each row corresponds to a node embedding; these rows are then clustered using  $k$ -means or another partitioning algorithm [26]. The second smallest eigenvector, known as the Fiedler vector, can be used to bipartition a graph by thresholding its values, and its relation to graph connectivity is formalized by Cheeger’s inequality, which bounds the conductance of the best partition by the second smallest eigenvalue of  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$  [6].

The choice of objective function determines which Laplacian is used and how the resulting partition is evaluated. For instance, minimizing the normalized cut [38] encourages partitions with dense intra-community and sparse inter-community connections, i.e., normalized by edge volume. It is expressed as

$$\text{NCut}(C_1, \dots, C_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\text{cut}(C_i, \bar{C}_i)}{\text{vol}(C_i)}, \quad \text{cut}(C_i, \bar{C}_i) = \sum_{u \in C_i, v \notin C_i} A_{uv}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\text{vol}(C_i) = \sum_{u \in C_i} d_u$  is the sum of node degrees in  $C_i$ , and  $\text{cut}(C_i, \bar{C}_i)$  is the total volume of edges connecting nodes in  $C_i$  to those outside of it. A similar formulation<sup>4</sup> employs the random-walk Laplacian  $\hat{\mathbf{L}} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ , which shares the eigenvalues of  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ , but whose eigenvectors correspond directly to the relaxed cluster indicator vectors, solvable as a generalized eigenproblem.

Minimizing balanced ratio cut [14] instead considers partition size  $|C_i|$  rather than edge volume, and is the default implementation in cuGraph [27], defined as

$$\text{RCut}(C_1, \dots, C_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\text{cut}(C_i, \bar{C}_i)}{|C_i|}. \quad (2)$$

Note that, while both objectives are NP-hard in their discrete form, their continuous relaxations allow efficient approximations corresponding to eigenvector problems on the normalized ( $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ ) and unnormalized ( $\mathbf{L}$ ) graph Laplacians, which

<sup>4</sup> Symmetric normalization introduces a  $\mathbf{D}^{1/2}$  scaling that requires an additional (imprecise) row-normalization step to correct for high node degree heterogeneity [20].

can be solved using iterative methods such as the Lanczos algorithm or power iteration, which are efficient for large sparse graphs. Spectral methods are computationally efficient on sparse graphs, but require the number of communities  $k$  to be specified in advance and are sensitive to disconnected graph components, i.e., groups of nodes with no paths in between, and may therefore yield suboptimal partitions on temporal graphs where nodes are not present across all time steps.

Constructing a supra-Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}^{\text{supra}}$  from (temporal) adjacencies  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{supra}}$  encoding intra-slice connections and inter-slice couplings as off-diagonal blocks allows for spectral clustering techniques to be extended to the temporal domain,

$$\mathbf{A}^{\text{supra}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}^{(1)} & \omega \mathbf{I} & \cdots & 0 \\ \omega \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{A}^{(2)} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \mathbf{A}^{(T)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}^{(t)}$  is the adjacency matrix of snapshot  $t$ ,  $\omega$  is the inter-slice coupling strength that encourages temporal consistency of community assignments across snapshots, and  $\mathbf{I}$  is the identity matrix connecting corresponding temporal nodes.

Although this enables the use of iterative solvers (Lanczos, power iteration), leveraging GPU acceleration for eigendecomposition and clustering, the resulting matrix has a prohibitive order of  $nT \times nT$ , where  $n$  is the number of nodes and  $T$  is the number of snapshots. Moreover, it is well-known [12] that Laplacian spectral methods fail in sparse networks above the detectability threshold of communities, the regime where many real temporal graphs are expected to lie.

To escape these issues, we first consider instead a principled alternative based on linearizing belief propagation [12], yielding the non-backtracking matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \mathbf{A}^{\text{s}} & -\lambda \mathbf{I} & \lambda \mathbf{A}^{\text{s}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \lambda(\mathbf{D}^{\text{s}} - \mathbf{I}) & \mathbf{0} & \lambda \mathbf{D}^{\text{s}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \eta \mathbf{A}^{\text{t}} & \mathbf{0} & \eta \mathbf{A}^{\text{t}} & -\eta \mathbf{I} \\ \eta \mathbf{D}^{\text{t}} & \mathbf{0} & \eta(\mathbf{D}^{\text{t}} - \mathbf{I}) & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where each of  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{s}}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{t}}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}^{\text{s}}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}^{\text{t}}$  is an  $nT \times nT$  matrix:  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{s}} = \bigoplus_t \mathbf{A}^{(t)}$  is the block-diagonal intra-slice adjacency matrix,  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{t}}$  is the inter-slice adjacency matrix connecting each node to its time-adjacent copies with block-bidiagonal identities,  $\mathbf{D}^{\text{s}}$  and  $\mathbf{D}^{\text{t}}$  are the corresponding diagonal degree matrices, and  $\mathbf{I}$  is the  $nT$ -dimensional identity. The scalar  $\lambda = (c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}})/(kc)$  is the second eigenvalue of the spatial label-transition matrix — with  $c_{\text{in}}$  and  $c_{\text{out}}$  the average within- and between-community connection rates,  $k$  the number of communities, and  $c$  the average degree — and governs the strength of community signal attenuation along spatial edges; analogously,  $\eta$  governs attenuation along temporal edges. Together they yield a more flexible and expressive formulation than that based solely on  $\omega$  (Eq. 3), with effective SNR equal to  $c\lambda^2$  dictating the detectability transition (Almeida-Thouless line or Kesten-Stigum threshold) and  $\eta \in [0, 1]$  governing the probability that a node retains its community label across consecutive time steps.

Note that, although the resulting matrix is  $4nT \times 4nT$ , it is also critically sparse, and therefore more amenable to iterative solvers on GPUs. Each block of

$\mathbf{B}$  corresponds to either an adjacency or diagonal matrix, and the construction is intentionally asymmetric (direction-aware), avoiding eigenvector localization on high-degree nodes (see Footnote 4). The  $k - 1$  eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{B}$  with largest eigenvalue in absolute value may be extracted to perform  $k$ -means clustering on the resulting  $n$  vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ . The symmetric<sup>5</sup> eigenproblem is solved instead fully on-GPU and within the RAPIDS ecosystem — yielding an efficient and consistent graph clustering algorithm [47] that is asymptotically optimal and the basis of our CUDA implementation for spectral clustering on temporal networks.

### 3.2 Modularity Optimization

Modularity  $Q$  aims to quantify the extent to which a network exhibits community structures by comparing the density of intra-community edges against a random graph that preserves the degree distribution of the observed network [5]. Let  $m$  be the number of edges,  $d_i^{\text{out}}$  and  $d_j^{\text{in}}$  the out- and in-degrees of nodes  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $c_i$  the community of node  $i$ , and  $\gamma = 1$  (default) the resolution parameter. Then,

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i,j} \left( A_{ij} - \gamma \frac{d_i^{\text{out}} d_j^{\text{in}}}{2m} \right) \delta(c_i, c_j), \quad (5)$$

where  $\delta(c_i, c_j) = 1$  if nodes  $i$  and  $j$  belong to the same community and 0 otherwise. Higher values of  $Q$  indicate denser intra-community and sparser inter-community connections relative to the null model; while  $\gamma$  allows tuning the resolution<sup>6</sup> of detected communities, with higher values favoring smaller community sizes.

Maximizing  $Q$  over all possible partitions is NP-hard [9], so heuristic approaches are employed in practice. The Leiden algorithm [42] adds a refinement phase to the widely used Louvain method [3], under assumptions of assortativeness and connectedness, which iteratively merges nodes into communities to maximize local modularity gains and recursively aggregates communities into supernodes. The heuristic extends to directed and weighted graphs, and supports alternative quality functions such as surprise [1] and the Constant Potts Model (CPM) [41]. Alternatively, modularity also admits a spectral formulation  $Q = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{C}) / 2m$ , where  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{A} - \gamma(\mathbf{d}_{\text{out}} \mathbf{d}_{\text{in}}^T) / 2m$  is the modularity matrix. In this case, projecting (‘embedding’) nodes onto the leading eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{M}$  yields a low-dimensional representation that approximates the discrete optimization problem, which may be subsequently clustered to recover partitions [25] — for bipartitioning, the sign of the leading eigenvector determines the split, and the absence of positive eigenvalues signals that the current partition is locally optimal under modularity.

The measure has been extended to temporal graphs through, e.g., the multislice formulation [24], which couples snapshot-level modularity matrices

<sup>5</sup>Although ARPACK’s non-symmetric Arnoldi routines are available in SciPy, they require a GPU matvec callback (CPU-side iterations of per-step host-device transfers), which we avoid by reformulating the problem as a symmetric one (see Section 3.3).

<sup>6</sup>Modularity maximization is subject to a resolution limit: because the null model term couples all node pairs globally, communities smaller than a scale determined by  $m$  may be merged into larger ones, even in the partition that globally maximizes  $Q$  [10].

through inter-slice edges encoding temporal dependencies, enabling community detection and tracking across discrete-time aggregations. Continuous-time extensions, such as the longitudinal formulation [4], instead impose smoothness regularization directly on the temporal dimension. Both extensions increase the problem size proportionally to the number of snapshots, compounding the scalability challenges of the static case. The multislice formulation is compatible with existing optimization methods, such as Leiden, which we efficiently implement on GPUs by building the supra-adjacency matrix encoding both intra-slice and inter-slice connections, allowing for efficient spectral embedding and clustering.

Analogous to the static case, multislice modularity  $Q_{\text{MS}}$  [24] is defined accounting for additional inter-slice couplings with (optionally time-varying) strength  $\omega$  that encourage temporal consistency of community assignments across snapshots, yielding the following objective function to be maximized:


$$Q_{\text{MS}} = \frac{1}{2\mu} \sum_{i,j,s,r} \left[ \left( A_{ij}^{(s)} - \gamma^{(s)} \frac{k_i^{(s)} k_j^{(s)}}{2m^{(s)}} \right) \delta^{(sr)} + \delta_{ij} \omega^{(sr)} \right] \delta(c_i^{(s)}, c_j^{(r)}), \quad (6)$$

where  $A_{ij}^{(s)}$  is the adjacency matrix of snapshot  $s$ ,  $k_i^{(s)}$  is the degree of node  $i$  in snapshot  $s$ ,  $m^{(s)}$  is the number of edges in snapshot  $s$ ,  $\gamma^{(s)}$  is the resolution parameter for snapshot  $s$ ,  $\omega^{(sr)}$  is the inter-slice coupling strength between node  $i$  in snapshots  $s$  and  $r$ , and  $\mu$  is the size (total intra- and inter-slice connections).

Following Equation 6, we may express multislice modularity in spectral form by defining a supra-modularity matrix incorporating both intra-slice and inter-slice contributions, and a community assignment matrix  $\mathcal{C}$  encoding the partition across all snapshots. This yields a spectral formulation expressed as  $Q_{\text{MS}} = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{C}^\top \mathcal{M} \mathcal{C}) / 2\mu$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  is the (temporal) modularity matrix with diagonal blocks corresponding to the modularity matrices of each snapshot and off-diagonal blocks encoding the inter-slice couplings, and each block in  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times k}$  corresponds to the community assignments of a snapshot. If  $\mathcal{C}$  is binary with one non-zero entry per row, then  $Q_{\text{MS}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\text{MS}}$ , and the spectral relaxation with continuous values approximates the discrete optimization problem, allowing for efficient community detection and tracking across time through eigendecomposition and subsequent clustering of the resulting embeddings.

This formulation enables the application of spectral clustering techniques to the supra-modularity matrix, enabling efficient community detection and tracking across time. Unlike the non-backtracking case, the trace formulation and eigenvector embedding require  $\mathcal{M}$  to be symmetric, which holds only for undirected graphs with symmetric inter-slice couplings, i.e.,  $\omega^{(sr)} = \omega^{(rs)}$ . Note that the multislice formulation is compatible with alternative quality functions based on the configuration model, such as CPM [41], which may be implemented by replacing it with the corresponding null matrix in the supra-graph construction.

Alternatively, the Leiden algorithm [42] allows for identity-preserving characterization of communities across snapshots by encouraging temporal consistency of community assignments through inter-slice couplings. Both spectral decomposition and greedy optimization allow leveraging GPU acceleration, offering a unified framework for modularity optimization on dynamic graphs.



**Fig. 1. NetworkX-Temporal integration with cuGraph.** Temporal graph snapshots  $G^{(t)}$  are assembled into a supra-graph and dispatched through one of two GPU-accelerated paths: multislice modularity via Leiden, or spectral clustering of a (temporal) symmetric modularity or Bethe-Hessian matrix. All methods execute on the RAPIDS ecosystem and return per-snapshot community assignments, allowing zero-code-change execution by setting an environmental variable. In blue: our contributions.

### 3.3 Implementation Details & Trade-offs

It is worth noting that spectral clustering allows for a more principled approach to community detection in temporal graphs, as it directly captures the global structure of the network through its eigenvectors. However, GPU-based eigensolvers are currently restricted to symmetric (Hermitian or positive-definite) matrices, so the asymmetric non-backtracking (Hashimoto) operator  $\mathbf{B}$  [12] cannot be solved directly by available routines. We therefore reformulate it as a symmetric problem by considering the Bethe-Hessian  $\mathbf{H}(r) = (r^2 - 1)\mathbf{I} - r\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{D}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  are the adjacency and degree matrices of the supra-graph [37], and  $r$  is a regularization parameter, optimally set near  $\sqrt{c}$ , i.e., tied to the graph average degree, although in an independent manner from the  $\lambda$  parameter (Eq. 4). This maps the informative (out-of-bulk) eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{B}$  to the negative eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{H}(r)$  and effectively preserves asymptotic optimality down to the detectability threshold, ensuring full on-GPU execution, as depicted in Figure 1.

Meanwhile, Leiden optimization relies on heuristics that may not guarantee optimal partitions and can be sensitive to the choice of resolution parameter  $\gamma$  and inter-slice coupling strength  $\omega$ . On the other hand, it allows for multi-GPU execution via Dask-based workload distribution, advantageous for large-scale temporal graphs, making it a practical choice for diverse applications.

## 4 Experimental Results


We present preliminary experimental results of our code implementation on several real-world and synthetic dynamic graph datasets, summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Dataset properties.**  $|\mathcal{V}|$  and  $|\mathcal{E}|$  denote nodes and edges in the static graph representation;  $\Sigma(\mathcal{V})$  and  $\Sigma(\mathcal{E})$ , the total sum of nodes and edges over time, i.e., counting as many times as they appear across snapshots;  $|T|$  and  $|C|$  are the number of snapshots and communities; and  $\dagger$  marks static graphs here used as single-snapshot baselines.

Dataset	$ \mathcal{V} $	$\Sigma(\mathcal{V})$	$ \mathcal{E} $	$\Sigma(\mathcal{E})$	$ T $	$ C $
CiteSeer $\dagger$ [45]	3 279	3 279	4 552	4 552	1	6
Cora $\dagger$ [45]	2 708	2 708	5 278	5 278	1	7
Brain [33]	5 000	60 000	878 207	947 744	12	10
Dblp [48]	28 085	101 797	153 822	222 165	27	10
Patent [15]	12 214	41 529	41 916	41 916	891	6
PubMed [45,2]	19 717	37 003	44 324	44 324	42	3
School [22]	327	309 006	7 004	188 508	7 375	9
ArxivAI [18]	69 854	142 316	696 819	696 819	27	5
ArxivCS [18]	169 343	374 433	1 157 799	1 157 799	29	40
ArxivLarge [18]	1 324 064	4 998 391	13 649 351	13 649 351	40	172
ArxivMath [18]	270 013	614 578	783 165	783 165	31	31
ArxivPhy [18]	837 212	3 917 817	11 703 425	11 703 425	40	53
SBM [28]	50 000	250 000	1 250 539	1 251 057	5	10
SBM-N [28]	100 000	500 000	2 500 515	2 501 000	5	10
SBM-E [28]	50 000	250 000	2 498 067	2 500 045	5	10
SBM-T [28]	50 000	500 000	2 495 376	2 497 636	10	10

Our central comparison is temporal-versus-temporal: the GPU multislice Leiden backend against its CPU reference (`leidenalg`) on the supra-adjacency representation. For fairness across implementations with differing stopping criteria, all methods are capped at two optimization passes; we therefore report runtime under a fixed, equal-work budget rather than time-to-convergence. Observed speedups (Fig. 2a) are consistent and substantial, ranging from  $22\times$  on *ArxivAI* ( $336.3\text{ s} \rightarrow 15.4\text{ s}$ ) and *Dblp* ( $145.5\text{ s} \rightarrow 6.6\text{ s}$ ) to  $31\times$  on *ArxivCS*,  $30\times$  on *PubMed*, and  $64\times$  on *ArxivMath* ( $1357.7\text{ s} \rightarrow 21.2\text{ s}$ ); dense, but low-snapshot *Brain* yields a more modest  $2.7\times$ . The most striking case is *Patent*, collapsing from  $1397.0\text{ s}$  to  $1.4\text{ s}$  ( $\sim 978\times$ ). This advantage is precisely the scaling axis our work targets, and constitutes our main empirical result, as it demonstrates the practical benefits of GPU acceleration for fine-grained community detection on datasets with a large number of snapshots, where CPU-bound methods struggle to meet demand.

For the largest temporal instances, this is less a speedup than a change in tractability: methods that exceed practical time limits on CPU become routine on GPU, moving temporal community detection from an offline batch regime into an interactive one. We further report on two interesting boundary cases. First, *School* (7375 snapshots) exposes a scaling limit of the supra-graph construction: the inter-slice coupling grows with the snapshot count, so building and solving the supra-adjacency dominates (211 s for our method), with CPU-bound failing to complete within the time budget (OOT). Second, for small static graphs (*CiteSeer*, *Cora*), CPU-bound outperforms the GPU backend (0.016 s vs. 0.58 s), as kernel-launch and transfer overheads dominate; the GPU advantage emerges only at scale. Moreover, the synthetic SBM graphs are here included to characterize how the GPU implementation scales along single axes (nodes, edges, snapshots) rather than for head-to-head speedup claims over CPU-bound, shown in Figure 2b.



**Fig. 2. Runtime evaluation.** (a) Execution time of our GPU temporal method against the CPU-bound baseline across real-world datasets (log scale). (b) Effect of independently doubling each axis (nodes, edges, snapshots) on runtime over synthetic SBM instances. Algorithm runs were limited to two iterations only (`leidenalg` default). Results reported over five runs; error bars show standard deviation. Experiments conducted on an Intel Xeon Gold 6330 (CPU) and an NVIDIA A100 80GB (GPU).

## 5 Final Remarks

In this work, we presented GPU-accelerated implementations of spectral clustering and modularity optimization for dynamic graphs, leveraging the RAPIDS ecosystem for efficient matrix operations and eigensolvers on GPU hardware, to our knowledge the first in literature; and a unified integration of both as a zero-code-change backend for NetworkX-Temporal, yielding concrete usability benefits. Our implementations are designed to be compatible with existing graph analytics pipelines, allowing for seamless integration with data processing workflows without extensive codebase modifications. Limitations include the focus on non-attributed graphs, which may not capture the full richness of real-world networks, and the reliance on assortative community structures, which is not suitable for all contexts. Lastly, we leave evaluating the empirical performance of our spectral clustering approach under different regimes of detectability to the near future.

**Disclosure of Interests.** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

## References

- Aldecoa, R., Marín, I.: Surprise maximization reveals the community structure of complex networks. *Scientific Reports* **3**(1) (Jan 2013)
- Reis de Almeida Passos, N.A., Carlini, E., Trani, S.: Pubmed-temporal: A dynamic graph dataset with node-level features (Dec 2024)
- Blondel, V.D., Guillaume, J.L., Lambiotte, R., Lefebvre, E.: Fast unfolding of community in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2008**(10), P10008 (10 2008)

4. Brabant, V., Asgari, Y., Borgnat, P., Bonifati, A., Cazabet, R.: Longitudinal modularity, a modularity for link streams. *EPJ Data Science* **14**(1) (Feb 2025)
5. Chung, F., Lu, L.: Connected Components in Random Graphs with Given Expected Degree Sequences **6**(2), 125–145 (2002)
6. Chung, F.R.K.: *Spectral Graph Theory*. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society (1996)
7. Cugmas, M., Žiberna, A.: Approaches to blockmodeling dynamic networks: A monte carlo simulation study. *Social Networks* **73**, 7–19 (May 2023)
8. Dongen, S.V.: Graph clustering via a discrete uncoupling process. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **30**(1), 121–141 (1 2008)
9. Fortunato, S.: Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports* **486**(3-5), 75–174 (2 2010)
10. Fortunato, S., Barthélemy, M.: Resolution limit in community detection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **104**(1), 36–41 (1 2007)
11. Fortunato, S., Hric, D.: Community detection in networks: A user guide. *Physics Reports* **659**, 1–44 (Nov 2016)
12. Ghasemian, A., Zhang, P., Clauset, A., Moore, C., Peel, L.: Detectability thresholds and optimal algorithms for community structure in dynamic networks. *Physical Review X* **6**(3) (Jul 2016)
13. Girvan, M., Newman, M.E.J.: Community structure in social and biological networks. *National Academy of Sciences* **99**(12), 7821–7826 (6 2002)
14. Hagen, L., Kahng, A.: New spectral methods for ratio cut partitioning and clustering. *IEEE Tr. on Computer-Aided Design of Int. Circuits and S.* **11**(9), 1074–1085 (1992)
15. Hall, B., Jaffe, A., Trajtenberg, M.: *The NBER Patent Citation Data File: Lessons, Insights and Methodological Tools* (Oct 2001)
16. He, C., Fei, X., Cheng, Q., Li, H., Hu, Z., Tang, Y.: A survey of community detection in complex networks using nonnegative matrix factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* **9**(2), 440–457 (2022)
17. Holme, P., Saramäki, J. (eds.): *Temporal Network Theory*. Springer International Publishing (2023)
18. Liu, M., Liang, K., Liu, Y., Wang, S., Zhou, S., Liu, X.: arxiv4tgc: Large-scale datasets for temporal graph clustering (2023)
19. Longa, A., Lachi, V., Santin, G., Bianchini, M., Lepri, B., Lio, P., Scarselli, F., Passerini, A.: Graph neural networks for temporal graphs: State of the art, open challenges, and opportunities. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023)
20. von Luxburg, U.: A tutorial on spectral clustering. *Statistics and Computing* **17**(4), 395–416 (Aug 2007)
21. MacKay, D.J.: *Information Theory, Inference, and Learning Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press (2003)
22. Mastrandrea, R., Fournet, J., Barrat, A.: Contact patterns in a high school: A comparison between data collected using wearable sensors, contact diaries and friendship surveys. *PLOS ONE* **10**(9), e0136497 (Sep 2015)
23. McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., Cook, J.M.: Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* **27**(1), 415–444 (8 2001)
24. Mucha, P.J., Richardson, T., Macon, K., Porter, M.A., Onnela, J.P.: Community structure in time-dependent, multiscale, and multiplex networks. *Science* **328**(5980), 876–878 (5 2010)
25. Newman, M.E.J.: Modularity and community structure in networks. *National Academy of Sciences* **103**(23), 8577–8582 (2006)

26. Ng, A., Jordan, M., Weiss, Y.: On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. In: Dietterich, T., Becker, S., Ghahramani, Z. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. vol. 14. MIT Press (2001)
27. NVIDIA Corporation: cuGraph Documentation. (2026), accessed: 2026-05-29
28. Passos, N.A.R.A., Carlini, E., Trani, S.: Tadc-sbm: a time-varying, attributed, degree-corrected stochastic block model. In: *2025 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*. pp. 1–6 (2025)
29. Passos, N.A., Carlini, E., Trani, S.: Networkx-temporal: Building, manipulating, and analyzing dynamic graph structures. *SoftwareX* **31**, 102277 (2025)
30. Peixoto, T.P.: Bayesian stochastic blockmodeling (Nov 2019)
31. Peixoto, T.P.: Descriptive vs. Inferential Community Detection in Networks: Pitfalls, Myths and Half-Truths. *Elements in the Structure and Dynamics of Complex Networks*, Cambridge University Press (2023)
32. Pons, P., Latapy, M.: Computing communities in large networks using random walks. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications* **10**(2), 191–218 (2006)
33. Preti, M.G., Bolton, T.A., Van De Ville, D.: The dynamic functional connectome: State-of-the-art and perspectives. *NeuroImage* **160**, 41–54 (Oct 2017)
34. Raghavan, U.N., Albert, R., Kumara, S.: Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks. *Physical Review E* **76**(3) (Sep 2007)
35. Reichardt, J., Bornholdt, S.: Detecting fuzzy community structures in complex networks with a potts model. *Physical Review Letters* **93**(21) (Nov 2004)
36. Rosvall, M., Bergstrom, C.T.: Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *PNAS* **105**(4), 1118–1123 (Jan 2008)
37. Saade, A., Krzakala, F., Zdeborová, L.: Spectral clustering of graphs with the bethe hessian. In: Ghahramani, Z., Welling, M., Cortes, C., Lawrence, N., Weinberger, K. (eds.) *Advances in NIPS*. vol. 27. Curran Associates, Inc. (2014)
38. Shi, J., Malik, J.: Normalized cuts and image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **22**(8), 888–905 (2000)
39. Son, S.W., Jeong, H., Noh, J.D.: Random field ising model and community structure in complex networks. *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems* **50**(3), 431–437 (Apr 2006)
40. Su, X., Xue, S., Liu, F., Wu, J., Yang, J., Zhou, C., Hu, W., Paris, C., Nepal, S., Jin, D., Sheng, Q.Z., Yu, P.S.: A comprehensive survey on community detection with deep learning. *IEEE T. on N.Networks and Learning Systems* pp. 1–21 (2022)
41. Traag, V.A., Van Dooren, P., Nesterov, Y.: Narrow scope for resolution-limit-free community detection. *Physical Review E* **84**(1) (Jul 2011)
42. Traag, V.A., Waltman, L., van Eck, N.J.: From louvain to leiden: guaranteeing well-connected community. *Scientific Reports* **9**(1), 5233 (3 2019)
43. Xue, G., Zhong, M., Li, J., Chen, J., Zhai, C., Kong, R.: Dynamic network embedding survey. *Neurocomputing* **472**, 212–223 (Feb 2022)
44. Yan, C., Chang, Z.: Modularized tri-factor nonnegative matrix factorization for community detection enhancement. *Physica A: S.Mech.&Ap.* **533**, 122–050 (2019)
45. Yang, Z., Cohen, W.W., Salakhutdinov, R.: Revisiting semi-supervised learning with graph embeddings. In: *ICML'26 Proc.*, Vol.48. pp. 40–48. JMLR.org (2016)
46. Zhang, D., Yin, J., Zhu, X., Zhang, C.: Network representation learning: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* **6**(1), 3–28 (2020)
47. Zhao, Y., Levina, E., Zhu, J.: Consistency of community detection in networks under degree-corrected stochastic block models **40**(4)
48. Zuo, Y., Liu, G., Lin, H., Guo, J., Hu, X., Wu, J.: Embedding temporal network via neighborhood formation. In: *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining. KDD '18*, ACM (Jul 2018)