

Toward Efficient Community Detection on Time-Varying Attributed Graphs

Nelson Aloysio Reis de Almeida Passos^{1,2}[0000-0003-1869-2976], Emanuele Carlini²[0000-0003-3643-5404], and Salvatore Trani²[0000-0001-6541-9409]

¹ University of Pisa, Dept. of Computer Science, 56127 Pisa PI, Italy

² National Research Council, 56124 Pisa PI, Italy

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

Abstract. Community detection on time-varying attributed graphs must satisfy two competing demands: recovering ground-truth structure faithfully, and doing so efficiently at scale. This research charts a path toward both. We summarise contributions spanning the problem’s three interconnected challenges: software and datasets for dynamic graph representation, generative synthetic benchmarks for self-consistent model evaluation, and two complementary detection strands — a GPU-accelerated algorithmic route that brings multislice modularity and spectral clustering to the NVIDIA RAPIDS (cuGraph) ecosystem, turning previously intractable temporal instances into routine ones (from $\sim 2.7\times$ to $\sim 978\times$ over a CPU reference, depending on graph density and snapshot count), and a neural route that folds temporal signal into a scalable, end-to-end differentiable modularity objective. We close by outlining the open problems and next steps defining the remainder of this doctoral research.

Keywords: temporal graphs, community detection, neural networks

1 Introduction

Systems of interacting objects — *networks* — are commonly represented as *graphs*, with nodes (vertices) connected by edges (arcs). From molecules and food webs to transportation grids and the World Wide Web, this abstraction underpins the interdisciplinary study of complex systems known as Network Science [12]. A recurring observation across domains is that nodes organise into *communities*: groups characterised by distinct topological and/or attribute-based properties. Recovering these mesoscale structures — the task of *community detection* — is among the field’s most studied problems [5,6], addressed over the decades by algorithmic, statistical-inferential, and, more recently, neural approaches [11].

Most real-world systems, however, are *dynamic*: social ties form and dissolve, routes are rerouted, and biological processes unfold over time [8]. They are frequently *attributed* as well, carrying node- and edge-level information that provide essential context to their modeling and analysis, such as knowledge




Fig. 1. Quick recap of the research trajectory, with milestones, dependencies, and current status. The central question is tackled by three interconnected challenges: software for dynamic graph representations, principled model evaluation, and community detection in itself, addressed in both attributed and non-attributed (temporal) graph domains.

graphs. Static representations discard both, risking oversimplified or misleading descriptions of the mechanisms at play. This research concerns itself with community detection in *time-varying attributed graphs* — relational systems whose connections are not fixed over time and whose elements may carry diverse (high-dimensional, real-valued) feature sets. The problem is notoriously hard: communities can grow, shrink, merge and split, or vanish and resurge [4], and a model is often asked not merely to detect them at each instant but to track coherent assignments across time, jointly reconciling structural, temporal, and attribute information. Compounding this, ‘there is no free lunch’ in what regards community detection [17]: no algorithm is universally optimal, and ground truths in real networks need not align with any single notion of community, yielding diverse and often conflicting methods across scientific disciplines [18].

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) seem an appealing response, having reached the state of the art across graph-related tasks by jointly exploiting topology and attributes, with extensions to the temporal setting [9]. This motivates the central question of this research: *whether neural networks can recover ground-truth communities from dynamic graphs more accurately than other methods*. A ‘neural’ community is here a set of nodes clustered by a model that optimises a graph-theoretic objective, as opposed to groups obtained by descriptive measures (e.g., modularity or conductance) or statistical inference (e.g., stochastic blockmodeling) — both of which are nonetheless retained throughout as baselines, evaluation metrics, and benchmarks. Yet the answer is far from settled: all neural partitions still correspond to posterior distributions of a block model, and their advantage over principled statistical approaches — particularly under the dual demands of *efficacy* and computational *efficiency* at scale — remains unclear at best [17,19].

The question required tackling three interconnected challenges (Figure 1): new software developments for *dynamic graph representations*, the creation of

generative synthetic benchmarks for model evaluation, and the *neural community detection* problem itself, posing the greatest difficulty. Each yielded self-contained contributions, including NETWORKX-TEMPORAL [15], a library extending the well-known NetworkX library to build, manipulate, and analyze dynamic graphs; TADC-SBM [13], a time-varying, attributed, degree-corrected stochastic block model aimed at generating benchmark dynamic graphs under controlled experimental settings; and LMON [14], an end-to-end differentiable GNN optimising the longitudinal modularity objective. Across these strands, efficient computation was a cross-cutting concern — from GPU-accelerated extensions of spectral and greedy optimization algorithms, to neural methods that consider rich, high-dimensional information at node- and edge-level, applicable to real-world data at scale [16]. Together, they represent a step toward answering the central question, and more broadly, in the direction of building new knowledge and methods for temporal graph clustering that bridge network science and machine learning literature. This paper recounts that trajectory: the problem and its motivations, the contributions made to date, and open problems that remain.

2 Background & Related Work

Community detection seeks groups of nodes with shared characteristics or functional similarity. The prevailing assumption is that of *assortative* (homophilic) structures [10], i.e., that nodes more densely connected among themselves than with the rest of the network are more likely to share properties, roles, or functions — dominating in domains such as social network analysis, partly due to the way graphs are constructed (e.g., co-authorship and friendship/follower networks).

Other systems exhibit hierarchical (nested), disassortative (bipartite, core-periphery), or overlapping (mixed-membership) structures that call for alternative definitions [5,6]. A rich, interdisciplinary toolkit has accrued around the problem, including divisive edge-betweenness, statistical-physics formulations, inferential stochastic blockmodeling, information-theoretic methods such as Infomap, label and belief propagation, non-negative matrix factorization, random-walk sampling, and ensemble combinations [5,6]. Among these, modularity optimization is arguably among the most widely adopted [19], owing to its simplicity, empirical performance, sparse-matrix compatibility, and overall software availability.

More recently, machine learning on graphs has recast detection as representation learning. Graph embeddings and neural models approximate a mapping $f(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{X})$, placing nodes in a latent space where distance encodes topological and attribute-based similarity [24,21]. The resulting representations are either clustered *post hoc* with conventional methods such as k -means, or optimised end-to-end against a graph-theoretic objective. By exploiting attributes jointly with structure, GNNs have reached the state of the art across various graph-related tasks — though for community detection their advantage over principled statistical methods is not as clear-cut [17,19].

Real systems, however, are seldom static. Extending these methods to the temporal domain typically relies on segmenting the observed networks into

snapshots coupled through inter-slice links or aligned embeddings [8,23]. Beyond representation, the task itself grows more complex: assuming communities evolve — emerging, growing, merging, splitting, or dissolving — their detection must distinguish a single fixed-membership partition from assignments that change over time, ideally tracking coherent identities across the observed span: a problem akin to that of the ship of Theseus, begging the question of whether a community that changes over time retains its identity, how so, and for how long. Such extensions, moreover, often rely on costly operations — *ad-hoc* heuristics, repeated eigendecompositions, orthogonal alignment — that strain large or rapidly evolving networks under latency constraints, limiting their applicability to tasks such as mobility and trajectory analysis, social network monitoring, financial fraud prevention, and wildlife conservation, the latter by means of analyzing the spatial incidence and size of wildfire events [1,7,20,25], among other applications.

Graph representation learning marks the state-of-the-art paradigm from which this research departed. Time-aware GNNs augment message passing (n -hop feature aggregation over node neighborhoods) with memory, decay, gating, or attention to encode evolving topology and features [9]. Yet most methods still assign nodes to a fixed number of communities with static membership, leaving genuinely dynamic community detection with evolving labels at scale largely open, while gains over inferential baselines remain contested under the joint demands of efficacy and efficiency — a gap this research sought to address, and whose contributions along several strands (Fig. 1) are briefly recounted next.

3 Contributions

Addressing the central question along the three strands of Figure 1 yielded several self-contained contributions, summarised here in order of maturity and impact.

The most consequential result is algorithmic. Modularity optimisation and spectral clustering, though widely adopted, are traditionally CPU-bound and ill-suited to graphs with many snapshots. We introduce GPU-accelerated multislice formulations of both, built on the RAPIDS/cuGraph ecosystem and operating over a supra-adjacency representation of the temporal graph — to our knowledge the first such implementations — exposed as a zero-code-change backend for NetworkX-Temporal. Against its CPU reference (`leidenalg`) under an equal-work budget, the multislice Leiden backend attains consistent speedups spanning roughly two to three orders of magnitude (from $2.7\times$ on dense, low-snapshot *Brain* up to $\sim 978\times$ on *Patent*, $1397\text{s} \rightarrow 1.4\text{s}$). For the largest temporal instances, it represents a change in tractability: graphs that exceed practical time limits on CPU (e.g. *School*, out-of-time) become routine on GPUs. This advantage is naturally confined to scale, however — on small static graphs, launch and transfer overheads let the CPU dominate, a regime our work does not target [16].

Underpinning this is NETWORKX-TEMPORAL [15], a library extending NetworkX to build, manipulate, and analyse discrete- and continuous-time graphs, with broad adoption ($\sim 50\text{k}$ downloads in its first year) and an accompanying temporal dataset of the popular PUBMED [?] citation graph. To enable

controlled evaluation where real-world temporal ground truths are scarce, TADC-SBM [13] generates time-varying, attributed, degree-corrected benchmark graphs; experiments on these and on real data corroborate an earlier finding [2] that neural methods do not consistently surpass established baselines — motivating efficiency, rather than accuracy alone, as a primary objective.

On the neural strand, LMON extends the scalable DMON [22] architecture to the temporal setting: a spectral relaxation of longitudinal modularity [3] yields a differentiable objective that recovers static modularity in the absence of temporal coupling, while a Hawkes-based decay embedded in the encoder’s Laplacian distinguishes persistent structure from transient events. The operator is encoder-agnostic and, to our knowledge, the first to optimise a temporal modularity end-to-end, retaining its backbone’s best-in-class scalability of $\mathcal{O}(d^2n + m)$, where m is the number of edges, n the number of nodes, and d the embedding dimension. It presently recovers static-membership communities; genuinely dynamic (evolving-label) detection at scale remains an open problem that we seek to address next.

4 Final Remarks

This research charts a path toward community detection on temporal attributed graphs in a high-performance yet principled manner, contributing new software and datasets for dynamic graph representation learning, synthetic benchmark generators for self-consistent model evaluation, and two complementary strands: a GPU-accelerated algorithmic route that turns previously intractable temporal instances into routine ones, and a neural route that folds temporal signal into a scalable, differentiable modularity objective. Several open problems worthy of note remain, among which we highlight the design of neural architectures for truly dynamic, evolving-label community detection at scale, and the implementation of efficient eigensolvers for asymmetric, directed matrices on GPU hardware, which would enable spectral methods to scale to large temporal graphs under asymptotic conditions without resorting to normalization or costly heuristics.

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

References

1. et al., N.D.: Tracking community evolution in social networks: A survey. *Information Processing & Management* **56**(3), 1084–1102 (5 2019)
2. Reis de Almeida Passos, N.A., Carlini, E., Trani, S.: Deep community detection in attributed temporal graphs: Experimental evaluation of current approaches. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Graph Neural Networking Workshop 2024*. pp. 1–6. GNNNet ’24, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2024)
3. Brabant, V., Asgari, Y., Borgnat, P., Bonifati, A., Cazabet, R.: Longitudinal modularity, a modularity for link streams. *EPJ Data Science* **14**(1) (Feb 2025)
4. Failla, A., Cazabet, R., Rossetti, G., Citraro, S.: Describing group evolution in temporal data using multi-faceted events. *Machine Learning* **113**(10) (2024)

5. Fortunato, S.: Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports* **486**(3-5), 75–174 (2 2010)
6. Fortunato, S., Hric, D.: Community detection in networks: A user guide. *Physics Reports* **659**, 1–44 (Nov 2016)
7. Gouvêa, A.M.M.M., Vega-Oliveros, D.A., Cotacallapa, M., Ferreira, L.N., Macau, E.E.N., Quiles, M.G.: Dynamic community detection into analyzing of wildfires events. In: *Computational Science and Its Applications extendash ICCSA 2020*, pp. 1032–1047. Springer International Publishing (2020)
8. Holme, P., Saramäki, J. (eds.): *Temporal Network Theory*. Springer International Publishing (2023)
9. 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)
10. 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)
11. Newman, M.E.J., Girvan, M.: Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E* **69**(2) (2 2004)
12. Newman, M.: *Networks*. Oxford University Press, 2 edn. (2018)
13. 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)
14. Passos, N.A.R.A., Carlini, E., Trani, S.: Dynamic graph clustering with graph neural networks (2026), accepted as a poster to Learning on Graphs (Pisa Meetup, June 2026). To appear as a preprint.
15. Passos, N.A., Carlini, E., Trani, S.: Networkx-temporal: Building, manipulating, and analyzing dynamic graph structures. *SoftwareX* **31**, 102277 (2025)
16. Passos, N.A., Carlini, E., Trani, S.: Accelerating dynamic graph clustering on gpu architectures with cugraph (2026), submitted to the 6th workshop EuroPar/FRAME; Under review. To appear as a preprint.
17. Peel, L., Larremore, D.B., Clauset, A.: The ground truth about metadata and community detection in networks. *Science Advances* **3**(5) (May 2017)
18. Peel, L., Peixoto, T.P., De Domenico, M.: Statistical inference links data and theory in network science. *Nature Communications* **13**(1) (Nov 2022)
19. 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)
20. Sarma, D., Alam, W., Saha, I., Alam, M.N., Alam, M.J., Hossain, S.: Bank fraud detection using community detection algorithm. In: *ICIRCA*. pp. 642–646 (2020)
21. 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)
22. Tsitsulin, A., Palowitch, J., Perozzi, B., Müller, E.: Graph clustering with graph neural networks. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **24**(1) (mar 2024)
23. Xue, G., Zhong, M., Li, J., Chen, J., Zhai, C., Kong, R.: Dynamic network embedding survey. *Neurocomputing* **472**, 212–223 (Feb 2022)
24. Zhang, D., Yin, J., Zhu, X., Zhang, C.: Network representation learning: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* **6**(1), 3–28 (2020)
25. Zhao, Y., Chen, B.Y., Gao, F., Zhu, X.: Dynamic community detection considering daily rhythms of human mobility. *Travel B. and Society* **31**, 209–222 (4 2023)