

Efficient SimRank Computation via Linearization

Takanori Maehara
National Institute of
Informatics
JST, ERATO, Kawarabayashi
Project
maehara@nii.ac.jp

Mitsuru Kusumoto
Kyoto University
JST, ERATO, Kawarabayashi
Project
mkusumoto@kuis.kyoto-
u.ac.jp

Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi
National Institute of
Informatics
JST, ERATO, Kawarabayashi
Project
k_keniti@nii.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

SimRank, proposed by Jeh and Widom, provides a good similarity score and has been successfully used in many applications (e.g., web spam detection, collaborative tagging analysis, link prediction, and so on). There are many algorithms proposed so far to compute SimRank, but unfortunately, their computational costs are very expensive.

In this paper, we propose a very efficient algorithm for SimRank. We first observe that the computational difficulty of SimRank comes from the “non-linearity” in its definition. To reduce this difficulty, we introduce a novel technique *linearized SimRank* that gives a linear formulation of SimRank that computes exact scores. Note that the similar (and much simpler) modification has already appeared in some papers and they claimed that it is equivalent to the original SimRank. However, we point out that their modification computes some scores that are different from SimRank (Indeed there is a counterexample to that claim).

Our algorithm, which is based on the linearized SimRank, consists of two-phases: the preprocessing phase and the query phase. The algorithm first estimates some parameters in the preprocessing phase, and answers single-pair, single-source, and all-pairs SimRank queries in the query phase. The preprocessing runs in almost linear time, which depends on the (arbitrarily) desired accuracy. Once the preprocessing is done, we can answer a single-pair query in $O(Tm)$ time, a single-source query in $O(T^2m)$ time, and the all-pairs query in $O(T^2nm)$ time, where n and m denote the number of vertices and edges, and T denotes the number of iterations. Concerning space complexity, the algorithm only requires $O(m)$ space for all phases. Note that these complexities are almost optimal.

We conduct our experiments to implement our proposed algorithm. For small networks ($n \leq 1,000,000$), the algorithm only takes a few minutes for the preprocessing and answers a single-pair query in 100 milliseconds and a single-source query in a few seconds. It can also answer the all-pairs query for networks of size $n \leq 100,000$ in a reasonable

time. For large networks ($n \geq 40,000,000$), it requires a few hours for the preprocessing and answers a single-pair query in about ten seconds and a single-source query in a few minutes. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time to scale up to such large networks. We compare our algorithm with the existing results, and it is 1000 times faster than them.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, much effort has been devoted to extracting useful information from large graphs. With the rapidly increasing amount of graph data, searching graph databases to identify vertices has become an important research problem. This is because vertex similarities play a central role in many applications: link prediction [27], graph clustering [38, 45], spam detection [14], and recommender systems [2]. These techniques adopt a link-based similarity measure, which computes the proximity between two vertices based on the paths connecting them.

The development of similarity search algorithms between web pages is motivated by the “related pages” queries of web search engines and web document classification. Both applications require efficient evaluation of an underlying similarity function, which extracts similarities from either the textual content of pages or the hyperlink structure. In this paper, we are only interested in the hyperlink structure modeled by the web graph, with vertices corresponding to web pages and directed arcs to the hyperlinks between pages, because in contrast to textual content, link structure is a more homogeneous and language independent source of information and it is more resistant against spamming.

Several link-based similarity functions have been suggested over the web graph. Functions introduced in social network analysis, like co-citation, bibliographic coupling, utilize only the one-step neighborhoods of pages. To exploit the information in multi-step neighborhoods, Jeh and Widom [16] proposed *SimRank* for the similarity search in the World Wide Web. The idea behind SimRank is:

two pages are similar if they are referenced by similar pages.

They formulate this intuition by the following recursive definition of SimRank:

$$s(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & (i = j), \\ \frac{c}{|\delta_-(i)||\delta_-(j)|} \sum_{i' \in \delta_-(i), j' \in \delta_-(j)} s(i', j'), & (i \neq j), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Table 1: Complexity of SimRank algorithms. n denotes the number of vertices, m denotes the number of edges, d denotes the average degree, T denotes the number of iterations, r denotes the rank for low-rank approximation.

Algorithm	Type	Time	Space	Technique
Proposed	Single-pair	$O(Tm)$	$O(m)$	Linearization
Proposed	Single-source	$O(T^2m)$	$O(m)$	Linearization
Proposed	All-pairs	$O(T^2nm)$	$O(m)$	Linearization
Li et al. [26]	Single-pair	$O(Td^2n^2)$	$O(n^2)$	Random surfer pair (Iterative)
Fogaras and R���� [11]	Single-pair	— ¹	— ¹	Random surfer pair (Monte Carlo)
Jeh and Widom [16]	All-pairs	$O(Tn^2d^2)$	$O(n^2)$	Naive
Lizorkin et al. [31]	All-pairs	$O(T \min\{nm, n^3 / \log n\})$	$O(n^2)$	Partial sum
Yu et al. [42]	All-pairs	$O(T \min\{nm, n^\omega\})$	$O(n^2)$	Fast matrix multiplication
Li et al. [25]	All-pairs	$O(r^4n^2)$	$O(n^2)$	Singular value decomposition
Fujiwara et al. [12]	All-pairs	$O(r^4n)$	$O(r^2n^2)$	Singular value decomposition
Yu et al. [40]	All-pairs	$O(n^3 + Tn^2)$	$O(n^2)$	Eigenvalue decomposition

where $c \in (0, 1)$ is a decay factor, which is usually set to $c = 0.8$ [16] or $c = 0.6$ [31]. While there are several algorithms proposed so far to compute SimRank scores, unfortunately, its computation complexity (in both time and space) is very expensive; see Table 1. The naive (and original) algorithm, which is proposed by Jeh and Widom [16], requires $O(Tn^2d^2)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space, where n and m denote the number of vertices and edges, T denotes the number of iteration, and d is the average degree.

2. CONTRIBUTION

In this paper, we shall reduce the computational cost of SimRank. We are not interested in approximate (heuristic) approaches [8, 18] that do not actually compute SimRank, but we seek for the exact solutions for SimRank.

We propose an algorithm that is based on a novel technique, *linearized SimRank*. We shall observe that the computational difficulty of SimRank comes from its non-linearity. Hence we introduce this technique to give a linear formulation of SimRank that computes scores exactly. Note that the similar (and much simpler) modification has already appeared in some papers (e.g., [12, 25, 40, 41]), and they claimed that it is equivalent to the original SimRank. However, we point out that this “simpler” modification computes some scores that are different from SimRank² (and we experimentally show that the scores based on this formula may be different from exact SimRank scores by as much as 0.1, see Subsection 7.1 and Remark 2).

Our algorithm is a two-phase algorithm that consists of the preprocessing phase and the query phase. In order to achieve the desired accuracy, we need to estimate the parameters for a given network. This is done in the preprocessing phase. In the query phase, using the estimated parameters, we can answer the following three fundamental queries for SimRank:

1. *Single-pair SimRank*: Given two vertices $i, j \in V$. Compute a SimRank score S_{ij} .
2. *Single-source SimRank*: Given a vertex $i \in V$. Compute SimRank scores S_{ij} for all $j \in V$.
3. *All-pairs SimRank*: Compute SimRank scores S_{ij} for all $i, j \in V$.

¹Not mentioned in the paper [11].

²Indeed, a counterexample is given in *Examples 1 and 2* in Section 4 (also see Remark 1).

Note that the most of existing methods can only solve the all-pairs query, but in practice single-pair and single-source queries are also, and sometimes more important. Our method can answer all of these types of queries.

Our algorithm has the following appealing features:

- **Efficient in time**: The preprocessing takes $O(TLRn)$ time, where T is the number of iteration of SimRank, and L and R are the parameters that are estimated for the accuracy of the algorithm; see Section 6 for details.

Once the parameters are estimated, in the query phase, the algorithm only takes $O(Tm)$ time for a single-pair query, $O(T^2m)$ time for a single-source query, and $O(T^2nm)$ time for the all-pairs query (that applies single-source queries n times). This is the first linear time algorithm to compute SimRank. Moreover, for a sparse network, the complexities for a single-source query and the all-pairs query are almost optimal (because we definitely need $O(n)$).

It is also worth noting that our algorithm for the all-pairs query is distributed computing friendly. If we have M machines, we can assign initial vertices to each machine and compute the single-source SimRank independently. Thus the computational time is $O(T^2nm/M)$.

- **Efficient in space**: Both in the preprocessing phase and the query phase, the algorithm only requires $O(m)$ space to store the network (so this is the best possible). This is the first linear space algorithm to compute SimRank. Note that for the all-pairs case, we do not really have to store the similarity of all pairs of vertices.
- **Accurate**: It gives an exact score of SimRank. More precisely, the algorithm can compute an arbitrarily accurate SimRank scores by taking parameters L and R for the preprocessing phase suitably. Furthermore, the accuracy of the algorithm (i.e., maximum absolute error) can be estimated in the algorithm.

We point out that the accuracy of the algorithm only depends on the accuracy of the estimated parameters, which will be done in the preprocessing phase. So if we want more accurate solutions, we only have to apply our preprocessing many more times. Hence the only preprocessing takes more time and the query time stays the same.

We conduct our experiments to evaluate our proposed algorithm. For small networks ($n \leq 1,000,000$), the algorithm only takes a few minutes for the preprocessing and answers

a single-pair query in 100 milliseconds and a single-source query in a few seconds. It can also answer the all-pairs query for networks of size $n \leq 100,000$ in a reasonable time. For large networks ($n \geq 40,000,000$), it requires a few hours for the preprocessing and answers a single-pair query in about ten seconds and a single-source query in a few minutes. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time to scale up to such large networks. We compare our algorithm with the existing results, and it is 1000 times faster than them.

Technically speaking, once the preprocessing phase is done, the query phase is straightforward; see Section 4. So the difficulty of our algorithm is in the preprocessing phase. We apply an iterative algorithm for the parameter estimation that alternatively updates the parameters using Monte Carlo simulation. We can prove the convergence of this algorithm under some condition, and in practice the algorithm can efficiently estimate the parameters.

3. RELATED WORK

Link-based similarity measures

Similarity measures are divided into two classes: content-based measures, and link-based measures. Content-based measures use content information, such as textual, image, or music information and link-based measures use only graph structures. In this paper, we are only interested in link-based measures for large real networks.

There are many link-based similarity measures, e.g., bibliographic coupling [20], co-citation [35], SimRank [16], PageSim [28], Extended Nearest Neighborhood Structure [29], MatchSim [30], and so on.

SimRank is introduced by Jeh and Widom [16] for the similarity search in the World Wide Web that exploits the information in multi-step neighborhoods by the recursive definition (1). *SimRank* and its related similarity measures (e.g., *SimRank++* [4], *S-SimRank* [9], *P-Rank* [43], *SimRank** [41], etc) give high-quality scores in many areas, such as natural language processing [34], computational advertisement [4], collaborative filtering [39], web analysis [16], and so on. The reason is that *SimRank* exploits the information in multi-step neighborhoods while other similarity measures, such as bibliographic coupling or co-citation, utilize only the one-step neighborhoods of pages. This is a similar reason for *PageRank*, as used by the Google search engine, because both *SimRank* and *PageRank* can take “global” information of given networks into account.

SimRank computation

Here, we briefly survey existing computational techniques for SimRank. All proposed algorithms to compute SimRank can scale up to at most $n \leq 100,000$ size networks, and there is no proposed algorithm so far that can compute SimRank for at least $n \geq 1,000,000$ size networks.

In the original paper by Jeh and Widom [16], SimRank is computed by recursively evaluating the equation (1) for all $i, j \in V$. This “naive” computation yields an $O(Td^2n^2)$ time algorithm, where T denotes the number of iterations and d denotes the average degree of a network. Lizorkin et al. [31] proposed a “partial sum” technique to reduce the time complexity of the naive algorithm. This leads to an $O(T \min\{nm, n^3/\log n\})$ algorithm. Yu et al. [42] applied the fast matrix multiplication [36, 37] and then obtained an

$O(T \min\{nm, n^\omega\})$ algorithm, where $\omega < 2.373$ is the exponent of matrix multiplication. Note that the space complexity of these algorithms is $O(n^2)$, since they have to maintain all SimRank scores for each pair of nodes to evaluate the equation (1).

Some acceleration techniques to compute SimRank are proposed very recently. Jia et al. [19] removed “dangling nodes” of a network that has no in-links, and this resulted in a bit faster algorithm, since SimRank scores of dangling nodes are zero. Cai et al. [8] proposed an algorithm to set some certain threshold to discard SimRank scores that are smaller than the threshold. This technique works effectively on scale-free networks. Jia et al. [18] proposed an algorithm to maintain only vertex pairs of small distance. This technique works effectively on small-world networks. Unfortunately, these methods only give rise to approximate solutions for SimRank. In this paper, we are interested in the exact solutions to compute SimRank.

Jeh and Widom [16] showed a random-walk interpretation of SimRank, which is called a “random surfer-pair model”. Consider random walks that start from vertices i and j and follow the in-links, and let $\tau_{i,j}$ be the random variable that denotes the first meeting time of i and j . Then SimRank the score is obtained by $s(i, j) = \mathbf{E}[c^{\tau_{i,j}}]$. Fogaras and Rácz [11] evaluate the right-hand side by Monte Carlo simulation with a fingerprint tree data structure. Li et al. [26] also use the random surfer-pair model, but their algorithm is deterministic, which is an iterative algorithm for the first meeting time.

Some papers [12, 25, 40, 41] proposed spectral decomposition (or low-rank decomposition) based algorithms but unfortunately their algorithms are based on an “wrong formula” of SimRank and hence their algorithm does not actually compute SimRank. Indeed, a counterexample is given in *Examples 1 and 2* in Section 4 (also see Remark 1). For more details, see Appendix B. This is also our motivation to compute the exact solutions for SimRank.

Organization of paper

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 4, we introduce the linearized SimRank, which is the main idea of this paper. In Section 5, we propose algorithms for three fundamental queries for the linearized SimRank. In Section 6, we propose a parameter estimation algorithm for the linearized SimRank, which is needed in our preprocessing. In Section 7, we evaluate our algorithm on several real networks in accuracy and efficiency. Finally in Section 8, we conclude this paper with some future work.

4. LINEARIZED SIMRANK

We first introduce a matrix notation of SimRank. Let P be a transition matrix of the transposed graph G^\top , i.e.,

$$P_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1/|\delta_-(j)|, & (i, j) \in E, \\ 0, & (i, j) \notin E. \end{cases}$$

Let $S := (s(i, j))_{ij}$ be a matrix whose (i, j) entry is the SimRank score of i and j . We refer this matrix as *SimRank matrix*. Then the SimRank equation (1) is simply represented by

$$S = (cP^\top SP) \vee I, \quad (2)$$

where \vee denotes the element-wise maximum, i.e., $(A \vee B)_{ij} := \max\{A_{ij}, B_{ij}\}$. Our task is to compute SimRank efficiently.

In our view, the difficulty of computing SimRank by the equation (2) comes from the element-wise maximum, which is a “non-linear” operation. To avoid the element-wise maximum, we introduce a new formulation of SimRank as follows. By observing (2), since S and $cP^\top SP$ only differ in their diagonal elements, there exists a diagonal matrix D such that

$$S = cP^\top SP + D. \quad (3)$$

We call such a matrix D as the *diagonal correction matrix*. The main idea of this paper is to compute SimRank by this “linear” recurrence equation.

To be more precise, we introduce the notion of *linearized SimRank*. Let Θ be an $n \times n$ matrix. A linearized SimRank $S^L(\Theta)$ is a matrix that satisfies the following “linear” recurrence equation:

$$S^L(\Theta) = cP^\top S^L(\Theta)P + \Theta. \quad (4)$$

It is important that the map S^L is nonsingular. So, for every Θ , $S^L(\Theta)$ is uniquely determined; see Proposition 1 in Appendix A. By the definition of the diagonal correction matrix D , we have $S = S^L(D)$.

By introducing a linearized SimRank, the SimRank computation problem is now divided into the two parts that exactly correspond to our two-phase algorithm:

1. Estimate the diagonal correction matrix D ,
2. Compute the linearized SimRank with the estimated D .

The second part, computing the linearized SimRank is straightforward and much easier than computing the original SimRank. We discuss this part in Section 5. The first part is the difficult part of our method. We propose an iterative algorithm that alternatively updates the parameters using Monte Carlo simulation in Section 6.

Let us now give two examples that can illustrate what the linearized SimRank is.

EXAMPLE 1 (STAR GRAPH OF ORDER 4). *Let G be the star graph of order 4 (i.e., a claw). The transition matrix (of the transposed graph) is*

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and SimRank for $c = 0.8$ is

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 4/5 & 4/5 \\ 0 & 4/5 & 1 & 4/5 \\ 0 & 4/5 & 4/5 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since

$$S - cP^\top SP = \text{diag}(23/75, 1/5, 1/5, 1/5),$$

we can take $D = \text{diag}(23/75, 1/5, 1/5, 1/5)$ for the diagonal correction matrix. Let us emphasize that $D \neq (1 - c)I$.

EXAMPLE 2 (COMPLETE GRAPH OF ORDER n). *Let G be the complete graph of order n with self-loop at every vertex. Then the transition matrix P (of the transposed graph) is*

E/n , where E is the all-one matrix. Note that $E^2 = nE$. By the symmetry, we can assume $S = aI + (1 - a)E$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and $D = dI$ for some $d \in \mathbb{R}$. Substitute these to (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} aI + (1 - a)E &= dI + c(E/n)(aI + (1 - a)E)(E/n) \\ &= dI + c(1/n + 1 - a)E. \end{aligned}$$

By solving this equation, we obtain $d = (1 - c)/(1 - c + c/n)$.

If $n = 1$ then $d = 1 - c$, and if $n \rightarrow \infty$ then $d \rightarrow 1$ (with increasing monotonically). This shows that the diagonal correction matrix D is close to $(1 - c)I$ if n is small, and close to I if n is large.

REMARK 1. Some papers used the following “wrong” formula for SimRank (e.g., equation (2) in [12], equation (2) in [15], equation (2) in [25], and equation (3) in [41]):

$$S = cP^\top SP + (1 - c)I. \quad (5)$$

This formula says $(1 - c)I$ is the diagonal correction matrix, but this is wrong; the above two examples are counterexamples. See Appendix B for more details.

5. LINEARIZED SIMRANK COMPUTATION

In this section, we assume that the diagonal estimation D is already given, which satisfies $S = S^L(D)$. Then we can compute SimRank S via computing the linearized SimRank $S^L(D)$. Since the linearized SimRank satisfies the linear recursion (4), all the problems about SimRank can be solved efficiently.

Specifically, we here consider the following three fundamental problems for SimRank:

1. *Single-pair SimRank*: Given two vertices $i, j \in V$. Compute a SimRank score S_{ij} .
2. *Single-source SimRank*: Given a vertex $i \in V$. Compute SimRank scores S_{ij} for all $j \in V$.
3. *All-pairs SimRank*: Compute SimRank scores S_{ij} for all $i, j \in V$.

We propose algorithms for these problems. Our algorithm answers the single-pair SimRank problem in $O(Tm)$ time, the single-source SimRank problem in $O(T^2m)$ time, and the all-pairs SimRank problem in $O(T^2nm)$ time, where T denotes the number of SimRank iteration. As mentioned before, for all the queries, the time complexity is essentially optimal. The space complexity is $O(m)$ for all queries. This is definitely optimal as we have to read all edges of a given graph.

All of the algorithms are based on the same idea. Consider the following series expansion of SimRank that is obtained from (4):

$$S = D + cP^\top DP + c^2P^\top P^2 DP^2 + \dots \quad (6)$$

This series converges with convergence rate $O(c^t)$; see Proposition 2 in Appendix A. Our algorithms compute the SimRank scores by evaluating the first T terms of the above.

Let us look at the single-pair SimRank problem, the single-source SimRank problem and the all-pairs SimRank problem respectively.

5.1 Single-pair SimRank

Let e_i be the i -th unit vector ($i = 1, \dots, n$). Then the SimRank score S_{ij} is obtained by $e_i^\top Se_j$. Hence, by applying e_i^\top and e_j to the both-hand sides of (6), we obtain

$$S_{ij} = e_i^\top De_j + c(Pe_i)^\top DPe_j + c^2(P^2e_i)^\top DP^2e_j + \dots$$

Our algorithm computes the right-hand side of the above equation efficiently by maintaining P^te_i and P^te_j . The algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1. The time complexity of the algorithm is $O(Tm)$ since we have to compute $O(T)$ matrix vector products, i.e., P^te_i and P^te_j for $t = 1, \dots, T-1$.

Algorithm 1 Single-pair SimRank

```

1: procedure SINGLEPAIRSIMRANK( $i, j$ )
2:    $\alpha \leftarrow 0, x \leftarrow e_i, y \leftarrow e_j$ 
3:   for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$  do
4:      $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha + c^t x^\top Dy, x \leftarrow Px, y \leftarrow Py$ 
5:   end for
6:   Report  $S_{ij} = \alpha$ 
7: end procedure
```

It is worth noting that we can exploit the sparsity of P (i.e., the network structure) for computing the matrix-vector product Px in line 4 of Algorithm 1. In general, there are two algorithms for matrix-vector product called *inner-product form* and *outer-product form* [13]; see Algorithm 2. The inner-product form is preferred for a dense vector and the outer-product form is preferred for a sparse vector (we can skip the inner-loop if $x_j = 0$). For a single-pair query, we can greatly improve the performance of the algorithm by using outer-product form.

Algorithm 2 The inner-product form and the outer-product form for matrix vector product

```

1: procedure INNERPRODUCTFORM( $A, x$ )
2:    $y = \vec{0}$ 
3:   for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
4:     for  $j = 1, \dots, n$  do
5:        $y_i = y_i + A_{ij}x_j$ 
6:     end for
7:   end for
8:   return  $y$ 
9: end procedure

1: procedure OUTERPRODUCTFORM( $A, x$ )
2:    $y = \vec{0}$ 
3:   for  $j = 1, \dots, n$  do
4:     for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
5:        $y_i = y_i + A_{ij}x_j$ 
6:     end for
7:   end for
8:   return  $y$ 
9: end procedure
```

5.2 Single-source SimRank

We next consider the single-source case. We can observe that the i -th component of Se_j is S_{ij} . So to answer a single-source query, we only have to compute the vector Se_j .

By applying e_j to (6), we obtain

$$Se_j = De_j + cP^\top DPe_j + c^2P^{\top 2}DP^2e_j + \dots$$

Our algorithm computes the right-hand side of the above equation efficiently by maintaining P^te_j . The algorithm is shown in Algorithm 3. The time complexity of the algorithm is $O(T^2m)$ since we have to compute $O(T^2)$ matrix vector products, i.e., $P^{\top t'}DP^te_j$ for $t = 1, \dots, T-1$ and $t' = 1, \dots, t$.

Our additional experiments show that using outer-product form for the product of P and inner-product form for the product of P^\top , we can obtain a faster algorithm.

Algorithm 3 Single-source SimRank

```

1: procedure SINGLESOURCESIMRANK( $i$ )
2:    $\gamma \leftarrow \vec{0}, x \leftarrow e_j$ 
3:   for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$  do
4:      $\gamma \leftarrow \gamma + c^t P^{\top t} Dx, x \leftarrow Px$ 
5:   end for
6:   Report  $S_{ij} = \gamma_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ 
7: end procedure
```

5.3 All-pairs SimRank

Let us first emphasize that computing all-pairs SimRank is an expensive task for a large network. It must take $O(n^2)$ time since the number of pairs is $\Theta(n^2)$. If we actually want to compute all-pairs SimRank, in reality we must avoid using $O(n^2)$ space, because $O(n^2)$ space is quite impractical for $n \geq 1,000,000$ size networks.

Our all-pairs SimRank algorithm just applies the single-source SimRank algorithm (Algorithm 3) for all initial vertices, as shown in Algorithm 4. The complexity is $O(T^2nm)$ time and $O(m)$ space. Since the standard SimRank algorithm requires at least $O(Tnm)$ time and $O(n^2)$ space, our algorithm significantly improves the space complexity with the almost same time complexity (since the cost of factor T is much smaller than n or m). Due to the small memory requirement, our algorithm can handle networks of size $n \geq 1,000,000$ (see in Section 7), but on the other hand, algorithms with space complexity $O(n^2)$ would not handle this large size graph, because $O(n^2)$ is much bigger than $O(m)$ (at least 100,000 times bigger, in our experiment), and hence it is impossible to store all the pairs.

Note that we can slightly improve the computational time of this algorithm by replacing the vector x to an $n \times w$ matrix X in Algorithm 3, where w is a small integer (e.g., $w = 64$). This does not change the theoretical complexity but due to cache performance, this reduces the computational time by a factor 2-3, in our experiment (see Section 7).

It is worth noting that this algorithm is distributed computing friendly. If we have M machines, we assign initial vertices to each machine and compute the single-source SimRank independently. Then the computational time is $O(T^2nm/M)$.

6. DIAGONAL ESTIMATION

As seen in the previous section, once the diagonal correction matrix D is obtained, SimRank computation is a straightforward task. In this section, we show how to estimate the diagonal correction matrix.

Algorithm 4 All-pairs SimRank

```

1: procedure ALLPAIRSSIMRANK
2:   for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
3:     Compute SingleSourceSimRank( $i$ )
4:   end for
5: end procedure

```

Since the diagonal correction matrix D is introduced to satisfy $S^L(D)_{kk} = 1$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$), the diagonal estimation problem is naturally formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Find a diagonal matrix } D \\ &\text{such that } S^L(D)_{kk} = 1, (k = 1, \dots, n). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note that this problem is a linear equation since $S^L(D)_{kk}$ is linear in D . We can prove that (7) has a unique solution D . Therefore D is equal to the diagonal correction matrix, i.e., $S^L(D) = S$. See Proposition 3 in Appendix A.

We here propose an efficient algorithm for the problem (7). We combine an “alternating method” (explained in Subsection 6.1) with “Monte Carlo simulation” (explained in Subsection 6.2). We obtain an $O(TLRn)$ time algorithm to estimate the diagonal correction matrix (see at the end of Subsection 6.2). We also estimate L, R in Subsections 6.1 and 6.2, respectively.

Note that the accuracy of our framework only depending to the accuracy of this estimation phase. Formally, we measure the error in the maximum off-diagonal difference:

$$\text{error} = \max_{i \neq j} |s_{\text{exact}}(i, j) - s_{\text{proposed}}(i, j)|. \quad (8)$$

If error is at most ϵ , then we say *accuracy* ϵ . Note that, since there is a small number (e.g., $O(n)$) of pairs that have large SimRank scores, the maximum error is a better measure than the average error.

6.1 Alternating method for diagonal estimation

Since (7) is a linear equation, we can solve the problem by using standard method in numerical linear algebra. However, since evaluating $S^L(D)_{kk}$ for all k is expensive, we have to develop more efficient algorithm.

The main idea of our method is the following intuition:

$S^L(D)_{kk}$ is the most affected by D_{kk} . Hence it is enough to consider only $S^L(D)_{kk}$ for D_{kk} .

Admittedly, the above statement is not always true, but this idea leads to an efficient algorithm for the diagonal estimation problem (7) as follows.

Let E_{kk} be the matrix whose entries are zero, except for the (k, k) entry that equals to one. According to the above intuition, we introduce the following problem to update the k -th diagonal entry for the current estimation D :

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Find } \delta \\ &\text{such that } S^L(\delta E_{kk} + D)_{kk} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Our algorithm starts from some initial solution and *iteratively* (more precisely: cyclically L times) solves this problem and updates k -th diagonal entry of D as $D_{kk} \leftarrow \delta + D_{kk}$. This approach only considers $S^L(D)_{kk}$ to update D_{kk} for each step but by solving the problem iteratively, we can gather all information of $S^L(D)$.

The whole algorithm is shown in Algorithm 5. Under a technical assumption, we can prove that the algorithm converges to the solution of (7) and the number of iteration L required to compute with accuracy ϵ is $O(\log(1/\epsilon))$; see Proposition 4 in Appendix A. In practice, the algorithm converges very fast; see Subsection 7.1 in our experiments.

Algorithm 5 Diagonal estimation algorithm

```

1: procedure DIAGONALESTIMATION
2:   Set initial estimate of  $D$ , e.g.,  $D_{kk} = 1 - c$  for all  $k$ .
3:   for  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  do
4:     for  $k = 1, \dots, n$  do
5:       Solve the problem (9)
6:        $D_{kk} \leftarrow D_{kk} + \delta$ 
7:     end for
8:   end for
9: end procedure

```

6.2 Monte Carlo based evaluation

The remaining issue of Algorithm 5 is how to solve the problem (9) efficiently. Since S^L is linear, the solution of (9) is given by

$$\delta = \frac{1 - S^L(D)_{kk}}{S^L(E_{kk})_{kk}}. \quad (10)$$

Therefore if we can evaluate $S^L(D)_{kk}$ and $S^L(E_{kk})_{kk}$, we can solve the problem (9). However, this seems a hard problem. We can adapt an idea of our single-pair SimRank algorithm (Algorithm 1) to this purpose, but this approach only gives an $O(Tmn)$ algorithm for the diagonal estimation. This is too expensive for a large network.

To deal with this issue, we develop a Monte Carlo based algorithm. Consider a random walk that starts from a vertex k and follows its in-links. Let $k^{(t)}$ denotes the location of the random walk after t steps. Then we have

$$\mathbf{E}[e_{k^{(t)}}] = P^t e_k.$$

We evaluate the left-hand side by Monte Carlo simulation. We perform R independent random walks simultaneously and for each step t , we count the frequency $p_i^{(t)}$ of random walks that is on a vertex i . Then we have

$$\sum p_i^{(t)} e_i \simeq \mathbf{E}[e_{k^{(t)}}] = P^t e_k,$$

and hence the k -th diagonal of t -th term of the series expansion (6) is evaluated as

$$(P^t e_k)^\top D P^t e_k \simeq \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{(t)2} D_{ii}. \quad (11)$$

By combining (10) and (11), we now obtain Algorithm 6 for the problem (9). Note that α in the algorithm corresponds to $S^L(E_{kk})_{kk}$ and β in the algorithm corresponds to $S^L(D)_{kk}$.

Using a hash table, we can implement this algorithm with time complexity $O(TR)$, where R denotes the number of samples and T denotes the maximum steps of random walks that are exactly the number of SimRank iterations. Plugging the alternating method to solve the problem (9) (Algorithm 5) in Algorithm 6, we obtain an $O(TLRn)$ time algorithm to estimate the diagonal correction matrix.

6.3 Accuracy of the algorithm

Since the algorithm is Monte Carlo simulation, there is a trade-off between the accuracy and the number of samples R . By Hoeffding's inequality, we can estimate the number of samples R required to compute $S^L(D)_{kk}$ with accuracy ϵ with desired probability δ as $O(\log(1/\delta) \log(n)/\epsilon^2)$; see Proposition 5 in Appendix A.

In practice, the following accuracy estimation is useful. Recall that we measure the accuracy by “off-diagonal” errors (8), but these values cannot measure directly. On the other hand, in the algorithm, we can estimate the “diagonal” errors $|S^L(D)_{kk} - 1|$ by Monte-Carlo simulation. We can prove that the “off-diagonal” errors by “diagonal” errors as follows. Suppose that $\max_k |S^L(D)_{kk} - 1| \leq \epsilon$. Then we have

$$\max_{i \neq j} |S^L(D)_{ij} - S_{ij}| \leq c\epsilon/(1-c). \quad (12)$$

See Proposition 6 in Appendix A.

Algorithm 6 Diagonal update algorithm

```

1: procedure DIAGONALUPDATE( $k$ )
2:    $\alpha \leftarrow 0, \beta \leftarrow 0, k_1 \leftarrow k, k_2 \leftarrow k, \dots, k_R \leftarrow k$ 
3:   for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$  do
4:     for  $i \in \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_R\}$  do
5:        $p_i^{(t)} \leftarrow \#\{r = 1, \dots, R : k_r = i\}/R$ 
6:       if  $i = k$  then
7:          $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha + c^t p_i^{(t)2}$ 
8:       end if
9:        $\beta \leftarrow \beta + c^t p_i^{(t)2} D_{ii}$ 
10:    end for
11:    for  $r = 1, \dots, R$  do
12:       $k_r \leftarrow \delta_{-}(k_r)$  randomly
13:    end for
14:  end for
15:  Update  $D_{kk} \leftarrow D_{kk} + (1 - \beta)/\alpha$ 
16: end procedure

```

7. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we evaluate our algorithm in accuracy and efficiency. All experiments are conducted on an Intel Xeon E5-2690 2.90GHz CPU with 256GB memory and running Ubuntu 12.04. Our algorithm is implemented in C++ and compiled with g++v4.6 with -O4 option. We use the datasets shown in Table 2³.

7.1 Accuracy

Recall that there are four parameters in our algorithm:

1. The decay factor c of SimRank,

2. The number of iterations T of SimRank,
3. The number of outer-loops L of Algorithm 5, and
4. The number of samples R of Monte Carlo simulation in Algorithm 6.

To evaluate the accuracy of our algorithm, we have to discuss the relation between the parameters and the accuracy.

In the previous section, we analyzed $L = O(\log(1/\epsilon)/\log d)$ and $R = O(\log n/\epsilon^2)$. However, since the theoretical analysis is for the worst case, we can set much smaller values in practice. To compute SimRank in large networks efficiently, this is an important optimization.

We here discuss the suitable setting of these values. Let us first assume that computed SimRank scores should have accuracy $\epsilon = 0.01$.

Decay factor / Number of iterations

Jeh and Widom [16] suggested using $c = 0.8$ and $T = 5$, but recently, Lizorkin et al. [31] pointed out that these parameters could cause (numerically) inaccurate solutions. They suggested using either a small decay factor (e.g., $c = 0.6$) or more iterations.

We therefore set the decay factor $c = 0.6$. We can show that, the approximation error of T -th iterated solution is $c^T/(1-c)$; see Propositions 2, 7, and Remark 5 in Appendix A. Therefore we set $T = 11$ in order for $c^T/(1-c) \leq 0.01$.

Number of outer-loops / Number of samples

To optimize the parameters, we empirically evaluate the accuracy of the algorithm. We compute SimRank scores $s_{\text{proposed}}(i, j)$ by our algorithm. We also compute the “exact” SimRank scores $s_{\text{exact}}(i, j)$ by the original algorithm proposed by Jeh and Widom [16]. Then we compare these values by the maximum off-diagonal errors (8). Since the above evaluation is expensive (i.e., we have to output n^2 pairs), we here use four smaller datasets: “ca-GrQc” dataset, “as20000102” dataset, “wiki-Vote” dataset, and “ca-HepTh” dataset.

The results are shown in Figures 1. In summary, the proposed algorithm can compute SimRank with the desired accuracy by setting parameters suitably. More precisely, we can see the following.

- There is “accuracy limit” that is determined by the number of samples R , i.e., even though the number of iterations L increases, the accuracy cannot be improved better than the limit. For example, for ca-GrQc dataset (Figure 1 (a)), the accuracy limit is 0.1 for $R = 10$, 0.02 for $R = 100$, 0.006 for $R = 1000$, and 0.002 for $R = 10000$. If we want to compute SimRank with desired accuracy, we have to increase the number of samples R to improve the accuracy limit.
- Before achieving the accuracy limit, if we increase the number of iterations L , the accuracy improves exponentially in L . Since we estimate the number of iterations L as $L = O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ in Subsection 6.1, this fact coincides with the theoretical justification.
- The quantitative relation between the number of samples and the accuracy limit depends on the network structure. So from Table 2, we simply set $R = 100$ and $L = 3$ to compute SimRank score with accuracy 0.01 for the experiments in the next subsection.

³ca-GrQc, as20000102, Wiki-Vote, ca-HepTh, soc-SlashDot0811, soc-SlashDot0902, soc-Epinions1, web-BerkStan web-Google, web-NotreDame, web-Stanford, and soc-LiveJournal data sets are available at <http://snap.stanford.edu/data/index.html> [3, 21, 22, 23, 24]. dblp-2011, in-2004, indochina-2004, it-2004, twitter-2010, and uk-2007-05 data sets are available at <http://law.di.unimi.it/datasets.php> [5, 6]. flickr data set is available at <http://socialnetworks.mpi-sws.org/datasets.html> [33]. Cora [32] set is available at <http://people.cs.umass.edu/mccallum/data.html>. See the web pages for detailed information of datasets.

It is worth noting that the accuracy of our algorithm only depends on the accuracy of diagonal estimation. Therefore if we want to compute more accurate scores, we have to increase the preprocessing time for the diagonal estimation but we do not have to increase the query time.

REMARK 2. Since we used $D_{kk} = 1 - c$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ as the initial guess for the diagonal estimation, $L = 0$ in Figures 1 shows the accuracy of the “wrong formula (5)” of SimRank that is used in some papers (e.g., [12, 25, 40, 41], see Remark 1 and Appendix B).

For all instances, the wrong formula only gives inaccurate results that have maximum errors greater than 0.1. This shows the importance of introducing our linearized formulation (4) to compute the SimRank values.




Figure 1: Number of iterations L vs. maximum off-diagonal error of computed SimRank.

7.2 Efficiency

We next evaluate the efficiency of the algorithm. We first performed the diagonal estimation as preprocessing. According to the previous experiments for accuracy 0.01, we set $R = 100$ and $L = 3$ for the parameters. Then we performed single-pair and single-source queries for several real networks. For very small networks ($n \leq 100,000$), we also performed the all-pairs SimRank queries. To see the improvement from the basic algorithm, we also performed Jeh and Widom’s original SimRank algorithm [16] for very small networks.

The results are summarized in Table 2. Here, the results of single-pair and single-source computations are the average of ten trials. From these experimental results, we can observe the following.

- For small networks ($n \leq 1,000,000$), it requires a few minutes for the preprocessing, and answers single-pair queries in 100 milliseconds and single-source queries

in a few seconds. This efficiency is certainly acceptable for online services. We emphasize that these networks are considered as “large” in the previous literature of SimRank. For very small size networks ($n \leq 100,000$), we can compute all-pairs SimRank in almost two hours.

- For large networks, $n \geq 40,000,000$, it requires a few hours for the preprocessing, and answers a single-pair query in about ten seconds and a single-source query in a few minutes. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time to scale up to such large networks.
- A single-pair query is answered much faster than a single-source query, even though these theoretical complexity only differs by a factor of T . This is because the single-pair computation can exploit the sparsity more than the single-source computation.
- The computational time of our algorithm depends on network structures. Specifically, we can observe that the algorithm is faster for web graphs than for social networks (e.g., the computational time for in-2004 is faster than that for flickr, the time for indochina-2004 is faster than that for soc-LiveJournal and the time for it-2004 and uk-2007-05 is faster than that for twitter-2010). One reason for this is that exploiting sparsity in web graphs is easier than in social networks.

7.3 Comparison with existing results

We give a brief comparison with existing results, which are shown in Table 3. From this comparison, we can observe the following:

- Cao et al. [10] implemented the standard (all-pairs) SimRank algorithm on MapReduce environment. Their algorithm computes all-pairs SimRank on wiki-Vote dataset in 32,065 seconds and ours computes in 35 seconds (including preprocessing). So our algorithm is 900 times faster than the standard algorithm. Actually, their main purpose is to establish the efficient variant of SimRank, called “delta-SimRank” which is 2–30 times faster than the standard SimRank. However, our algorithm is even more (20–450 times) faster than their delta-SimRank.
- Zheng [44] considered *SimRank join problem*: given two sets $I, J \subseteq V$ of vertices, enumerate high-similarity pairs $(i, j) \in I \times J$. To solve this problem efficiently, they first construct a landmark type index, called “h-go cover index”, and then compute SimRank score with pruning, using their index. Since our algorithm is also a two-phase algorithm, we here compare each phase.
For the preprocessing phase, for Cora-direct dataset, their algorithm builds 188MB index in 1,617 seconds, and ours builds $8n = 1.8\text{MB}$ index (8 byte floating number for each vertex) in 3.8 seconds. So our algorithm requires 100 times smaller space, and it is 400 times faster.
For the query phase, their algorithm computes the single-pair SimRank in about 20 seconds, but our algorithm can compute it within 0.02 seconds. Therefore, it is 1000 times faster.
We would note that our algorithm can be extend to the SimRank join problem by a simple modification.

Table 2: Computational time of the proposed algorithm. All results are in second. We set the decay factor $c = 0.6$ and the number of iterations $T = 11$. For the preprocessing phase, we set the number of iterations $L = 3$ and the number of Monte Carlo samples $R = 100$. Accuracy is 0.01.

Dataset	n	m	Preprocess	Proposed			Jeh-Widom All-pairs
				Single-pair	Single-source	All-pairs	
ca-GrQc	5,242	14,496	0.507	0.000	0.003	8.148	17.931
as20000102	6,474	13,895	0.180	0.000	0.002	5.968	9.024
Wiki-Vote	7,155	103,689	0.346	0.001	0.007	33.926	205.247
ca-HepTh	9,877	25,998	1.296	0.001	0.007	31.189	89.262
soc-Epinions1	75,879	508,837	9.485	0.010	0.077	2971.845	16727.039
soc-SlashDot0811	77,360	905,468	10.749	0.019	0.152	5444.616	61244.310
soc-SlashDot0902	82,168	948,464	10.167	0.018	0.164	6809.800	68413.026
Cora-direct	225,026	714,266	3.869	0.014	0.218		
web-Stanford	281,903	2,312,497	39.191	0.012	0.660		
web-NotreDame	325,728	1,497,134	14.427	0.018	0.206		
web-BerkStan	685,230	7,600,505	29.005	0.043	1.094		
web-Google	875,713	5,105,049	89.420	0.068	1.820		
dblp-2011	933,258	6,707,236	169.109	0.080	2.064		
in-2004	1,382,908	17,917,053	114.920	0.093	1.925		
flickr	1,715,255	22,613,981	325.397	0.352	6.728		
soc-LiveJournal	4,847,571	68,993,773	1092.296	0.497	27.209		
indochina-2004	7,414,866	194,109,311	661.137	0.498	17.762		
it-2004	41,291,549	1,150,725,436	4221.735	2.775	121.562		
twitter-2010	41,652,230	1,468,365,182	18113.276	16.924	961.583		
uk-2007-05	105,896,555	3,738,733,648	11408.209	7.236	517.306		

Table 3: Computational time (existing results).

Dataset	n	m	Algorithm	Type	Time[s]	Comment
ca-GrQc	5,242	14,496	MapReduce [10]	All-pairs	9,712	8 nodes of 2.4GHz/16GB
ca-HepTh	9,877	25,998	MapReduce [10]	All-pairs	33,120	8 nodes of 2.4GHz/16GB
Wiki-Vote	7,155	103,689	MapReduce [10]	All-pairs	32,065	8 nodes of 2.4GHz/16GB
Cora-direct	220K	710K	h-go cover [44]	Index-build	1,617	index 188MB, 3.0GHz/4GB
Coauthor	338K	1040K	h-go cover [44]	Index-build	2,673	index 948MB, 3.0GHz/4GB
Coauthor	338K	1040K	h-go cover [44]	Single-pair	20	using above index, 3.0GHz/4GB

8. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a very efficient algorithm for SimRank computation. Our algorithm is a two-phase method that estimates the parameters in preprocessing phase and computes SimRank scores in the query phase. We conducted our experiments to implement our proposed algorithm. The algorithm is accurate and scales up to the real networks of $n \geq 40,000,000$, and it is 1000 times faster than the existing results.

For future work, it would be interesting to extend our method to a dynamic network [25]. When a network is modified by adding or removing some vertices or edges, we have to update the matrix D efficiently. Establishing such a method seems noteworthy both in theory and practice.

Finally, we would add that, in general, our linearization technique can be applied to recursively defined values with maximum. For example, let us consider P-Rank [7,43] which generalizes SimRank as follows. Let P be a transition matrix of G^\top and let Q be a transition matrix of G . Then P-Rank is defined by

$$S = \left((1 - \lambda)cP^\top SP + \lambda cQ^\top SQ \right) \vee I.$$

SimRank is the case of $\lambda = 0$ and rvs-SimRank [43] is the case of $\lambda = 1$, i.e., SimRank only uses the in-link information, and rvs-SimRank only uses out-link information, but P-Rank uses both link information. We can give a linear formulation of P-Rank as

$$S = \left((1 - \lambda)cP^\top SP + \lambda cQ^\top SQ \right) + D$$

with a suitable diagonal matrix D . Therefore we can possibly extend our algorithms to P-Rank by the above formula.

9. REFERENCES

- [1] K. M. Abadir and J. R. Magnus. *Matrix Algebra*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [2] Z. Abbasi and V. S. Mirrokni. A recommender system based on local random walks and spectral methods. In *WebKDD/SNA-KDD*, pages 139–153. Springer, 2007.
- [3] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A.-L. Barabasi. Internet: Diameter of the World-Wide Web. *Nature*, 401(6749):130–131, 1999.
- [4] I. Antonellis, H. Garcia-Molina, and C.-C. Chang. Simrank++: query rewriting through link analysis of the click graph. *PVLDB*, 1(1):408–421, 2008.
- [5] P. Boldi, M. Rosa, M. Santini, and S. Vigna. Layered label propagation: a multiresolution coordinate-free ordering for compressing social networks. In *WWW*, pages 587–596, 2011.
- [6] P. Boldi and S. Vigna. The webgraph framework I: compression techniques. In *WWW*, pages 595–602, 2004.
- [7] Y. Cai and S. Chakravarthy. Pairwise similarity calculation of information networks. In *DaWaK*, pages 316–329, 2011.
- [8] Y. Cai, G. Cong, X. Jia, H. Liu, J. He, J. Lu, and X. Du. Efficient algorithm for computing link-based similarity in real world networks. In *ICDM*, pages 734–739, 2009.

- [9] Y. Cai, P. Li, H. Liu, J. He, and X. Du. S-SimRank: Combining content and link information to cluster papers effectively and efficiently. In *ADMA*, pages 317–329, 2008.
- [10] L. Cao, B. Cho, H. D. Kim, Z. Li, M.-H. Tsai, and I. Gupta. Delta-SimRank computing on MapReduce. In *BigMine*, pages 28–35, 2012.
- [11] D. Fogaras and B. Rácz. Scaling link-based similarity search. In *WWW*, pages 641–650, 2005.
- [12] Y. Fujiwara, M. Nakatsuji, H. Shiokawa, and M. Onizuka. Efficient search algorithm for SimRank. In *ICDE*, pages 589–600, 2013.
- [13] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. 3rd eds., Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences, 2012.
- [14] Z. Gyöngyi, H. Garcia-Molina, and J. O. Pedersen. Combating web spam with TrustRank. In *VLDB*, pages 576–587, 2004.
- [15] G. He, H. Feng, C. Li, and H. Chen. Parallel SimRank computation on large graphs with iterative aggregation. In *KDD*, pages 543–552, 2010.
- [16] G. Jeh and J. Widom. SimRank: a measure of structural-context similarity. In *KDD*, pages 538–543, 2002.
- [17] G. Jeh and J. Widom. Scaling personalized web search. In *WWW*, pages 271–279, 2003.
- [18] X. Jia, Y. Cai, H. Liu, J. He, and X. Du. Calculating similarity efficiently in a small world. In *ADMA*, pages 175–187, 2009.
- [19] X. Jia, H. Liu, L. Zou, J. He, and X. Du. A fast two-stage algorithm for computing SimRank and its extensions. In *WAIM Workshops*, pages 61–73, 2010.
- [20] M. M. Kessler. Bibliographic coupling extended in time: Ten case histories. *ISR*, 1(4):169–187, 1963.
- [21] J. Leskovec, D. P. Huttenlocher, and J. M. Kleinberg. Predicting positive and negative links in online social networks. In *WWW*, pages 641–650, 2010.
- [22] J. Leskovec, D. P. Huttenlocher, and J. M. Kleinberg. Signed networks in social media. In *CHI*, pages 1361–1370, 2010.
- [23] J. Leskovec, J. M. Kleinberg, and C. Faloutsos. Graphs over time: densification laws, shrinking diameters and possible explanations. In *KDD*, pages 177–187, 2005.
- [24] J. Leskovec, K. J. Lang, A. Dasgupta, and M. W. Mahoney. Community structure in large networks: Natural cluster sizes and the absence of large well-defined clusters. *Internet Math.*, 6(1):29–123, 2009.
- [25] C. Li, J. Han, G. He, X. Jin, Y. Sun, Y. Yu, and T. Wu. Fast computation of SimRank for static and dynamic information networks. In *EDBT*, pages 465–476, 2010.
- [26] P. Li, H. Liu, J. X. Yu, J. He, and X. Du. Fast single-pair simrank computation. In *SDM*, pages 571–582. SIAM, 2010.
- [27] D. Liben-Nowell and J. M. Kleinberg. The link-prediction problem for social networks. *JASIST*, 58(7):1019–1031, 2007.
- [28] Z. Lin, I. King, and M. R. Lyu. PageSim: A novel link-based similarity measure for the World Wide Web. In *WI*, pages 687–693, 2006.
- [29] Z. Lin, M. R. Lyu, and I. King. Extending link-based algorithms for similar web pages with neighborhood structure. In *WI*, pages 263–266, 2007.
- [30] Z. Lin, M. R. Lyu, and I. King. MatchSim: a novel similarity measure based on maximum neighborhood matching. *KAIS*, 32(1):141–166, 2012.
- [31] D. Lizorkin, P. Velikhov, M. N. Grinev, and D. Turdakov. Accuracy estimate and optimization techniques for SimRank computation. *VLDBJ*, 19(1):45–66, 2010.
- [32] A. McCallum, K. Nigam, J. Rennie, and K. Seymore. Automating the construction of internet portals with machine learning. *IRJ*, 3(2):127–163, 2000.
- [33] A. Mislove, M. Marcon, P. K. Gummadi, P. Druschel, and B. Bhattacharjee. Measurement and analysis of online social networks. In *IMC*, pages 29–42, 2007.
- [34] C. Scheible. Sentiment translation through lexicon induction. In *ACL (Student Research Workshop)*, pages 25–30, 2010.
- [35] H. Small. Co-citation in the scientific literature: A new measure of the relationship between two documents. *JASIS*, 24(4):265–269, 1973.
- [36] V. Strassen. Gaussian elimination is not optimal. *Numer. Math.*, 13(4):354–356, 1969.
- [37] V. V. Williams. Multiplying matrices faster than Coppersmith-Winograd. In *STOC*, pages 887–898, 2012.
- [38] X. Yin, J. Han, and P. S. Yu. LinkClus: Efficient clustering via heterogeneous semantic links. In *VLDB*, pages 427–438, 2006.
- [39] L. Yu, Z. Shu, and X. Yang. SimRate: Improve collaborative recommendation based on rating graph for sparsity. In *ADMA*, pages 167–174, 2010.
- [40] W. Yu, X. Lin, and J. Le. Taming computational complexity: Efficient and parallel SimRank optimizations on undirected graphs. In *WAIM*, pages 280–296, 2010.
- [41] W. Yu, X. Lin, W. Zhang, L. Chang, and J. Pei. More is simpler: Effectively and efficiently assessing node-pair similarities based on hyperlinks. *PVLDB*, 7(1):13–24, 2013.
- [42] W. Yu, W. Zhang, X. Lin, Q. Zhang, and J. Le. A space and time efficient algorithm for SimRank computation. *WWW*, 15(3):327–353, 2012.
- [43] P. Zhao, J. Han, and Y. Sun. P-Rank: a comprehensive structural similarity measure over information networks. In *CIKM*, pages 553–562, 2009.
- [44] W. Zheng, L. Zou, Y. Feng, L. Chen, and D. Zhao. Efficient SimRank-based similarity join over large graphs. *PVLDB*, 6(7):493–504, 2013.
- [45] Y. Zhou, H. Cheng, and J. X. Yu. Graph clustering based on structural/attribute similarities. *PVLDB*, 2(1):718–729, 2009.

APPENDIX

A. PROPOSITIONS AND PROOFS

We here give some propositions and proofs mentioned in the paper.

We introduce a vectorized form of SimRank, which is convenient for us to analyze. Let \otimes be the Kronecker product

of matrices, i.e., for $n \times n$ matrices $A = [a_{ij}]$ and B ,

$$A \otimes B = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}B & \cdots & a_{1n}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1}B & \cdots & a_{nn}B \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let “vec” be the vectorization operator, which reshapes an $n \times n$ matrix to an n^2 vector, i.e., $\text{vec}(A)_{n \times i+j} = a_{ij}$. Then we have the following relation, which is well-known in linear algebra [1]:

$$\text{vec}(ABC) = (C^\top \otimes A)\text{vec}(B). \quad (13)$$

Remind that a linearized SimRank satisfies the relation

$$S^L(\Theta) = cP^\top S^L(\Theta)P + \Theta.$$

By applying the vectorization operator and using (13), we obtain

$$(I - cP^\top \otimes P^\top) \text{vec}(S^L(\Theta)) = \text{vec}(\Theta). \quad (14)$$

PROPOSITION 1. *Let Θ be an $n \times n$ matrix and let $c \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists a unique matrix $S^L(\Theta)$ that satisfies (14).*

PROOF. To prove this proposition, we prove the coefficient matrix of (14), $I - cP^\top \otimes P^\top$, is nonsingular.

Since $P^\top \otimes P^\top$ is a (left) stochastic matrix, its spectral radius is equal to one. Hence all eigenvalues of $I - cP^\top \otimes P^\top$ are contained in the disk with center 1 and radius c in the complex plane. Therefore $I - cP^\top \otimes P^\top$ does not have a zero eigenvalue, and hence $I - cP^\top \otimes P^\top$ is nonsingular. \square

PROPOSITION 2. *Let $S^L(\Theta)$ be a linearized SimRank with a correction matrix Θ and let $S^{L(T)}(\Theta)$ be T -th iterated linearized SimRank, i.e.,*

$$S^{L(T)}(\Theta) = \Theta + cP^\top \Theta P + \cdots + c^{T-1}P^\top \Theta P^{T-1}.$$

Then $S^{L(T)}$ converges to S^L as $T \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, for all i, j , we have

$$\frac{c^T \min_{k,l} \Theta_{kl}}{1-c} \leq S^L(\Theta)_{ij} - S^{L(T)}(\Theta)_{ij} \leq \frac{c^T \max_{k,l} \Theta_{kl}}{1-c}.$$

PROOF. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S^L(\Theta)_{ij} - S^{L(T)}(\Theta)_{ij} &= e_i^\top (S^L(\Theta) - S^{L(T)}(\Theta)) e_j \\ &= c^T (P^T e_i)^\top \Theta P^T e_j + c^{T+1} (P^{T+1} e_i)^\top \Theta P^{T+1} e_j + \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

We evaluate each term of the right-hand side. Since $P^T e_i$ and $P^T e_j$ are stochastic vectors, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (P^T e_i)^\top \Theta P^T e_j &\leq \max\{x^\top \Theta y : x, y \text{ stoch.}\} = \max_{k,l} \Theta_{kl}, \\ (P^T e_i)^\top \Theta P^T e_j &\geq \min\{x^\top \Theta y : x, y \text{ stoch.}\} = \min_{k,l} \Theta_{kl}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Substituting these inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S^L(\Theta)_{ij} - S^{L(T)}(\Theta)_{ij} &\leq (c^T + c^{T+1} + \cdots) \max_{k,l} \Theta_{kl} \\ &= \frac{c^T \max_{k,l} \Theta_{kl}}{1-c}, \\ S^L(\Theta)_{ij} - S^{L(T)}(\Theta)_{ij} &\geq (c^T + c^{T+1} + \cdots) \min_{k,l} \Theta_{kl} \\ &= \frac{c^T \min_{k,l} \Theta_{kl}}{1-c}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

PROPOSITION 3. *The problem*

Find a diagonal matrix D

$$\text{such that } S^L(D)_{kk} = 1 \quad (k = 1, \dots, n) \quad (16)$$

has a unique solution.

PROOF. Since S^L is a linear operator, the problem (16) is a linear equation problem. In short, a diagonal matrix D has n variables and there are n equality constraints, the solution is unique.

To be more precise, we can give an explicit formula for D . Let us consider the linear system (14) and let $Q := P^\top \otimes P^\top$. We partite the system (14) into 2×2 blocks that correspond to the diagonal entries and the others:

$$\begin{bmatrix} I - cQ_{DD} & -cQ_{DO} \\ -cQ_{OD} & I - cQ_{OO} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \vec{1} \\ X \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(D) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where X is for the off-diagonal entries of $S^L(D)$. Since $I - cQ_{OO}$ is nonsingular, the diagonal entries D are uniquely determined by

$$(I - cQ_{DD} + c^2 Q_{DO}(I - cQ_{OO})^{-1} Q_{OD}) \vec{1} = \text{diag}(D).$$

\square

PROPOSITION 4. *Consider two independent random walks start from the same vertex i and follow their in-links. Let $p_i(t)$ be the probability that two random walks meet t -th step (at some vertex). Let $\Delta := \max_i \{\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} c^t p_i(t)\}$. If $\Delta < 1$ then Algorithm 5 converges and the convergence rate $O(\Delta^t)$.*

PROOF. The key observation is: Algorithm 5 is the Gauss-Seidel method [13] for the linear system $A \text{diag}(D) = \vec{1}$, where A is some matrix. Recall that if the coefficient matrix is strictly diagonally dominant, $|A_{jj}| \geq \sum_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}|$, the Gauss-Seidel method converges and the convergence rate is $O((\sum_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}/A_{jj}|)^t)$; see [13]. We check this condition.

In our case, we can write our system as follows.

$$\begin{bmatrix} S^L(E_{11})_{11} & \cdots & S^L(E_{nn})_{11} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ S^L(E_{11})_{nn} & \cdots & S^L(E_{nn})_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_{11} \\ \vdots \\ D_{nn} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We prove the coefficient matrix is diagonally dominant. By definition, each diagonal entry $S^L(E_{jj})_{jj}$ is greater than or equal to one. For the off diagonals, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq j} S^L(E_{ii})_{jj} &= \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} c^t (P^t e_j)^\top E_{ii} (P^t e_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} c^t (P^t e_j)^\top (P^t e_j) = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} c^t p_j(t) \leq \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\Delta < 1$ then Algorithm 5 converges and the convergence rate is $O(\Delta^t)$. \square

REMARK 3. *Let us observe that, in practice, the assumption $\Delta < 1$ is not an issue. For a network of average degree d , the probability $p_i(t)$ is expected to $1/d^t$. Therefore $\Delta = \sum_t c^t p_i(t) \simeq (c/d)/(1 - (c/d)) \leq 1/(d-1)$. This shows the algorithm is expected to converges and the number of iteration for accuracy ϵ is $O(\log \epsilon / \log d)$.*

LEMMA 1. *Let $k_1^{(t)}, \dots, k_R^{(t)}$ be positions of t -th step of independent random walks that start from a vertex k and*

follow \ln -links. Let $X_k^{(t)} := (1/R) \sum_{r=1}^R e_{k_r^{(t)}}$. Then for all $l = 1, \dots, n$,

$$P \left\{ \left| e_l^\top \left(X_k^{(t)} - P^t e_k \right) \right| \geq \epsilon \right\} \leq 2 \exp(-2R\epsilon^2).$$

PROOF. Since $\mathbb{E}[e_{k_r^{(t)}}] = P^t e_k$, this is a direct application of the Hoeffding's inequality. \square

PROPOSITION 5. Let us assume the notation as Lemma 1. For any diagonal matrix D such that $0 \leq D_{kk} \leq 1$ for all k , we have

$$P \left\{ \left| \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c^t X_k^{(t)\top} D X_k^{(t)} - S^L(D)_{kk} \right| \geq \epsilon \right\} \leq 2nT \exp \left(-\frac{(1-c)^2 R \epsilon^2}{2} \right).$$

PROOF. By the union bound and $1+c+c^2+\dots=1/(1-c)$, we have

$$P \left\{ \left| \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c^t X_k^{(t)\top} D X_k^{(t)} - S^L(D)_{kk} \right| \geq \epsilon \right\} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} P \left\{ \left| X_k^{(t)\top} D X_k^{(t)} - (P^t e_k)^\top D P^t e_k \right| \geq (1-c)\epsilon \right\}.$$

So we evaluate each term of the above.

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \left| X_k^{(t)\top} D X_k^{(t)} - (P^t e_k)^\top D (P^t e_k) \right| \geq (1-c)\epsilon \right\} \\ & \leq P \left\{ \left| X_k^{(t)\top} D \left(X_k^{(t)} - P^t e_k \right) \right| \geq (1-c)\epsilon/2 \right\} \\ & + P \left\{ \left| (P^t e_k)^\top D \left(X_k^{(t)} - P^t e_k \right) \right| \geq (1-c)\epsilon/2 \right\} \\ & \leq 2P \left\{ \left| e_l^\top \left(X_k^{(t)} - P^t e_k \right) \right| \geq (1-c)\epsilon/2 \text{ for some } l \right\} \\ & \leq 2n \exp(-(1-c)^2 R \epsilon^2 / 2). \end{aligned}$$

By combining them, we proved the proposition. \square

REMARK 4. In Algorithm 6, we use the same samples to estimate $S^L(D)_{kk}$ and $S^L(E_{kk})_{kk}$. This could result in that the estimated values are stochastically dependent. We can easily modify this point at the expense of twice the computational cost, i.e., use two different sets of samples to estimate $S^L(D)_{kk}$ and $S^L(E_{kk})_{kk}$ independently. Our additional experiments show this this modification does not change the accuracy in practice.

PROPOSITION 6. Let D be a diagonal matrix. Suppose that $\max_k |S^L(D)_{kk} - 1| \leq \epsilon$. Then

$$\max_{i \neq j} |S^L(D)_{ij} - S_{ij}| \leq \frac{c}{1-c} \epsilon.$$

PROOF. We use the same notation as Proposition 3. Let D^* be the diagonal correction matrix, i.e., $S^L(D^*) = S$, and let $(d, Y) = \text{vec}(S^L(D) - S)$, where d corresponds to the diagonal entries and Y corresponds to the off-diagonal entries. Note that $\|d\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. Then, by (17), we have

$$-cQ_{OD}d + (1 - cQ_{OO})Y = O.$$

Therefore

$$\|Y\|_\infty \leq c\|Q_{OD}\|_\infty \|(1 - cQ_{OO})^{-1}\|_\infty \epsilon.$$

Recall that Q_{OD} and Q_{OO} are (row-)substochastic matrices. Therefore we have $\|Q_{OD}\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\|(1 - cQ_{OO})^{-1}\|_\infty \leq 1/(1-c)$. This proves the proposition. \square

PROPOSITION 7. If a diagonal matrix D satisfies $S^L(D) = S$, then $1 - c \leq D_{ii} \leq 1$.

PROOF. Applying e_i^\top and e_i to $D = S - cP^\top SP$, we have $D_{ii} = 1 - c(Pe_i)^\top SP e_i$. By (15), we have

$$1 - c \max_{k,l} S_{kl} \leq D_{ii} \leq 1 - c \min_{k,l} S_{kl}.$$

Since $0 \leq S_{kl} \leq 1$ by the original definition of SimRank, we have $1 - c \leq D_{ii} \leq 1$. \square

REMARK 5. For the diagonal correction matrix D , i.e., $S^L(D) = D$, by combining Propositions 2 and 7, we have

$$0 \leq S^L(D)_{ij} - S^{L(T)}(D)_{ij} \leq c^T / (1 - c),$$

since $\min_{kl} D_{kl} = 0$ and $\max_{kl} D_{kl} \leq 1$.

B. SOME MISTAKES OF SIMRANK COMPUTATION

Some papers use the following SimRank “formula”:

$$S = cP^\top SP + (1 - c)I.$$

where S is the SimRank matrix (equation (2) in [12], equation (2) in [15], equation (2) in [25], and equation (3) in [41]). However, this is wrong. Let \tilde{S} be the matrix that satisfies the above recursion (we must distinguish \tilde{S} and the true SimRank S). Then \tilde{S} does not necessarily satisfy $\tilde{S}_{kk} = 1$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$); Examples 1 and 2 are examples of $\tilde{S}_{kk} \neq 1$ for some k . Experimentally, as mentioned in Remark 2, the error between the wrong SimRank and the true SimRank is greater than 0.1. So \tilde{S} is in fact different to S .

Actually, the above recursion gives the linearized SimRank $S^L((1 - c)I)$. Hence their algorithms is indeed for the linearized SimRank $\tilde{S} = S((1 - c)I)$. However, in our view, their algorithms can be corrected by replacing $(1 - c)I$ to D . In order to make this work, we need to compute D by some algorithm (e.g., Algorithm 5), which should be preprocessing.

Next, let us look the following “equation” (which is a simplified version of equation (8) in [40]):

$$U^{-1}(A \vee I)U = (U^{-1}AU) \vee I.$$

However, this is incorrect. The following is a counterexample:

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ U^{-1}(A \vee I)U &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ (U^{-1}AU) \vee I &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

It is worth noting that the following “linearized” version of the equation is correct:

$$U^{-1}(A + I)U = (U^{-1}AU) + I.$$

Hence their algorithm can be, again, regarded as an algorithm for the linearized SimRank $S^L(I)$ for an incorrect diagonal matrix I . This mistake can be corrected by replacing “ $\vee I$ ” with “ $+D$ ” carefully, and then their algorithm can also compute the exact scores of SimRank.