Finite size analysis of the detectability limit of the stochastic block model
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It has been shown in recent years that the stochastic block model is undetectable in the sparse limit, i.e., that no algorithm can identify a partition correlated with the partition used to generate an instance, if the instance is sparse and infinitely large. Real networks are however finite objects, and one cannot expect all results derived in the infinite limit to hold for finite instances. In this contribution, we treat the finite case explicitly. We give a necessary condition for finite size detectability in the general SBM, using arguments drawn from information theory and statistics. We then distinguish the concept of average detectability from the concept of instance-by-instance detectability, and give explicit formulas for both definitions. Using these formulas, we prove that there exist large equivalence classes of parameters, where widely different network ensembles are equally detectable with respect to our definitions of detectability. In an extensive case study, we investigate the finite size detectability of a simplified variant of the SBM, which encompasses a number of important models as special cases. These models include the symmetric SBM, the planted coloring model, and more exotic SBMs not previously studied. We obtain a number of explicit expressions for this variant, and also show that the well-known Kesten-Stigum bound does not capture the phenomenon of finite size detectability—even at the qualitative level. We conclude with two Appendices, where we study the interplay of noise and detectability, and establish a connection between our information-theoretic approach and Random Matrix Theory.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Mesoscopic analysis methods [1] are among the most valuable tools available to applied network scientists and theorists alike. Their aim is to identify regularities in the structure of complex networks, thereby allowing for a better understanding of their function [1–3], their structure [4, 5], their evolution [6, 7], and of the dynamics they support [8–10]. Community detection is perhaps the best-known method of all [1, 2], but it is certainly not the only one of its kind [3]. It has been shown, for example, that the separation of nodes in a core and a periphery occurs in many empirical networks [11], and that this separation gives rise to more exotic mesoscopic patterns such as overlapping communities [12]. This is but an example—there exist multitudes of decompositions in structures other than communities that explain the shape of networks both clearly and succinctly [13].

The stochastic block model (SBM) has proven to be versatile and principled in uncovering these patterns [14–16]. According to this simple generative model, the nodes of a network are partitioned in blocks (the planted partition), and an edge connects two nodes with a probability that depends on the partition. The SBM can be used in any of two directions: Either to generate random networks with a planted mesoscopic structure [8, 10], or to infer the hidden mesoscopic organization of real complex networks, by fitting the model to network datasets [13, 14, 17]—perhaps its most useful application.

Stochastic block models offer a number of advantages over other mesoscopic pattern detection methods [3]. One, there is no requirement that nodes in a block be densely connected, meaning that blocks are much more general objects than communities. Two, the sound statistical principles underlying the SBM naturally solve many hard problems that arise in network mesoscopic analysis; this includes the notoriously challenging problem of determining the optimal number of communities in a network [18–20], or of selecting among the many possible descriptions of a network [1, 20, 21].

Another consequence of the statistical formulation of the SBM is that one can rigorously investigate its limitations. It is now known, for example, that the SBM admits a resolution limit [18] akin to the limit that arises in modularity-based detection method [22]. The limitations that have attracted the most attention, however, are the detectability limit and the closely related concept of consistency limit [23]. The SBM is said to be detectable for some parameters if an algorithm can construct a partition correlated with the planted partition [24], using no information other than the structure of a single—ininitely large—instance of the model. It is said to be consistent if one can exactly recover the planted partition. Therefore, consistency begets detectability, but not the other way around. Understanding when and why consistency (or detectability) can be expected is important, since one cannot trust the partitions extracted by SBM if it oper-
Due to rapid developments over the past few years, the locations of the boundaries between the different levels of detectability are now known for multiple variants of the SBM, in the limit of infinite network sizes. If the average degree scales at least logarithmically with the number of nodes, then the SBM is consistent [25, 26], unless the constant multiplicative factor is too small, in which case the SBM is then detectable, but not consistent. If the average degree scales slower than logarithmically, then the SBM is at risk of entering an undetectable phase where no information on the planted partition can be recovered from the network structure [27–29]. This happens if the average degree is a sufficiently small constant independent of the number of nodes.

These asymptotic results are, without a doubt, extremely useful. Many efficient algorithms have been developed to extract information out of hardly consistent instances [29–32]. Striking connections between the SBM and other stochastic processes have been established in the quest to bound the undetectable regime from below [23, 26, 33, 34]. But real networks are not infinite objects. Thus, many of the findings of these asymptotic theories do not carry over to real networks—one can only assume that the asymptotic derivations are robust enough to inform us on finite cases. The objective of our contribution is to investigate detectability in finite networks generated by the SBM.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We begin by formally introducing the SBM and the necessary background in Sec. II. We use this section to briefly review important notions, including inference (Sec. II B), as well as the consistency and detectability of the infinite SBM (Sec. II C). In Sec. III, we present a necessary condition for detectability, and show that it is always met, on average, by finite instances of the SBM. We then establish the existence of a large equivalence class with respect to this notion of average detectability. In Sec. V, we introduce the related concept of \( \eta \)-detectability and investigate the complete detectability distribution, beyond its average. In Sec. VI, we apply the perfectly general framework of Secs. III–V to a constrained variant of the SBM: The general modular graph model of Ref. [35]. The results of this section hold for a broad range of models, since the general modular graphs encompass the symmetric SBM, the planted coloring model and many other models as special cases. We gather concluding remarks and open problems in Sec. VII. Two Appendices follow. The first investigates the interplay between noise and our notion of average detectability (Appendix A); the second establishes a connection between our framework and Random Matrix Theory (Appendix B).

II. STOCHASTIC BLOCK MODEL

A. Definition of the model

The stochastic block model is formally defined as follows: Begin by partitioning a set of \( n \) nodes in \( q \) blocks of fixed sizes \( n = (n_1, \ldots, n_q) \), with \( n = \sum_{r=1}^q n_r \). Denote this partition by \( \mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_q\} \), where \( B_r \) is the set of nodes in the \( r \)th block. Then, connect the nodes in block \( B_r \) to the nodes in block \( B_s \) with probability \( p_{rs} \). In other words, for each pair of nodes \((v_i, v_j)\), set the element \( a_{ij} \) of the adjacency matrix \( A \) to 1 with probability \( p_{\sigma(v_i)\sigma(v_j)} \) and to 0 otherwise, where \( \sigma(v) \) is the block of \( v \). Note that for the sake of clarity, we will obtain all of our results for simple graphs, where edges are undirected and self-loops (edges connecting a node to itself) are forbidden [36]. This implies that \( p_{rs} = p_{sr} \) and that \( a_{ii} = 0 \).

We will think of this process as determining the outcome of a random variable, whose support is the set of all networks of \( n \) nodes. Due to the independence of edges, the probability (likelihood) of generating a particular network \( G \) is simply given by the product of \( \binom{n}{2} \) Bernoulli random variables, i.e.,

\[
P(G|\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{P}) = \prod_{i < j} [1 - p_{\sigma(v_i)\sigma(v_j)}]^{1-a_{ij}} [p_{\sigma(v_i)\sigma(v_j)}]^{a_{ij}},
\]

where \( \mathbf{P} \) is the \( q \times q \) matrix of connection probabilities of element \( p_{rs} \) (sometimes called the affinity or density matrix), and \( i < j \) is a shorthand for \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \). It is easy to check that the probability (1) is properly normalized over the set of all networks of \( n \) distinguishable nodes.

A useful alternative to Eq. (1) expresses the likelihood in terms of the number of edges between each pair of blocks \( (B_r, B_s) \) rather than as a function of the adjacency matrix [17]. Notice how the number of edges among the \( n_r \) nodes in block \( B_r \) is at most equal to

\[
m_{rs}^{\text{max}} = \binom{n_r n_s}{2} \text{ if } r = s,
\]

\[
m_{rs}^{\text{max}} = n_r n_s \text{ otherwise.}
\]

Each of these \( m_{rs}^{\text{max}} \) edges exists with probability \( p_{rs} \). This implies that \( m_{rs} \) is determined by the sum of \( m_{rs}^{\text{max}} \) Bernoulli trials of probability \( p_{rs} \), i.e., that \( m_{rs} \) is a binomial variable of parameter \( p_{rs} \) and maximum \( m_{rs}^{\text{max}} \). The probability of generating a particular instance \( G \) can therefore be written equivalently as

\[
P(G|\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{P}) = \prod_{r \leq s} (1 - p_{rs})^{m_{rs}^{\text{max}} - m_{rs}} (p_{rs})^{m_{rs}}.
\]

where \( m_{rs} \) and \( m_{rs}^{\text{max}} \) are jointly determined by the partition \( \mathcal{B} \) and the structure of \( G \), and \( r \leq s \) denotes \( "r, s : 1 \leq r \leq s \leq q" \).

Having a distribution over all networks of \( n \) nodes, one can then compute average values over the ensemble. For
example, the average degree of node $v_i$ is given by
\begin{equation}
\langle k_i \rangle = \sum_r p_{\sigma(v_i)r}(n_r - \delta_{\sigma(v_i)r}),
\end{equation}
where $\delta_{ij}$ is the Kronecker Delta. The expression correctly depends on the block $B_r(v_i)$ of $v_i$; nodes in different blocks will in general have different average degree. Averaging over all nodes, one finds the average degree of the network
\begin{equation}
\langle k \rangle = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{r \leq s} m_{rs}^{\text{max}} p_{rs}.
\end{equation}

This global quantity determines the density of the SBM when $n \to \infty$. The SBM is said to be dense if $\langle k \rangle = O(n)$, i.e., if $p_{rs}$ is a constant independent of $n$. It is said to be sparse if $\langle k \rangle = O(1)$, i.e., if $p_{rs} = \epsilon_{rs}/n$ goes to zero as $n^{-1}$. In the latter case, a node has a constant number of connections even in an infinitely large network—a feature found in most large scale real networks [37].

For finite instances, it will often be more useful to consider the average density directly. It is defined as the number of edges in $G$, normalized by the number of possible edges, i.e.,
\begin{equation}
\rho = \frac{\langle k \rangle}{n-1} = \sum_{r \leq s} \left( \frac{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}}{m_{\text{max}}} \right) p_{rs} = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs},
\end{equation}
where $m_{\text{max}} = \sum_{r \leq s} m_{rs}^{\text{max}}$, and
\begin{equation}
\alpha_{rs} := \frac{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}}{m_{\text{max}}}.
\end{equation}
The dense versus sparse terminology is then clearer: The density of sparse networks goes to zero as $O(n^{-1})$, while dense networks have a nonvanishing density $\rho = O(1)$.

### B. Inference

Depending on the elements of $P$, the SBM can generate instances reminiscent of real networks with, e.g., a community structure [3] ($p_{1r} > p_{sr}$) or a core-periphery organization [11] ($p_{11} > p_{12} > p_{22}$ and $p_{22} \sim 0$). However, the SBM really shines when it is used to infer the organization in blocks of the nodes of real complex networks—this was, after all, its original purpose [14].

To have inferred the mesoscopic structure of a network (with the SBM) essentially means that one has found the partition $B^*$ and density matrix $P^*$ that best describes it. In principle, it is a straightforward task, since one merely needs to (a) assign a likelihood $P(B, P|G)$ to each pair of partition and parameters [see Eqs. (1)--(3)], then (b) search for the most likely pair $(B^*, P^*)$. Since there are exponentially many possible partitions, this sort of enumerative approach is of little practical use. Fortunately, multiple approximate and efficient inference tools have been proposed to circumvent this fundamental problem. They draw on ideas from various fields such as statistical physics [13, 29, 32], Bayesian statistics [17, 38], spectral theory [30, 31, 39, 40] and graph theory [41], to name a few, and they all produce accurate results in general.

### C. Detectability and consistency

One could expect perfect recovery of the parameters and partition from most of these sophisticated algorithms. This is called the consistency property. It turns out, however, that all known inference algorithms for the SBM, as diverse as they might be, fail on this account. And their designs are not at fault, for there exists an explanation of this generalized failure.

Consider the density matrix of elements $p_{rs} = \rho \forall (r, s)$. It is clear that the block partition is irrelevant—the generated network cannot and will not encode the planted partition. Thus, no algorithm will be able to differentiate the planted partition from other partitions. It is then natural to assume that inference will be hard or impossible if $p_{rs} = \rho + \epsilon_{rs}(n)$, where $\epsilon_{rs}(n)$ is a very small perturbation for networks of $n$ nodes; there is little difference between the uniform case and this perturbed case. In contrast, if the elements of $P$ are widely different from one another, e.g., if $p_{rr} = 1$ and $p_{rs} = 0$ for $r \neq s$, then easy recovery should be expected.

Understanding where lies the transition between these qualitatively different regimes has been the subject of much recent research (see Ref. [23] for a thorough survey). As a result, the regimes have been clearly separated as follows: (i) the undetectable regime, (ii) the detectable (but not consistent) regime and (iii) the consistent regime (and detectable). It has further been established that the scaling of $\rho$ with respect to $n$ determines which regime is reached, in the limit $n \to \infty$.

The SBM is said to be strongly consistent if its planted partition can be inferred perfectly, with a probability that goes to 1 as $n \to \infty$ (it is also said to be in the exact recovery phase). Another close but weaker definition of consistency asks that the probability of misclassifying a node goes to zero with $n \to \infty$ (the weakly consistent or almost exact recovery phase). These regimes prevail when $P$ scales at least as fast as $P = \log(n)C/n$, where $C$ is a $q \times q$ matrix of constants [25, 26, 42]. Predictably, most algorithms (e.g., those of Refs. [17, 41, 42]) work well in the exact recovery phase regime, since it is the easiest of all.

In the detectable (but not consistent) regime, exact recovery is no longer possible (the partial recovery phase). The reason is simple: Through random fluctuations, some nodes that belong to, say, block $B_1$, end up connecting to other nodes as if they belonged to block $B_2$. They are thus systematically misclassified, no matter the choice of algorithms. This occurs whenever $P = C/n$, or $P = f(n)C/n$, with $f(n)$ a function of $n$ that scales slower than $\log(n)$.

The discovery of the third regime—the undetectable regime—arguably rekindled the study of the fundamental limits of the SBM. In this regime, which occurs when $P = C/n$ and $C$ is more or less uniform, it is impossible to detect a partition that is even correlated with the planted one. That is, one cannot classify nodes better than at random, and no information on the planted
partition can be extracted. Thus, some parametrizations of the SBM are said to lie below the detectability limit. This limit was first shown to exist using informal arguments from statistical physics and Random Matrix Theory [18, 27–29, 32, 35, 43–45], and has since been rigorously investigated in Refs. [34, 46], among others.

There exist many efficient algorithms that are reliable above the detectability limit, for almost all parameterizations of the SBM; noteworthy examples include Belief-Propagation [29, 32, 47], and spectral algorithms based on the ordinary [30] and weighted [33] non-backtracking matrix, as well as matrices of self-avoiding walks [31]. When the number of blocks is too large, most of these algorithms are known to fail well above the information theoretic threshold, i.e., the point where it can be proven that the partition is detectable. It has been therefore conjectured in Ref. [32], that the undetectable regime is further separated in two phases: A truly undetectable regime, and a regime where detection is not achievable efficiently. In the latter, it is thought that one can find a good partition, but only by enumerating all partitions—a task of exponential complexity.

III. DETECTABILITY OF FINITE NETWORKS

Detectability and consistency are well separated phases of the infinite stochastic block model. A minute perturbation to the parameters may potentially translate into widely different qualitative behaviors. The picture changes completely when one turns to finite instances of the model. Random fluctuations are not smoothed out by limits, and transitions are much less abrupt. We argue that, as a result, one has to account for the complete distribution of networks to properly quantify detectability, i.e., define detectability for network instances rather than parameters. This, in turn, commands a different approach that we now introduce.

A. Hypothesis test and the detectability limit

Consider a single network $G$, generated by the SBM with some planted partition $\mathcal{B}$ and matrix $P = r11^T + \epsilon$, where $11^T$ is a matrix of ones, $r$ a constant, and $\epsilon$ a matrix of (small) fluctuations. Suppose that the average density equals $\rho$, and consider a second density matrix $\rho 11^T$ for which the block structure has no effect on the generative process. If an observer with complete knowledge of the generative process and its parameters cannot tell which density matrix, $P$ or $\rho 11^T$, is the most likely to have generated $G$, then it is clear that this particular instance does not encode the planted partition. As a result, it will be impossible to detect a partition correlated with the planted partition.

This idea can be translated into a mathematical statement by way of a likelihood test. For a SBM of average density $\rho$, call the ensemble of Erdős-Rényi graphs of density $\rho$ the ensemble of equivalent random networks. Much like the SBM (see Sec. II), its likelihood $Q(G|\rho)$ is given by the product of the density of $\binom{n}{2}$ independent and identically distributed Bernoulli variables, i.e.,

$$Q(G|\rho) = \prod_{i<j} \rho^{a_{ij}} (1-\rho)^{n_{ij}} = \rho^m (1-\rho)^{m_{\text{max}} - m},$$

where $m := \sum_{r \leq s} m_{rs}$ is the total number of edges in $G$.

The condition is then the following: Given a network $G$ generated by the SBM of average density $\rho$ and density matrix $P$, one can detect the planted partition $\mathcal{B}$ if the SBM is more likely than its equivalent random ensemble of density $\rho$, i.e.,

$$\Lambda = \frac{Q(G|\mathcal{B}, P)}{Q(G|\rho)} > 1.$$  

A similar condition has been used in Ref. [46] and [34] to pinpoint the location of the detectability limit in infinite and sparse instances of the SBM. But nothing forbids its application to the finite size problem; one will see shortly that it serves us well in the context of finite size detectability.

B. Normalized log-likelihood ratio

The (equivalent) normalized log-likelihood ratio

$$\mathcal{L} := \frac{\log \Lambda}{m_{\text{max}}}$$

will be more practical for our purpose. This simple transformation brings the line of separation between models from $\Lambda = 1$ to $\mathcal{L} = 0$, and prevents the resulting quantity from becoming too large. More importantly, it changes products into sums, and allows for a simpler expression

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{r \leq s} \left( \frac{m_{rs}}{m_{\text{max}}} \log \frac{p_{rs}(1-\rho)}{\rho(1-p_{rs})} + \alpha_{rs} \log \frac{1-p_{rs}}{1-\rho} \right).$$

We will focus, for the remainder of this contribution, on the case where network instances $G$ of $n$ nodes are drawn from the SBM of parameters $(\mathcal{B}, P)$. From this point of view, $\mathcal{L}$ can be seen as a random variable whose support is the networks of $n$ nodes with labeled nodes (see Fig. 1). Since $P$, $\rho$, $\alpha$ and $m_{\text{max}}$ are all parameters, $\mathcal{L}$ is simply a weighted sum of binomial distributed random variables $m_{rs} \sim \text{Bin}(m_{\text{max}}, p_{rs})$, with a constant offset. Its average will be a prediction of the detectability for the ensemble (Sec. IV), and the probability $\text{Pr}(\mathcal{L} < 0; P, \alpha, m_{\text{max}})$ will give the fraction of instances that are undetectable for the selected parameters (Sec. V).

C. Interpretation of $\mathcal{L}$

Because likelihood ratio tests can be understood as quantifying the amount of evidence for a hypothesis
Many empirical results will validate this interpretation (Sec. VI).

IV. AVERAGE DETECTABILITY

A. Average normalized log-likelihood

The average of a log-likelihood ratio is also known as the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence $D(\cdot∥\cdot)$ of two hypotheses [49], i.e.

$$
\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle = \sum_{\{G\}} \mathbb{P}(G|B, P) \log \frac{\mathbb{P}(G|B, P)}{\mathbb{P}(G|P)} = \frac{D(\mathbb{P}|\mathbb{Q})}{m_{\text{max}}}.
$$

(12)

Since the KL divergence is always greater or equal to zero, with equality if and only if $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{Q}$, and since $\mathcal{L} > 0$ is only a necessary condition for detectability, the average $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ will not be enough to conclude on detectability of the SBM, except for the case $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{Q}$ [50]. Results pertaining to $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ will therefore be best interpreted in terms of inference difficulty.

Even if the average log-likelihood ratio is always positive (assuming $\mathbb{P} \neq \mathbb{Q}$), it can be extremely close to zero for density matrix $P$ "close" to $\rho 11^\top$ [Fig. 1 (f)]. In fact, as we will see in Sec. V, $\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle \approx 0$ implies that there are instances for which $\mathcal{L} < 0$, i.e., truly undetectable instances. Therefore, whenever the average is small, we may also interpret $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ as a measure of detectability in the rigorous sense.

B. Compact form

While Eq. (12) has a precise information theoretic interpretation, there exists an equivalent form, both more compact and easier to handle analytically. It is given by

$$
\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle = h(\rho) - \sum_{r \leq s} a_{rs} h(p_{rs}),
$$

(13)

where

$$
h(\rho) = -(1 - p) \log(1 - p) - p \log(p)
$$

(14)

is the binary entropy of $p \in [0, 1]$. This expression can be derived in two different ways. The simplest and most obvious of the two derivations is by direct computation of the average Eq. (11) over the joint distribution of the random variables $\{m_{rs}\}$; the second derivation follows from the extensivity of KL divergence for independent random variables [51].

The bounds of $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ will give us an intuition for what the easiest and hardest detectability problems might look like. The KL divergence is never negative, and Eq. (13) shows that the maximum of $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ is $h(1/2)$; the average of the normalized log-likelihood is thus confined to the interval

$$
0 \leq \frac{D(\mathbb{P}|\mathbb{Q})}{m_{\text{max}}} = \langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle \leq h(1/2).
$$

(15)
An example of parameters that achieves the upper bound would be the SBM of density matrix \( p_{11} = p_{22} = 1, p_{12} = 0 \), with \( n = [n/2, n/2] \), i.e., the “ensemble” of disconnected \( n/2 \)-cliques (which contains a single instance). An example of parameters that achieves the lower bound would be \( p = Q \), but also \( \rho \to 0 \) [see Eq. (13)]. This goes to show that detectability is not guaranteed in sparse networks.

C. Equivalent stochastic block models

Equation (13) also reveals connections between the qualitative regimes of the SBM, since it induces equivalence classes in the parameter space of the model, with respect to \( \langle L \rangle \). That is, it induces subset of parameters which all satisfy

\[
\lambda = \langle L(P, \alpha) \rangle ,
\]

where \( \lambda \) is a constant that defines the equivalence class.

In the next paragraphs, we will characterize these equivalence classes in two complementary ways. First, we will look for global transformations that preserve \( \lambda \) and map parameters \( (\alpha, P) \) to some other—not necessarily close—pair of parameters \( (\alpha', P') \). Provided that they satisfy a number of standard constraints, these transformations will be shown to correspond to the symmetry group of the set of hypersurfaces \( \langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle = \lambda \). Second, we will consider Eq. (16) explicitly and use it to obtain an approximate hypersurface equation. This equation will be used in later sections to determine the location of the hypersurfaces that separate the parameter space of the SBM in different detectability phases.

1. Global transformations: the symmetry group of the SBM

We first look for the set of \( \lambda \)-preserving global transformations, i.e., all transformations \( T(f_1, f_2) \) of the form

\[
\alpha' = f_1(\alpha), \quad P' = f_2(P)
\]

valid at every point of the parameter space. This is a broad definition and it must be restricted if we are to get anything useful out of it. Intuitively, we do not want these transformations to change the space on which they operate, so it is natural to ask that they be space-preserving. Under the (reasonable) constraint that these transformations are invertible as well, we can limit our search for \( \lambda \)-preserving transformations to the symmetry group of the parameter space.

We will be able to harness known results of geometry and algebra once the parameter space of the SBM is properly defined. This space is in fact the Cartesian product of two parameter spaces: The parameter space of \( \alpha \) and that of \( P \). Since there is \( q^n = q(q + 1)/2 \) free parameters in both \( \alpha \) and \( P \), the complete space is of dimension \( 2q^n - 1 \). It is the product of the \( q^n \)-dimensional hypercube—in which every point corresponds to a choice of \( P \)—and the \( (q^n - 1) \)-dimensional simplex—in which every point corresponds to a choice of \( \alpha \). The latter is a simplex due to the normalization \( \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} = (m_{\max})^{-1} \sum_{r \leq s} m_{rs}^{\max} = 1 \).

Now, the symmetry group of the \( q^n \)-dimensional hypercube and that of the \( (q^n - 1) \)-dimensional regular simplex are well-known [52]. They are respectively the hyperoctahedral group \( B_q \) and the symmetric group \( S_{q^n} \). Their action on \( \alpha \) and \( P \) can be described as

\[
\alpha_{rs} \mapsto \alpha'_{rs} = \alpha_{\pi(r,s)} ,
\]

\[
p_{rs} \mapsto p'_{rs} = \gamma_{rs} + (1 - 2\gamma_{rs})p_{\omega(r,s)} ,
\]

where \( \gamma_{rs} = \{0,1\} \), and where both \( \pi(r,s) \) and \( \omega(r,s) \) are permutations of the indexes \( (r,s) \). While the symmetries of \( \langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle \) are automatically symmetries of the parameters, the converse is not true. We therefore look for transformations \( T \) that satisfy

\[
\langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle = \langle L(f_1(\alpha), f_2(P)) \rangle .
\]

It turns out that this constraint is satisfied if and only if \( \pi = \omega \) and \( \gamma_{rs} = \gamma \forall (r,s) \), i.e., for transformations of the form

\[
\alpha_{rs} \mapsto \alpha'_{rs} = \alpha_{\pi(r,s)} ,
\]

\[
p_{rs} \mapsto p'_{rs} = \gamma + (1 - 2\gamma)p_{\pi(r,s)} ,
\]

with \( \gamma = \{0,1\} \) [51]. The permutation component of the symmetry is not to be confused with the symmetries generated by relabeling blocks: The latter only leads to \( q! \) different symmetries, whereas the former correctly generates \( q! \gg q! \) symmetries, or a total of \( 2_q q! \) symmetries once they are compounded with \( p_{rs} \mapsto 1 - p_{rs} \). The symmetries come about because the ordering of summation of the terms \( \alpha_{rs} h(p_{rs}) \) in Eq. (13) does not matter, and both \( h(\rho) \) and \( h(p_{rs}) \) are preserved when \( p_{rs} \mapsto 1 - p_{rs} \).

As an example of symmetry, let us focus on the special transformation \( p_{rs} \mapsto 1 - p_{rs} \forall (r,s) \) with \( \pi(r,s) = (r,s) \), i.e., the only transformation that does not change the block structure of the model. Since networks generated by these parameters can be seen as complement of one another (i.e., an edge present in \( G \) is absent from \( G' \), and vice-versa), we may call this transformation the graph complement transformation. The fact that it preserves detectability can be understood on a more intuitive level with the following argument. Suppose that we are given an unlabelled network \( G \) generated by the SBM and that we are asked to confirm or infirm the hypothesis that it was, in fact, generated by the SBM. Even if nothing is known about the generative process, we can take the complement of the network—a trivial (and reversible) transformation. But this should not help our cause. After all, this transformation cannot enhance or worsen detectability since no information is added to or removed from \( G \) in the process. So we expect that \( \lambda \) be preserved, and it is. Because all other symmetries affect the block structure through a change of \( \alpha \), what the above result
shows is that there is no other “information-preserving” transformation that can be applied to $G$ without a prior knowledge of its planted partition.

2. Hypersurfaces and detectability regions

We now turn to the problem of finding compact and explicit formulas that describe the hypersurfaces of constant $\langle L \rangle$ in the parameter space [see Eq. (16)]. In so doing we will have to be mindful of the fact that the scale $m^{\text{max}}$ intervenes in the calculation, even though it is absent from our expression for $\langle L \rangle$. This can be made explicit by rewriting Eq. (16) as $(\log \Lambda)/m^{\text{max}} = \tilde{\lambda}$; it is easy to see that any given hypersurface will be comparatively closer to the region $\langle L \rangle = 0$ in larger networks.

We focus on the universal behavior of the hypersurfaces and remove all references to the scale of the problem by defining $\lambda := m^{\text{max}} \tilde{\lambda}$—predictions for real systems can be recovered by reverting to the correct scale.

While Eq. (16) is easily stated, it is not easily solved for, say, $\{p_{rs}\}$. The average normalized log-likelihood ratio involves a sum of logarithmic terms; the hypersurface equation is thus transcendental. To further complicate matters, there are $2q^2 - 1 = q(q - 1) - 1$ degrees of freedom and the number of free parameters grow quadratically with $q$. As a result, little can be said of truly general instances of the SBM—at least analytically. All is not hopeless, however, because there are approximation methods that work well when the number of free parameters is not too large. We sketch the idea here, and apply it to a simpler variant of the SBM in the case study of Sec. VI.

Expanding the binary entropy functions $h(p_{rs})$ around $p_{rs} = \rho \forall r \leq s$ drastically simplifies the hypersurface equation. Leaving the term $h(\rho)$ untouched, we find from Eq. (16)

$$
\lambda = h(\rho) - \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} \left( h(\rho) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\partial^k h(x)}{\partial x^k} \bigg|_{x=\rho} (p_{rs} - \rho)^k \right).
$$

Due to the normalization of $\{\alpha_{rs}\}_{r \leq s}$, all terms in $h(\rho)$ cancel out, and the definition $\sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs} = \rho$ allows us to eliminate the first order terms as well. We are therefore left with

$$
2\lambda(1 - \rho) = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} (p_{rs} - \rho)^2 + O[(p_{rs} - \rho)^3],
$$

where $\rho$ is fixed and $\{\alpha, P\}$ take on values constrained by both Eqs. (6) and (20). We then resort to a change of parameters and choose $\rho(P, \alpha)$ as one of the parameters. Selecting the $q^2 - 1$ other parameters $\Delta_{rs}$ such that $p_{rs} = \rho(P, \alpha) + \Delta_{rs}(P, \alpha)$, we obtain the form

$$
2\lambda(1 - \rho) = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} (\Delta_{rs})^2.
$$

Hypersurfaces are therefore ellipsoids when $p_{rs} \approx \rho \forall(r, s)$.

Besides the simplicity of Eq. (21), there are two additional arguments for dropping the higher order terms in Eq. (20). One, the series is invariant under the symmetry $p_{rs} \mapsto 1 - p_{rs} \forall(r, s)$ only if we limit ourselves to the second order expression: It easily verified that

$$
\frac{\partial^k h(x)}{\partial x^k} \bigg|_{x=\rho} (p_{rs} - \rho)^k = (-1)^k(k - 2)! \left[ \frac{1}{(\rho - 1)^{k-1}} - \frac{1}{(\rho - 1)^{k-1}} \right] (p_{rs} - \rho)^k
$$

is off by a sign for odd powers of $k$ under the mapping $p_{rs} \mapsto 1 - p_{rs}$, which also implies $\rho \mapsto 1 - \rho$. Two, the true hypersurfaces enclose sets of parameters which are convex with respect to $P$, and so does the hypersurface implicitly defined in Eq. (20). The convexity of the hypersurface follows from the fact that the sublevel set of a convex function encloses a convex set [53], and from the observation that $\langle L \rangle$ is convex with respect to $P$ [this is easy to show with Eq. (13) and the log-sum inequality [51]]. The convexity of the approximate level set is trivial to the second order, since it is an ellipsoid [Eq. (21)]. However, the approximate level set need not be convex when higher order terms are included. Together, these two observations tell us that while not exact, Eq. (20) captures the important qualitative features of the problem, and that it is not necessarily true of approximate solutions with only a few extra terms.

V. DETECTABILITY DISTRIBUTION

In the previous section, we have computed the average $\langle L \rangle$ and used it to obtain equivalence among the parameters, with respect to detectability. We have also shown that $\langle L \rangle > 0$ for most parameters, i.e., that we could not use the necessary condition $\mathcal{L} > 0$ to conclude on the undetectability of the finite SBM, on average. As we will now argue, this conclusion must be further refined; the full distribution of $\mathcal{L}$ leads to a more accurate picture of detectability.

A. The whole picture: $\eta$-detectability

Consider a parametrization $(B, \rho \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T + \epsilon)$ of the SBM which yields $\langle L \rangle \approx 0$. Turning to the distribution of $\mathcal{L}$ for this parametrization, one expect to find $\mathcal{L} < 0$ with non-zero probability (unless the distribution of $\mathcal{L}$ concentrates on $\mathcal{L} = 0$). Therefore, $\langle L \rangle$ could be indicative of detectability for some fraction of the networks generated by the SBM.

Let us formalize this notion and introduce the concept of $\eta$-detectability. We will say that the ensemble of networks generated with the SBM of parameters $(B, P)$ is
\( \eta \)-detectable if

\[
\Pr(\mathcal{L} < 0; \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}) = 1 - \eta .
\]  

(22)

That is, \( \eta \) gives the fraction of networks in the ensemble which evades the necessary condition for undetectability. If \( \eta \to 0 \), then detection is impossible, in the sense that most instances are best described by the null hypothesis \( \mathcal{Q} \). If \( \eta \to 1 \), then most instances contain statistical evidence for \( \mathcal{B} \); detection cannot be ruled out on the basis of the log-likelihood test.

We must compute the complete distribution or the cumulative distribution function of \( \mathcal{L} \) to determine \( \eta \). An exact result is out of reach since the outcome of \( \mathcal{L} \) is determined by a weighted sum of independent binomial variables with non-identical distributions. In the following paragraphs, we give an approximate derivation based on the central limit theorem—it agrees extremely well with empirical results for all but the smallest networks.

### B. Approximate equation for \( \eta \)

Equation (11) gives the normalized log-likelihood ratio as a sum of independent binomial random variables; it can be written as

\[
\mathcal{L} = \sum_{r \leq s} \frac{m_{rs}}{m_{max}} x_{rs} + C
\]  

(23a)

where the constants \( x_{rs} \) and \( C \) are given by

\[
x_{rs} = \log \left[ \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - p_{rs}} \right],
\]  

(23b)

\[
C = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} \log \left[ \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \rho} \right],
\]  

(23c)

and where \( m_{rs} \sim \text{Bin}(p_{rs}, m_{rs}^{\text{max}}) \).

The central limit theorem (CLT) predicts that the distribution of an appropriately rescaled and centered transformation of \( \mathcal{L} \) will converge to the normal distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0,1) \) if the number of summed random variables \( q^* = q(q+1)/2 \) goes to infinity. In the finite case, \( q^* \) obviously violates the conditions of the CLT, but it nonetheless offers a good approximation of the distribution of \( \mathcal{L} \) (see Fig. 2).

To apply the CLT, we first define the centered and normalized variable \( Z = (\mathcal{L} - C - \mu_{q^*})/S_{q^*} \), where

\[
S_{q^*}^2 = \sum_{r \leq s} \left[ \langle x_{rs} m_{rs} \rangle^2_{m_{\text{max}}} - \langle x_{rs} m_{rs} \rangle^2 \right]
\]  

(23d)

\[
= \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} \frac{m_{rs}}{m_{\text{max}}} p_{rs}(1 - p_{rs}) x_{rs}^2
\]

is the sum of the variances of the \( q^* \) scaled binomial variables \( x_{rs} m_{rs}/m_{rs}^{\text{max}} \), and where \( \mu_{q^*} = \sum_{r \leq s} \langle x_{rs} m_{rs} \rangle = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs} x_{rs} \equiv h(\rho) - \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} h(p_{rs}) - C \) (23c)

is the sum of their means [we have used Eq. (13) in the last step]. The CLT then tells us that \( Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1) \), approximately.

Recall that the cumulative distribution function of a normal random variable can be expressed in terms of the error function as

\[
\Pr(Z < z) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \text{erf} \left( \frac{z}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right].
\]  

(24)

Now, assuming that \( Z \) is indeed normally distributed we can use the fact that \( \Pr(\mathcal{L} < 0) \) is equivalent to \( \Pr[Z < -(C + \mu_{q^*})/S_{q^*}] \) to compute \( \eta \). Writing \( \mu_{q^*} + C \) as \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \) [see Eq. (23c)], we find

\[
\eta \approx \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \text{erf} \left( \frac{\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle}{\sqrt{2} S_{q^*}} \right) \right],
\]  

(25)

i.e., a (approximate) equation in closed form for \( \eta \).

Crucially, Eq. (25) predicts that \( \eta \) can never be smaller than \( 1/2 \). This comes about because (i) \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle > 0 \) and (ii) \( S_{q^*} \) is a sum of variances, i.e., a positive quantity. There are therefore two possible limits which will
yield $\langle L \rangle / S_q^* \approx 0$ and $\eta = 1/2$: Either $\langle L \rangle = 0$ or $S_q^* \gg 0$. Some care must be exerted in analyzing the case $\langle L \rangle = 0$; equations (11)–(12) tell us that the distribution of $\mathcal{L}$ is concentrated on 0 when its average is exactly equal to 0. We conclude that $\eta = 1/2$ is never reached but only approached asymptotically, for parameters that yield $\langle L \rangle = \varepsilon$, with $\varepsilon$ small but different from zero. The consequence of $\eta \geq 1/2$ is that at most half of the instances of the SBM can be declared undetectable on the account of the condition $\mathcal{L} < 0$.

**C. Relation between average detectability and $\eta$–detectability**

We can immediately reach a few conclusions on the interplay between the notions of average and $\eta$–detectability. First, the symmetries of $\langle L \rangle$, (see Sec. IV C1) translates into symmetries for $\eta$. To see this, first notice that $S_q^*$ is conserved under the mapping $p_{rs} \mapsto 1 - p_{rs}$

$$[x_{rs}(p_{rs}, \rho)]^2 \mapsto [-x_{rs}(1 - p_{rs}, 1 - \rho)]^2,$$

$$p_{rs}(1 - p_{rs}) \mapsto (1 - p_{rs})p_{rs}.$$  

and that a permutation of the indexes $\pi(r, s)$ only changes the order of summation of the terms of $S_q^*$. Second, hypersurfaces of constant average detectability need not be hypersurfaces of constant $\eta$–detectability.

To investigate this second important aspect of the connection between average detectability and $\eta$–detectability, let us further approximate Eq. (25). The MacLaurin series of the error function is, to the first order,

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left[ \frac{\langle L \rangle}{S_q^*} - \mathcal{O}\left(\langle L \rangle^3 / S_q^*^3\right) \right] \right\},$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\langle L \rangle}{S_q^*} + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (26)$$

This is a reasonably accurate calculation of $\eta$ when $\langle L \rangle$ is small, i.e., close to the average undetectable regime. (Recall that we do not allow diverging $S_q^*$ for the reasons stated in Sec. VB). It then becomes clear that on the hypersurfaces where $\langle L \rangle = \lambda$ is constant (and close to 0),

$$\sqrt{2\pi} \left( \eta - \frac{1}{2} \right) S_q^* = \lambda, \quad (27)$$

is conserved rather than $\eta$ itself. Equation (27) embodies a trade-off between accuracy ($\eta$) and variance ($S_q^*$): In the regions of the hypersurface of constant $\langle L \rangle$ where the variance is large, $\eta$ must be comparatively small, and vice-versa.

**D. 1–detectability**

Now, turning to the complementary case where $\langle L \rangle$—and consequently $\eta$—is close to its maximum, we obtain a simple criterion for 1–detectability based the asymptotic behavior of $\text{erf}(x)$. It is reasonable to define a (small) threshold $T$ beyond which $\text{erf}(x > T) = 1$ for all practical purposes. The error function goes asymptotically to 1 with large values of its argument, but reaches its maximum of $\text{erf}(x) = 1$ very quickly, so quickly, in fact, that $\text{erf}(5)$ is numerically equal to 1 to the $10^{\text{th}}$ decimal place.

Asking that the argument of $\text{erf}(x)$ in Eq. (25) be greater than this practical threshold, we obtain the inequality

$$\langle L \rangle \geq \sqrt{2T} S_q^*, \quad (28)$$

for 1–detectability. Whenever the inequality holds, the associated ensemble is 1–detectable with a tolerance threshold $T$, i.e., we can say that for all practical purposes, there are no instances of the SBM which are necessarily $[54]$ undetectable.

**VI. CASE STUDY: GENERAL MODULAR GRAPHS**

The stochastic block model encompasses quite a few well-known models as special cases; noteworthy examples include the planted partition model $[41, 55]$, the closely related symmetric SBM (SSBM) $[26, 29, 44]$, the core-periphery model $[11]$, and many more. These simplified models are important for two reasons. One, they are good abstractions of structural patterns found in real networks, and a complete understanding of their behavior with respect to detectability is therefore crucial. Two, they are simple enough to lend themselves to a thorough analysis; this contrasts with the general case, where simple analytical expressions are hard to come by. In the paragraphs that follow, we investigate the general modular graph model (GMGM) $[35]$, a mathematically simple, yet phenomenologically rich simplified model. Thanks to its simpler parametrization, we obtain easily interpretable versions of the expressions derived in Secs. III–V.

**A. Parameterization of general modular graphs**

The GMGM can be seen as constrained version of the SBM, in which pairs of blocks assume one of two roles: Inner or outer pairs. If a pair of blocks $(B_r, B_s)$ is of the “inner type”, then one sets $p_{rs} = p_{in}$. If a pair of blocks $(B_r, B_s)$ is of the “outer type”, then one sets $p_{rs} = p_{out}$. The resulting density matrices can therefore be expressed as

$$P = (p_{in} - p_{out}) W + p_{out} 11^T,$$

where $W$ is a $q \times q$ indicator matrix $[w_{rs} = 1$ if $(B_r, B_s)$ is an inner pair], and where $1$ is a length $q$ vector of ones. A non-trivial example of a density matrix of this form is shown in Fig. 3 (a). The figure is meant to illustrate just
how diverse the networks generated by the GMGM may be, but it is also important to note that the results of this section apply to any ensemble whose density matrix can be written as in Eq. (29). This includes, for example, the $q$–block SSBM, obtained by setting $W = I_q$ and \( n_r = n/q \) for $r = 1, \ldots, q$.

Whilst the parametrization in terms of $p_{in}$ and $p_{out}$ is simple, we will prefer an arguably more convoluted parameterization which is also more revealing of the natural symmetries of the GMGM (in line with the transformation proposed in Sec. IV C 2). The first natural parameter is the average density, which can be computed from Eqs. (6) and (29) and which equals

\[
\rho = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} (w_{rs} p_{in} + (1 - w_{rs}) p_{out}) ,
\]

\[
= \beta p_{in} + (1 - \beta) p_{out} ,
\]

(30a)

where $\beta := \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} w_{rs}$ is the fraction of potential edges that falls between block pairs of the inner type. The second natural parameter is simply the difference

\[
\Delta = p_{in} - p_{out} .
\]

(30b)

The absolute value of $\Delta$ quantifies the distance between the parameters of the GMGM and that of the equivalent random ensemble; its sign tells us which type of pairs is more densely connected. In this natural parametrization the density matrix takes on the form $P = \rho 11^t + \Delta (1 - \beta) W$, i.e., a uniform matrix of $\rho$ with perturbation proportional to $\Delta (1 - \beta)$ for the inner pairs. It might appear that we have increased the complexity of the model description, since the additional parameter $\beta$ now appears in the definition of the density matrix. It is, however, not the case, because we could consider the combined parameter $\delta = \Delta (1 - \beta)$. Therefore, Eqs. (30a)–(30b), together with $W$ and $n$, suffice to unambiguously parametrize the model.

### B. Average detectability of general modular graphs

The average normalized log-likelihood ratio $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ is tremendously simplified in the natural parametrization of the GMGM; it is straightforward to show that the ratio takes on the compact (and symmetric) form

\[
\langle \mathcal{L}(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle = \beta \left\{ h(\rho) - h\left[ \rho + (1 - \beta) \Delta \right] \right\} - (1 - \beta) \left\{ h(\rho) - h\left[ \rho - \beta \Delta \right] \right\} ,
\]

(31)

by using $p_{rs} = w_{rs} p_{in} + (1 - w_{rs}) p_{out}$ together with the inverse of Eqs. (30a)–(30b):

\[
p_{in} = \rho + (1 - \beta) \Delta ,
\]

(32a)

\[
p_{out} = \rho - \beta \Delta .
\]

(32b)

In Fig. 3 (b), we plot $\langle \mathcal{L}(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle$ in the $(\rho, \Delta)$ space—hereafter the density space—for the indicator matrix $W$ shown in Fig. 3 (a) (and unequal block sizes, see caption). Unsurprisingly, $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ is largest when the block types are clearly separated from one another, i.e., when $|\Delta|$ is the largest. Notice, however, how large separations are not achievable for dense or sparse networks. This is due to the fact that not all $(\rho, \Delta)$ pairs map to probabilities $(p_{in}, p_{out})$ in $[0, 1]$. The region of the density space which does yield probabilities is the interior of the quadrilateral whose vertices are, in $(\rho, \Delta)$ coordinates: $\{0, 0\}, (\beta, 1), (1, 0), (1 - \beta, 1)$. Changing the value of $\beta$ skews this accessible region and, presumably, the functions that are defined on it, such as $\langle \mathcal{L}(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle$.

We also show on Fig. 3 (b) two members of the level set defined by $\langle \mathcal{L}(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle = \lambda$. As mentioned previously, the exact functional form of this family of hypersurfaces (here simply curves) seems elusive, but an approximate solution is available. Using the method highlighted in...
Sec. IV, we find, to the second order,
\[ 2\lambda\rho(1 - \rho) \approx \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs}(p_{rs} - \rho)^2 \]
\[ = \beta[(1 - \beta)\Delta^2 + (1 - \beta)(\beta\Delta)^2]. \]  
Equation (33) fixes the relative value of all parameters on the line where \( \langle L \rangle = \lambda \). Solving for \( \Delta \), we find
\[ \Delta^*(\rho; \lambda, \beta) = \pm \sqrt{2\lambda\rho(1 - \rho) / (\beta(1 - \beta))}, \] 
also shown on Fig. 3 (b) for comparison.

Figure 3 highlights the accuracy of our approximation when \( \lambda \) is small. But it also highlights its inaccuracy when \( \lambda \) is large; \( \lambda \gg 1 \) forces \( \Delta^*(\rho; \lambda, \beta) \) to pass through a region where \( \Delta^* \approx 1 \), i.e., a region where the omitted terms on the RHS of Eq. (33) contribute heavily. Fortunately, this is not so problematic, since most detectability-related phenomena—phase transitions, undetectable instances, etc.—arise near \( \Delta = 0 \), i.e., where the approximation works.

C. \( \eta \)-detectability of general modular graphs

While \( \langle L(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle \) takes on a particularly compact form once we substitute \( \{p_{rs}\} \) by the natural parameters of the GMGM, the same cannot be said of \( \eta(\rho, \Delta; \beta, n) \). Some analytical progress can be made by, e.g., noticing that only two types of terms are involved in the calculation of \( S_q \), but, ultimately, the resulting expression is no more useful than the simple Eq. (25) and Eq. (26). We will therefore omit the calculation of \( \eta \).

In Fig. 3 (c) we plot \( \eta(\rho, \Delta; \beta, n) \) in the density space [using Eq. (25)]. We also display the numerical solutions of \( \eta(\rho, \Delta; \beta, n) = \eta^* \) for two values of \( \eta^* \). The figure highlights just how quickly \( \eta \) goes to 1 as a function of \( \Delta \), even for the fairly small system sizes considered: We find that \( \eta \geq 0.99 \) for any value of \( \rho \), as soon as \( \Delta > 0.06 \). The condition (9) is therefore a weak one. It allows us to determine that some parameters are overwhelmingly undetectable, but only when \( \Delta \) is very close to 0.

Figure 3 also shows how increases in variance translate into decreases in accuracy [see Fig. (27)]: Following a line of constant (and relatively small) \( \Delta \), one can see that \( \eta \) is minimized close to \( \rho = 1/2 \), i.e., near the maximum of variance. This is characteristic of many parameterizations of the SBM and GMGM; it turns out that, for fixed \( n \), the hardest detection problems are not confined to vanishing densities. In fact, values of \( \rho \) closer to 1/2 are associated with a comparatively larger interval of \( \Delta \) for which detection is hard.

D. Symmetries of general modular graphs

In Secs. IV–V, we have proved that there are \( 2q^2 \) transformations that preserve \( \langle L(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle \) and \( \eta(\rho, \Delta; \beta, n) \). We could therefore go about computing the symmetries of the GMGM by listing all of these transformations in terms of \( (\rho, \Delta, \beta) \). But since there are only 3 free parameters in the GMGM, we can also choose an alternative route and directly solve \( \langle L(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle = \langle L(a_1\rho + b_1, a_2\Delta + b_2, a_3\beta + b_3) \rangle \) by, e.g., obtaining a linear system from the Taylor series of \( \langle L(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle \). This simple approach yields the following set of \( \lambda \)-preserving transformations for the model:

\[ (\rho, \Delta, \beta) \mapsto (\rho, \Delta, \beta), \]
\[ (\rho, \Delta, \beta) \mapsto (\rho, -\Delta, 1 - \beta), \]
\[ (\rho, \Delta, \beta) \mapsto (1 - \rho, \Delta, 1 - \beta), \]
\[ (\rho, \Delta, \beta) \mapsto (1 - \rho, -\Delta, \beta). \]

Figure 3 also shows how increases in variance translate into decreases in accuracy [see Fig. (27)]: Following a line of constant (and relatively small) \( \Delta \), one can see that \( \eta \) is minimized close to \( \rho = 1/2 \), i.e., near the maximum of variance. This is characteristic of many parameterizations of the SBM and GMGM; it turns out that, for fixed \( n \), the hardest detection problems are not confined to vanishing densities. In fact, values of \( \rho \) closer to 1/2 are associated with a comparatively larger interval of \( \Delta \) for which detection is hard.

E. Where the framework is put to the test: Inference

1. Procedure

It will be instructive to put our framework to the test and compare its predictions with numerical experiments that involve inference, i.e., the detection of the planted partition of actual instances of the GMGM. The procedure will be the following: (i) generate an instance of the model, (ii) run an inference algorithm on the instance, and (iii) compute the correlation of the inferred and planted partition. The average detectability \( \langle L \rangle \) should predict the point where the average correlation becomes
significant (see below for a precise definition), and $\eta$—detectability should give an upper bound on the fraction of correlated instances. Before we proceed, let us emphasize that the outcome of these experiments is influenced by a number of factors.

Since it is conjectured that there exists a gap between information-theoretically feasible inference and efficiently achievable inference [23, 29], we will have to be careful in choosing an inference algorithm—otherwise we would run at risk of confounding the sources of error. Even for the size considered, enumeration is impossible; we must therefore resort to an approximate algorithm. We use an efficient algorithm based on the Metropolis-Hasting algorithm of Ref. [17]. Unlike Belief Propagation [29], it works well on dense networks with many short loops. In the spirit of Refs. [29, 32] we initialize the algorithm with the planted partition itself, to achieve our information-theoretic threshold, even if efficient inference is not possible [51].

We must also define precisely what is meant by correlated inference if we are to quantify our experiment. Crucially, we have to account for finite size effects that could introduce spurious correlations. The so-called renormalized normalized mutual information (rNMI) of Ref. [57] appears a good choice. Much like the well-known NMI [58, 59], the rNMI is bounded to the $[0, 1]$ interval, and $\text{rNMI}(B_p, \hat{B}) = 1$ means that the planted partition $B_p$ and the inferred partition $\hat{B}$ are identical. Unlike the NMI, $\text{rNMI}(B_p, \hat{B}) = 0$ signals the absence of correlation between the two partitions, even in finite networks.

**2. Results**

In Fig. 4 (a), we plot $\langle \text{rNMI}(B_p, \hat{B}) \rangle$ in the density space of the GMGM. We use the parameters $W = I$, and $n = \lfloor n/2, n/2 \rfloor$ (i.e., the SSBM), since the resulting ensemble is conjectured to be the hardest of all, with respect to detectability [32]. Two important parallels can be drawn between the results shown in Fig. 4 (a) and the functional form of $\langle \mathcal{L}(\rho, \Delta; \beta) \rangle$ and $\eta(\rho, \Delta; \beta, n)$ [shown in Fig. 3 (b)–(c) for a different GMGM]. First, notice how the boundary that marks the onset of the (theoretically) 1–detectable region partitions the density space in two qualitative regimes: A regime where perfect detection is possible for all instances, and a region where it is not. There is, of course, some level of arbitrariness involved in selecting the threshold $T$ [see Eq. (28)]. But the fact that a line of constant $\eta$ partitions the space is a hint that while $\mathcal{L} < 0$ is not sufficient for undetectability, there exists a level of significant $\lambda^\ast$ for which $\mathcal{L}$ properly separates detectable and undetectable instances.

The second important parallel concerns hypersurfaces of constant $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ and their connection with $\langle \text{rNMI} \rangle$. We have argued in Sec. IV that $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$ can be seen as a measure of how easy the inference problem is: Large positive values, in particular, indicate a high level of significance of the hypothesis $\mathbb{P}$. It is not surprising, therefore, that
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there exists a hypersurface of constant \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \) which also partitions the density space in two qualitative regions [60]: One where \( r_{\text{NMI}} \approx 0 \) and one where \( r_{\text{NMI}} \) is clearly greater than zero. On this hypersurface, the average level of significance is the same for all parameterizations of the GMGM; our results show that the inference problem is also equally hard.

One could argue that these parallels are not so obvious in Fig. 4 (a): we therefore focus on a subset of the density space in Fig. 4 (b)-(c) to make our case clearer. In these figures, we plot the same information, but only for networks of constant density \( \rho = 0.25 \) and size \( n = 100 \) (b) and \( n = 500 \) (c). We also show the probability \( \Pr\{r_{\text{NMI}}(B_p,B) > 0\} \) that the inferred partition is correlated with the planted partition. This a direct measurement of the fraction of detectable instances, which we compare against \( \eta(\Delta; \rho, \beta, n) \). It never reaches 0, because random fluctuations produce correlated partitions even when \( \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{Q} \) (the rNMI corrects for the average correlation). If \( \mathcal{L} > 0 \) were a necessary and sufficient condition for detectability, then \( \eta(\Delta; \rho, \beta, n) \) and \( \Pr\{r_{\text{NMI}} > 0\Delta; \rho, \beta, n\} \) would correspond perfectly. But since \( \mathcal{L} > 0 \) is only a necessary condition, \( \eta(\Delta) \) acts as an upper bound rather than an exact expression, i.e., \( \Pr\{r_{\text{NMI}} > 0; \eta\} \) can never be greater than \( \eta(\Delta) \).

Two further observations must be made. First, it is known that in the sparse two-blocks SSBM, the transition between undetectable and detectable regions [33] occurs on the so-called Kesten-Stigum (KS) bound—located at \( \Delta = \pm q\sqrt{\rho/n} \) for finite size instances. Despite the fact that this bound was derived for infinite ensembles, it holds very well in the finite case, as shown in Fig. 4 (b)–(c). But the finite size approach has the potential to be more precise. Building upon the interpretation of \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \) as a measure of the average difficulty of the inference problem, we set a threshold \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle = 1/2n \) on the average detectability. For this choice of threshold, the approximate hypersurface equation predicts a transition at

\[
\Delta^* = \pm 2\sqrt{\rho(1-\rho)/n} ,
\]

very close to the KS bound, but with a correction for nonvanishing densities. Interestingly, one can also motivate this choice of threshold with Random Matrix Theory (see Appendix B for details).

Second, in asymptotic theories, the SSBM is either said to be undetectable with overwhelming probability, or the converse. The finite size approach is more nuanced in the sense that it accounts for random fluctuations, which are also manifest in empirical results [see the curves \( \Pr\{r_{\text{NMI}}(B_p,B) > 0\} \)]. While \( \eta \)-detectability is not perfect, as is argued above, it nonetheless accounts for a sizable portion of the uncorrelated instances (since it dips well below \( \eta = 1 \) near \( \Delta = 0 \)).

VII. CONCLUSION

Building upon ideas from statistical theory, we have developed a framework to study the information-theoretic detectability threshold of the finite size SSBM. Our analysis relies on two different interpretations of the log-likelihood ratio \( \mathcal{L} \) of the SSBM and its equivalent random ensemble. We have used the rigorous interpretation of \( \mathcal{L} \) to put a necessary condition on detectability. We have then computed the distribution of \( \mathcal{L} \), and proved that up to half of the instances of the finite size SSBM could be declared undetectable on the basis of this simple test alone. We have further argued that the average of \( \mathcal{L} \) could be interpreted as a measure of inference difficulty. This interpretation has proved to be fruitful; starting with a compact form for \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \), we have established the existence of a large equivalence class with respect to average detectability. In Appendix A, we have shown that \( \mathcal{L} \) can also be used to prove that, quite naturally, detectability decreases when the datasets are noisy. Using a correspondence with the finite size Kesten-Stigum bound (as well as with Random Matrix Theory, see Appendix B), we have presented numerical evidence that the hypersurface \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle = 1/2n \) separates detectable from undetectable instances in a special case of the SSBM.

The unifying theme of this contribution has been the idea that \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \) quantifies both detectability and consistency in the finite size SSBM. This interpretation leaves many questions open for future works. Perhaps the most important of all: Can one justify the threshold \( \lambda = 1/2n \) within the framework of the theory itself, with no recourse to the KS bound or Random Matrix Theory?

A second important question pertains to sufficiency: Can one modify the condition to make it necessary and sufficient? Or is a completely different approach needed? In asymptotic analyses of the limit, one can use different conditions to bound the limit from above and below, as is done in Ref. [34]. Can a similar approach be fruitfully applied to finite instances?

In closing, let us mention a few of the many possible generalizations of the methods introduced. First, it will be important to verify how our approach behaves in the limit \( n \to \infty \). How this limit is taken will matter. In particular, we believe that our framework has much to say about the limit where \( q \to \infty \), since it does not assume Poisson distributed degree, unlike other asymptotic theories of the limit. Second, we see no major obstacle to a generalization of our methods to other generative models of networks with a mesoscopic structure. This includes, for example, the consistency of graphons, a subject whose study has been recently undertaken [61]. Changing the null model from the equivalent random network ensemble to the configuration model [62, 63] could even allow an extension to degree-corrected SSBM [64].
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Appendix A: Detectability and noise

One almost never has a perfect knowledge of the structure of real networks. The culprit can lie at the level of data collection, storage, transmission— or a combination of the above, but the outcome is the same: Some edges are spurious and others are omitted [65]. To model imperfect knowledge, we will suppose that instances of the SBM first go through a noisy channel where modifications— random edge removals or additions— are applied to the structure. Only then are we asked to tell which of hypotheses P and Q is the most likely. It should be clear that it will be harder to separate the two hypotheses, since noise is not necessarily aligned with the planted partition.

We will approach the problem with the following universal perturbation process (UPP): At each step t of this process, a new random edge is added with probability c; otherwise, a random edge is removed. If a new edge must be added, then it is selected uniformly from the set of non-edges. If an edge must be removed, then it is selected uniformly from the set of edges already present in the network. This randomization step is then repeated T times. We call this process universal because one can compute 

\[ \rho \] 

the network. This randomization step is then repeated

\[ m_{rs}(t) = \frac{(1-c)[m_{rs}(t)]}{\sum_{t \leq s} m_{rs}(t)} + \frac{c}[m_{max} - m_{rs}(t)] - \sum_{t \leq s} m_{rs}(t) \]  

(A3)

The first term accounts for edge removal events, which occur with probability \((1-c)\) and involve edges that connect nodes in blocks \(B_r, B_s\) with probability \(m_{rs}/m_{rs}(t)\). A similar argument leads to the second term, which accounts for edge creation events.

Equation (A3) can be transformed into an equation for \(p_{rs}(t)\) by dividing through by \(m_{rs}\), and then using the definitions \(p_{rs}(t) = m_{rs}(t)/m_{rs}\) and \(\rho(t) = \sum_{t \leq s} m_{rs}(t)/m_{rs}\). We find

\[ p_{rs}(t) = \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{-1} \left[ c \left( \frac{1-p_{rs}(t)}{1-\rho(t)} \right) - (1-c) \frac{p_{rs}(t)}{\rho(t)} \right], \]  

(A4)

which, upon substitution in Eq. (A1), yields

\[ \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{L} = \Theta \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} \log \left[ \frac{f(p_{rs})}{f(\rho)} \right] \left[ \frac{f(c)f(\rho)}{f(p_{rs})} - 1 \right], \]  

(A5)

where \(\Theta = \frac{2(1-c)p_{rs}/[pn(n-1)]}\) is a non-negative factor, and where we have defined \(f(x) = x/(1-x)\). It turns out that the sum is not only globally negative, but that each term is also individually negative, i.e.,

\[ -\log \left[ \frac{f(\rho)}{f(p_{rs})} \right] \left[ \frac{f(c)f(\rho)}{f(p_{rs})} - 1 \right] \leq 0 \quad \forall r \leq s. \]  

(A6)

This comes about because the sign of the logarithm always matches that of the bracket.

To prove this statement, we treat 5 different cases and use the following identities repeatedly:

\[ \frac{f(x)}{f(y)} < 1 \quad \Rightarrow x < y, \]  

(A7)

\[ \frac{f(c)f(\rho)}{f(p_{rs})} > 1 \quad \Rightarrow c > \frac{p_{rs}(1-\rho)}{\rho(1-p_{rs}) + p_{rs}(1-\rho)}. \]  

(A8)

The cases are:

1. If \(\rho = p_{rs}\): The logarithm equals 0 and the upper bound of Eq. (A6) holds.

2. If \(p_{rs} < \rho \) and \(c \leq 1/2\): The logarithm is positive [see Eq. (A7)]. The bracket is also positive, since inequality (A8) can be rewritten as \((1-\rho)p_{rs} \leq \rho(1-p_{rs})\) using the fact that \(c < 1/2\). This simplifies to \(p_{rs} \leq \rho\), in line with our premise.

3. If \(p_{rs} < \rho \) and \(c \geq 1/2\): The logarithm is positive. Using our premise, we conclude that \(f(\rho)/f(p_{rs}) > 1\) and \(f(c) \geq 1\). Therefore, \(f(c)f(\rho)/f(p_{rs}) > 1\), i.e., the bracket is positive.

Without specifying the dynamics, and using Eq. (13), one can compute

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{rs}} \mathcal{L} = \alpha_{rs} \log \left[ \frac{p_{rs} \rho}{\rho(1-p_{rs})} \right] = \alpha_{rs} x_{rs}, \]  

(A2)

where \(x_{rs}\) is identical to Eq. (23b). This leaves the \(p_{rs}\) terms, whose expressions are determined by the perturbation dynamics. For the UPP, the evolution of \(\{m_{rs}(t)\}_{t \leq s}\) is determined by the set of differential equations

\[ m_{rs}(t) = \left( \frac{1-c}[m_{rs}(t)] \right) + \frac{c}{m_{max} - m_{rs}(t)} - \sum_{t \leq s} m_{rs}(t) \]  

(A3)
4. If $p_{rs} > \rho$ and $c \leq 1/2$: The logarithm is negative. Using our premise, we conclude that $f(\rho)/f(p_{rs}) < 1$ and $f(c) \leq 1$. Therefore, $f(c)f(\rho)/f(p_{rs}) < 1$, i.e., the bracket is negative.

5. If $p_{rs} > \rho$ and $c > 1/2$: The logarithm is negative. The bracket is also negative, since the converse of inequality (A8) can be rewritten as $(1 - \rho)p_{rs} \geq \rho(1 - p_{rs})$ using the fact that $c > 1/2$. This simplifies to $p_{rs} \geq \rho$, in line with our premise.

This list covers all cases, and therefore completes the proof that $d(\mathcal{L})/dt \leq 0$, i.e., that average detectability decreases as a result of the application of a UPP.

Appendix B: Connection with Random Matrix Theory

In Refs. [44, 66] it is argued that SBM is undetectable when the extremal eigenvalues of the modularity matrix of its instances merge with the so-called “continuous eigenvalue band”. It is proved in Ref. [44] that this occurs when

$$n(p_{in} - p_{out}) = \pm 1/n \sqrt{2n(p_{in} + p_{out})}, \quad \text{(B1)}$$

for the 2 block SSBM with Poisson distributed degrees. Since we are concerned with the finite case, let us first modify this result to account for binomial distributed degrees instead. It turns out that the corrected condition is found by substituting the expectations of Poisson variables [in the RHS of Eq. (B1)] by that of binomial variables. This leads to

$$(p_{in} - p_{out}) = \pm 1/n \sqrt{2n(p_{in} - p_{out})},$$

or, in terms of the natural parameters of the GMGM,

$$\Delta^* = \pm \sqrt{n/(n - 1)} \rho(1 - \rho). \quad \text{(B3)}$$

This equation bears striking similarity with Eq. (34), our approximate equation for curves of constant $\beta$. In fact, for the 2 block SSBM ($\beta \approx 1/2$), the latter reads

$$\Delta^* = \pm \sqrt{8\lambda p(1 - \rho)}.$$  \hfill \text{(B4)}

One obtains an exact equivalence between the two expressions by setting $\lambda = 1/(n - 1) \approx 1/2n$. The fact that modularity based spectral methods cannot infer a correlated partition if $\Delta \leq \Delta^*$ [Eq. (B3)] can thus be understood as stemming from a lack of statistical evidence for the SBM.
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Finite size analysis of the detectability limit of the stochastic block model
Supplemental Material

I. AVERAGE OF THE NORMALIZED LOG-LIKELIHOOD RATIO DISTRIBUTION

Theorem 1 (Average of the normalized log-likelihood ratio). Let \( \mathbb{P} \) be the distribution over all graphs of \( n \) nodes prescribed by the stochastic block model of parameters \( \{p_{rs}\} \) and block size vector \( \mathbf{n} \). Let \( \mathbb{Q} \) be the distribution over all graphs of \( n \) nodes, as prescribed by the Erdős-Rényi model \( G(n, \rho) \), where \( \rho = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs} \) is the average density and where \( \alpha_{rs} = m_{rs}^{\text{max}} / m_{rs} \) is a function of \( \mathbf{n} \). Define \( \mathcal{L} \) as the random variable \( (m_{rs}^{\text{max}})^{-1} \log(\mathbb{P}/\mathbb{Q}) \) whose support is all graphs of \( n \) nodes, drawn from distribution \( \mathbb{P} \). Then,

\[
\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) \rangle = \frac{D(\mathbb{P}||\mathbb{Q})}{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}} = h(\rho) - \sum_{r,s:1 \leq r \leq s \leq q} \alpha_{rs} h(p_{rs}) ,
\]

where \( D(\mathbb{P}||\mathbb{Q}) \) is the Kullback-Leibler divergence and \( h(x) \) is the binary entropy function.

The first equality follows directly from the definition of the average of \( \mathcal{L} \). In the main text, we argued that it was straightforward to show by direct calculation that \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \) led to \( h(\rho) - \sum \alpha_{rs} h(p_{rs}) \); we now carry out this calculation explicitly (§1A). We also give an alternative proof of Theorem 1, where we obtain the expression in terms of differences of entropies directly from the KL divergence (§1B). Note that to lighten the text, we will use “\( r \leq s \)” as an abbreviation of the more precise “\( r, s : 1 \leq r \leq s \leq q \).

A. Direct computation of the expectation

Direct proof. As we show in the main text, one can think of the support of \( \mathcal{L}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) \) as all vertex labeled graphs of \( n \) nodes, but also as all symmetric matrices \( \mathbf{m} = (m_{11}, m_{12}, \ldots, m_{qq}) \) with entries in \( \mathbb{N} \) and upper bounds given by \( m_{rs}^{\text{max}} = (m_{11}^{\text{max}}, m_{12}^{\text{max}}, \ldots, m_{qq}^{\text{max}}) \). In other words, all graphs drawn from the SBM of parameters \( (\mathbf{B} \implies \mathbf{m}^{\text{max}}, \mathbf{P}) \) can be mapped to a particular realization of \( \mathbf{m} \), drawn with probability \( \text{Pr}[\mathbf{m}] = \prod_{r \leq s} \text{Pr}[m_{rs}] \), where \( \text{Pr}[m_{rs}] = (m_{rs}^{\text{max}})^{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}}(1 - p_{rs})^{m_{rs}^{\text{max}} - m_{rs}} \) is the probability mass function of the binomial distribution.

Using this simpler definition of the random variable \( \mathcal{L}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) \), we write its expectation as

\[
\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) \rangle_{\mathbb{P}} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \text{Pr}[\mathbf{m}] \left\{ \sum_{r \leq s} \frac{m_{rs}}{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - p_{rs}} + \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} \log \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \rho} \right\} .
\]

It is straightforward to check that by the linearity of expectations

\[
\sum_{\mathbf{m}} \text{Pr}[\mathbf{m}] \sum_{r \leq s} \frac{m_{rs}}{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - p_{rs}} = \sum_{r \leq s} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - p_{rs}} \frac{1}{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \text{Pr}[\mathbf{m}] m_{rs} ,
\]

\[
= \sum_{r \leq s} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - p_{rs}} \frac{1}{m_{rs}^{\text{max}}},
\]

\[
= \sum_{r \leq s} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - p_{rs}} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs} ,
\]

where we have used \( \alpha_{rs} = m_{rs}^{\text{max}} / m_{rs}^{\text{max}} \) to get the last equality. Since the second summation in Eq. (2) is independent of \( \mathbf{m} \), one obtains directly

\[
\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) \rangle_{\mathbb{P}} = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} \left\{ \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - p_{rs}} p_{rs} + \log \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \rho} \right\} ,
\]

\[
= \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} [ (1 - p_{rs}) \log(1 - \rho) + p_{rs} \log \rho] + \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} [(1 - p_{rs}) \log(1 - p_{rs}) + p_{rs} \log p_{rs}] ,
\]

\[
= h(\rho) - \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} h(p_{rs}) .
\]
The final result follows from (i) the definition \( h(x) = -(1 - x) \log(1 - x) - x \log(x) \), (ii) the normalization of \( \{ \alpha_{rs} \} \) and (iii) the fact that the average density can be written as \( \rho = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs} \).

\[ \square \]

### B. From the KL divergence to difference of entropies

We now provide an alternative proof of Theorem 1 for the equation \( D(P || Q) = m_{\text{max}} \left[ h(\rho) - \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} h(p_{rs}) \right] \).

**Proof.** The following chain rule holds for the Kullback-Leibler divergence [1]:

\[
D(p(x,y)||q(x,y)) = D(p(x)||q(x)) + D(p(y|x)||q(y|x)) ,
\]

where \( p, q \) are joint distributions for \((X,Y)\) on the same supports \( X, Y \). It is easy to see that if \( X \) and \( Y \) are independent according to both distributions \( p \) and \( q \), then the divergence is additive, i.e,

\[
D(p(x,y)||q(x,y)) = D(p(x)||q(x)) + D(p(y)||q(y)) .
\]

This property trivially generalizes to an arbitrary number of random variables [1]. Because the distribution over all graphs can be seen as a product of independent distributions over all edges, we may write the Kullback-Leibler divergence as

\[
D(P || Q) = \sum_{i<j} D(P_{ij} || Q_{ij}) ,
\]

where \( P_{ij} \) and \( Q_{ij} \) are the Bernoulli random variables that govern the existence of the edge linking nodes \( v_i \) and \( v_j \), according to the distribution \( P \) and \( Q \). These variables have two outcomes: Either the edge exists with probability \( p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j} \) (resp. \( q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j} \)), or does not with probability \( 1 - p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j} \) (resp. \( 1 - q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j} \)). We write \( \sigma_i \) as an abbreviation of \( \sigma(v_i) \), the index of the block to which node \( v_i \) belongs. The divergence associated with an edge is therefore

\[
D(P_{ij} || Q_{ij}) = p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j} \log \frac{p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}}{q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}} + (1 - p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}) \log \frac{1 - p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}}{1 - q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}}
\]

\[
= -h(p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}) - p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j} \log \frac{q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}}{q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}} - (1 - p_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}) \log \frac{1 - q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}}{1 - q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j}} ,
\]

where \( h(x) \) is, again, the binary entropy. Now, taking \( q_{\sigma_i,\sigma_j} = \rho \) for all pairs and summing over all edges [see Eq. (3)], we find, after grouping terms by types,

\[
D(P || Q) = - \sum_{r \leq s} m_{rs}^{\text{max}} h(p_{rs}) - \sum_{r \leq s} m_{rs}^{\text{max}} [p_{rs} \log \rho + (1 - p_{rs}) \log(1 - \rho)] .
\]

The final result follows from the definition of the average density, after one substitutes \( m_{rs}^{\text{max}} \) for \( \alpha_{rs} m_{\text{max}} \).

\[ \square \]
II. SYMMETRIES OF THE AVERAGE DETECTABILITY

Theorem 2 ($\lambda$-preserving symmetries). All transformations $T(\alpha, P)$ of the parameter space of the SBM that are (i) reversible, (ii) space-preserving, and (iii) valid at every point of the parameter space can be written as

\begin{align}
p_{rs} &\mapsto p'_{rs} = \gamma_{rs} + (1 - 2\gamma_{rs})p_{\omega(r,s)}, \\
\alpha_{rs} &\mapsto \alpha'_{rs} = \alpha_{\pi(r,s)},
\end{align}

where $\gamma_{rs} \in \{0, 1\}$ and where $\pi$ and $\omega$ are permutations that acts on the set $\{(r, s) \mid 1 \leq r, s \leq q\}$. Under the additional constraint that $\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle$ be preserved by $\{T\}$ and equal to $\lambda$, one must have

$$\pi = \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{rs} = \gamma \quad \forall (r, s).$$

Remark. The (constrained) transformation that acts on $p_{rs}$ can be seen as an element of group $Z_2 \times S_q^r$. If $q^* = (q)$, where $q$ is the dimension of $\alpha$ and $P$, then $\pi(r, s)$ and $\omega(r, s)$ can be seen as elements of the symmetric group $S_q^r$. The constrained symmetry group is therefore $Z_2 \times S_q^r$, and it is of order $2(q^*)!$.

Let us first introduce new notation to clarify the proof of Theorem 2. First, we will define vectors $|p\rangle$ and $|\alpha\rangle$ whose entries are the $q^*$-dimensional vector parametrized by $(\alpha^*(r, s))$ and that satisfy $|p\rangle$. We use $|a, b\rangle$ to denote the standard scalar product between vectors $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$ in $\mathbb{R}^{q^*}$. Thus, in particular, we will write the average density as $\langle \alpha|p\rangle$ and the average detectability as

$$\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} \left\{ \log \left[ \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} \right] p_{rs} + \log \left[ \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \rho} \right] \right\},$$

where $|u(\alpha, P)\rangle$ is a $q^*$-dimensional vector parametrized by $(\alpha, P)$, whose entries are given by

$$u_{rs}(\alpha, P) = p_{rs} \log \left[ \frac{p_{rs}}{\alpha|p\rangle} \right] + (1 - p_{rs}) \log \left[ \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \alpha|p\rangle} \right].$$

We also introduce $\Pi$ and $\Omega$, two $q^* \times q^*$ permutation matrices such that $\Pi|\alpha\rangle_{rs} = \alpha_{\pi(r,s)}$ and $\Omega|p\rangle_{rs} = p_{\omega(r,s)}$, where $|a\rangle_{ij}$ is the element $(i, j)$ of vector $|a\rangle$ (we use double indexes in the vectors to emphasis the matrix to vector change in notation). In this notation, Eqs. (1) are given by

\begin{align}
|\alpha\rangle &\mapsto |\alpha'\rangle = \Pi|\alpha\rangle, \\
|p\rangle &\mapsto |p'\rangle = \Gamma|1\rangle + (I - 2\Gamma)\Omega|p\rangle = \Omega\Gamma'|1\rangle + \Omega(I - 2\Gamma')|p\rangle,
\end{align}

where $\Gamma$ is a diagonal matrix with element $\gamma_{rs}$ on the diagonal, where $I$ is the identity matrix, and where $\Gamma' = \Omega^{-1}\Gamma$ is also a diagonal matrix.

Proof. The first part of Theorem 2 follows trivially from the definition of the parameter space, and from the fact that transformations which meet requirements (i), (ii) and (iii) are the symmetries of this space. Since $\alpha$ takes its value in the standard simplex of dimension $(q^* - 1)$ and since $P$ is confined to the $q^*$-dimensional unit cube, the complete parameter space is given by the Cartesian product of both spaces—we can simply compose the symmetry group of both spaces to obtain the complete symmetry group. The symmetry group of the standard simplex and that of the unit cube are well-known results in geometry and algebra [2]: The symmetry group of the $q^*$-dimensional unit cube is isomorphic to the hyperoctahedral group $B_{q^*}$, and the symmetry group of the $(q^* - 1)$-dimensional standard simplex is isomorphic to the symmetric group $S_q^r$. Their action can be written as in Eq. (1a)–(1b), which proves the first part of the theorem.

To prove the second part of the theorem, we look for the subset of all transformations of the form (1) that also preserve $\langle \mathcal{L} \rangle$, i.e., transformations $T$ in $S_q^r \times B_{q^*}$ that map $(\alpha, P)$ to $(\alpha', P')$ and that satisfy

$$\langle \alpha|u(\alpha, P)\rangle = \langle \alpha'|u(\alpha', P')\rangle.$$

It is easy to check that if $\Omega = \Pi$ and $\Gamma = \gamma I$ with $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$, then the average density equals

$$\rho' = \langle \alpha'|p'\rangle = \gamma + (1 - 2\gamma) \langle \alpha|p\rangle = \gamma + (1 - 2\gamma)\rho.$$
With the same constraint on the permutations and \( \{ \gamma_{rs} \} \), the average of the normalized log likelihood is given by, in the transformed parameters,

\[
\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha', P') \rangle = h(p') - \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs}' h(p'_{rs}) ,
\]

\[
= h(\gamma + (1 - 2\gamma)p) - \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{\pi(r,s)} h(\gamma + (1 - 2\gamma)p_{\pi(r,s)}) ,
\]

\[
= h(p) - \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} h(p_{rs}) = \langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle ,
\]

since \( h(x) = h(1 - x) \) and permutations can be ignored (they induce an irrelevant reordering of the sum). The constrained transformations therefore preserve \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \).

The above calculation is the sufficient part of the proof. To complete the proof we must show that \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \) is conserved only if \( \Gamma = \gamma I \) and \( \Omega = \Pi \). First, we note that by the properties of the scalar product and permutation matrices, we have the following obvious symmetry

\[
\langle \alpha | u \rangle = \langle \Pi \alpha | \Pi u \rangle ,
\]

which is valid for all permutation matrices \( \Pi \). We use this symmetry to “shift” all permutation matrices to the second part of the scalar product representation of \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \), i.e. we write

\[
\langle \alpha | u \rangle \rightarrow \langle \alpha' | u' \rangle = \langle \Pi \alpha | u' \rangle = \langle \alpha | \Pi^{-1} u' \rangle ,
\]

(we use the fact that \( \Pi^{-1} \) is a permutation matrix by definition). Now, from Eq. (3), it is clear that we will have \( \langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha, P) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha', P') \rangle \) if and only if

\[
\langle \alpha | u - \Pi^{-1} u' \rangle = 0 ,
\]

where \( |u' := |u(\alpha', P')\rangle \). Since \( |u - \Pi^{-1} u'\rangle \) is analytic in \( \alpha \), we can expand it by using Taylor series; this creates an infinite series of constraints that must all be satisfied. In particular, condition (9) will be satisfied only if

\[
|u - \Pi^{-1} u'\rangle = |0\rangle .
\]

This is true if and only if, for all \( (r, s) \), one has

\[
p_{rs} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\langle \alpha | p \rangle} + (1 - p_{rs}) \log \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \langle \alpha | p \rangle} = \bar{p}_{rs} \log \frac{\bar{p}_{rs}}{\langle \alpha | \bar{p} \rangle} + (1 - \bar{p}_{rs}) \log \frac{1 - \bar{p}_{rs}}{1 - \langle \alpha | \bar{p} \rangle} ,
\]

where \( |\bar{p}\rangle = \Pi^{-1} |p\rangle \). Here, \( |\bar{p}\rangle \) is the transformed vector \( |p\rangle \), on which the inverse of permutation \( \pi(r, s) \) is also applied. Note that in writing condition (11) we have used \( \langle \alpha' | p' \rangle = \langle \alpha | \Pi^{-1} p' \rangle = \langle \alpha | \bar{p} \rangle \) in the denominators.

Let us now suppose that \( \alpha \) tends to the point \( \tilde{\alpha} \), which is such that \( \tilde{\alpha}_{rs} = 0 \) for all \( (r, s) \) except for \( (r, s) = (a, b) \) (i.e., \( \tilde{\alpha}_{ab} = 1 \)). In this limit, Eq. (11) reads

\[
p_{rs} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{p_{ab}} + (1 - p_{rs}) \log \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - p_{ab}} = \bar{p}_{rs} \log \frac{\bar{p}_{rs}}{\bar{p}_{ab}} + (1 - \bar{p}_{rs}) \log \frac{1 - \bar{p}_{rs}}{1 - \bar{p}_{ab}} ,
\]

which is trivially satisfied when \( (r, s) = (a, b) \) but not otherwise. Let us suppose \( (r, s) \neq (a, b) \) and expand the equation around \( p_{ab} = \bar{p}_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \). From this second series expansion one concludes that the equality is satisfied if either \( p_{ab} = \bar{p}_{ab} \) or \( \bar{p}_{ab} = 1 - p_{ab} \). In both cases, the indices must match, which implies that \( (a, b) = \pi^{-1} \circ \omega(a, b) \). By repeating the same argument for all \( (a, b) \), we conclude that \( \omega = \pi \). Thus, the map \( T : (\alpha, P) \rightarrow (\alpha', P') \) is a symmetry only if \( \Pi = \Omega \). This leaves the last part open, i.e., the proof that \( \Gamma = \gamma I \).

Let us, by contradiction, assume that \( \gamma_{rs} \) differs from one set of indices to the other and define the sets \( A \) and \( B \) by

\[
A = \{(r, s): \gamma_{rs} = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{(r, s): \gamma_{rs} = 1\} .
\]

Then one can write

\[
\rho = \langle \alpha | p \rangle = \langle p \rangle_A + \langle p \rangle_B ,
\]

(13)
where \( \langle p \rangle_X := \sum_{(r,s) \in X} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs} \). Returning to Eq. (11) for \( (r, s) \in A \) and using the newfound fact that \( \Pi = \Omega \) which implies \( \bar{p}_{rs} = \gamma_{rs} + (1 - 2\gamma_{rs})p_{rs} \) (no more permutations), we find

\[
p_{rs} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\rho} + (1 - p_{rs}) \log \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \rho} = p_{rs} \log \frac{p_{rs}}{\langle p' \rangle_A + \langle p' \rangle_B} + (1 - p_{rs}) \log \frac{1 - p_{rs}}{1 - \langle p' \rangle_A - \langle p' \rangle_B}.
\]

This can only be true if \( \rho = \langle p' \rangle_A + \langle p' \rangle_B \), i.e., if \( A = \emptyset \) or \( B = \emptyset \). Therefore, \( \gamma_{rs} = \gamma \ \forall (r,s) \), with \( \gamma \in \{0,1\} \).
III. CONVEXITY OF $\langle L \rangle$

Theorem 3. $\langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle$ is convex with respect to $P$.

This property of $\langle L \rangle$ is—perhaps surprisingly—not a consequence of the convexity of the KL divergence. Instead, it follows from the log-sum inequality.

Proof. We prove that $\langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle$ is convex with respect to $P$ by showing that it satisfies the convexity condition

$$\langle L(\alpha, (1-t)P + tQ) \rangle \leq (1-t)\langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle + t\langle L(\alpha, Q) \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

explicitly for all $t \in [0,1]$. Again, for the sake of clarity, we will use the notation developed in the previous section, and, in particular, write the density as $\rho = \langle \alpha | P \rangle$. Focusing on one of the terms on the LHS of Eq. (1), we have

$$\alpha_{rs} \left\{ [(1-t)p_{rs} + tq_{rs}] \log \frac{(1-t)p_{rs} + tq_{rs}}{(1-t)\langle \alpha | P \rangle + t \langle \alpha | Q \rangle} + [1 - (1-t)p_{rs} - tq_{rs}] \log \frac{1 - (1-t)p_{rs} - tq_{rs}}{1 - (1-t)\langle \alpha | P \rangle - t \langle \alpha | Q \rangle} \right\} \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

It is easy to see that the log-sum inequality

$$(a + \bar{a}) \log \frac{a + \bar{a}}{b + \bar{b}} \leq a \log \frac{a}{b} + \bar{a} \log \frac{\bar{a}}{\bar{b}}$$

can be applied to both parts of Eq. (2) to separate terms by their coefficients $(1-t)$ and $t$. Repeating the same operation on all terms yields inequality (1).

\[\square\]

Corollary 1 (Detectability plus estimation is easier). Define $\langle L_{\text{est}}(\alpha, P) \rangle$ as the average of the random variable

$$L_{\text{est.}} = \frac{1}{m_{\text{max}}} \left[ \log P(G|\alpha, \hat{P}) - \log Q(G|\hat{\rho}) \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $G$ is drawn from the SBM of parameters $(\alpha, P)$, and where $(\hat{P}, \hat{\rho})$ are the maximum likelihood estimator of $(P, \rho)$ computed from the planted partition $B$, i.e., $p_{rs} := m_{rs}/m_{rs}^{\text{max}}$ where $m_{rs} \sim \text{Bin}(m_{rs}^{\text{max}}, p_{rs})$ and $\hat{\rho} := \sum_{r \leq s} m_{rs}/m_{\text{max}}$. Then, the following inequality holds

$$\langle L_{\text{est}}(\alpha, P) \rangle \geq \langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Proof. From the calculations of Sec. I, we know that $\langle L \rangle$ can be written as

$$\langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} p_{rs} x_{rs}(p_{rs}) + C \equiv f(P, \rho; \alpha),$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

or, equivalently, as $f(\langle \hat{P} \rangle_{(G)}, \langle \hat{\rho} \rangle_{(G)}; \alpha)$ where $\langle \hat{P} \rangle_{(G)} = P$ and $\langle \hat{\rho} \rangle_{(G)} = \rho$ are the expected values of the estimators. Jensen’s inequality then prescribes

$$\langle L_{\text{est}}(\alpha, P) \rangle_{(G)} = f(\langle \hat{P} \rangle_{(G)}, \langle \hat{\rho} \rangle_{(G)}; \alpha) \geq f(\langle \hat{P} \rangle_{(G)}, \langle \hat{\rho} \rangle_{(G)}; \alpha) = \langle L(\alpha, P) \rangle_{(G)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

\[\square\]

Corollary 1 says that estimating the parameters simplifies the detection problem under certain particular conditions—a result whose consequence are not immediately obvious. It can be understood on an intuitive level as follows: Suppose that we use the density matrix $P = I + c11^T$ (with $c \approx 0$) and that, for the sake of simplicity, $n = [n/2, n/2]$. Then, consider the instance with edge count matrix $m = [[n/2, n/2], [n/2, n/2]]$. The likelihood ratio will be much smaller if one compares hypotheses with the true parameters instead of with the parameters estimated from $B$. One could argue that a large ratio would be appropriate here; the partition is, after all, very clear. But the instance actually contains little information on the planted partition, since the observed structure is not due to the planted partition but instead to an extreme random fluctuation. Corollary 1 can therefore be taken as a cautionary tale: Parameter estimation creates statistical evidence, and it must be handled carefully.
IV. CASE STUDY: GENERAL TWO BLOCKS SBM

In the main text, we have analyzed the general modular graph model of Ref. [3] and have shown how our framework yielded nicely interpretable expressions for such a low-dimensional model. We now investigate another simple model—the general two blocks SBM—which also lends itself to exhaustive analysis.

A. Parameterizing the two blocks SBM

The parametrization of the two blocks SBM is specified with the 3 probabilities \( \{p_{11}, p_{22}, p_{12}\} \) as well as the two blocks sizes, \( n_0 \) and \( n_1 \). It contains the core-periphery model (with \( p_{11} > p_{12} \) and \( p_{22} \approx 0 \)) and the SSBM \( (p_{11} = p_{22}) \) as special cases. We follow the path laid out in our analysis of the GMGM and obtain a natural parametrization in terms of average density and displacement from the equivalent random model. The simplest parameterization of this kind is perhaps

\[
\rho = \alpha_{11} p_{11} + \alpha_{22} p_{22} + \alpha_{12} p_{12}, \tag{1a}
\]

\[
\Delta_x = p_{22} - p_{11}, \tag{1b}
\]

\[
\Delta_y = -\frac{\alpha_{11}}{1 - \alpha_{12}} p_{11} - \frac{\alpha_{22}}{1 - \alpha_{12}} p_{22} + p_{12}. \tag{1c}
\]

Figure 1 (a) illustrates the change of variables. It amounts to placing ourselves in a plane of constant density in the \( p_{11} \times p_{22} \times p_{12} \) space, then measuring the distance from the point \( (p_{11}, p_{22}, p_{12}) = (\rho, \rho, \rho) \) in the \( \Delta_x \) and \( \Delta_y \) direction. Again, much like in the case of the GMGM, not all \( (\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y) \) tuples correspond to probabilities—it is only true for the region of the constant density plane contained inside \( [0, 1]^3 \). When \( \rho \) is close to 0 or 1, this region is a triangle. At intermediate values of \( \rho \), parts of the triangle lie outside the cube of probabilities—the region is then a polygon of more than 3 edges, see Fig. 1 (b) for an example.

We do not investigate the general 2 blocks SBM as thoroughly as the GMGM, since much of the results and observations are identical to those of the previous case study. It will, however, be instructive to consider the average detectability and symmetries of this simple model.

B. Average detectability

The average log-likelihood \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \) is, in the \( \rho \times \Delta_x \times \Delta_y \) space,

\[
\langle \mathcal{L}(\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y, \beta) \rangle = \beta^2 \left\{ h(\rho) - h \left[ \rho - \frac{(1 - \beta)^2}{1 - 2 \beta (1 - \beta)} \Delta_x - 2 \beta (1 - \beta) \Delta_y \right] \right\} + (1 - \beta)^2 \left\{ h(\rho) - h \left[ \rho + \frac{\beta^2}{1 - 2 \beta (1 - \beta)} \Delta_x - 2 \beta (1 - \beta) \Delta_y \right] \right\} + 2 \beta (1 - \beta) \left\{ h(\rho) - h \left[ \rho + [1 - 2 \beta (1 - \beta)] \Delta_y \right] \right\}, \tag{2}
\]

Our main objective in studying the two-blocks SBM is to showcase anew the technique introduced in the main text to compute the hypersurfaces of constant \( \langle \mathcal{L} \rangle \). The first step is to invert the parametrization (1)

\[
p_{11} = \rho - \frac{\alpha_{22}}{1 - \alpha_{12}} \Delta_x - \alpha_{12} \Delta_y, \tag{3}
\]

\[
p_{22} = \rho + \frac{\alpha_{11}}{1 - \alpha_{12}} \Delta_x - \alpha_{12} \Delta_y, \tag{4}
\]

\[
p_{12} = \rho + (1 - \alpha_{12}) \Delta_y. \tag{5}
\]

Upon substitution of these parameters in

\[
2 \lambda \rho (1 - \rho) = \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} (p_{rs} - \rho)^2 + \mathcal{O}[(p_{rs} - \rho)^3],
\]

one finds

\[
2 \lambda \rho (1 - \rho) \approx \sum_{r \leq s} \alpha_{rs} (p_{rs} - \rho)^2 \approx \Delta_x^2 \left[ \frac{\alpha_{11} \alpha_{22}}{(1 - \alpha_{12})} \right] + \Delta_y^2 [\alpha_{12} (1 - \alpha_{12})]. \tag{6}
\]
Equation (6) predicts that these hypersurfaces are ellipses in the plane of constant density $\rho$, centered at $(\Delta_x = 0, \Delta_y = 0)$, with major axis $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 / (1 - \alpha_1 \alpha_2)$ and minor axis $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 (1 - \alpha_1 \alpha_2)$. This result is put to the test in Fig. 1 (b), where we also show numerical solutions for comparison. Agreement is, once again, excellent when $\lambda$ is not too large, while $\lambda \gg 1$ leads to significant errors in our prediction. Following the ellipses in Fig. 1-(c) shows that that the easiest inference problems—those where $\langle L \rangle$ is the largest—are the ones in the corner on the edges of the accessible region. These regions are those where block pairs are well segregated, i.e., the bipartite ensemble with $(p_{11}, p_{22}, p_{12}) = (0, 0, \rho)$ [top-corner], the perfectly assortative cases $(\rho, \rho, \rho)$ and $(0, 0, \rho)$, the completely disassortative $(\rho, \rho, 0)$, the planted and the inferred partition in the plane of constant density. The solid red line shows the solutions of $\langle L \rangle = 1/2n$.

C. Symmetries

The purpose of the parametrization $(\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y)$ is to facilitate the calculation of hypersurfaces of constant $\langle L \rangle$. For the GMGM, the natural parametrization also had the added benefit of highlighting the symmetries naturally. This needs not be the case in all variants of the SBM, as we now show.

Let us first simplify the notation; we define $\beta$ as the fraction of nodes that belong to block $B_1$, i.e., $n_1 = \beta n$ and $n_2 = (1 - \beta)n$ (not to be confused with the $\beta$ of the GMGM). In the limit where $n \gg 1$, we then have

$$\alpha_{11} \approx \beta^2 \quad \alpha_{22} \approx (1 - \beta)^2 \quad \alpha_{12} \approx 2 \beta (1 - \beta) .$$

Since the parametrization (1) assigns a special significance to the $(p_{11}, p_{22})$ direction, the symmetries that involve these two blocks [and not the $(B_1, B_2)$ pair], are the simplest. By direct enumeration, one finds

$$\langle L \rangle = \lambda (\Delta_x, \Delta_y; \rho, \alpha) \quad (\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y, \beta) \rightarrow (\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y, \beta) , \quad (8a)$$

$$\langle L \rangle = \lambda (\Delta_x, \Delta_y; \rho, \alpha) \quad (\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y, \beta) \rightarrow (1 - \rho, -\Delta_x, -\Delta_y, \beta) , \quad (8b)$$

$$\langle L \rangle = \lambda (\Delta_x, \Delta_y; \rho, \alpha) \quad (\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y, \beta) \rightarrow (\rho, -\Delta_x, \Delta_y, 1 - \beta) , \quad (8c)$$

$$\langle L \rangle = \lambda (\Delta_x, \Delta_y; \rho, \alpha) \quad (\rho, \Delta_x, \Delta_y, \beta) \rightarrow (1 - \rho, \Delta_x, -\Delta_y, 1 - \beta) . \quad (8d)$$

i.e., the identity, the pure graph complement, the permutation of block pairs $(0,0)$ and $(1,1)$, and the same permutation accompanied by the graph complement. Notice how this subset of transformation forms, once again, a group isomorphic to the Klein four-group.

The transformation equations would be, however, much less compact if we were to list transformations involving, say, cyclic permutations of the blocks. This situation is common: Choices of parameters that favor a particular pair of blocks will yield compact symmetry equations for this pair of blocks, but not the others. Therefore symmetries are, in general, best expressed directly in terms of $\alpha$ and $P$, unless the model has a special and all encompassing parametrization—like the GMGM.
V. NUMERICAL METHODS

In this short section, we detail the inference algorithm used in the case studies of the main text.

A. Markov Chain Monte Carlo Method

Optimal inference can be achieved (quite inefficiently) by evaluating the complete posterior distribution of the model \(\{Pr(B_r|G, P, n)\}_{B_r}\) for all possible partitions. The idea is to construct the marginal distribution \[1\]

\[\mu_r^i(G) = \sum_{\{B_r\}} Pr(B_r|G, P, n)\delta(\sigma(v_i) = r) \tag{1} \]

which gives the probability that node \(v_i\) is in block \(B_r\), given a network \(G\) and some generating parameter \(P\) and \(n\) \([\sigma(v_i)\] denotes the index of the block of node \(v_i\) in partition \(B_r\)). It is easy to see that we can then maximize the probability of guessing the partition correctly by assigning nodes according to

\[\hat{\sigma}(v_i) = \arg\max_r(\mu_r^i) \tag{2}\]

While this method is attracting, it runs into an important problem very quickly, for it is impossible to compute the marginal distribution exactly for networks of even moderate size—an exponential number of terms is involved.

There are multiple ways to circumvent this problem. A popular method is to construct the marginal distribution directly, using a belief propagation (BP) algorithm \[4, 5\] (see Ref. \[6\] for an overview of related method). BP based methods are extremely efficient, since their complexity is of the order of the number of edges in the network \[4\]. Moreover, they work virtually perfectly for all practical purposes \[6\]. The only problem is that BP algorithms rely on the hypothesis that the network is locally tree-like; this is never entirely true, but still a reasonable approximation for sparse instances of the SBM. Unfortunately, since our analysis calls for accurate results in all regimes (i.e., not only on sparse networks), we are forced to turn an inefficient alternative of BP, the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method \[7\].

MCMC algorithms sample from the posterior distribution and can therefore be used to estimate the marginal distribution of Eq. (1). We will use one of the simplest implementation of the MCMC method, the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. One only needs to specify a proposal distribution (given a partition \(B_0\), what is the probability that the next partition in the chain is \(B_1\)) and an acceptance probability \(A(B_0, B_1)\) proportional to \(Pr(B_1|G, P, n)/Pr(B_0|G, P, n)\) for all proposed transitions. The proposal distribution usually intervenes in the calculation of \(A\) but will not be needed here, since we opt for a symmetric distribution (see next paragraph). The chain formed by accepting transitions \(B_0 \to B_1\) with probability \(\min\{1, A(B_0, B_1)\}\) is then ergodic if a number of conditions are met (e.g., the proposal distribution must respect the detailed balance).

Our proposal distribution will be simple: Take a node at random, and assign it to a random block (see Ref. \[8\] for a more efficient alternative). One can easily check that this distribution meets all the necessary conditions for the ergodicity of the Markov chain. Following an argument analogous to that of Ref. \[9\], we find that the acceptance probability associated to this proposal distribution is

\[A = \frac{p_{rs}(1 - p_{rr})}{p_{rr}(1 - p_{rs})} k_r^{(i)}(1 - p_{rs}) \frac{k_s^{(i)}}{1 - p_{rs}} \frac{n_s - 1}{n_s} \prod_{l \neq r, s} \frac{p_{ls}(1 - p_{rl})}{p_{rl}(1 - p_{ls})} \frac{k_l^{(i)}}{1 - p_{rl}} n_l \tag{3}\]

if node \(v_i\) is switched from block \(B_r\) to block \(B_s\), with \(k_r^{(i)}\) denoting the number of neighbors of node \(v_i\) in block \(B_r\). Since there are \(2q\) terms in Eq. (3), transition probabilities can be calculated in \(O(q)\) time, assuming that products and exponentiations are \(O(1)\), and that one keeps \(O(nq)\) items in memory to track the neighborhoods and the block assignments. Updating the memberships and neighborhoods is then a \(O((k))\) operation. The memory cost can be reduced to \(O(n)\) if the neighborhoods \(\{k_r^{(i)}\}_{i=1,..,n, r=1,..,q}\) are computed on the fly. This comes at no significant costs since keeping the memory up-to-date is as expensive as computing the memberships every time. We give a reference implementation of the algorithm at \texttt{www.github.com/jg-you/sbm_canonical_mcmc}.

Also, we note that if one samples from the general modular graph model (GMGM), the algorithmic complexity is dramatically reduced, since the acceptance probability then simplifies to

\[A = \frac{p_{in}}{p_{out}} k_r^{(i)} - k_r^{(i)} \left(1 - \frac{p_{in}}{1 - p_{out}}\right)^{(n_s - k_r^{(i)}) - (n_s - k_r^{(i)}) + 1} \tag{4}\]

i.e., the transition probability only depends on the blocks of the nodes involved in the MCMC move.
B. Initial condition

In a normal setting—where the planted partition is not known—one would initialize the Metropolis-Hastings at random or using the partition generated by a simpler algorithm. But since we are interested in detectability, we might as well initialize the chain with the planted partition itself. If the partition is undetectable, then the algorithm will show no particular preference for this initial configuration and “wander away” towards partitions uncorrelated with the planted partition. However, if the partition is detectable, then the chain will concentrate around the initial configuration, and the marginal distribution will yield a distribution correlated with the planted partition.

This choice of initial condition is not merely a trick to avoid transients: It also allows correlated recovery even in the hard phase, where the planted partition is detectable, but exponentially hard to find. In this phase, the planted partition is identifiable but not globally stable, in the sense that many other locally optimal partitions exist [10]. When this is the case, an algorithm that relies on local information—such as the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm—cannot be expected to identify the correct partition. By seeding the algorithm with the planted partition, we ensure that it will be found (if it is detectable).

C. Calibration

Even though we seed the inference algorithm with the planted partition, the chain can still go through a transient before it settles in its steady state, since the planted partition need not be typical of the stationary distribution. This can cause problems, since one must ensure that the chain has settled before the sampling begins—otherwise biased results are to be expected. In Fig. 2, we show the distance between the partition currently considered by the algorithm and the initial condition for different parametrization of the GMGM. These results show that the transient can be extremely long when there is little difference between the parameters of the ensemble and that of the equivalent random ensemble. For instance, the bottom panel of Fig. 2 shows that the algorithm is still in the transient after $10^5$ steps, when it is applied to instances of the GM with $W = I$, $n = [125, 125, 125, 125]$, $\rho = 0.25$ and $\Delta = 0.08$. To avoid biases we only start sampling after an initial burn-in period of 20,000 steps (when $n = 100$) and of 200,000 steps (when $n = 500$). The numerical results of Fig. 2 indicate that the chain will have settled by then, on average.

![Variation of information (VI) for different values of $\Delta$.](image1)

**FIG. 2.** Variation of information (VI) of the planted partition and the partition under consideration, as a function of the number of MCMC steps, in the GMGM of (top panel) $n = 100$ nodes and (bottom panel) $n = 500$ nodes. The VI is a metric that quantifies the distance between two partitions [11]. Its maximum equals $2 \log_2 q$ when the two compared partition have both $q$ clusters and $q \leq \sqrt{n}$ (this is the case here). Each line shows the average of (top panel) 200 and (bottom panel) 100 independent MH run, using a random network instance and the planted partition as an initial condition each time. We only show positive values of $\Delta$ for the sake of clarity; the results are similar for negative values of $\Delta$. 
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