

Task 2: Hubs, Authorities und PageRank (theoretical)

- a) We have defined matrices **M** and **A** for the iterations. In this sub task we use the original HITS algorithm. Compute the matrices for the example graph.

*We obtain matrix **A** by setting the component $a_{i,j}$ to 1 if there is a link from node i to node j . The rows in **A** contain all outgoing links and the columns in **A** contain all incoming links. Hence, we get (empty cells are 0):*

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & 1 & & & & \\ & & & & 1 & 1 & & & \\ & & 1 & & 1 & & & & \\ & & & & & & 1 & & \\ 1 & 1 & & & & & & 1 & \\ & & 1 & & & & & & 1 \\ & 1 & 1 & & & & & & \\ & & & 1 & 1 & & & & \\ & & & & & & 1 & 1 & \\ & & & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & & 1 & & \\ & & & & & & & 1 & \end{bmatrix}$$

*Similarly, we obtain the matrix **M** by setting the component $m_{i,j}$ to 1 over the number of outgoing links of node j if node j has a link to node i . Note that this leads to a transposed view compared to **A**. So, rows contain that incoming links and columns the outgoing links. In our case, all nodes have outgoing links, so the special case from the script does not apply. We get:*

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & 1/3 & & & & \\ & & & & 1/3 & & 1/3 & & \\ & & & & & 1/2 & 1/3 & & \\ & & 1/2 & & & & & & \\ 1 & 1/2 & 1/2 & & & & 1/3 & & \\ & 1/2 & & & & & 1/3 & & \\ & & & 1 & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & 1/3 & & 1/3 & 1 & \\ & & & & & 1 & 1/3 & & \\ & & & & & 1/2 & & 1 & \end{bmatrix}$$

Task 2: Hubs, Authorities und PageRank (theoretical)

- b) Write a small program (e.g., with MATLAB, but also works with Excel) that evaluates the fix-point iteration to obtain all results.

The following code is written for scilab (a free version of Matlab):

```
A = [0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0;
      0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0;
      0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0;
      0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0;
      1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0;
      0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0;
      0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1;
      0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0;
      0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0;
      0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0;
      0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0;
      0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0];
h(1:size(A,1),1) = sqrt(size(A,1))/size(A,1);
ho = zeros(size(A,1), 1);
a = h; ao = ho;
i = 0;
while (i < 100) && (norm(a-ao) > 1.0E-03)
    ao = a; ho = h;
    a = A'*ho; h = A*ao;
    a = a/norm(a); h = h/norm(h);
    i = i+1;
end
[s,auths]=gsort(a);
[s,hubs]=gsort(h);
auths
hubs

M = A'*diag(1./sum(A',1));
alpha = 0.85;
N = size(A,1);
r = ones(size(A,1), 1)./N;
ro = zeros(size(A,1), 1);
i = 0;
while (i < 100) && (norm(r-ro) > 1.0E-03)
    ro = r;
    r=(1-alpha)/N*ones(N,1)+alpha*M*ro
    i = i+1;
end
[s,ranks]=gsort(r);
ranks
```

Task 2: Hubs, Authorities und PageRank (theoretical)

- c) For the example graph, determine the best hubs, authorities, and the documents with high PageRanks.

We get the following results for our example graph:

authority: $6 > 10 > 2 > 5 > 1 > 11 > 4 > 7 > 3 > 12 > 8 > 9$

hub: $9 > 5 > 2 > 3 > 1 > 8 > 11 > 6 > 7 > 10 > 4 > 12$

PageRank ($\alpha = 0.85$): $11 > 10 > 6 > 8 > 3 > 2 > 4 > 7 > 12 > 1 > 5 > 9$

- d) Apply the SALSA algorithm to the example graph. Does the order change compared to the original HITS algorithm?

We first need to compute the matrices A_S and H_S (we use here the subscript to distinguish from the adjacency matrix A). This is the tricky part, especially as we want to build it with the help of the adjacency matrix A from subtask a). Let W_r be the matrix generated from A by dividing each entry from A by its row sum. Similarly, let W_c be the matrix generated from A by dividing each entry from A by its column sum. The matrix A_S is defined as:

$$A_S(i,j) = \sum_{q: q \rightarrow p_i \wedge q \rightarrow p_j} \frac{1}{L_{in}(p_i)} \cdot \frac{1}{L_{out}(q)}$$

As the columns in A contain all incoming links, matrix W_c contains the $\frac{1}{L_{in}(p_i)}$ values and W_r holds the $\frac{1}{L_{out}(q)}$ values. We obtain $A_S = W_c^T W_r$ and, similarly, $H_S = W_r W_c^T$ (\rightarrow transform the matrix multiplication into its sum notation). The scilab code is as follows:

```
Wr=diag(1./(sum(A,2)+1e-10))*A;
Wc=A*diag(1./(sum(A,1)+1e-10));
As=Wc'*Wr;
Hs=Wr*Wc';
h = ones(size(A,1), 1)./size(A,1);
ho = zeros(size(A,1), 1);
a = h; ao = ho;
i = 0;
while (i < 100) && (norm(a-ao)+norm(h-ho) > 1.0E-03)
    ao = a; ho = h;
    a = As'*ao; h = Hs'*ho;
    i = i+1;
end
[s,auths]=gsort(a);
[s,hubs]=gsort(h);
auths
hubs
```

Task 2: Hubs, Authorities und PageRank (theoretical)

- d) Apply the SALSA algorithm to the example graph. Does the order change compared to the original HITS algorithm? [continuation]

We get the following results for our example graph:

authority (SALSA): 6 > 10 > 11 > 3 > 2 > 8 > 4 > 7 > 5 > 12 > 1 > 9

hub (SALSA): 8 > 5 > 9 > 7 > 2 > 3 > 4 > 12 > 6 > 10 > 11 > 1

For direct comparison, we had the following results from subtask c)

authority (HITS): 6 > 10 > 2 > 5 > 1 > 11 > 4 > 7 > 3 > 12 > 8 > 9

hub (HITS): 9 > 5 > 2 > 3 > 1 > 8 > 11 > 6 > 7 > 10 > 4 > 12

Discussions: SALSA works a bit differently then HITS. We see this with the authority value of node 11. With HITS, 11 has a smaller authority as it is not linked by nodes 6, 8, and 10 which are not among the best hubs. SALSA, however, assigns node 11 a high authority as it is co-linked by 8 with node 2 and 3 obtaining high shares of their authority values (and keeping a lot of its own authority as nodes 6 and 10 only link to 11). Similarly, node 8 has become a good hub as it links to the same node as the other good hubs 5 (both link to node 2) and 7 (both link to node 3).

Obviously, with such a small example it is difficult to assess which algorithm works better. We would need a more extensive test data set for that.