

Efficient PageRank Computation via Distributed Algorithms with Web Clustering

Atsushi Suzuki and Hideaki Ishii

Abstract—PageRank is a well-known centrality measure for the web used in search engines, representing the importance of each web page. In this paper, we follow the line of recent research on the development of distributed algorithms for computation of PageRank, where each page computes its own PageRank value by interacting with pages connected over hyperlinks. Our approach is novel in that it is based on a reinterpretation of PageRank, which leads us to a set of algorithms with exponential convergence rates. We first employ gossip-type randomization for the page selections in the update iterations. Then, the algorithms are generalized to deterministic ones, allowing simultaneous updates by multiple pages. Finally, based on these algorithms, we propose a clustering-based scheme, in which groups of pages make updates by locally interacting among themselves many times to expedite the convergence. In comparison with other existing techniques, significant advantages can be exhibited in their convergence performance, as demonstrated via numerical examples using real web data, and also in the limited amount of communication required among pages.

I. INTRODUCTION

For search engines at Google, one of the many measures used for ranking the web pages in search results is the so-called PageRank. For each web page, the PageRank value provides a measure of its importance or popularity, which is based on the network structure of the web in terms of the hyperlinks. A page is considered more important and popular if it receives more hyperlinks from other pages and especially those that are important themselves. PageRank has received a great deal of interest in the context of complex networks as it is an effective measure of centrality; see, e.g., [12], [17], [21] and the references therein.

The problem of computing PageRank has been a subject of studies over the years. Despite the simple nature of the problem, because of the problem size involving billions of pages in the web, its efficient computation remains a difficult task. For centralized computation, the simple power method has been the realistic option for this reason. Alternative methods have been studied based on Monte Carlo simulations of the underlying Markov chain (e.g., [2]) and distributed algorithms (e.g., [29], [30]).

This paper follows the line of recent research in systems and control, where PageRank has gained much attention from the viewpoint of distributed algorithms. The approach is to view each web page as an agent which computes its own PageRank value iteratively by communicating with neighbors

connected via hyperlinks. In [16], [17], it was pointed out that the problem shares similarities with the multi-agent consensus problem [6], [24], and randomized distributed algorithms were developed. To cope with the network size, the pages determine to initiate updates randomly, which is called gossiping; for the use of randomization techniques in the systems control literature, see [33]. The method is guaranteed to converge in the mean-square sense. However, it involves the time averaging of the state values, resulting in the convergence rate of order $1/k$ with respect to the updating time k .

This approach has been further extended in different directions. An efficient computation scheme based on aggregation of pages is presented in [19], which provides another motivation of our study as we will discuss below. In [36], an alternative analysis of the algorithms was carried out based on methods in stochastic approximation. Moreover, in [7], [18], [22], different probability distributions are employed for the randomization. Related studies on distributed computation of PageRank include [26]–[28]. More in general, distributed computation of other network centrality measures is studied in, e.g., [25], [34]. Other works considered the problem of optimizing PageRank for pages of interest by changing the link structure [8], [10] and a game theoretic analysis for enhancing PageRank via page aggregation [23].

More recently, distributed algorithms for PageRank demonstrating exponential convergence speeds were proposed. In [35], the PageRank problem is formulated as a least squares problem and then a gradient-based distributed algorithm is applied. The algorithm in [20] introduces an additional feature to maintain the state to be a probability vector throughout the iterations. The work [9] employs techniques from matching pursuit algorithms and presents a randomized version.

In this paper, we introduce a new approach for interpreting the PageRank problem by reexamining its definition. The idea is quite simple, but as a consequence, we arrive at a set of very efficient distributed algorithms. We propose algorithms for both synchronous and asynchronous cases in the communication among the linked pages and fully analyze their convergence properties, which are shown to be exponential. In particular, for the asynchronous case, we first employ randomization-based gossiping, but then extend the approach to deterministic gossiping, where multiple pages may be selected to simultaneously make updates. As long as each page updates its state infinitely often, convergence to its corresponding PageRank value is guaranteed.

The highlight of this work is that through this development, we become able to construct an efficient algorithm based on clustering of web pages for distributed computation of PageRank. As the web inherently has a hierarchical structure,

A. Suzuki and H. Ishii are with the Department of Computer Science, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Yokohama, 226-8502, Japan. E-mails: suzuki@sc.dis.titech.ac.jp, ishii@c.titech.ac.jp

This work was supported in part by the JST CREST Grant No. JP-MJCR15K3 and by JSPS under Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Grant No. 15H04020 and No. 18H01460.

clustering can be easily carried out, for example, by grouping pages in the same domains or subdomains. In this context, instead of the pages, it is the groups that initiate updates for their member pages. When a group determines to do so, the pages in the group make calculations by interacting among themselves, which is equivalent to iterating infinitely many times. Such updates can actually be performed in one step, expressed as matrix operations involving only local states. Part of the computation can be completed offline based on the information of the link structure within the group. Hence, the additional requirement for computation should be limited. We demonstrate the fast convergence performance in numerical examples using real web data.

The novel aspects of our approach can be summarized as follows. First, the reformulation idea is simple and its advantage may not be immediately clear. This is partly because additional states are introduced for the pages, which may increase the computational burden. In fact, in the synchronous case, the convergence is not necessarily faster than the power method. Second, in the proposed algorithms, the states are guaranteed to reach the true PageRank values from below in a monotonic fashion. Hence, even if randomization is adopted, the responses of the states are smooth, which may explain the efficiency of the approach. Third, the pages communicate only over their outgoing hyperlinks and do not require the knowledge of the incoming ones; this is another advantage of the schemes in comparison with conventional methods.

In the clustering-based algorithm, pages within each group collectively update their values and the exact values of PageRank can be obtained. It is emphasized that this approach relies on the properties of the specific schemes developed in this paper. In gossiping for page selections, no specific randomization is required especially for obtaining the true PageRank. Moreover, multiple pages can make updates at the same time partly due to the simple communication scheme.

It is remarked that for large-scale computation, a related, but slightly different approach based on web aggregation has been studied as well. There, aggregated PageRank values representing the groups are computed first, and then a more local computation takes place within groups to assign values to individual pages, which typically results in approximation in the final values. Such studies can be found, for example, in [21], [37] using classical methods in Markov chains and in [5] via extensive simulations. The work [19] developed a method motivated by the studies on large-scale systems based on singular perturbation analyses for Markov chains (e.g., [1]) and consensus networks (e.g., [3]).

This paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we first give a brief overview of the PageRank problem and then introduce an alternative formulation. In Section III, a novel distributed algorithm based on randomized gossiping is presented along with an analysis on their convergence properties. In Section IV, we extend our approach and develop a generalized distributed algorithm. This is then further exploited to deal with clustering-based calculations in Section V. Illustrative numerical examples are provided in Section VI. The paper is finally concluded in Section VII. Preliminary versions of this paper have appeared as [31], [32]. The current paper provides

the full proofs of the results and extended discussions along with a numerical example of larger scale.

Notation: For vectors and matrices, inequalities are used to denote entry-wise inequalities: For $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $X \leq Y$ implies $x_{ij} \leq y_{ij}$ for all i, j ; in particular, we say that the matrix X is nonnegative if $X \geq 0$ and positive if $X > 0$. A probability vector is a nonnegative vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i = 1$. A matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be (column) stochastic if it is nonnegative and each column sum equals 1, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij} = 1$ for each j . Let $\mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vector whose entries are all 1 as $\mathbf{1}_n := [1 \cdots 1]^T$. For a discrete set \mathcal{D} , its cardinality is given by $|\mathcal{D}|$.

II. A NOVEL APPROACH TOWARDS PAGERANK

In this section, we briefly introduce the notion of PageRank and its interpretation commonly employed for its computation. Then, we discuss an alternative formulation of the problem, which will lead us to a novel class of distributed algorithms.

A. The PageRank Problem

The computation of PageRank proposed by Brin and Page [4] starts with regarding the entire web as a directed graph. Let n be the number of pages; we assume $n \geq 2$ to avoid the trivial case. The web graph is given by $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{V} := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is the set of vertices representing the web pages, and \mathcal{E} is the set of hyperlinks connecting the pages. Here, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ holds if and only if page i has a hyperlink to page j . Hyperlinks are not always mutual, so this graph is generally a directed graph. For node i , let the set of outgoing neighbors and that of incoming neighbors be given, respectively, by $\mathcal{L}_i^{\text{out}} := \{j : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_i^{\text{in}} := \{j : (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

When a node does not have any outgoing link, it is referred to as a dangling node. Here, to simplify the discussion, we assume that all pages have at least one outgoing hyperlink. This is commonly done by slightly modifying the structure of the web, specifically by adding hyperlinks from such dangling nodes, which correspond to the use of back buttons; see, e.g., [21], [22] for more details.

Next, we define the hyperlink matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of this graph by

$$a_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n_j} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{out}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_i^{\text{out}}$ is the set of outgoing neighbors of page i and n_i is its cardinality. By the assumption that all pages have one or more hyperlinks, this matrix A is stochastic.

For the web consisting of n pages, the PageRank vector $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as

$$x^* = (1 - m)Ax^* + \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n, \quad \mathbf{1}_n^T x^* = 1, \quad (1)$$

where the parameter is chosen as $m \in (0, 1)$; in this paper, we take the commonly used value $m = 0.15$.

The definition in (1) can be rewritten as

$$x^* = Mx^*, \quad \mathbf{1}_n^T x^* = 1, \quad (2)$$

where the modified link matrix M is given by $M = (1 - m)A + (m/n)\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^T$. Since M is a convex combination of




Fig. 1. An example graph with seven nodes

two stochastic matrices A and $(1/n)\mathbf{1}_n\mathbf{1}_n^T$, it is stochastic as well. It is now clear that x^* is the eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue 1 of the link matrix M .

For its computation, the PageRank vector x^* can be obtained by solving the linear equation (1) or (2). However, due to its large dimension, the computation must rely on simple algorithms. It is common to use the power method given by the iteration of the form

$$x(k+1) = (1-m)Ax(k) + \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n, \quad (3)$$

where $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state whose initial value $x(0)$ can be taken as any probability vector. By Perron's theorem [14], it follows that $x(k) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 1 Consider the web consisting of seven pages depicted in Fig. 1. We can calculate the PageRank vector of this graph as

$$x^* = [0.316 \ 0.259 \ 0.156 \ 0.132 \ 0.0951 \ 0.0214 \ 0.0214]^T.$$

Note that the indices of the pages are given according to the order of their PageRank values. Pages 1 and 2 rank the first and second, which can be due to having, respectively, 4 and 3 incoming links. Pages 3 and 4 have only 1 incoming link, but take better rankings than page 5, which has 3 links. This is because the ranks depend not only on the number of incoming links, but also on the values of the pages from which the links originate. In this respect, pages 3 and 4 are clearly advantageous, being neighbors of pages 1 and 2. Pages 6 and 7 have no incoming hyperlink and, as a result, take the lowest possible value, which is equal to $m/n = 0.15/7 = 0.0214$.

B. Reformulation of the PageRank Problem

Now, we present a new formulation of PageRank by transforming its original definition. This formulation becomes the key for developing novel distributed algorithms. The idea itself is simple, but its advantage in the context of distributed computation of PageRank will become clear.

The formula of PageRank in (1) can be transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} x^* &= (1-m)Ax^* + \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n \\ \iff x^* &= (I - (1-m)A)^{-1} \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n \\ \iff x^* &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} ((1-m)A)^t \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In the last transformation, the Neumann series (e.g., [14]) is applied. Notice that $(1-m)A$ is a Schur stable matrix because the link matrix A is stochastic with spectral radius equal to 1.

The formula in (4) implies that the PageRank computation can be carried out iteratively in several ways. It is immediate to write down an equation for the state $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ given by

$$x(k) = \sum_{t=0}^k ((1-m)A)^t \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n. \quad (5)$$

Clearly, the power method in (3) is a compact way to realize this using only $x(k)$ as the state.

Another approach is to use a slightly redundant iteration by using an additional state. This is denoted by $z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Set the initial states as $x(0) = z(0) = (m/n)\mathbf{1}_n$. Then, the update scheme of the two states is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x(k+1) &= x(k) + (1-m)Az(k), \\ z(k+1) &= (1-m)Az(k). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Through this alternative algorithm, we can obtain the PageRank vector x^* . We formally state this along with its other properties as a lemma in the following. Similar properties will appear in our development of distributed algorithms later.

Lemma 1 In the update scheme in (6), the states $x(k)$ and $z(k)$ satisfy the following:

- (i) $z(k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.
- (ii) $x(k) \leq x(k+1) \leq x^*$ for k .
- (iii) $x(k) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: (i) As the link matrix A is stochastic, its spectral radius equals 1, and thus $(1-m)A$ is a Schur stable matrix. This implies that $z(k)$ converges to zero.

(ii) Note that $z(k) \geq 0$ because A is stochastic and $z(0) > 0$. Furthermore, we have $x(0) > 0$. Thus, it is clear that $x(k)$ is nondecreasing as a function of k . The fact that it is upper bounded by x^* follows from (iii), which is shown next.

(iii) From (6), we can write $x(k)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k) &= x(0) + \sum_{t=1}^k z(t) = x(0) + \sum_{t=1}^k ((1-m)A)^t z(0) \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^k ((1-m)A)^t \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This and (4) indicate that $x(k)$ converges to x^* as $k \rightarrow \infty$. ■

We have a few remarks on the alternative approach introduced above in comparison with the power method in (3). First, the computation requires the second state $z(k)$ in addition to $x(k)$. As seen in (7), this state $z(k)$ is integrated over time to compute $x(k)$ in (5). Second, the initial values of $x(k)$ and $z(k)$ are fixed to $(m/n)\mathbf{1}_n$, and there is no freedom in these choices. Hence, each time the computation takes place through the update scheme (6), the algorithm cannot make use of the PageRank values computed in the past as initial guesses. This point may be a limitation of this approach. Also, the initial states are not probability vectors as in the power method. In fact, $x(k)$ becomes a probability vector only after converging to x^* . Third, notice that m/n is the minimum PageRank value, which will be assigned to pages having no

incoming links. For such pages, the states will not change during the updates.

C. Distributed Algorithm for Synchronous Updates

One interpretation of (6) from the perspective of distributed algorithms can be given as follows:

- 1) At time 0, all pages start with the value m/n .
- 2) At time k , each page attenuates its current value by $1 - m$ and then sends it to its linked pages after equally dividing it. At that time, page i computes the weighted sum of the values received from the neighbors having links to the page.

Though we do not discuss in this paper, there is a generalized PageRank definition which uses a probability vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ instead of $(1/n)\mathbf{1}_n$, that is, $x^* = (1 - m)Ax^* + mv$. In such a case, the proposed algorithm can be modified by replacing the initial states with $x(0) = z(0) = mv$.

We finally present a distributed algorithm based on (6).

Algorithm 1 (Synchronous Distributed Algorithm)

- 1) For page i , set the initial values as $x_i(0) = z_i(0) = m/n$.
- 2) At time k , page i transmits its value $z_i(k)$ to its neighbors along its outgoing links and then updates its states to obtain $x_i(k+1)$ and $z_i(k+1)$ according to

$$x_i(k+1) = x_i(k) + \sum_{j: i \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{out}}} \frac{1-m}{n_j} z_j(k),$$

$$z_i(k+1) = \sum_{j: i \in \mathcal{L}_j^{\text{out}}} \frac{1-m}{n_j} z_j(k).$$

As we show through simulations in Section VI, this synchronized algorithm may not be particularly fast, especially in comparison with the power method. Moreover, due to the additional state $z(k)$, the algorithm requires more memory. The advantage of the proposed reformulation however becomes evident in the asynchronous versions of this distributed algorithm, which will be presented in the next section.

III. GOSSIP-TYPE DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHMS

We now develop asynchronous versions of the distributed algorithm. They are based on randomized communication among the pages, which is referred to as gossiping.

In the asynchronous update schemes, at each time k , one page is randomly chosen, which transmits its current state value to the linked pages. We present two algorithms which differ in their probability distributions for selecting the updating pages. One uses the uniform distribution and the other is more general. In both cases, the distributions remain fixed throughout the execution of the algorithms; thus, the updating pages are chosen in an independently identically distributed (i.i.d.) manner. Denote by $\theta(k) \in \mathcal{V}$ the selected page at time k . In the section on numerical examples, it will be shown that nonuniform distribution may be beneficial from the perspective of convergence speed.

A. Algorithm Based on the Uniform Distribution

We consider the case where the selection of the updating pages follows the uniform distribution. The proposed distributed algorithm for this case is provided below.

Algorithm 2 (Distributed Randomized Algorithm)

- 1) For page $i \in \mathcal{V}$, set the initial values as $x_i(0) = z_i(0) = m/n$.
- 2) At time k , select one page $\theta(k)$ based on the uniform distribution:

$$\text{Prob}\{\theta(k) = i\} = \frac{1}{n} \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (8)$$

- 3) Page $\theta(k)$ transmits its value $z_{\theta(k)}(k)$ over its outgoing links to pages in $\mathcal{L}_{\theta(k)}^{\text{out}}$.
- 4) Each page $i \in \mathcal{V}$ updates its states to obtain $x_i(k+1)$ and $z_i(k+1)$ as

$$x_i(k+1) = \begin{cases} x_i(k) + \frac{1-m}{n_{\theta(k)}} z_{\theta(k)}(k) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{L}_{\theta(k)}^{\text{out}}, \\ x_i(k) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$z_i(k+1) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = \theta(k), \\ z_i(k) + \frac{1-m}{n_{\theta(k)}} z_{\theta(k)}(k) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{L}_{\theta(k)}^{\text{out}}, \\ z_i(k) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The resemblance of this algorithm to Algorithm 1 is obvious. The two states $x_i(k)$ and $z_i(k)$ play similar roles in both algorithms. The differences are that in the asynchronous case, the updates are made with one neighbor at a time, and also both $x_i(k)$ and $z_i(k)$ are integrated over time. For $z_i(k)$, this was not the case in Algorithm 1. The two variables are updated differently when page i is the selected page $\theta(k)$ at time k as in such cases, its own $z_i(k)$ is set to zero. By contrast, in Algorithm 1, $z_i(k)$ is zero only in the case where page i has no incoming link.

We now rewrite this algorithm in a vector form. First, let

$$Q := (1 - m)A. \quad (10)$$

Denote by e_i and q_i , respectively, the i th columns of the $(n \times n)$ -identity matrix and Q for $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Then, we define the matrices $Q_i, R_i, S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$, by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i &:= [e_1 \ e_2 \ \cdots \ e_{i-1} \ q_i \ e_{i+1} \ \cdots \ e_n], \\ R_i &:= [0_n \ 0_n \ \cdots \ 0_n \ q_i \ 0_n \ \cdots \ 0_n], \\ S_i &:= [e_1 \ e_2 \ \cdots \ e_{i-1} \ 0_n \ e_{i+1} \ \cdots \ e_n], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where in both Q_i and R_i , it is the i th column that is equal to q_i , and in S_i , only the i th column is zero. Note that the matrices Q, Q_i, R_i , and S_i are all nonnegative matrices for $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, by definition, it holds $Q_i = R_i + S_i$.

As in the synchronous case, the initial states are taken as $x(0) = z(0) = (m/n)\mathbf{1}_n$. The update schemes in (9) for the two states can be written in the compact form as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k+1) &= x(k) + R_{\theta(k)} z(k), \\ z(k+1) &= Q_{\theta(k)} z(k), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\theta(k)$ is the page selected for updating at time k in step 2) of the algorithm.

We are now ready to present the main result for this distributed algorithm for PageRank computation. It shows that the true PageRank values can be obtained almost surely.

Theorem 1 Under Algorithm 2, the PageRank vector x^* is computed with $x(k) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with probability 1. In particular, the following two properties hold:

- (i) $x(k) \leq x(k+1) \leq x^*$ holds for $k \geq 0$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}[x(k)] \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and the convergence speed is exponential.

We first show the following lemma regarding the synchronous update scheme (6). It is a simple result, but will be useful in the proofs of different results in this paper. Denote by $x_s(k)$ and $z_s(k)$ the states in (6). Let

$$\tilde{Q}_s(k) := Q^{k+1}. \quad (13)$$

Also, let $q_{ij} := [Q]_{ij} = (1-m)a_{ij}$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$. Clearly, $q_{ij} \geq 0$ holds for any i, j .

Lemma 2 The state $x_s(k)$ of the synchronous update scheme (6) can be expressed as

$$x_s(k) = \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \tilde{Q}_s(t) \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n, \quad k \geq 0. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, the (i, j) th element of the matrix $\tilde{Q}_s(t)$ in (13) can be written as

$$[\tilde{Q}_s(t)]_{ij} = \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_t \in \mathcal{V}} q_{im_t} q_{m_t m_{t-1}} \cdots q_{m_1 j} \quad \text{for } i, j. \quad (15)$$

In the summation in (15), it is clear that the term $q_{im_t} q_{m_t m_{t-1}} \cdots q_{m_1 j}$ is nonzero if and only if there exists a sequence of hyperlinks $(j, m_1), (m_1, m_2), \dots, (m_t, m_{t-1}), (i, m_t) \in \mathcal{E}$ in the web graph. It is however noted that such a property will not be explicitly used in our analysis.

Proof: From the update scheme in (6) and the definition of Q in (10), we have

$$x_s(k+1) = x_s(k) + Qz_s(k), \quad z_s(k+1) = Qz_s(k).$$

Thus, it follows that $z_s(k) = Q^k z_s(0)$. Furthermore,

$$x_s(k) = x_s(0) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} Qz_s(t) = x_s(0) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} Q^{t+1} z_s(0).$$

Since the initial states are set as $x_s(0) = z_s(0) = (m/n)\mathbf{1}_n$, we obtain (14).

Because $\tilde{Q}_s(t) = Q^{t+1}$, we have that $[\tilde{Q}_s(t)]_{ij}$ is the summation of all terms that can be expressed as the product $q_{im_t} q_{m_t m_{t-1}} \cdots q_{m_1 j}$ of $t+1$ elements in the matrix Q , where m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t are all taken from \mathcal{V} . Thus, we have (15). ■

Proof of Theorem 1: (i) Since both $Q_{\theta(k)}$ and $R_{\theta(k)}$ are nonnegative, by (12), $x(k)$ and $z(k)$ are nonnegative at all k . In particular, $x(k)$ is a nondecreasing function of time, i.e., $x(k) \leq x(k+1)$ holds.

Next, we show $x(k) \leq x^*$. This is done by proving

$$x(k) \leq x_s(k) \quad \text{for } k \geq 0, \quad (16)$$

where $x_s(k)$ is the state of the synchronous update scheme in (6). Then, by Lemma 1 (ii), we obtain $x(k) \leq x_s(k) \leq x^*$.

For $k=0$, we have $x(0) = x_s(0)$ and thus (16) holds. For $k \geq 1$, the state $z(k)$ in (12) can be written as

$$z(k) = Q_{\theta(k-1)} Q_{\theta(k-2)} \cdots Q_{\theta(0)} z(0).$$

Thus, we can express $x(k)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k) &= x(0) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} R_{\theta(t)} z(t) \\ &= \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} R_{\theta(t)} Q_{\theta(t-1)} Q_{\theta(t-2)} \cdots Q_{\theta(0)} \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

For $k \geq 0$, define the nonnegative matrix $\tilde{Q}_{\theta}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by

$$\tilde{Q}_{\theta}(k) := R_{\theta(k)} Q_{\theta(k-1)} Q_{\theta(k-2)} \cdots Q_{\theta(0)}. \quad (18)$$

Then, we have from (17)

$$x(k) = \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \tilde{Q}_{\theta}(t) \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n. \quad (19)$$

By comparing (19) with (14) in Lemma 2, we observe that for establishing (16), it suffices to show the inequality below:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \tilde{Q}_{\theta}(t) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \tilde{Q}_s(t) \quad \text{for } k \geq 1. \quad (20)$$

In particular, we should show

$$[\tilde{Q}_{\theta}(t)]_{ij} \leq [\tilde{Q}_s(t)]_{ij} \quad \text{for } i, j \text{ and } t = 0, \dots, k-1. \quad (21)$$

The approach for its proof is to establish that any term appearing on the left-hand side in (21) always appears in the right-hand side. Since all terms are nonnegative, the inequality (21) implies (20). The right-hand side of (21) is written out in (15) of Lemma 2.

In what follows, we obtain the formula for the left-hand side of (21), that is, $[\tilde{Q}_{\theta}(t)]_{ij}$. Recall that by (11), we have $Q_i = R_i + S_i$. Hence, by using R_i and S_i , we can write $\tilde{Q}_{\theta}(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{\theta}(t) &= R_{\theta(t)} Q_{\theta(t-1)} Q_{\theta(t-2)} \cdots Q_{\theta(0)} \\ &= R_{\theta(t)} (R_{\theta(t-1)} + S_{\theta(t-1)}) \cdots (R_{\theta(0)} + S_{\theta(0)}). \end{aligned}$$

We must compute the products of R_i and S_i appearing on the far right-hand side above.

To this end, we derive a formula for the product where R_i appears $\ell \leq t+1$ times and S_i appears $k_{\ell} - \ell \leq t$ times:

$$R_{\theta(k_{\ell})} \underbrace{\cdots}_{0 \text{ or more } S_i} R_{\theta(k_{\ell}-1)} \underbrace{\cdots}_{0 \text{ or more } S_i} \cdots R_{\theta(k_1)} \underbrace{\cdots}_{0 \text{ or more } S_i}, \quad (22)$$

where $0 \leq k_1 < \cdots < k_{\ell} = t \leq k-1$. By (11), in R_i , all elements except the i th column are 0 while S_i is equal to the identity matrix except for the i th column, which is a zero vector. These facts lead us to the following relation for arbitrary i, j :

$$R_i S_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = j, \\ R_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Thus, the product in (22) becomes zero if one of the following conditions holds:

- $\theta(k_\ell)$ is equal to one of $\theta(k_\ell - 1), \dots, \theta(k_{\ell-1} + 1)$;
- $\theta(k_{\ell-1})$ is equal to one of $\theta(k_{\ell-1} - 1), \dots, \theta(k_{\ell-2} + 1)$;
- \dots
- $\theta(k_1)$ is equal to one of $\theta(k_1 - 1), \dots, \theta(0)$.

Otherwise, the term in (22) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{\theta(k_\ell)} \underbrace{\quad \cdots \quad}_{0 \text{ or more } S_i} R_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})} \underbrace{\quad \cdots \quad}_{0 \text{ or more } S_i} \cdots R_{\theta(k_1)} \underbrace{\quad \cdots \quad}_{0 \text{ or more } S_i} \\ &= R_{\theta(k_\ell)} R_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})} \cdots R_{\theta(k_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

For the product of R_i above, we can use the formula

$$R_i R_j = q_{ij} R_j^{(i)},$$

where the matrix $R_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is nonzero only in the j th column as

$$R_j^{(i)} := [0_n \quad 0_n \quad \cdots \quad 0_n \quad q_i \quad 0_n \quad \cdots \quad 0_n].$$

We also need another formula that holds for arbitrary i, j, m :

$$R_j^{(i)} R_m = q_{jm} R_m^{(i)}.$$

Then, applying these formulae to the product in (23) repeatedly yields

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{\theta(k_\ell)} R_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})} \cdots R_{\theta(k_1)} \\ &= q_{\theta(k_\ell)\theta(k_{\ell-1})} q_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})\theta(k_{\ell-2})} \cdots q_{\theta(k_2)\theta(k_1)} R_{\theta(k_1)}^{(\theta(k_\ell))}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the (i, j) th element is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} & [R_{\theta(k_\ell)} R_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})} \cdots R_{\theta(k_1)}]_{ij} \\ &= q_{\theta(k_\ell)\theta(k_{\ell-1})} q_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})\theta(k_{\ell-2})} \cdots q_{\theta(k_2)\theta(k_1)} [R_{\theta(k_1)}^{(\theta(k_\ell))}]_{ij} \\ &= \begin{cases} q_i q_{\theta(k_\ell)} q_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})} q_{\theta(k_{\ell-2})} \cdots q_{\theta(k_2)} j & \text{if } \theta(k_1) = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

To prove (21), it remains to show the following: Given the sequence $\{\theta(t)\}_{t=0}^{k-1}$ and time k , for any sequence of nodes $(m_2, \dots, m_\ell) \in \mathcal{V}^{\ell-1}$ with $\ell \leq k-1$, there exists at most one sequence of time $0 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_\ell \leq k-1$ such that

$$[R_{\theta(k_\ell)} R_{\theta(k_{\ell-1})} \cdots R_{\theta(k_1)}]_{ij} = q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \cdots q_{m_2 j} \quad (24)$$

for $i \in \mathcal{V}$, where in the left-hand side, the product of R_i is interpreted as being obtained from (23). This is shown by establishing that if (24) holds, then the sequence of time k_1, \dots, k_ℓ is uniquely determined from $\{\theta(t)\}_{t=0}^{k-1}$. This can be done through the procedure below:

- k_1 is the smallest $t \geq 0$ such that $\theta(t) = j$;
- k_2 is the smallest $t > k_1$ such that $\theta(t) = m_2$;
- \dots
- k_ℓ is the smallest $t > k_{\ell-1}$ such that $\theta(t) = m_\ell$.

We have now proven that (21) holds for arbitrary i, j, k .

(ii) Here, we study the average dynamics of the randomized update scheme (12). To this end, let the average matrices be given by $\bar{Q} := \mathbb{E}[Q_{\theta(k)}]$ and $\bar{R} := \mathbb{E}[R_{\theta(k)}]$. Since the updated pages are selected in an i.i.d. manner from the uniform distribution, we have

$$\bar{Q} = \frac{n-1}{n}I + \frac{1}{n}Q, \quad \bar{R} = \frac{1}{n}Q. \quad (25)$$

Here, by (17), the expectation of $x(k)$ is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[x(k)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} R_{\theta(t)} Q_{\theta(t-1)} \cdots Q_{\theta(0)} \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n\right] \\ &= \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[R_{\theta(t)}] \mathbb{E}[Q_{\theta(t-1)}] \cdots \mathbb{E}[Q_{\theta(0)}] \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n \\ &= \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \bar{R}\bar{Q}^t \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Notice that in the second term in the far right-hand side above, the average link matrix \bar{Q} in (25) is Schur stable since it is a nonnegative matrix whose column sums are equal to $(n-1)/n + (1-m)/n = 1 - m/n < 1$. Thus, taking the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$, we can apply the Neumann series as

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \bar{R}\bar{Q}^t = \bar{R}(I - \bar{Q})^{-1}.$$

Moreover, by (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{R}(I - \bar{Q})^{-1} \\ &= \bar{R}\left[I - \left(\frac{n-1}{n}I + \frac{1}{n}Q\right)\right]^{-1} = n\bar{R}(I - Q)^{-1} \\ &= n\bar{R} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^k Q^t = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q \sum_{t=0}^k Q^t = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=1}^k Q^t. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Substituting this into (26) as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and by (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[x(k)] &= \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \bar{R}\bar{Q}^t \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n \\ &= \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=1}^k Q^t \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} Q^t \frac{m}{n}\mathbf{1}_n = x^*. \end{aligned}$$

From (26), it is clear that $\mathbb{E}[x(k)]$ can be written as a step response of a stable linear time-invariant system. This implies that it converges to x^* exponentially fast. This completes the proof of (ii).

Finally, by property (i) above, $x(k)$ is monotonically nondecreasing and has an upper bound x^* , so $x(k)$ converges with probability 1. Then, due to property (ii), the convergence value for $x(k)$ is x^* . ■

Theorem 1 guarantees that the proposed gossip-based algorithm computes the true PageRank almost surely in a fully distributed fashion. Each page keeps track of its states $x_i(k)$ and $z_i(k)$ and when chosen by $\theta(k)$, it transmits $z_i(k)$ to its neighboring pages along its hyperlinks. Such hyperlinks are clearly known to the pages and the necessary communication is limited with only one value at a time. Other pages not linked by page $\theta(k)$ will simply keep their states unchanged.

The convergence is shown to be exponential in the mean, that is, $\mathbb{E}[x(k)]$ goes to x^* exponentially fast. It is interesting to note that in (27) in the proof, we have not shown $\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \bar{R}\bar{Q}^t = \sum_{t=1}^k Q^t$, which would indicate that in the mean the system is the same as the synchronous one. Indeed, this equality holds only in the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Our method is based on a simple reinterpretation of the definition of PageRank from the systems viewpoint, and it

seems well suited for the PageRank computation in terms of convergence. The distributed algorithms proposed in [9], [20], [35] also have exponential convergence speeds (under different notions). The approaches there rely on techniques for distributed optimization. The work [35] views the PageRank problem as a least-squares problem while [9] employs a randomized version of the so-called matching pursuit algorithms. On the other hand, in [20], a modified gradient-descent algorithm is constructed so that the states of all pages remain to have the total equal to one throughout its execution.

It is highlighted that our approach has an advantage in terms of the communication loads for each node. As seen earlier, in the update scheme, the nodes need to transmit their values only over their outgoing links, and no further communication is necessary. The same type of communication scheme is adopted in [11], which is an extension of those in [16], and thus the algorithms there do not exhibit exponential convergence. Similarly, in the algorithm of [9], the nodes utilize only the outgoing links, but there is a difference in that the nodes must also receive the values from the linked pages during the same time step, and hence communication is always bidirectional. Meanwhile, the knowledge of the pages connected by the incoming links is necessary in [35]. The scheme in [20] requires communication along both incoming and outgoing links. In this respect, among the different approaches, our Algorithm 2 is superior in requiring the least amount of communication per update. Further discussions on comparisons of the methods can be found in [15].

B. Generalization to Non-Uniform Distributions

We next generalize the gossip-type distributed algorithm to the case where the pages will be chosen from distributions not limited to the uniform one. This extension is an interesting feature of the proposed approach and makes the algorithm more suitable for its use in distributed environments. For example, depending on the computational and communication resources, the pages or the servers that carry out the PageRank computation may adjust to update at different frequencies [7].

The update scheme here follows Algorithm 2. Consider an i.i.d. random sequence $\{\theta(k)\}$ for the page selections. Let p_i be the probability of page i to be chosen. Assume that $p_i > 0$ for i and $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$. In Algorithm 2, step 2) should be replaced with the following

2)' Select one page $\theta(k)$ based on the distribution p_i :

$$\text{Prob}\{\theta(k) = i\} = p_i \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (28)$$

For this algorithm, we now state the main result.

Proposition 1 Under Algorithm 2 using step 2)' introduced above, the PageRank vector x^* is computed with $x(k) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with probability 1.

Proof: This proposition can be established similarly to Theorem 1 by showing the properties (i) and (ii), where the main difference is in (ii). Let the matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the diagonal matrix whose i th diagonal entry is p_i , i.e.,

$P := \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$. By $p_i > 0$, P is nonsingular. Next, let the average matrices of $Q_{\theta(k)}$ and $R_{\theta(k)}$ be respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{Q}' &:= \mathbb{E}[Q_{\theta(k)}] = (I - P) + QP, \\ \overline{R}' &:= \mathbb{E}[R_{\theta(k)}] = QP. \end{aligned}$$

These matrices are nonnegative. Moreover, for \overline{Q}' , the sum of its i th column is equal to $1 - mp_i$; this means that it has the spectral radius $\max_i 1 - mp_i < 1$ and thus is Schur stable. Now, as in the discussion around (26), we can establish

$$\mathbb{E}[x(k)] = \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \overline{R}' (\overline{Q}')^t \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n.$$

For the summation in the right-hand side, take the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ and then apply the Neumann series to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \overline{R}' (\overline{Q}')^t &= \overline{R}' (I - \overline{Q}')^{-1} \\ &= \overline{R}' [I - ((I - P) + QP)]^{-1} = \overline{R}' P^{-1} (I - Q)^{-1} \\ &= \overline{R}' P^{-1} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=0}^k Q^t = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (QP) P^{-1} \sum_{t=0}^k Q^t \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=1}^k Q^t. \end{aligned}$$

This expression is the same as (27). The rest of the proof follows similarly to the proof of Theorem 1 (ii). ■

This gossip-type distributed algorithm can be carried out even if the probability distribution for the page selection is not uniform. Though other algorithms may be able to deal with non-uniform selections [7], [18], [22], in those cases, additional computations and adjustments are often required. In contrast, in our algorithm, no change is necessary, and the update scheme performed by each page is exactly the same. We have seen that the state values increase monotonically to reach the true PageRank. This might indicate that increasing the selection probability of a page with a large value may lead to faster convergence. We will examine this idea in the numerical example later.

IV. GENERALIZATION OF THE APPROACH

We extend the randomization-based distributed algorithms developed in the previous section in two directions to enhance their convergence performance and also the flexibility in implementation.

First, while Algorithm 2 is restricted to allowing only one page to initiate an update at a time, here we realize simultaneous updates by multiple nodes in distributed computation. The other extension is to incorporate update times which are deterministic so that no randomization is necessary. It will be shown that an algorithm with these novel features possess similar convergence properties.

In the proposed algorithm, we denote the set of updating pages chosen at time k by $\phi(k) \subset \mathcal{V}$. This set need not be randomly determined and may contain arbitrary number of page indices. We now introduce the algorithm in the following.

Algorithm 3 (Distributed Algorithm with Simultaneous Updates)

- 1) For each page $i \in \mathcal{V}$, set the initial states as $x_i(0) = z_i(0) = m/n$.
- 2) At time k , each page i decides whether to make an update or not. Let $\phi(k) \subset \mathcal{V}$ be the set of indices of all pages that decided to make an update.
- 3) Each page $i \in \phi(k)$ transmits its value $z_i(k)$ over its outgoing links to pages in $\mathcal{L}_i^{\text{out}}$.
- 4) Each page $i \in \mathcal{V}$ makes an update in its states to obtain $x_i(k+1)$ and $z_i(k+1)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(k+1) &= x_i(k) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}_i^{\text{in}} \cap \phi(k)} \frac{1-m}{n_j} z_j(k), \\ z_i(k+1) &= \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}_i^{\text{in}} \cap \phi(k)} \frac{1-m}{n_j} z_j(k) & \text{if } i \in \phi(k), \\ z_i(k) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}_i^{\text{in}} \cap \phi(k)} \frac{1-m}{n_j} z_j(k) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

This algorithm has a structure similar to that of Algorithm 2. The communication load is minimal since the pages that initiate updates in step 2) transmit only their states $z_i(k)$ and not $x_i(k)$, and this is done over their outgoing hyperlinks. In step 4), the update scheme (29) for the states is a generalized version of the one in (9) from Algorithm 2. The pages receiving state values over their incoming edges are characterized by having a nonempty set $\mathcal{L}_i^{\text{in}} \cap \phi(k)$, and only these pages make changes in their states.

For the set $\phi \subset \mathcal{V}$ of chosen pages, we introduce three nonnegative matrices Q_ϕ , R_ϕ , and S_ϕ as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\phi &= [q_1(\phi) \quad \cdots \quad q_n(\phi)], \\ R_\phi &= [r_1(\phi) \quad \cdots \quad r_n(\phi)], \\ S_\phi &= [s_1(\phi) \quad \cdots \quad s_n(\phi)], \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where the component vectors $q_i(\phi)$, $r_i(\phi)$, and $s_i(\phi)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} q_i(\phi) &= \begin{cases} q_i & \text{if } i \in \phi, \\ e_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad r_i(\phi) = \begin{cases} q_i & \text{if } i \in \phi, \\ 0_n & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ s_i(\phi) &= \begin{cases} 0_n & \text{if } i \in \phi, \\ e_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We note that the following three relations hold:

$$R_\phi = \sum_{i \in \phi} R_i, \quad (31)$$

$$Q_\phi = R_\phi + S_\phi, \quad (32)$$

$$R_i S_\phi = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in \phi, \\ R_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

With these matrices, we can write the update scheme of Algorithm 3 in a vector form as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k+1) &= x(k) + R_{\phi(k)} z(k), \\ z(k+1) &= Q_{\phi(k)} z(k), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where the initial states are $z(0) = x(0) = (m/n)\mathbf{1}_n$.

Regarding the choice of the sequence $\{\phi(k)\}$, we make the following assumption. It says that each page must initiate the updates of its states infinitely often over time.

Assumption 1 Each page $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is contained in infinitely many sets $\phi(0), \phi(1), \dots, \phi(k), \dots$

We are now in the position to state the main result for the distributed algorithm with multiple updates.

Theorem 2 Under Assumption 1, in the distributed algorithm with simultaneous updates of Algorithm 3, the state $x(k)$ converges to the true PageRank vector x^* , that is, $x(k) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If, in addition, for some $T > 0$, each page updates at least once in every T steps, then the convergence to x^* is exponential.

The proof of this theorem is a generalization of that for Theorem 1 for Algorithm 2. It consists of showing two properties similar to (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1. Here, we state the first property as a lemma. Its proof is given in Appendix A, which follows similar lines as that of Theorem 1, but is more technical and involved.

Lemma 3 Under Assumption 1, in the distributed algorithm with simultaneous updates of Algorithm 3, it holds $x(k) \leq x(k+1) \leq x^*$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Proof of Theorem 2: By Lemma 3, the state $x(k)$ of Algorithm 3 converges to some vector $x' \leq x^*$. We must show that this x' is always equal to x^* . Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $k_s(\varepsilon)$ be the step number $k \geq 1$ such that under the synchronous update scheme (6), whose states are denoted by $x_s(k)$ and $z_s(k)$, the error bound of

$$\|x_s(k) - x^*\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$$

is achieved for the first time. By Lemma 1, in the synchronous algorithm, the error $x_s(k) - x^*$ asymptotically converges to zero. Thus, for any given ε , a finite value for k_s always exists.

Next, for a given sequence $\{\phi(k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$, we recursively define the time sequence $\{\delta(k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ by $\delta(0) = -1$ and

$$\delta(k) = \min \left\{ \ell > \delta(k-1) : \bigcup_{t=\delta(k-1)+1}^{\ell} \phi(t) = \mathcal{V} \right\} \quad (35)$$

for $k \geq 1$. By definition, during the time interval from $\delta(k-1)$ to $\delta(k)$, all nodes $1, 2, \dots, n$ are chosen at least once. By Assumption 1, this sequence $\{\delta(k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is well defined.

To establish that the state $x(k)$ converges to x^* , we must show that for arbitrary ε , the following inequality holds:

$$x^* > x(\delta(k_s(\varepsilon))) \geq x_s(k_s(\varepsilon)). \quad (36)$$

This relation indicates that as the state $x_s(k)$ of the synchronous algorithm converges to the PageRank vector x^* , it will be followed by the state $x(k)$ of Algorithm 3 at a slower speed governed by $\delta(k)$.

In what follows, we prove the relation

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\delta(k_s(\varepsilon))} [\tilde{Q}_\phi(t)]_{ij} \geq \sum_{t=0}^{k_s(\varepsilon)} [\tilde{Q}_s(t)]_{ij} \quad \text{for } i, j. \quad (37)$$

Note that this relation is similar to (52) in the proof of Lemma 3, but with the difference in the direction of the inequality and the times over which the summations are taken. By (15) of Lemma 2, we can rewrite the right-hand side of (37) as

$$\sum_{t=0}^{k_s(\varepsilon)} \left[\tilde{Q}_s(t) \right]_{ij} = \sum_{t=0}^{k_s(\varepsilon)} \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_t \in \mathcal{V}} q_{im_t} q_{m_t m_{t-1}} \cdots q_{m_1 j}.$$

We now focus on the left-hand side of (37). Note that similarly to the proof of Lemma 3, it is the sum of the terms appearing in (56) at most once. For each $t \leq \{0, 1, \dots, k_s(\varepsilon)\}$, consider the ordered set of nodes, $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t) \in \mathcal{V}^t$. We show that for each i, j , the term $q_{im_t} q_{m_t m_{t-1}} \cdots q_{m_1 j}$ corresponding to this set of nodes appears once in the left-hand side of (37).

Consider the sequence $(k_{t+1}, k_t, \dots, k_1)$ of time, where

- k_1 is the smallest $\ell \geq 0$ such that $m_1 \in \phi(\ell)$;
- k_2 is the smallest $\ell > k_1$ such that $m_2 \in \phi(\ell)$;
- ...
- k_t is the smallest $\ell > k_{t-1}$ such that $m_t \in \phi(k)$.

The sequence $(k_{t+1}, k_t, \dots, k_1)$ exists. This is because by the choice of $\delta(\cdot)$ in (35), it holds $\delta(t-1) < k_t \leq \delta(t)$. Therefore, it follows that the left-hand side of (37) is a sum of nonnegative terms, and moreover, it contains all terms appearing in the right-hand side. We therefore conclude that the relations (37) and thus (36) hold.

Since this holds for arbitrary ε , it finally follows that $x(k)$ converges to x^* . Under the additional assumption that each page updates at least once in every T steps, it holds $\delta(k+1) - \delta(k) \leq T$. Since $x_s(k)$ exponentially converges to x^* , $x(k)$ does as well. ■

V. CLUSTERING-BASED DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM

In this section, we develop a novel approach based on web clustering for the computation of PageRank.

In this context, web clustering means the following: (i) Prior to running the algorithm, we group the pages, preferably, having strong dependence on each other through hyperlinks. (ii) During the computation, we allow the pages within groups to communicate with each other for updating their states together. That is, in this case, the states are updated not by the individual pages but by the groups. In doing so, we assume that extra computation resources are available locally within the group, which will be exploited to expedite the convergence speed. This scheme is especially suitable in view of the structure of the web since pages belong to domains and subdomains, which can be directly considered as groups.

Even through the grouping, our approach is able to compute the true PageRank values and, more important, this can be realized much more efficiently in terms of computation speed. This advantage is realized by introducing extra local computation in the group-wise updates, where multiplications based on submatrices of the link matrices are performed. In previous research, grouping of pages often arises as part of an aggregation process, where PageRank values representing the groups are computed for reducing the size of the problem; see, e.g., [5], [19], [21], [37].

A. Grouping of Pages

We partition the web consisting of n pages into $N \leq n$ groups, denoted by $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_N \subset \mathcal{V}$. Here, let $l_h := |\mathcal{V}_h|$ be the size of group $h = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Then, the constraints on the grouping are $l_h \geq 1$, $\bigcup_{h=1}^N \mathcal{V}_h = \mathcal{V}$, and $\mathcal{V}_{h_1} \cap \mathcal{V}_{h_2} = \emptyset$ for $h_1 \neq h_2$. It is however expected that the convergence of the computation would be faster if groups are dense in the links among the group member pages and if the numbers of links going outside the groups are small.

The order of the indices can be changed without loss of generality and is done according to the grouping as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_1 &= \{1, 2, \dots, l_1\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_2 &= \{l_1 + 1, l_1 + 2, \dots, l_1 + l_2\}, \\ &\vdots \\ \mathcal{V}_N &= \{n - l_N + 1, n - l_N + 2, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

After this renaming of the pages, let A be the link matrix of the web. Recall that $Q = (1 - m)A$. We partition this matrix Q according to the groups as

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \check{Q}_{11} & \check{Q}_{12} & \cdots & \check{Q}_{1N} \\ \check{Q}_{21} & \check{Q}_{22} & \cdots & \check{Q}_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \check{Q}_{N1} & \check{Q}_{N2} & \cdots & \check{Q}_{NN} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (38)$$

with the submatrices $\check{Q}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_j}$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Similarly, the states $x(k)$ and $z(k)$ are partitioned as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k) &= [\check{x}_1(k)^T \quad \check{x}_2(k)^T \quad \cdots \quad \check{x}_N(k)^T]^T, \\ z(k) &= [\check{z}_1(k)^T \quad \check{z}_2(k)^T \quad \cdots \quad \check{z}_N(k)^T]^T, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where $\check{x}_h(k), \check{z}_h(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{l_h}$ denote the states for group h .

In the clustering-based algorithm to be presented, one group at each time makes an update. The group making updates at time k is denoted by $\psi(k) \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. In Algorithm 3 from Section IV, this can be expressed as $\phi(k) = \mathcal{V}_{\psi(k)}$ at each time k . In the next subsection, we introduce a novel method for accelerating the convergence in the state updates.

B. Group-Based Update Scheme

The idea behind our approach for clustering-based computation is that at time k , the pages within the chosen group $\psi(k)$ make updates at once as in Algorithm 3. The major difference however is that when they do so, they make a large number of updates by exploiting the information locally available within the group. More concretely, at time k , based on their present states $\check{x}_{\psi(k)}(k)$ and $\check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k)$, the members of the group $\psi(k)$ update their states infinitely many times. Then, the asymptotic values will be set as the next states $\check{x}_{\psi(k)}(k+1)$ and $\check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k+1)$. Note that the infinite updates are based only on intra-group communications, and those with pages in other groups will be performed only after the updates in the group are completed. We show that the infinite updates within the group can be done in one step, by small-scale matrix operations.

We first derive the update scheme for the states. At time k , assume that group $\psi(k)$ is chosen to make updates for the

rest of the time $t \geq k$. We write the update scheme in (34) with auxiliary states $x'(t|k)$ and $z'(t|k)$ whose initial values are set as $x'(k|k) = x(k)$ and $z'(k|k) = z(k)$. For time $t \geq k$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} x'(t+1|k) &= x'(t|k) + R_{\psi(k)} z'(t|k), \\ z'(t+1|k) &= Q_{\psi(k)} z'(t|k). \end{aligned}$$

By using the partition of Q in (38), and also by partitioning $x'(t|k)$ and $z'(t|k)$ as in (39), the states in the updating group $\psi(k)$ are given as

$$\begin{aligned} \check{x}'_{\psi(k)}(t+1|k) &= \check{x}'_{\psi(k)}(t|k) + \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)} \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(t|k), \\ \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(t+1|k) &= \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)} \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(t|k). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Moreover, the states in any remaining group $h \neq \psi(k)$ are updated by

$$\begin{aligned} \check{x}'_h(t+1|k) &= \check{x}'_h(t|k) + \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(t|k), \\ \check{z}'_h(t+1|k) &= \check{z}'_h(t|k) + \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(t|k). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

As mentioned above, in this algorithm, the states $x(k+1)$ and $z(k+1)$ are taken as the limits of the states $x'(t|k)$ and $z'(t|k)$ with $t \rightarrow \infty$ while the same group $\psi(k)$ is continuously chosen infinitely many times. First, the state $\check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k+1)$ of the chosen group $\psi(k)$ is set to zero because by (40), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k+1) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(t|k) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}^{t-k} \check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k|k) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Note that the submatrix $\check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}$ is Schur stable since it is a submatrix of Q , which is nonnegative and Schur stable.

Second, from (41), the state $\check{z}_h(k+1)$ of group $h \neq \psi(k)$ can be obtained by using the relation in (42) and by the Schur stability of the matrix $\check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \check{z}_h(k+1) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{z}'_h(t|k) \\ &= \check{z}'_h(k|k) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \sum_{l=k}^{t-1} \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(l|k) \\ &= \check{z}'_h(k|k) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \sum_{l=0}^{t-k-1} \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}^l \check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k|k) \\ &= \check{z}_h(k) + \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \left(I - \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)} \right)^{-1} \check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where in the last equality, the Neumann series is used.

Third, observe in (40) and (41) that the state $\check{x}_h(k+1)$ takes similar forms for both $h = \psi(k)$ and $h \neq \psi(k)$. Thus, by a derivation similar to (43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \check{x}_h(k+1) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{x}'_h(t|k) \\ &= \check{x}'_h(k|k) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \sum_{l=k}^{t-1} \check{z}'_{\psi(k)}(l|k) \\ &= \check{x}_h(k) + \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \left(I - \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)} \right)^{-1} \check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

To summarize the discussion above, by (42)–(44), we arrive at the following distributed algorithm for the PageRank computation based on web clustering.

Algorithm 4 (Clustering-Based Distributed Algorithm)

- 1) For each group $h \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, set the initial values of the states as $\check{x}_h(0) = \check{z}_h(0) = m/n \mathbf{1}_{l_h}$.
- 2) At time k , one group $\psi(k) \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ is chosen for making updates in the states.
- 3) Using its own state $\check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k)$, group $\psi(k)$ computes the auxiliary vector

$$\bar{\check{z}}_{\psi(k)}(k) := (I - \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)})^{-1} \check{z}_{\psi(k)}(k) \quad (45)$$

and transmits it over outgoing links to groups containing pages in $\mathcal{L}_i^{\text{out}}$ for $i \in \psi(k)$.

- 4) Each group h updates its states to obtain $\check{x}_h(k+1)$ and $\check{z}_h(k+1)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \check{x}_h(k+1) &= \check{x}_h(k) + \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \bar{\check{z}}_{\psi(k)}(k), \\ \check{z}_h(k+1) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } h = \psi(k), \\ \check{z}_h(k) + \check{Q}_{h\psi(k)} \bar{\check{z}}_{\psi(k)}(k) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We interpret the updates made by one group $h = \mathcal{V}_{\psi(k)}$ at each time k to be those made by the member pages in the group simultaneously. In this way, the argument in Section IV can be similarly applied to the clustering-based case.

This clustering-based algorithm has several advantageous features in terms of computation speed and distributed implementation. To be more specific, in this algorithm, one update by a group h corresponds to an infinite number of updates by the pages in the group in Algorithm 3. As seen in (45), it involves matrix operations of the size of the group. This can greatly accelerate the convergence in one step compared to the previous algorithms. The performance would likely improve especially by grouping the pages so that more groups consist of dense subgraphs in the web, and/or each group has a limited number of links going outside.

Furthermore, in comparison to Algorithm 3, the main additional computation in the iteration is step 3) for obtaining $\bar{\check{z}}_{\psi(k)}(k)$ in (45). Note however that this is done locally within the group, and $\bar{\check{z}}_{\psi(k)}(k)$ need not be stored for the next step. Also, the matrix inversion for computing $(I - \check{Q}_{hh})^{-1}$ only once within each group h can be performed offline prior to running the algorithm. We should note that the matrix \check{Q}_{hh} may be a sparse matrix in general for PageRank, but the matrix $(I - \check{Q}_{hh})^{-1}$ may have a dense structure.

We express the algorithm above in a vector form. It is useful to notice that by the definition (30) of $R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k)}}$, we have

$$R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k)}}^{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \check{Q}_{1\psi(k)} \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}^t & 0 \\ 0 & \check{Q}_{2\psi(k)} \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}^t & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \check{Q}_{N\psi(k)} \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}^t & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

for $t \geq 0$, where only the columns corresponding to the chosen group $\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k)}$ are nonzero. Due to the matrix $\check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)}$ being




Fig. 2. Time responses of the synchronous algorithms for the small graph: The power method and Algorithm 1

Schur stable, by applying the Neumann series, we obtain

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}^{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \check{Q}_{1\psi(k)}(I - \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \check{Q}_{2\psi(k)}(I - \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \check{Q}_{N\psi(k)}(I - \check{Q}_{\psi(k)\psi(k)})^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Denote this matrix by $\hat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}$. Since the matrix $R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}$ is also Schur stable, it follows that

$$\hat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}} := \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}^{t+1} = R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}(I - R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}})^{-1}. \quad (48)$$

Now, by (47) and (48), the updates of $x(k)$ in (46) of Algorithm 4 can be written as

$$x(k+1) = x(k) + \hat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}z(k).$$

Further, based on (48) and the definition of $S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}$ in (30), we can write the updates of $z(k)$ in (46) as follows:

$$z(k+1) = S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}}(I + \hat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi}^{(k)}})z(k).$$

The initial states are set as $x(0) = z(0) = (m/n)\mathbf{1}_n$.

We introduce an assumption regarding $\psi(k)$.

Assumption 2 Each group i is chosen infinitely many times in $\psi(0), \psi(1), \dots, \psi(k), \dots$

The main result for this algorithm is stated as follows:

Proposition 2 Under Assumption 2, in Algorithm 4, the state $x(k)$ converges to the true PageRank vector x^* , that is, $x(k) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If, in addition, for some $T > 0$, each group is chosen at least once in every T steps, then the convergence to x^* is exponential.

The proof of this proposition relies on the following lemma, whose proof is presented in Appendix B.

Lemma 4 In the distributed algorithm based on clustering of Algorithm 4, it holds $x(k) \leq x(k+1) \leq x^*$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.




Fig. 3. Time responses of the asynchronous algorithms for the small graph: You et al. [35], Dai and Freris [9], Ishii and Tempo [16], and Algorithm 2

With this lemma, the proof of Proposition 2 itself follows similarly to that of Theorem 2 and is hence omitted. The crucial difference however is due to the infinite updates made within groups in Algorithm 4. This aspect becomes evident by comparing Lemma 3 (for Theorem 2) and Lemma 4 (for Proposition 2). Specifically, the finite summation in (51) in the proof of the former result will be replaced with an infinite one, which is found in (59) in the proof of the latter.

VI. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the proposed algorithms by numerical simulations and compare them with conventional methods. Our update schemes are applied to two graphs, a simple one and one from actual web data.

A. Small Graph

We first use the simple graph with seven pages in Fig. 1.

1) *Synchronous Algorithms*: We compare two synchronous algorithms, the power method and our proposed Algorithm 1. The two algorithms differ in their initial states. The proposed algorithm requires $x(0)$ to be $(m/n)\mathbf{1}_n$ while the power method can take any initial state as long as it is a probabilistic vector; in this simulation for the latter, we also used uniform values, i.e., $(1/n)\mathbf{1}_n$. On the other hand, these two algorithms are both deterministic and, as a consequence, the responses of pages 6 and 7 become exactly the same.

The time responses of the PageRank values for the seven pages are shown in Fig. 2. We observe that the power method converges faster in most nodes. In the responses of the proposed algorithm, it is noticeable that they are nondecreasing with respect to time, a property shown in Lemma 1 (i). Also, recall that for pages 6 and 7, in the proposed algorithm, the PageRank values are equal to the assigned initial values m/n . Hence, for these pages, the proposed algorithm is faster.




Fig. 4. Time responses of the sums of errors for Algorithm 2 in the small graph: Comparison between two distributions, uniform and non-uniform

2) *Gossip-Type Distributed Algorithms*: Next, we discuss the results for the proposed randomized distributed algorithm, Algorithm 2, based on the uniform distribution for the gossip-based communication. We make comparisons of its performance with several randomized algorithms in the literature. Specifically, we implemented those of Ishii and Tempo [17], Dai and Freris [9], and You, Tempo, and Qiu [35]. In the latter two algorithms, the total number n of pages in the web is considered unknown though it is of course needed for the calculation of the PageRank as defined in (1); here, we assume that n is known by all pages.

All four algorithms select one page at each time k based on the uniform distribution, and we used the same sequence $\{\theta(k)\}$. Concerning the initial states, our proposed algorithm and that of [9] require that the pages take a fixed value, respectively, equal to m/n and 0. Other algorithms have some freedom in the choices. Here, however, we set them so that all pages are given the same initial values and took $1/n$.

The time responses of the calculated PageRank values of the nodes are plotted in Fig. 3. We omit the result for page 7 as its behavior is similar to that of page 6. It is clear that the proposed algorithm is the fastest in terms of convergence time for all pages in comparison with other distributed randomized algorithms. The responses of the proposed algorithm are characteristic in that despite the randomization due to gossiping, they are very smooth and again nondecreasing as in Fig. 2.

3) *Comparison of Distributions in Page Selection*: Here, we illustrate how the convergence speed can be improved by employing Algorithm 2 with a non-uniform distribution (28) for $\theta(k)$. As discussed earlier, it seems reasonable to increase the selection probability of pages expected to take larger PageRank values. We adjusted the probabilities so that pages having more incoming links are more likely to be selected. In particular, we assigned each page the probability proportional to its in-degree plus 1.

We made Monte Carlo simulations of 1,000 runs by executing Algorithm 2 for two cases: One under the uniform distribution and the other under the non-uniform distribution. The time responses of the sample averages of the sum of the errors, i.e., $\|x(k) - x^*\|_1$, are shown in Fig. 4. The non-uniform distribution slightly accelerates the convergence. It remains to be investigated what kind of distribution can be beneficial.




Fig. 5. Web graph of the large network




Fig. 6. PageRank values of the pages in the large network: Markers are colored for groups larger than 20 nodes.

B. Clustering-Based Algorithm Using Real Web Data

In this subsection, we apply the proposed algorithms including the one based on clustering to real data of the web and demonstrate their performance.

1) *Web Data and Clustering*: As the web graph, we used data from the database [13] collected from Lincoln University in New Zealand in 2006. This data has been used as a benchmark for testing different algorithms related to PageRank in, e.g., [10], [17], [35]. In particular, we adopted the data from [17], which is slightly modified to remove unlinked pages and to add additional links for dangling nodes. It consists of $n = 3,754$ pages with 40,646 hyperlinks. Further details regarding the data can be found in [17].

We ordered the pages alphabetically according to their address names and then grouped them. First, for the 2,891 pages in the university domain (www.lincoln.ac.nz), they were grouped based on the first subdomain names. Then, the remaining pages outside the university were grouped based on their domain names. In total, the number of groups is 718, numerically indexed starting with group 1 containing page 1.

The larger groups contain 1,502, 346, 282, 221 pages and so on, but then there were 594 groups with only one page and 78 groups with two pages. The graph structure is shown in Fig. 5, where the dots indicate the nonzero entries of the hyperlink matrix A . Here, the colored columns correspond to some of the larger groups, containing more than 20 member




Fig. 7. Time responses of errors in asynchronous randomized algorithms: Algorithm 2, Ishii and Tempo [16], You et al. [35], Dai and Freris [9], and Lagoa et al. [20]


pages; there are 10 such groups. Also, in Fig. 6, the PageRank values of the pages are plotted, with the same coloring scheme.

Observe that the pages of the group colored in blue (group 282, around page index 700, with 346 pages) and those in the group shown in cyan color (group 290, around page index 1,100, with 282 pages) take especially high PageRank values. As seen in Fig. 5, these groups have fairly dense link structures within their groups and many incoming links from outside. The pages taking the two highest PageRank values (page indices 991 and 992) are the university search page, which form a group by themselves; they receive about 270 incoming links.


2) *Comparison among Distributed Algorithms:* We discuss the results for the asynchronous distributed algorithm, Algorithm 2. As in the previous subsection, we make comparisons of its performance with the algorithms from [9], [17], [20], and [35], which are all randomization based. All five algorithms select one page at each time k based on the uniform distribution, and we used the same sequence $\{\theta(k)\}$. As initial states, all pages were given the same values. In our algorithms, this is m/n . For the algorithm of [9], it was set to 0, and in the remaining three algorithms, we took $1/n$.

In Fig. 7, the error $\|x(k) - x^*\|_1$ from the true PageRank vector x^* is plotted in the logarithmic scale for all five algorithms. We must highlight that while most of them decrease exponentially fast, our proposed method is by far the fastest. The plot is cut at the error level of 10^{-2} , but in fact, the decrease in error continues at this rate.

3) *Influence of Initial States:* It may appear that the fast convergence of the proposed Algorithm 2 is due to the restricted choice in the initial values. Since many pages in the web take very small values, assigning the smallest possible value m/n as the initial values may be advantageous. To check this point, we also ran simulations of other methods by assigning m/n as the initial states to pages having especially small PageRanks; other pages received values by equally dividing the remaining PageRank. However, the results did not exhibit major changes in the responses, at least at the scale visible in plots similar to Fig. 7. Thus, we conclude that at least for this example, the influence of the initial states seems very limited.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 8. (a) Time responses of errors: Algorithm 2, aggregation-based Algorithm 4, and the power method. (b) Enlarged with markers placed at time instants when group-based updates are made.

4) *Clustering-Based Method:* Finally, in Fig. 8(a), we compare the performance of the two proposed algorithms and the (centralized) power method. To make the comparison fair, the horizontal axis is taken as the number of updated nodes. The page selection for Algorithm 2 is by randomization and that for Algorithm 4 is periodic (i.e., selecting groups as $1, 2, \dots, n, 1, 2, \dots$). Though the power method is faster than Algorithm 2, and also comparable with Algorithm 4 in the very beginning, the clustering-based method shortly catches up and shows faster convergence.

In Fig. 8(b), we show an enlarged version of Fig. 8(a) with markers \times put at the times when updates by groups took place. It shows how for Algorithm 4, the error decreases when certain groups make updates in their state values. In fact, groups 282 and 290 mentioned above have major contributions here. This is likely because their member pages take large values.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have developed a new class of distributed algorithms for the computation of PageRank based on a reinterpretation of its definition. We first have introduced two types of distributed algorithms, synchronous and asynchronous based on gossiping. Their exponential convergence properties have been established, and the relation of the proposed algorithms to those in the literature has been discussed. The second part of the paper has been devoted to their extensions to the

case with multiple updates and grouping. We have shown that our algorithms exhibit superior performance through simulations using real web data. In future research, we will further analyze the convergence speeds of the algorithms and employ other schemes for page selections.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 3

By (30) and (34), we can easily show $z(k) \geq 0$ and $0 \leq x(k) \leq x(k+1)$. Thus, in the remaining, we must show $x(k) \leq x^*$. By using the state $x_s(k)$ of the synchronous update scheme (6), it suffices to show

$$x(k) \leq x_s(k) \quad \text{for } k \geq 0. \quad (49)$$

Then, by Lemma 1 (ii), we obtain $x(k) \leq x_s(k) \leq x^*$.

For $k = 0$, we have $x(0) = x_s(0)$, and thus (49) holds. For $k \geq 1$, by (34), the closed-form solution of $z(k)$ is given by

$$z(k) = Q_{\phi(k-1)} Q_{\phi(k-2)} \cdots Q_{\phi(0)} z(0)$$

and that of $x(k)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k) &= z(0) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} R_{\phi(t)} z(t) \\ &= \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} R_{\phi(t)} Q_{\phi(t-1)} Q_{\phi(t-2)} \cdots Q_{\phi(0)} \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \geq 0$, let

$$\tilde{Q}_{\phi}(k) := R_{\phi(k)} Q_{\phi(k-1)} Q_{\phi(k-2)} \cdots Q_{\phi(0)}.$$

Then, we have

$$x(k) = \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t) \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n. \quad (50)$$

Thus, for establishing (49), by (14) of Lemma 2, we must show for each $k > 0$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} [\tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t)]_{ij} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} [\tilde{Q}_s(t)]_{ij}. \quad (51)$$

Since the matrices $\tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t)$ and $\tilde{Q}_s(t)$ are nonnegative, more specifically, it suffices to show that the following inequality holds element-wise:

$$[\tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t)]_{ij} \leq [\tilde{Q}_s(t)]_{ij} \quad \text{for } i, j \text{ and } t = 0, 1, \dots, k-1. \quad (52)$$

The terms in the right-hand side of (52) are written out in (15) of Lemma 2. Thus, we will obtain the expressions for $[\tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t)]_{ij}$ on the left-hand side. Here, due to the relations in (31) and (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t) &= R_{\phi(t)} Q_{\phi(t-1)} Q_{\phi(t-2)} \cdots Q_{\phi(0)} \\ &= R_{\phi(t)} (S_{\phi(t-1)} + R_{\phi(t-1)}) \cdots (S_{\phi(0)} + R_{\phi(0)}) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i \in \phi(t)} R_i \right) \left(S_{\phi(t-1)} + \sum_{i \in \phi(t-1)} R_i \right) \\ &\quad \cdots \left(S_{\phi(0)} + \sum_{i \in \phi(0)} R_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

This indicates that $\tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t)$ can be written as the sum of all matrices which are products of $t+1$ matrices of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &R_{m_l} S_{\phi(k_l-1)} \cdots S_{\phi(k_{l-1}+1)} \\ &\quad \cdot R_{m_{l-1}} S_{\phi(k_{l-1}-1)} \cdots S_{\phi(k_{l-2}+1)} \\ &\quad \cdots R_{m_1} S_{\phi(k_1-1)} \cdots S_{\phi(0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where the indices k_1, \dots, k_l are taken such that $k_l = t$ and $0 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_l$; moreover, m_i are taken such that $m_i \in \phi(k_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$.

From (33), we have that the matrix product in (53) is equal to either a nonzero matrix of the form $R_{m_l} R_{m_{l-1}} \cdots R_{m_1} \geq 0$ or a zero matrix. It becomes a zero matrix if the chosen sequence ϕ and the indices m_1, \dots, m_l satisfy at least one of the following conditions:

- m_1 is contained in one of the sets $\phi(k_1 - 1), \dots, \phi(0)$;
- m_2 is contained in one of the sets $\phi(k_2 - 1), \dots, \phi(k_1 + 1)$;
- \dots
- m_l is contained in one of the sets $\phi(k_l - 1), \dots, \phi(k_{l-1} + 1)$.

If none of the conditions holds, then the matrix product in (53) becomes equal to $R_{m_l} R_{m_{l-1}} \cdots R_{m_1}$.

Next, we reduce the expression of $R_{m_l} R_{m_{l-1}} \cdots R_{m_1}$ to a product of scalars and matrices. Here, we can use the formula

$$R_i R_j = q_{ij} R_j^{(i)},$$

where $R_j^{(i)}$ is nonzero only in the j th column as

$$R_j^{(i)} := [0_n \quad 0_n \quad \cdots \quad 0_n \quad q_i \quad 0_n \quad \cdots \quad 0_n]. \quad (54)$$

We also need another formula that holds for arbitrary i, j, m :

$$R_j^{(i)} R_m = q_{jm} R_m^{(i)}.$$

By repeatedly applying these formulae, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &R_{m_l} R_{m_{l-1}} \cdots R_{m_1} \\ &= q_{m_l m_{l-1}} q_{m_{l-1} m_{l-2}} \cdots q_{m_2 m_1} R_{m_1}^{(m_l)}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Here, the (i, j) th element can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &[R_{m_l} R_{m_{l-1}} \cdots R_{m_1}]_{ij} \\ &= q_{m_l m_{l-1}} q_{m_{l-1} m_{l-2}} \cdots q_{m_2 m_1} [R_{m_1}^{(m_l)}]_{ij} \\ &= \begin{cases} q_{im_l} q_{m_l m_{l-1}} \cdots q_{m_2 j} & \text{if } m_1 = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

So far, we have shown that the summation $\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} [\tilde{Q}_{\phi}(t)]_{ij}$ in the left-hand side of (52) can be described as a sum of the terms $q_{im_l} q_{m_l m_{l-1}} \cdots q_{m_2 j}$ using the set of nodes, $(m_2, \dots, m_l) \in \mathcal{V}^{l-1}$, $2 \leq l \leq k-1$.

To establish the inequality in (52), we must prove that for each i, j, k and each node sequence $(m_2, \dots, m_\ell) \in \mathcal{V}^{\ell-1}$, the number of sequences of time $0 \leq k_1 < \cdots < k_\ell \leq k-1$ satisfying the following conditions is at most one:

$$[R_{\phi(k_\ell)} R_{\phi(k_{\ell-1})} \cdots R_{\phi(k_1)}]_{ij} = q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \cdots q_{m_2 j}. \quad (56)$$

We can find the times k_1, \dots, k_ℓ so that the left-hand side of (56) becomes nonzero in a unique manner by the given sequence of $\phi(k)$ through the following procedure:

- k_1 is the smallest $t \geq 0$ such that $m_1 = j \in \phi(t)$;
- k_2 is the smallest $t > k_1$ such that $m_2 \in \phi(t)$;
- ...
- k_ℓ is the smallest $t > k_{\ell-1}$ such that $m_\ell \in \phi(k)$.

If there are k_1, \dots, k_ℓ such that $j \in \phi(k_1)$, $m_2 \in \phi(k_2)$, \dots , $m_\ell \in \phi(k_\ell)$, then the corresponding term in (56) becomes zero. In conclusion, there is at most one combination of times k_1, \dots, k_ℓ for which (56) holds.

To summarize, we have that for each $2 \leq \ell \leq k-1$, the left-hand side of (52) contains at most one term expressed as $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_2 j} \geq 0$. As shown in (15), the right-hand side always contains one term $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_2 j} \geq 0$. Therefore, for each i, j, t , the inequality (52) holds. This implies $x(k) \leq x^*$, and consequently, we arrive at $x(k) \leq x(k+1) \leq x^*$. ■

B. Proof of Lemma 4

We can write $z(k)$ as

$$z(k) = S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k-1)}} \left(I + \widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k-1)}} \right) S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k-2)}} \left(I + \widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k-2)}} \right) \dots S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(0)}} \left(I + \widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(0)}} \right) z(0). \quad (57)$$

Moreover, $x(k)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k) &= z(0) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t)}} z(t) \\ &= x(0) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t)}} S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t-1)}} \left(I + \widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t-1)}} \right) \\ &\quad \dots S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(0)}} \left(I + \widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(0)}} \right) z(0) \\ &=: \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \widehat{Q}_{\psi(t)} \frac{m}{n} \mathbf{1}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Since $Q_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t)}}$, $R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t)}}$, $S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t)}}$, and $z(0)$ are all nonnegative, $z(k)$ is nonnegative as well. Therefore, the term $\widehat{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(k)}} z(t)$ appearing in $x(k)$ is nonnegative. Hence, it holds $x(k) \leq x(k+1)$.

It thus suffices to show that for each k

$$\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \left[\widehat{Q}_{\psi(t)} \right]_{ij} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left[\widetilde{Q}_s(t) \right]_{ij} \quad \text{for } i, j. \quad (59)$$

Note that the summation on the right-hand side has infinite terms, which is different from the relations used in other proofs such as that of Theorem 1. We can however still use the expression for $\widetilde{Q}_s(t)$ given in (15) of Lemma 2.

In what follows, we show that the left-hand side of (59) is the sum of terms written only in the form of $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j} \geq 0$ and, moreover, these terms are all distinct in that each term is different from others. That is, the terms appearing in the left-hand side form a subset of those in the right-hand side of (59), confirming the inequality.

In (58), observe that $\widehat{Q}_{\psi(t)}$ consists of terms only of the form

$$R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t-1)}}^{\alpha_t+1} S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t-2)}} R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(t-2)}}^{\alpha_{t-1}} \dots S_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(0)}} R_{\mathcal{V}_{\psi(0)}}^{\alpha_0}, \quad (60)$$

where $\alpha_t, \dots, \alpha_0$ are nonnegative integers. Here, note that by the definitions of $R_{\mathcal{V}_h}$ and $S_{\mathcal{V}_h}$, this product is either a zero matrix or a product of matrices $R_{\mathcal{V}_h}$. Moreover, the (i, j) th element of the matrix in (60) is nonnegative and is a summation of terms only expressed as $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$ for $\ell > 0$.

Based on this observation, for establishing (59), we must show that for each term expressed as $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$, there is only one matrix product in the form of (60) whose (i, j) th element contains the term.

For each page m , denote by $g(m)$ the index of the group to which it belongs. Then, it can be confirmed that a term expressed as $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$ is contained in

$$\left[R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_\ell)}} R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_{\ell-1})}} \dots R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(j)}} \right]_{ij}. \quad (61)$$

To find the product of the form (60) that contains the term $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$, we consider inserting matrices $R_{\mathcal{V}_h}$ and $S_{\mathcal{V}_h}$ between the matrices in (61) anywhere except on the left side of $R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_\ell)}}$.

First, if we insert any matrix $R_{\mathcal{V}_h}$ in (61), then the term $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$ will not be present any more. Next, we consider inserting $S_{\mathcal{V}_h}$ in (61). By definition, it holds

$$R_{\mathcal{V}_{h_1}} S_{\mathcal{V}_{h_2}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } h_1 = h_2, \\ R_{\mathcal{V}_{h_1}} & \text{if } h_1 \neq h_2. \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

Thus, if $S_{\mathcal{V}_{h_1}}$ is inserted on the right side of a matrix $R_{\mathcal{V}_{h_2}}$ with $h_1 \neq h_2$, then the term $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$ will remain in the product. This fact indicates that $S_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_u)}}$ cannot be inserted between matrices $R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_u)}}$ and $R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_{u-1})}}$ whose indices satisfy $g(m_u) = g(m_{u-1})$.

Now, we can find the specific matrix product of the form (60) containing the term $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$. First, the product should contain $\ell + 1$ matrices of the type $R_{\mathcal{V}_h}$. Thus, the product would be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_\ell)}} \underbrace{\dots}_{0 \text{ or more } S_{\mathcal{V}}} R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_{\ell-1})}} \underbrace{\dots}_{0 \text{ or more } S_{\mathcal{V}}} \dots \\ & R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(m_1)}} \underbrace{\dots}_{0 \text{ or more } S_{\mathcal{V}}} R_{\mathcal{V}_{g(j)}} \underbrace{\dots}_{0 \text{ or more } S_{\mathcal{V}}} \dots \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

For the given sequence $\psi(0), \dots, \psi(k-1)$, this product is a nonzero matrix if there exists a sequence $0 \leq i_0 \leq \dots \leq i_\ell \leq k-1$ of time instants satisfying the following:

- i_0 is the smallest $k \geq 0$ such that $g(j) \in \psi(k)$;
- i_1 is equal to i_0 if $g(m_1) = g(j)$; otherwise, it is the smallest $k > i_0$ such that $g(m_1) \in \psi(k)$;
- ...
- i_ℓ is equal to $i_{\ell-1}$ if $g(m_\ell) = g(m_{\ell-1})$; otherwise, it is the smallest $k > i_{\ell-1}$ such that $g(m_\ell) \in \psi(k)$.

It is clear that if such a sequence i_0, \dots, i_ℓ exists, then it is unique.

Therefore, we conclude that the left-hand side of (59) consists of terms only in the form $q_{im_\ell} q_{m_\ell m_{\ell-1}} \dots q_{m_1 j}$ and they are all distinct. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] R. W. Aldhaheri and H. K. Khalil. Aggregation of the policy iteration method for nearly completely decomposable Markov chains. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 36:178–187, 1991.
- [2] K. Avrachenkov, N. Litvak, D. Nemirovsky, and N. Osipova. Monte Carlo methods in PageRank computation: When one iteration is sufficient. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45:890–904, 2007.
- [3] E. Bıyık and M. Arcak. Area aggregation and time-scale modeling for sparse nonlinear networks. *Syst. & Cont. Lett.*, 57:142–149, 2008.
- [4] S. Brin and L. Page. The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual Web search engine. *Computer Networks & ISDN Systems*, 30:107–117, 1998.
- [5] A. Z. Broder, R. Lempel, F. Maghoul, and J. Pedersen. Efficient PageRank approximation via graph aggregation. *Inform. Retrieval*, 9:123–138, 2006.
- [6] F. Bullo. *Lectures on Network Systems*. CreateSpace, 2018.
- [7] T. Charalambous, C. Hadjicostis, M. Rabbat, and M. Johansson. Totally asynchronous distributed estimation of eigenvector centrality in digraphs with application to the PageRank problem. In *Proc. 55th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pages 25–30, 2016.
- [8] B. C. Csáji, R. M. Jungers, and V. D. Blondel. PageRank optimization by edge selection. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 169:73–87, 2014.
- [9] L. Dai and N. Freris. Fully distributed PageRank computation with exponential convergence. *arXiv:1705.09927*, 2017.
- [10] O. Fercoq, M. Akian, M. Bouhtou, and S. Gaubert. Ergodic control and polyhedral approaches to PageRank optimization. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 2013.
- [11] P. Frasca, H. Ishii, C. Ravazzi, and R. Tempo. Distributed randomized algorithms for opinion formation, centrality computation and power systems estimation: A tutorial overview. *European J. Control*, 24:2–13, 2009.
- [12] D. F. Gleich. PageRank beyond the Web. *SIAM Review*, 57(3):321–363, 2015.
- [13] Statistical Cybermetrics Research Group. Academic Web Link-database Project, Univ. Wolverhampton, U.K. [Online] Available: <http://cybermetrics.wlv.ac.uk/database/>, 2006.
- [14] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.
- [15] H. Ishii and A. Suzuki. Distributed randomized algorithms for pagerank computation: Recent advances. In T. Başar, editor, *Uncertainty in Complex Networked Systems: In Honor of Roberto Tempo*, pages 419–447. Birkhäuser, 2018.
- [16] H. Ishii and R. Tempo. Distributed randomized algorithms for the PageRank computation. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 55:1987–2002, 2010.
- [17] H. Ishii and R. Tempo. The PageRank problem, multi-agent consensus and web aggregation: A systems and control viewpoint. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 34:34–53, 2014.
- [18] H. Ishii, R. Tempo, and E.-W. Bai. PageRank computation via a distributed randomized approach with lossy communication. *Syst. & Cont. Lett.*, 61:1221–1228, 2012.
- [19] H. Ishii, R. Tempo, and E.-W. Bai. A web aggregation approach for distributed randomized PageRank algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 57:2703–2717, 2012.
- [20] C. M. Lagoa, L. Zaccarian, and F. Dabbene. A distributed algorithm with consistency for PageRank-like linear algebraic systems. In *Proc. 20th IFAC World Congress*, pages 5339–5344, 2017.
- [21] A. N. Langville and C. D. Meyer. *Google's PageRank and Beyond: The Science of Search Engine Rankings*. Princeton University Press, 2006.
- [22] J. Lei and H.-F. Chen. Distributed randomized PageRank algorithm based on stochastic approximation. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 60:1641–1646, 2015.
- [23] J. M. Maestre, H. Ishii, and E. Algaba. Node aggregation for enhancing PageRank. *IEEE Access*, 5:19799–19811, 2017.
- [24] M. Mesbahi and M. Egerstedt. *Graph Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [25] E. Montijano, G. Oliva, and A. Gasparri. Distributed estimation of node centrality with application to agreement problems in social networks. In *Proc. 57th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pages 5245–5250, 2018.
- [26] A. V. Nazin and B. T. Polyak. Randomized algorithm to determine the eigenvector of a stochastic matrix with application to the PageRank problem. *Automation and Remote Control*, 72:342–352, 2011.
- [27] B. T. Polyak and A. Tremba. Regularization-based solution of the PageRank problem for large matrices. *Automation and Remote Control*, 73:1877–1894, 2012.
- [28] C. Ravazzi, P. Frasca, R. Tempo, and H. Ishii. Ergodic randomized algorithms and dynamics over networks. *IEEE Trans. Control of Network Syst.*, 2:78–87, 2015.
- [29] A. Sarma, A. Molla, G. Pandurangan, and E. Upfal. Fast distributed PageRank computation. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 561:113–121, 2015.
- [30] S. Shi, J. Yu, G. Yang, and D. Wang. Distributed page ranking in structured P2P networks. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Parallel Processing*, pages 179–186, 2003.
- [31] A. Suzuki and H. Ishii. Distributed randomized algorithms for PageRank based on a novel interpretation. In *Proc. American Control Conf.*, pages 472–477, 2018.
- [32] A. Suzuki and H. Ishii. PageRank computation via web aggregation in distributed randomized algorithms. Submitted for conference publication, 2019.
- [33] R. Tempo, G. Calafiore, and F. Dabbene. *Randomized Algorithms for Analysis and Control of Uncertain Systems, with Applications*, Second Edition. Springer, London, 2013.
- [34] W. Wang and C. Y. Tang. Distributed estimation of closeness centrality. In *Proc. 54th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pages 4860–4865, 2015.
- [35] K. You, R. Tempo, and L. Qiu. Distributed algorithms for computation of centrality measures in complex networks. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 62:2080–2094, 2017.
- [36] W. Zhao, H.-F. Chen, and H. Fang. Convergence of distributed randomized PageRank algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, 50:1177–1181, 2013.
- [37] Y. Zhu, S. Ye, and X. Li. Distributed PageRank computation based on iterative aggregation-disaggregation methods. In *Proc. 14th ACM Conf. on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 578–585, 2005.