Measuring Networks and Random Graph Models

Pedro Ribeiro
(DCC/FCUP & CRACS/INESC-TEC)

U.PORTO
FACULDADE DE CIÊNCIAS
UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

CRACS
INESCTEC
ASSOCIATE LABORATORY
PORTUGAL

(Heavily based on slides from Jure Leskovec and Lada Adamic@ Stanford University - CS224W)

Network Properties:
how to measure a network?

Plan: Key Network Properties

- (1) Degree distribution $P(k)$

- (2) Path Length h

- (3) Clustering coefficient C

- (4) Connected components s

(1) Degree Distribution

- Degree distribution **P(k)**: probability that a randomly chosen node has degree k

  N_k = # nodes with degree **k**

- Normalized histogram:

  $P(k) = N_k / N$ → plot

(2) Paths in a Graph

- A ***path*** is a sequence of nodes in which each node is linked to the next one

$$P_n = \{i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots , i_n\} \quad or$$

$$P_n = \{(i_0, i_1), (i_1, i_2), (i_2, i_3), \dots, (i_{n-1}, i_n),\}$$

- A path can intersect itself and pass trough the same edge multiple times

  – E.g. ACBDCDEG

  – In a directed graph, a path can only follow the direction of the "arrow"

Distance in a Graph

- **Distance** (shortest path, geodesic) between a pair of nodes is defined as the number of edges along the shortest path connecting the nodes

  – If the two nodes are **not connected**, the distance is usually defined as **infinite**

$$h_{B,D} = 2$$
$$h_{A,X} = \infty$$

- In **directed graphs** paths need to follow the direction of the arrows

  – Consequence: distance is **not symmetric**: $h_{B,C} \neq h_{C,B}$

$$h_{B,C} = 1, \ h_{C,B} = 2$$

Network Diameter

- **Diameter:** The maximum (shortest path) distance between any pair of nodes in a graph

- **Average path length** for a connected graph (component) or a strongly connected (component of a) directed graph

$$\bar{h} = \frac{1}{2E_{\max}} \sum_{i, j \neq i} h_{ij}$$

Where h_{ij} is the distance from node i to node j
E_{max} is max number of edges (total number of node pairs) = $n(n-1)/2$

  – Many times we compute the average only over the connected pairs of nodes (that is, we ignore "infinite" length paths)

(3) Clustering Coefficient

- **Clustering coefficient**:
  - What portion of i's neighbors are connected?
  - Node i with degree k_i
  - $C_i \in [0,1]$
  - $C_i = \dfrac{2e_i}{k_i(k_i-1)}$ where e_i is the number of edges between the neighbors of node i


$$C_i = 1 \qquad C_i = 1/2 \qquad C_i = 0$$

- **Average clustering coefficient:** $C = \dfrac{1}{N} \displaystyle\sum_i^n C_i$

Clustering Coefficient

- **Clustering coefficient**:
  - What portion of *i*'s neighbors are connected?
  - Node *i* with degree k_i
  - $C_i = \dfrac{2e_i}{k_i(k_i-1)}$ where e_i is the number of edges between the neighbors of node *i*


$k_B=2,\quad e_B=1,\quad C_B = 2/2 = 1$

$k_D=4,\quad e_D=2,\quad C_D = 4/12 = 1/3$

Avg. Clustering: C = 0.33

(4) Connectivity

- Size of the largest connected component

  - Largest set where any two vertices can be joined by a path

- **Largest component = Giant component**

How to find connected components:

- Start from random node and perform Breadth First Search (BFS)
- Label the nodes BFS visited
- If all nodes are visited, the network is connected
- Otherwise find an unvisited node and repeat BFS

Summary: Key Network Properties

- (1) Degree distribution $P(k)$

- (2) Path Length h

- (3) Clustering coefficient C

- (4) Connected components s

Measuring these properties in a Real World Graph

MSN Messenger

- **MSN Messenger**
  - 1 month activity
    - 245 million users logged in
    - 180 million users engaged in conversations
    - More than 30 billion conversations
   - More than 255 billion exchanged messages

**Planetary-Scale Views on a Large Instant-Messaging Network**

WWW 2008

Jure Leskovec[*]
Carnegie Mellon University
jure@cs.cmu.edu

Eric Horvitz
Microsoft Research
horvitz@microsoft.com

Spatial Network: Geography

Communication → Connections

**Network:** 180M people, 1.3B edges

Messaging as multigraph



Contact — Conversation

Messaging as an undirected graph
- Edge (u,v) if users u and v exchanged at least 1 msg
- N=180 million people
- E=1.3 billion edges

# MSN: (1) Degree Distribution

MSN: Log-Log Degree Distribution

Note: We plotted the same data as on the previous slide, just the axes are now logarithmic.

MSN: (2) Diameter

number of paths vs distance (hops)

Number of links between pairs of nodes in the largest connected component

Avg. path length 6.6
90% of the nodes can be reached in < 8 hops

nodes as we do BFS out of a random node

Steps	#Nodes
0	1
1	10
2	78
3	3,96
4	8,648
5	3,299,252
6	28,395,849
7	79,059,497
8	52,995,778
9	10,321,008
10	1,955,007
11	518,410
12	149,945
13	44,616
14	13,740
15	4,476
16	1,542
17	536
18	167
19	71
20	29
21	16
22	10
23	3
24	2
25	3

MSN: (3) Clustering Coefficient

C_k: average C_i of nodes i of degree k: $C_k = \dfrac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i:k_i=k} C_i$

largest component
(99.9% of the nodes)

Weakly connected component size

# MSN: Key Network Properties

- (1) Degree distribution — *Heavily skewed avg. degree = 14.4*

- (2) Path Length — *6.6*

- (3) Clustering coefficient — *0.11*

- (4) Connected components — *giant component*

Are these values "expected"?
Are they "surprising"?
To answer this we need a null-model!

Another Example: PPI Network

a.

b.

c.

d.

a. Undirected network
N=2,018 proteins as nodes
E=2,930 binding interactions as links.

b. Degree distribution:
Skewed. Average degree $<k>=2.90$

c. Diameter:
Avg. path length = 5.8

d. Clustering:
Avg. clustering = 0.12
Connectivity: 185 components
the largest component 1,647
nodes (81% of nodes)

Intermezzo: Network Datasets

The KONECT Project

Networks • Statistics • Plots • Categories • Handbook

Jérôme Kunegis
University of Namur

n = Size	∈ ℕ	
m = Volume	∈ ℕ	
$\bar{m}$ = Unique edge count	∈ ℕ	
l = Loop count	∈ ℕ	
s = Wedge count	∈ ℕ	
z = Claw count	∈ ℕ	
x = Cross count	∈ ℕ	
t = Triangle count	∈ ℕ	
q = Square count	∈ ℕ	
T_4 = 4-Tour count	∈ ℕ	
d_{max} = Maximum degree	∈ ℕ	
d = Average degree	∈ ℝ+	
p = Fill	∈ [0, 1]	
$\tilde{m}$ = Average edge multiplicity	∈ ℝ+	
N = Size of LCC	∈ ℕ	
N_s = Size of LSCC	∈ ℕ	
δ = Diameter	∈ ℕ	
$δ_{0.5}$ = 50-Percentile effective diameter	∈ ℝ+	
$δ_{0.9}$ = 90-Percentile effective diameter	∈ ℝ+	
$δ_M$ = Median distance	∈ ℕ	
$δ_m$ = Mean distance	∈ ℝ+	
G = Gini coefficient	∈ [0, 1]	
P = Balanced inequality ratio	∈ [0, 1]	
H_{er} = Relative edge distribution entropy	∈ [0, 1]	

- Fruchterman–Reingold graph drawing
- Degree distribution
- Cumulative degree distribution
- Lorenz curve
- Spectral distribution of the adjacency matrix
- Spectral distribution of the normalized adjacer
- Spectral distribution of the Laplacian
- Spectral graph drawing based on the adjacenc
- Spectral graph drawing based on the Laplacian
- Spectral graph drawing based on the normaliz
- Degree assortativity
- Zipf plot
- Hop distribution
- Double Laplacian graph drawing
- Delaunay graph drawing
- In/outdegree scatter plot
- Item rating evolution
- Edge weight/multiplicity distribution
- Clustering coefficient distribution
- Average neighbor degree distribution
- Temporal distribution
- Temporal hop distribution
- Diameter/density evolution
- Signed temporal distribution
- Rating class evolution
- SynGraphy
- Inter-event distribution
- Node-level inter-event distribution

Plots

Degree distribution

**Cumulative degree distribution**

Lorenz curve

In/outdegree scatter plot

Edge weight/multiplicity distribution

http://konect.cc/

Intermezzo: Network Datasets

Network Repository. An **Interactive** *Scientific* Network Data Repository.
THE FIRST SCIENTIFIC NETWORK DATA REPOSITORY WITH INTERACTIVE VISUAL ANALYTICS.
NEW **GraphVis**: interactive visual graph mining and machine learning

REPOSITORY | **ANAL**

All Network Datasets | network data

NETWORK DATA COLLECTIONS

- Animal Social Networks — 816
- Biological Networks — 37
- Brain Networks — 116
- Collaboration Networks — 19
- Cheminformatics — 646
- Citation Networks — 4
- Ecology Networks — 6
- Economic Networks — 16
- Email Networks — 6
- Graph 500 — 8
- Heterogeneous Networks — 15
- Interaction Networks — 29
- Infrastructure Networks — 8
- Labeled Networks — 105
- Massive Network Data — 21
- Miscellaneous Networks — 2668
- Power Networks — 8

Network Data Statistics

Nodes	15.2K
Edges	246K
Density	0.00212112
Maximum degree	375
Minimum degree	1
Average degree	32
Assortativity	0.343624
Number of triangles	6.7M
Average number of triangles	442
Maximum number of triangles	14.5K
Average clustering coefficient	0.211165
Fraction of closed triangles	0.287461
Maximum k-core	79
Lower bound of Maximum Clique	43

Graph Name	|V|	|E|	d_{max}	d_{avg}	r	|T|	T_{avg}	T_{max}	κ_{avg}	κ	K	ω_{heu}	Size	Download
♥ bio-CE-CX	15K	246K	375	32	0.34	7M	442	14K	0.21	0.29	79	43	3 MB	⬇ Download
♥ bio-CE-GN	2K	54K	242	48	0.07	686K	308	3K	0.18	0.14	49	16	512 KB	⬇ Download
♥ bio-CE-GT	924	3K	151	7	-0.18	12K	12	684	0.61	0.13	10	8	30 KB	⬇ Download
♡ bio-CE-HT	3K	3K	44	2	-0.30	87	-	4	0.01	0.01	4	4	19 KB	⬇ Download
♡ bio-CE-LC	1K	2K	131	2	-0.17	699	-	31	0.08	0.04	7	7	10 KB	⬇ Download
♡ bio-CE-PG	2K	48K	913	51	-0.15	2M	1K	30K	0.42	0.32	81	28	500 KB	⬇ Download

http://networkrepository.com/

Erdös-Renyi
Random Graph Model

Simplest Model of Graphs

- **Erdös-Renyi Random Graphs**
  [Erdös-Renyi, '60]

  ON THE EVOLUTION OF RANDOM GRAPHS
  by
  P. ERDŐS and A. RÉNYI

  Dedicated to Professor P. Turán at his 50th birthday.

  Introduction

  Our aim is to study the probable structure of a random graph $\Gamma_{n,N}$ which has n given labelled vertices $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n$ and N edges; we suppose that these N edges are chosen at random among the $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges,

- $G_{n,p}$: undirected graph on n nodes and each *(u,v)* appears i.i.d. with probability *p*

- $G_{n,m}$: undirected graph with n nodes and m uniformly at random picked edges

What kind of networks do such models produce?

Random Graph Model

- ***n*** and ***p*** do not uniquely determine the graph!
    - The graph is a result of a random process

- We can have many different realizations given the same ***n*** and ***p***

n = 10
p = 1/6

Properties of $G_{n,p}$

- Degree distribution $P(k)$

- Clustering coefficient C

- Path Length h

- Connected components s

**What are the values of these properties for $G_{n,p}$?**

$G_{n,p}$: degree distribution

- Fact: Degree Distribution of $G_{n,p}$ is **binomial**

- Let **P(k)** denote the fraction of nodes with degree **k**

$$P(k) = \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k}$$

Select k nodes out of n-1

Probability of having k edges

Probability of missing the rest of the n-1-k edges

Mean, variance of a binomial distribution

$$\bar{k} = p(n-1)$$

$$\sigma^2 = p(1-p)(n-1)$$

$$\frac{\sigma}{\bar{k}} = \left[\frac{1-p}{p} \frac{1}{(n-1)} \right]^{1/2} \approx \frac{1}{(n-1)^{1/2}}$$

By the law of large numbers, as the network size increases, the distribution becomes increasingly narrow—we are increasingly confident that the degree of a node is in the vicinity of k.

Intermezzo: NetLogo

NetLogo is a multi-agent programmable modeling environment. It is used by many hundreds of thousands of students, teachers, and researchers worldwide. It also powers HubNet participatory simulations. It is authored by Uri Wilensky and developed at the CCL. You can download it free of charge. You can also try it online through NetLogo Web.

Home
Download
Help
Resources
Extensions

Visualize some of the properties described in the lectures

https://ccl.northwestern.edu/netlogo/

NetLogo: $G_{n,p}$ and degree dist.

ErdosRenyiDegDist.nlogo

$G_{n,p}$: clustering coefficient

- Remember: $C_i = \dfrac{2 e_i}{k_i(k_i-1)}$ where e_i is the number of edges between the neighbors of node i

- Edges in **$G_{n,p}$** appear i.i.d. with prob. **p**

- So, expected **$E[e_i]$** is $= p \dfrac{k_i(k_i-1)}{2}$

  each pair is connected with prob. p

  number of distinct pairs of neighbors of node i of degree k_i

- Therefore **$E[C]$** $= \dfrac{p \cdot k_i(k_i-1)}{k_i(k_i-1)} = p = \dfrac{\bar{k}}{n-1} \approx \dfrac{\bar{k}}{n}$

Clustering coefficient of a random graph is small.
If we generate bigger and bigger graphs with fixed avg. degree k (that is we set $p = k \cdot 1/n$), then C decreases with the graph size n.

Properties of $G_{n,p}$

- Degree distribution

$$P(k) = \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k}$$

- Clustering coefficient

$$C = p \approx \frac{\bar{k}}{n}$$

- Path Length

*next!*

- Connected components

What are the values of these properties for $G_{n,p}$?

- Graph *G(V,E)* has **expansion α**: $if \; \forall \, S \subseteq V$:

 \# of edges leaving $S \geq \alpha \cdot min(|S|, |V \setminus S|)$

- Or equivalently:

$$\alpha = \min_{S \subseteq V} \frac{\#\, edges\; leaving\; S}{\min(|\,S\,|, |\,V \setminus S\,|)}$$

Expansion: measures robustness

- Expansion is measure of robustness:
 - to disconnect L nodes, we need to $cut \geq \alpha \cdot L \, edges$

- Low expansion

- High Expansion

- Social Networks:
  - "communities"

Expansion: $G_{n,p}$

- Fact: In a graph of **n** nodes with expansion α for all pairs of nodes there is a path of length **O((log n)/α)**.

- **Random graph $G_{n,p}$:**
  For *log n > np > c*, diam*$(G_{n,p})$ = O(log n / log (np))*

  – random graphs have good expansion, so it takes a logarithmic number of steps for BFS to visit all nodes

S nodes   *α·S edges*

S' nodes   *α·S' edges*

$G_{n,p}$: average shortest path

Erdös-Renyi Random Graphs can grow very large but nodes will be just a few hops apart

Here $n \cdot p$ = constant
That is, avg deg k is const

Properties of $G_{n,p}$

- Degree distribution

$$P(k) = \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-1-k}$$

- Clustering coefficient

$$C = p \approx \frac{\bar{k}}{n}$$

- Path Length

$O(\log n)$

- Connected components

next!

What are the values of these properties for $G_{n,p}$?

"Evolution" of a random graph

- Graph structure of $G_{n,p}$ as p changes

- Emergence of a **giant component**

  avg. degree **k=2E/n or p=k/(n-1)**
  - *k=1-ε:* all components are of size *Ω(log n)*
  - *k=1+ε:* 1 component of size *Ω(n)*, others have size *Ω(log n)*
   - Each node has at least one edge in expectation

$G_{n,p}$ Simulation Experiment


Fraction of nodes in the largest component

- $G_{n,p}$, $n=10^6$, $k=p(n-1) = 0.5 \dots 3$

NetLogo: $G_{n,p}$ and giant component

GiantComponent.nlogo

$G_{n,p}$ - Erdös-Renyi Model

Paul Erdös, the most prolific mathematician who ever lived, has no home and no job, but he has wandered the world for over fifty years, inspiring other mathematicians. From the documentary N is a Number: A Portrait of Paul Erdös © 1993 by George Csicsery

"[When asked why are numbers beautiful?]

It's like asking why is Ludwig van Beethoven's Ninth Symphony beautiful. If you don't see why, someone can't tell you. I know numbers are beautiful. If they aren't beautiful, nothing is."

— Paul Erdos

- **$G_{n,p}$ is a cool model!**

  But let's compare it to real world networks

MSN vs $G_{n,p}$

n=180M

	MSN	$G_{n,p}$	
• Degree distribution			❌
• Avg. Clustering coef.	*0.11*	$\bar{k}/n$ $C \approx 8 \cdot 10^{-8}$	❌
• Path Length	*6.6*	*O(log n)* h ≈ 8.2	✅
• Largest Conn. Comp.	99%	GCC exists when $\bar{k} > 1$ $\bar{k} \approx 14$	✅

Real Networks *vs* $G_{n,p}$

- Are real networks like random graphs?
  - Average Path Length ✅
  - Giant Connected Component ✅
  - Degree Distribution ❌
  - Clustering Coefficient ❌

- **Problems** with the random networks model:
  - Degree distribution differs from that of real networks
  - Giant component in most real network does NOT emerge through a phase transition

- Most important: **Are real networks random?**
 - The answer is simply: **NO!**

Real Networks *vs G*$_{n,p}$

- If **G**$_{n,p}$ is wrong, why did we spend time on it?

  – It is the reference model

  – It will help us calculate many quantities, that can then be compared to the real data

  – It will help us understand to what degree is a particular property the result of some random process

So, while G$_{n,p}$ is "WRONG", it will turn out to be extremely USEFUL!

Intermezzo: Configuration Model

- Goal: Generate a random graph with a given degree sequence $k_1, k_2, \ldots k_N$

- **Configuration Model:**

Nodes with spokes

Randomly pair up "mini"-nodes

Resulting graph

- Useful as a "null" model of networks:

  – We can compare the real network **G** and a "random" **G'** which has the same degree sequence as **G**

The Small World Random Graph Model

Can we have high clustering while also having short paths?

The Small World Experiment

- What is the **typical shortest path length** between any two people?
  - Experiment on the global friendship network
    - Can't measure, need to probe explicitly

- **Small-world experiment** [Milgram'67] [Travers and Milgram '69]
  - Picked 296 people in Omaha, Nebraska and Wichita, Kansas
  - Ask them to get a letter to a stock-broker in Boston by passing it through friends

- How many steps did it take?

STANLEY MILGRAM

The Small-World Problem
By Stanley Milgram

An Experimental Study of the
Small World Problem*

JEFFREY TRAVERS
Harvard University

AND

STANLEY MILGRAM
The City University of New York

The Small World Experiment

- ## 64 chains completed:
  (i.e., 64 letters reached the target)

  – It took 6.2 steps on the average, thus **"6 degrees of separation"**

[Travers and Milgram '69]

N=64

- ## Further observations:

  – People who owned stock had shorter paths to the stockbroker than random people: 5.4 vs. 6.7

  – People from the Boston area have even closer paths: 4.4

6 degrees: Should we be surprised?

- Assume each human is connected to 100 other people
  Then:
  - Step 1: reach 100 people
  - Step 2: reach 100*100 = 10,000 people
  - Step 3: reach 100*100*100 = 1M people
  - Step 4: reach 100*100*100*100 = 100M people
 - **In 5 steps we can reach 10 billion people!**

- What's wrong here? We ignore clustering!
  - Not all edges point to new people
    - 92% of FB friendships happen through a **friend-of-a-friend**

Clustering Implies Edge Locality

- MSN network has 7 orders of magnitude larger clustering than the corresponding $G_{n,p}$!

- Other Examples:

  - Actor Collaborations (IMDB): N = 225,226 nodes, avg. degree $\bar{k}$ = 61

  - Electrical power grid: N = 4,941 nodes, $\bar{k}$ = 2.67

  - Network of neurons: N = 282 nodes, $\bar{k}$ = 14

Network	h_{actual}	h_{random}	C_{actual}	C_{random}
Film actors	3.65	2.99	0.79	0.00027
Power Grid	18.70	12.40	0.080	0.005
C. elegans	2.65	2.25	0.28	0.05

h … Average shortest path length
C … Average clustering coefficient
"actual" … real network
"random" … random graph with same avg. degree

The "Controversy"

- Consequence of expansion:
  - **Short paths: _O(log n)_**
    - This is the smallest diameter we can get if we have a constant degree.
  - But clustering is low!
- However, **networks have "local" structure**:
  - **Triadic closure:**
    - Friend of a friend is my friend
 - High clustering but diameter is also high
- **How can we have both?**

Low diameter
Low clustering coefficient

High clustering coefficient
High diameter

Small-World: How?

- Could a network with high clustering also be "small world" (*log n* diameter)?

  – How can we at the same time have **high clustering** and **small diameter**?

High clustering
High diameter

Low clustering
Low diameter

  – Clustering implies edge "locality"

  – Randomness enables "shortcuts"

Small-World Model
[Watts-Strogatz '98]

Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks

Duncan J. Watts* & Steven H. Strogatz

Department of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, Kimball Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

Two components to the model:

- (1) Start with a **low-dimensional regular lattice**
  - (In our case we are using a ring as a lattice)
  - Has high clustering coefficient

- Now introduce **randomness** ("shortcuts")

- (2) **Rewire**:
  - Add/remove edges to create shortcuts to join remote parts of the lattice
 - For each edge with prob. p move the other end to a random node

The Small World Model

REGULAR NETWORK SMALL WORLD NETWORK RANDOM NETWORK

P=0 → INCREASING RANDOMNESS → P=1

High clustering
High diameter

High clustering
Low diameter

Low clustering
Low diameter

$$h = \frac{N}{2\bar{k}} \qquad C = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$h = \frac{\log N}{\log \alpha} \qquad C = \frac{\bar{k}}{N}$$

Rewiring allows us to "interpolate" between
a regular lattice and a random graph

The Small World Model

NetLogo: $G_{n,p}$ and Small-World

initial setup | rewire-once

vary rewiring prob. from 0.0 to 1.0

rewiring-probability — 0.10

num-nodes — 100

average-path-length: 5.78 | clust-coeff: 0.4223

do-layout

Clustering coefficient a...
- cc
- av-path

SmallWorldWS.nlogo

Small-World: Summary

- Could a network with high clustering be at the same time a "small world"?

  – Yes! You don't need more than a few random links

- The Watts-Strogatz Model:

  – Provides insight on the interplay between clustering and being "small-world"

  – Captures the structure of many realistic networks

  – Accounts for the high clustering of real networks ✅

  – Does not lead to the correct degree distribution ❌

> We usually call **small world** to networks which exhibit:
> - Short avg. path length *(log n)*
> - *High clustering coefficient*

# Power Laws and Degree Distributions

Realistic Degree Distribution

Which interesting graph properties do we observe that need explaining?

- Small-world model:
  - Diameter ✅
  - Clustering coefficient ✅

- What about **node degree distribution**?
  - What fraction of nodes has degree k (as a function of k)?
  - Observation in **real networks**:
    very often a **power law**: $P(k) \propto k^{-\alpha}$
  - Small-World is similar to $G_{n,p}$: **pronounced peak at k**
    does not result in realistic distributions... ❌

Realistic Degree Distribution


Expected based on G_{np}

Found in data

$$P(k) \propto k^{-\alpha}$$

Example: Flickr

Plot: fraction of nodes with degree k:

$$p(k) = \frac{|\{u \mid d_u = k\}|}{N}$$

Flickr social network
$n = 584{,}207$,
$m = 3{,}555{,}115$

Probability: $p(k) = P(X = k)$

Degree, k

[Leskovec et al. KDD '08]

Example: Flickr

Same plot, but now on **log-log** scale

Intermezzo: exponential vs power-law

- ## How to distinguish:

  - **Exponential**: $P(k) \propto \lambda e^{-\lambda k}$

    vs

  - **Power-Law**: $P(k) \propto k^{-\alpha}$

gnuplot   plot [1:20] 2*exp(-2*x) lt rgb "#0000aa" lw 2, 0.4*x**-3 lt rgb "#aa0000" lw 2

- **Exponential**: $P(k) \propto \lambda e^{-\lambda k}$

  vs

- **Power-Law**: $P(k) \propto k^{-\alpha}$

Same plot, but now on **log-log** scale

Legend:
- 2*exp(-2*x)
- 0.4*x**-3

If y = f(x) = x$^{-\alpha}$, then
log(y) = -α log(x)

On a log-log axis
a power law
looks like
a **straight line**
of **slope -α**

gnuplot   set logscale xy

- **Exponential**: $P(k) \propto \lambda e^{-\lambda k}$

  VS

- **Power-Law**: $P(k) \propto k^{-\alpha}$

Above a certain **x** value, the power law is always higher than the exponential

gnuplot   plot [4:20] 1.5**-x, x**-1.5, x**-2

- **Power-Law**: $P(k) \propto k^{-\alpha}$

lower alpha (α) will mean less pronounced slope

gnuplot   plot [1:1000] x**-2 lw 2, x**-2.5 lw 2, x**-3 lw 2

- First observed in Internet Autonomous Systems
  [Faloutsos, Faloutsos and Faloutsos, 1999]

Internet domain topology

On Power-Law Relationships of the Internet Topology

Michalis Faloutsos
U.C. Riverside
Dept. of Comp. Science
michalis@cs.ucr.edu

Petros Faloutsos
U. of Toronto
Dept. of Comp. Science
pfal@cs.toronto.edu

Christos Faloutsos *
Carnegie Mellon Univ.
Dept. of Comp. Science
christos@cs.cmu.edu

Example: World Wide Web

[Broder et al., 2000]

Graph structure in the Web

Andrei Broder [a], Ravi Kumar [b,*], Farzin Maghoul [a], Prabhakar Raghavan [b],
Sridhar Rajagopalan [b], Raymie Stata [c], Andrew Tomkins [b], Janet Wiener [c]

[a] AltaVista Company, San Mateo, CA, USA
[b] IBM Almaden Research Center, San Jose, CA, USA
[c] Compaq Systems Research Center, Palo Alto, CA, USA

Other Examples

[Barabasi-Albert, 1999]

Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks

Albert-László Barabási* and Réka Albert

Actor collaborations

Web graph

Power-grid

Interpreting Power-Laws

Bell Curve — Number of nodes with *k* links vs. Number of links (*k*): Most nodes have the same number of links. No highly connected nodes.

Power Law Distribution — Number of nodes with *k* links vs. Number of links (*k*): Very many nodes with only a few links. A few hubs with large number of links.

Power-Law Degree Exponent

- Power-law degree exponent is typically:

$$2 < \alpha < 3$$

- Examples
  - Web graph:
    - $\alpha_{in} = 2.1$, $\alpha_{out} = 2.4$ [Broder et al. 00]
  - Autonomous systems:
    - $\alpha = 2.4$ [Faloutsos 3 , 99]
  - Actor-collaborations:
    - $\alpha = 2.3$ [Barabasi-Albert 00]
  - Citations to papers:
    - $\alpha \approx 3$ [Redner 98]
  - Online social networks:
    - $\alpha \approx 2$ [Leskovec et al. 07]

Power Laws are Everywhere

Power-Law Distributions in Empirical Data*

Aaron Clauset[†]
Cosma Rohilla Shalizi[‡]
M. E. J. Newman[§]

[Clauset, Shalizi, Newman, 2009]

Power Laws are Everywhere

Power-Law Distributions in Empirical Data*

Aaron Clauset[†]
Cosma Rohilla Shalizi[‡]
M. E. J. Newman[§]

[Clauset, Shalizi, Newman, 2009]

Not everyone likes Power Laws 😊

CMU grad-students at the G20 meeting in Pittsburgh in Sept 2009

Scale Free Networks

- Networks with a **power-law** tail in their degree distribution are often called **"scale-free networks"**

- Where does the term scale-free com from?

  - **Scale invariance:** there is no characteristic scale

    - means laws do not change if scales of length, energy, or other variables, are multiplied by a common factor

  - **Scale free function:** $f(\lambda x) = C(\lambda)\ f(x) \propto f(x)$ *$C(\lambda)$ depends only on λ*

    - Power-law: $f(x) = ax^{-\alpha}$

      $f(\lambda x) = a(\lambda x)^{-\alpha} = \lambda^{-\alpha}(ax^{-\alpha}) = \lambda^{-\alpha} f(x) \propto f(x)$

      Log() or Exp() are not scale free
      $f(\lambda x) = log(\lambda x) = log(\lambda) + log(x) = log(\lambda) + f(x)$
      $f(\lambda x) = exp(\lambda x) = exp(x)^{\lambda} = f(x)^{\lambda}$

Random vs Scale Free

Random network
(Erdos-Renyi random graph)

Degree distribution is Binomial

Scale-free (power-law) network

Degree distribution is Power-law

Preferential Attachment Model

Rich Get Richer

- **New nodes are more likely to link to nodes that already have high degree**

- Herbert Simon's result:
  - Power-laws arise from *"Rich get richer"* (cumulative advantage)

ON A CLASS OF SKEW DISTRIBUTION FUNCTIONS

By HERBERT A. SIMON†

Carnegie Institute of Technology

- Examples:

  - **Citations** *[de Solla Price '65]*: New citations to a paper are proportional to the number it already has

**Networks of Scientific Papers**

The pattern of bibliographic references indicates the nature of the scientific research front.

Derek J. de Solla Price

    - Herding: If a lot of people cite a paper, then it must be good, and therefore I should cite it too

  - **Sociology: Matthew effect** (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matthew_effect)

    - "For whoever has will be given more, and they will have an abundance. Whoever does not have, even what they have will be taken from them."

    - Eminent scientists often get more credit than a comparatively unknown researcher, even if their work is similar

- **Preferential attachment:**
  [Barabasi-Albert '99] **(Barabasi-Albert model)**

  Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks
  Albert-László Barabási* and Réka Albert

  – Nodes arrive in order **1,2,...,n**

  – At step **j**, let d_i be the degree of a previous node **i**

  – A new node **j** arrives and creates **m** out-links

  – Probability of **j** linking to a previous node **i** is proportional to degree d_i of node i

$$P(j \rightarrow i) = \frac{d_i}{\sum_k d_k}$$

Results for Simple Model

- We analyze the following **simple** model:

  - Nodes arrive in order *1,2,3, ... , n*

  - When *node j* is created it makes a **single out-link** to an earlier node ***i*** chosen:

    - **1)** With prob. ***p***, ***j*** links to ***i*** chosen **uniformly at random** (from among all earlier nodes)

    - **2)** With prob. ***1 − p***, node *j* chooses *i* uniformly at random & links **to a random node *v* that *i* points to**
      - **This is same as saying:** With prob. ***1 − p***, node ***j*** links to node ***v*** with prob. proportional to d_v (the in-degree of ***v***)

    - Our graph is **directed**: every node has out-degree 1

- **Claim:** The described model generates networks where the fraction of nodes with **in-degree _k_** scales as:

$$P(d_i = k) \propto k^{-(1+\frac{1}{q})}$$

where q=1-p

So we get power-law degree distribution with exponent:

$$\alpha = 1 + \frac{1}{1-p}$$

The model gives a **power-law**

# Preferential Attachment: The Good

- Preferential attachment gives **power-law** in-degrees!

- Intuitively reasonable process

- Can **tune** model parameter p to get the observed exponent

  - On the web, **P[node has in-degree k] ~ $k^{-2.1}$**

  - $2.1 = 1+1/(1-p) \rightarrow$ **p~0.1**

$p = 0 \rightarrow P(d_i = k) \sim k^{-2}$	$p = 0.5 \rightarrow P(d_i = k) \sim k^{-3}$

Preferential Attachment: The Bad

- Preferential attachment is **not so good at predicting network structure**

  - **Age-degree correlation**
    - Node degree is proportional to its age
    - Possible Solution: Node fitness (virtual degree)

  - **Links among high degree nodes:**
    - On the web nodes sometimes avoid linking to each other

- **Further questions:**

  - What is a reasonable model for **how people sample network nodes and link to them**?

Origins of Preferential Attachment

- **Link Selection Model:** perhaps the simplest example of a local or random mechanism capable of generating preferential attachment

  - **Growth:** At each time step we add a new node to the network

  - **Link selection:** We select a link at random and connect the new node to one of the nodes at the two ends of the selected link

- This simple mechanism generates **preferential attachment**

  - Why? Because nodes are picked with probability proportional to their number of edges

NEW NODE

Origins of Preferential Attachment

- ## Copying Model:

  - (a) **Random Connection:** with prob. **p** the new node links to random node *v*

  - (b) **Copying:** With prob. $1 - p$ randomly choose an outgoing link of node *v* and connect the new node to the selected link's target

    - The new node *"copies"* one of the links of an earlier node

Origins of Preferential Attachment

- Analysis of the **copying model**:
    - **(a)** the probability of selecting a node is *1/N*
    - **(b)** is equivalent to selecting a node linked to a randomly selected link. The probability of selecting a degree-*k* node through the copying process of step (b) is *k/2E* for undirected networks
    - Again, the likelihood that the new node will connect to a degree-*k* node follows preferential attachment

- Examples:
    - **Social networks:** Copy your friend's friends.
    - **Citation Networks:** Copy references from papers we read
   - **Protein interaction networks:** gene duplication

Many models lead to power-laws

- **Copying mechanism** (directed network)
  - Select a node and an edge of this node
  - Attach to the endpoint of this edge

- **Walking on a network** (directed network)
  - The new node connects to a node, then to every first, second, … neighbor of this node

- **Attaching to edges**
  - Select an edge and attach to both endpoints of this edge

- **Node duplication**
  - Duplicate a node with all its edges
  - Randomly prune edges of new node

$$\overline{h} = \begin{cases} const & \alpha = 2 \\[2em] \dfrac{\log\log n}{\log(\alpha-1)} & 2 < \alpha < 3 \\[2em] \dfrac{\log n}{\log\log n} & \alpha = 3 \\[2em] \log n & \alpha > 3 \end{cases}$$

Ultra small world

Small world

Avg. path length   Degree exponent

Size of the biggest hub is of order *O(N)*. Most nodes can be connected within two steps, thus the average path length will be independent of the network size *n*.

The avg. path length increases slower than logarithmically with *n*. In G_{np} all nodes have comparable degree, thus most paths will have comparable length. In a scale-free network vast majority of the paths go through the few high degree hubs, reducing the distances between nodes.

Some models produce $\alpha = 3$. This was first derived by Bollobas et al. for the network diameter in the context of a dynamical model, but it holds for the average path length as well.

The second moment of the distribution is finite, thus in many ways the network behaves as a random network. Hence the average path length follows the result that we derived for the random network model earlier.

Scale-Free Networks: Overview

Pedro Ribeiro – Measuring Networks and Random Graph Models

Scale-Free Networks: Ingredients

- Nodes appear over time **(growth)**

- Nodes prefer to attach to nodes with many connections **(preferential attachment, cumulative advantage)**

NetLogo: Preferential Attachment

RAndPrefAttachment.nlogo

Fitting power-law distributions

Simple Binning

- Most common and not very accurate method:

  - Bin the different values of x and create a frequency histogram

ln(# of times x occurred)

ln(x) is the natural logarithm of x, but any other base of the logarithm will give the same exponent of α because $\log_{10}(x) = \ln(x)/\ln(10)$

ln(x)

x can represent various quantities, the indegree of a node, the magnitude of an earthquake, the frequency of a word in text

Example on an artificially generated data set

- Take 1 million random numbers from a distribution with *α = 2.5*

- Can be generated using the so-called **"transformation method"**

- Generate random numbers r on the unit interval *0 ≤ r <1*

- Then x = $(1-r)^{-1/(\alpha-1)}$ is a **random power law** distributed real number in the range *1 ≤ x < ∞*

Linear scale plot of simple bin. of the data

- Number of times 1 or 3843 or 99723 occurred

- Power-law relationship not as apparent

- Only makes sense to look at smallest bins


First few bins

Whole range

- Same bins, but plotted on a log-log scale

- Fitting a straight line to it via least squares regression will give values of the exponent α that are too low

What goes wrong with simple binning

- Noise in the tail skews the regression result

First solution: logarithmic binning

- Bin data into **exponentially wider bins**:
  - 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, …

- **Normalize by the width** of the bin

evenly spaced datapoints

less noise in the tail of the distribution

- Disadvantage: binning smoothes out data but also loses information

# Second solution: cumulative binning

- No loss of information
  - No need to bin, has value at each observed value of x

- But now have **cumulative distribution**
  - i.e. how many of the values of x are at least X

- The **cumulative probability** of a power law probability distribution **is also a power law** but with an exponent *α - 1*

$$\int c x^{-\alpha} = \frac{c}{1-\alpha} x^{-(\alpha-1)}$$

- Fitted exponent (2.43) much closer to actual (2.5)

Where to start fitting?

- some data exhibit a power law **only in the tail**

- after **binning or taking the cumulative distribution** you can fit to the tail

- so need to select an x_{min} the value of x where you think the power-law starts

- certainly x_{min} needs to be greater than 0 because $x^{-\alpha}$ is infinite at $x = 0$

- Distribution of citations to papers

- Power-law is evident only in the tail
  ($x_{min} > 100$ citations)

Power laws, Pareto distributions and Zipf's law

M.E.J. NEWMAN*

Maximum likelihood fitting – best

- You have to be sure you have a power-law distribution (this will just give you an exponent but not a goodness of fit)

$$\alpha = 1 + n \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln \frac{x_i}{x_{min}} \right]^{-1}$$

- x_i are all your data points, and you have n of them

- for our data set we get **$\alpha = 2.503$** – pretty close!

Some exponents for real world data

|	x_{min}	exponent α
frequency of use of words	1	2.20
number of citations to papers	100	3.04
number of hits on web sites	1	2.40
copies of books sold in the US	2 000 000	3.51
telephone calls received	10	2.22
magnitude of earthquakes	3.8	3.04
diameter of moon craters	0.01	3.14
intensity of solar flares	200	1.83
intensity of wars	3	1.80
net worth of Americans	$600m	2.09
frequency of family names	10 000	1.94
population of US cities	40 000	2.30

Many real world networks are power-law

	exponent α (in/out degree)
film actors	2.3
telephone call graph	2.1
email networks	1.5/2.0
sexual contacts	3.2
WWW	2.3/2.7
internet	2.5
peer-to-peer	2.1
metabolic network	2.2
protein interactions	2.4

Example on a real data set

- Number of AOL visitors to different websites back in 1997

simple binning on a linear scale


simple binning on a log-log scale

Example on a real data set

- Direct fit is too shallow: *α = 1.17* ...

Example on a real data set

- **Binning logarithmically** helps
- Select exponentially wider bins
  - 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, ….

Example on a real data set

- Fitting the **cumulative distribution**

  – Shows perhaps 2 separate power-law regimes that were obscured by the exponential binning

  – Power-law tail may be closer to 2.4

Not everything is a power law!

- Number of **sightings of 591 bird species** in the North American Bird survey in 2003


Power laws, Pareto distributions and Zipf's law

M.E.J. NEWMAN*

- another example:
    - **size of wildfires** (in acres)

Not every network is power-law distributed

- Reciprocal, frequent email communication

- Power grid

Degree distribution

Cumulative degree distribution

- Company directors

Another common distribution

- ## Power-law with an exponential cutoff
  - $p(x) \sim x^{-a} e^{-x/\kappa}$

starts out as a power law

ends up as an exponential

but could also be a lognormal or double exponential ...

- Time between edge initiations

(a) FLICKR

(b) DELICIOUS

(c) ANSWERS

(d) LINKEDIN

Microscopic Evolution of Social Networks

Jure Leskovec[*]   Lars Backstrom[†]   Ravi Kumar[‡]   Andrew Tomkins[‡]
    [*]Carnegie Mellon University   [†]Cornell University   [‡]Yahoo Research
jure@cs.cmu.edu   lars@cs.cornell.edu   {ravikuma, atomkins}@yahoo-inc.com

Power-Laws: Wrap Up

- ## Power-laws are **cool** and **intriguing**

Power-law distributions in empirical data

Aaron Clauset,[1,2] Cosma Rohilla Shalizi,[3] and M. E. J. Newman[4]

[1] Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA
[2] Department of Computer Science, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA
[3] Department of Statistics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA
[4] Department of Physics and Center for the Study of Complex Systems, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

Power-law distributions occur in many situations of scientific interest and have significant consequences for our understanding of natural and man-made phenomena. Unfortunately, the empirical detection and characterization of power laws is made difficult by the large fluctuations that occur in the tail of the distribution. In particular, standard methods such as least-squares fitting are known to produce systematically biased estimates of parameters for power-law distributions and should not be used in most circumstances. Here we describe statistical techniques for making accurate parameter estimates for power-law data, based on maximum likelihood methods and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic. We also show how to tell whether the data follow a power-law distribution at all, defining quantitative measures that indicate when the power law is a reasonable fit to the data and when it is not. We demonstrate these methods by applying them to twenty-four real-world data sets from a range of different disciplines. Each of the data sets has been conjectured previously to follow a power-law distribution. In some cases we find these conjectures to be consistent with the data while in others the power law is ruled out.

- ## But make sure your data is actually power-law before boasting!

ARTICLE

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08746-5   OPEN

Scale-free networks are rare

Anna D. Broido[1] & Aaron Clauset [2,3,4]

Real-world networks are often claimed to be scale free, meaning that the fraction of nodes with degree k follows a power law $k^{-\alpha}$, a pattern with broad implications for the structure and dynamics of complex systems. However, the universality of scale-free networks remains controversial. Here, we organize different definitions of scale-free networks and construct a