Explaining the emergence of complex networks through log-normal attachment in a Euclidean node similarity space
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Our world is abundant with interdependent interactions occurring at all levels—be it in the global ecology, human social institutions, within the human brain, or in micro-scale protein interactions. When mapped as networks, connectivity patterns across such different phenomena show broadly consistent features, yet an accurate universal theory to explain this remains elusive. Here, we pose a new theory which considerably outperforms current mechanistic theories of complex network emergence in network modelling accuracy. Here, link probability is defined by a log-normal attachment (surface) factor and a Euclidean space-embedded node similarity (depth) factor. Topological modelling based on this theory strongly outperforms power-law and hyperbolic geometry explanations across 110 networks. A surface factor inversion approach on an economic world city network and an fMRI connectome results in considerably more geometrically aligned nearest neighbour networks. The proposed theory establishes new foundations from which to understand, analyse, deconstruct and interpret network phenomena.

INTRODUCTION

Theories and models of the emergence of complex networks allow us to gather insights into their potential generative mechanisms [1-2]. The seminal prototype of network models is the Erdős-Rényi random graph where all links have equal probability, \( p \), of appearing in the graph. A realisation of this random graph is generated by assigning uniformly random values to all node pairs and substantiating the existence of those links whose values lie above the probability threshold, \( p \) [3]. For a large enough number of nodes, each distinct graph topology (i.e. graph isomorphism class) has roughly equal probability of appearing from this model [4]. Yet, the topological characteristics of real-world networks substantially and consistently deviate from random graphs [5], telling us that real-world networks occupy a relatively small and highly uncommon set of graph isomorphism classes.

We can broadly classify network models either as being constructive or non-constructive. Non-constructive models such as configuration models [5-6], stochastic block models [7], and complex hierarchy models [8] attempt to target or emulate real-world network properties, focused on practical issues, for example studying the specialness of specific network properties. Constructive models, on the other hand, seek to derive complex network-like topologies from proposed generative mechanisms, the aim of which is to provide plausible physical explanations for the non-arbitrary topological features of real world networks. A popular branch of constructive models derive from the theory of preferential attachment where nodes which are older in the network have a greater share of links simply due to their age, and present with scale-free degree distributions seen in some networks [2]. It has also been shown that scale-free networks can instead develop from scale-free node ‘intrinsic fitness’, where each node has a probability of forming connections according to a scale-free distribution [9]. But while scale-free networks are sparse [10], recent results have shown the rarity of scale-free networks in the real-world while many have degree distributions which better resemble log-normal distributions [11]. Given that distributions of abilities or tendencies, such as those proposed in the idea of intrinsic fitness, tend to be log-normal rather than power-law [12], there would appear to be a greater rational for studying whether a log-normal attachment paradigm may better reflect emergent complex network topologies.

Another branch of constructive models considers nodes existing in a geometric space and connections occurring where those nodes are close together. The idea that nodes which are close together are connected together is intuitively sensible and recent evidence agrees [13]. A prototype of this approach is the random geometric graph, where nodes are random samples of an \( n \)-dimensional Euclidean space [14]. This model has some relevant properties to real word networks such as a high modularity and clustering, but does not display the degree heterogeneity implicated by hub nodes typical of complex networks. Further to this, Serrano et al. proposed a hyperbolic geometric model where nodes randomly sampled on the unit circle were attached geometrically with constraints for the expected degree distribution of the network [15-16]. It was then proposed that a trade-off of popularity and similarity was an alternative explanation of network evolution [17]. Although this combination of ‘popularity’ and ‘similarity’ is an attractive proposition, and one that will be echoed in the theory of this paper, these works do not provide an explanation for how the degree distributions of complex networks themselves arise.

The two main aspects to be explained in the emergence of complex networks: i) heavy-tailed degree distributions, and ii) the likelihood of any given pair of nodes to form a connection, are here addressed in a new theory which proposes link probability factors of log-normal
attachment and node similarity embedded in a high-dimensional Euclidean space. We rigorously test our theory against prevailing theories of power-law distributions and hyperbolic geometry across over 100 real world networks, showing that our theory significantly and consistently achieves much greater accuracy in emulating real world network topologies. We then describe an application of this theory for recovering the depth factor of a weighted complex network and validate this on pertinent economic and brain networks.

RESULTS

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be a set of nodes representative of individual agents. Then, suppose that these agents have individual tendencies to make connections to other agents, $s_i$, and that these tendencies are distributed according to a log-normal distribution $s \sim \text{LogN}(\mu, \sigma)$. For example, in social networks it stands to reason that the tendencies of people to make new friends is the result of a number of psychological variables, such as extroversion and charisma, while empirical evidence suggests that such variables should be modelled using a log-normal distribution [12]. We relate to this as the surface factor of the network, since it does not really help to describe why any two nodes are connected together beyond that either or both have a strong tendency to make connections. We could consider whether such tendencies are additive or multiplicative for pairs of nodes, i.e. is the combined tendency of $s_i$ and $s_j$ $(s_i + s_j)$ or $s_is_j$? In practice, this is not of immediate importance since both the addition and product of two log-normally distributed variables are log-normal.

Below this surface, however, we assume that there are similarities between agents which make it more likely for connections to occur between them. Thus, we suppose that agents are distinguishable by some number, $q$, of independent latent variables, $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_q$. Then, the similarity of nodes $i$ and $j$ across these variables can be described by some distance function

$$d_{ij} = f(x_1(i), x_1(j), x_2(i), x_2(j), \ldots, x_q(i), x_q(j)).$$

A very obvious and important consideration of such latent variables is simply the geometry within which the agents are set. If two agents live nearby one another, it stands to reason they are more likely to be connected to one another than to some other agent that lives far away, disregarding other variables. It is important to point out that variables could also be categorical. For instance, in a social network, people who belong to the same club, A, say, are more likely to be connected to others in another club, B. We refer to these latent variables as making up a depth factor for the network as it accurately describes the similarities of agents beyond their tendency to make connections.

Combining these consideration, the probability of a connection being established between nodes $i$ and $j$ is proportional to node similarity (depth factor) and the combined tendency of making connections of $i$ and $j$ (surface factor), giving

$$p_{ij} \sim d_{ij}(s_i + s_j).$$

Assuming that these as the only considerations of the probability of existence of a link, we can take the weights of links in our network as

$$w_{ij} = d_{ij}(s_i + s_j)$$

up to linearity. For a complex binary network with $m$ links, we can then, for example, take the $m$ largest weights as extant, use a nearest neighbours connectivity approach [18], or use a combination of the two to specify the exact number of links while ensuring there are no isolated nodes.

Model

Given the above, to construct a model, all we need is a description of the properties of the latent variables, $x_i$. We know that geometry is a key consideration of networks, and thus we have up to three variables which can be approximated using a random geometric graph where coordinates are chosen uniformly at random over the interval $[0, 1]$. The most simple model would prescribe all variables as equivalent and independent, thus we shall simply model similarities between nodes as distances of a random geometric graph in $q$ dimensions. Of course, it is likely that different variables will have different distributive properties in reality, but, as we shall demonstrate, this simple assumption actually works quite well in practice for modelling a diverse range of complex networks. Our model, then, has probabilistic weights for each link proportional to

$$w_{ij} = d_{ij}(s_i + s_j),$$

where

$$d_{ij} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{q} (x_{ik} - x_{jk})^2}$$

for each $x_i \sim U([0, 1])$, and $s \sim \text{LogN}(\mu, \sigma)$. Now, $\mu$ does not affect the relative values in $[4]$, i.e. $\mu$ will not affect relationships of the form $w_{ij} \leq w_{kl}$ for any $i, j, k, l \in \mathcal{V}$, thus essentially, we only need to consider the shape parameter, $\sigma$, of the log-normal distribution. Thus, the only parameters of this model are the number of dimensions of the deep factor, $q$, and the shape parameter for the log-normal distribution of the surface factor, $\sigma$ and, for a network, $G$, with $n$ nodes and $m$ links, we can describe its surface-depth model as $G_{s,d}(q, \sigma)$. 
Estimating the surface factor in a weighted network

Given the above theory, it would be of high interest to uncover the depth factor of real networks as this would help to determine and analyse the similarity structure of nodes beyond the somewhat confounding tendencies for attachment. However, recovering the depth factor of sparse binary networks poses a very challenging problem, as it would seem intractable to determine which links are stronger to a given node than any other from the binary links. What we can do, however is to apply our methods to weighted networks by assuming that the weights of the network are approximately linearly proportional to the underlying link probabilities of the network. This is motivated by the fact that, for example, thresholded functional brain networks display the consistent topological characteristics of binary real world networks [19].

We propose here an optimisation algorithm to determine an estimate of the log-normal surface factor of a network by minimising the skewness of network weights after inverting estimated surface factors determined by an array of log-normal distributions. In this case, the argument of the minimisation is the shape parameter $\sigma$ of the log-normal distribution. The skewness of network weights is chosen based on i) the observation that distances between random samples in an $q$-Euclidean geometric space have highly symmetric distributions even for fairly small $q$ and ii) simulation experiments showing correlations between the real and estimated depth factor weights are inversely related to skewness, see supplementary material section i.c. The pseudocode of the algorithm can be found in the Methods. Note, without knowledge of the degree distribution of the hypothetical depth factor, we are left with the practical assumption that the the ranks of the $n$ random samples of the log-normal distribution align with the ranks of the weighted degrees of the original network.

Validation

Section i.a of the supplementary material provides some initial explorations of the topology of the model covering topological differences between surface-depth models and random geometric graphs and the behaviour of degree distribution with increasing network density. We shall continue with the most pertinent results regarding the modelling of real world networks. We modelled 110 real world binary networks collected from two different sources. The most accurate surface-depth model was then chosen by optimising for the two model parameters, $\sigma$ and $q$, following Algorithm 1 (see methods). We then did the exact same approach with parameter substitutions for power-law attachment instead of log-normal, and spherical surface geometry for node similarity instead of Euclidean space.

The Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) in topology of the models for each network, calculated through five distinct and widely used normalised topological metrics (see methods), is scatter plotted against both error using a power-law surface factor and spherical surface depth factor in Fig 1a & b, respectively. The proposed theory’s model clearly outperforms models of theories of both power-law attachment and hyperbolic geometry, with a median RMSE of just 0.0449 compared with 0.1932 and 0.2012 for power-law attachment and hyperbolic geometry, respectively. It also clearly outperforms general $q$-dimensional spherical surface geometry with a median RMSE of 0.0813. In fact, RMSE is smaller in the proposed model than hyperbolic geometry in 99.09% of networks, scale-free attachment in 97.27% of networks and general spherical surface geometry in 80% of networks studied. Furthermore, the average sizes of RMSE are a remarkable 293.4%, 287.5% and 170.4% the size of the proposed model for hyperbolic geometry, power-law attachment and general spherical surface geometry models, respectively.

We then tested to see whether any correlation or anti-correlation was established between the optimised parameters, $q$ and $\sigma$, of the model. The existence of any significant correlation would indicate that the parameters were not independent and thus would negate the claims of the theory that independent surface and depth factors existed to make up link probability. Scatter plots of $\sigma$ against $q$ for all networks are shown for the proposed model, the power-law attachment model and the general spherical surface model in Fig 1a, b & c, respectively. Spearman’s correlation coefficient, $r_s$, was used to assess levels of correlation between $q$ and $\sigma$. There was no correlation found between $\sigma$ and $q$ of the proposed theory’s model ($r_s = -0.0563, p = 0.5590$), validating the independence assumption of surface and depth factors of complex networks. On the other hand, a significant anti-correlation was found between $\sigma$ and $q$ when spherical surface geometry was used ($r_s = -0.3872, p = 2.92 \times 10^{-5}$), indicating that this model and the hyperbolic geometry theory model of which it is a generalisation, is not as appropriate a theoretical foundation for network topology emergence.

Next, for 50 model realisation, we compared the degree distributions of the best-fit model with real networks using Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) two-sample statistical tests. The null hypothesis, that the distributions were not different, was rejected in the case that $p < 0.05$. Effect sizes for the KS test were computed as the normalised $z$-statistic, $z/\sqrt{n^2/2n} = z/\sqrt{n/2}$. Of the 110 networks studied, 68.2% had no significant $p$-value (median over 50 realisations), while 81.8% had no noticeable effect size ($0.2$, with all bar one of the remainder (17.27%) having only small effect sizes ($\in [0.2,0.5]$). Indeed, Fig 2 shows comparisons of degree distributions of the proposed model and network repository networks.
The similarity between distributions across all networks of various size, density and domain is remarkable. Performance against power-law attachment was stark, with average effect size of power-law attachment being 225.7% of log-normal attachment. From this, it must be put forward that log-normal attachment be adopted as the new unifying theory of attachment in complex network topologies, achieving scale-free like distributions in networks at sparse densities and log-normal like distributions in networks of larger densities, as seen in [11].

Interestingly, there was a particular class of networks that proved to have large errors for all models even though their degree distributions were on the whole largely indistinguishable from those of the proposed model. These were food web networks. Looking more closely, it appeared there was an exceptional difference in the clustering coefficients in this case. Median differences for each index across food web networks were as follows: $C_{\text{model}} - C_{\text{real}} = 0.2753, E_{\text{model}} - E_{\text{real}} = 0.0206, V_{\text{model}} - V_{\text{real}} = 0.0593, r_{\text{model}} - r_{\text{real}} = 0.0185, Q_{\text{model}} - Q_{\text{real}} = 0.0449$. The very low relative clustering in food web networks makes sense since we can expect that it is uncommon for predators of the same prey to hunt one another as well. This suggests that better modelling of the depth factor would help to capture the information in food web networks.

**Depth factor recovery through estimated surface factor inversion**

We applied depth factor recovery on two important cases of weighted networks. The first, was the complete weighted global city network, available from the Globalisation and World Cities research network [20, 21], constructed using relationships of producer service firms at the forefront of economic influence within each city. The second was the sparse (link density of 0.0917) weighted group average fMRI network available freely from the brain connectivity toolbox [22]. In both cases, we optimised the log-normal distributions of the surface factors following the network weight skewness minimisation Algorithm 2 in the methods.

For the global city network, the optimal log-normal distribution was found at $\sigma = 0.59$. K-Nearest Neighbour (KNN) graphs with $K = 5$ were then computed from the global city network and its estimated depth factor. We also compared this with just using the weighted degree distribution as an estimate of the surface factor. Fig [3] a, b & c show the weighted adjacency matrices of the

---

**FIG. 1.** Plots a. and b. show root mean squared errors of the proposed model against power-law attachment spherical surface geometry (including the hyperbolic model), respectively. c. Effect sizes of degree distributions between model and network (log-normal versus power-law attachment). Dotted lines show the line of parity. Plots d., e., and f. show the surface model parameter plotted against the depth model parameter for the proposed theory, power-law attachment theory and spherical surface geometry theory, respectively.

---
FIG. 2. Comparison of the degree distributions between real-world networks and their respective closest fit surface-depth model. These are log-log plots where there is a clear scaling distribution.

original network and the estimated depth factors from the weighted degree and tuned log-normal distribution surface inversion approaches, respectively.

Modules were computed using Louvain’s modularity method [23]. The 5NN graphs were then plotted using the same force-based algorithm where connected nodes are attracted and non-connected nodes repelled from one another [24]. Fig 3 d & e. Remarkably, surface inversion of the hub-centric world city network produced a highly modular network with geometric qualities. On inspection, spaces within the network layout were notable by their global proximity and cultural ties. We analysed this statistically in the case of global proximity. Section ii of the supplementary material contains these details alongside tables of the five nearest neighbours of each city for each approach. Of these, 180 (65.45%) were found to be proximal on the globe (either being in the same continent or observably close) for the tuned log-normal inversion compared to 50.55% for the degree-based inversion and 38 for the degree-based inversion. All in all, the tuned log-normal inversion provided a remarkably more geometrically congruent network, with a clear elimination of rich-club bias in nearest neighbours. Cultural ties were assessed qualitatively, for example Barcelona and Madrid being in the same community as all Latin American cities appeals to their cultural ties, whereas Latin American cities were not all found in the same community in the original network. Also, Eastern Europe and East Asia both had clearly distinct communities in the recovered depth factor but not so in the original network.

For the fMRI network, the optimal log-normal distribution was found at \( \sigma = 0.27 \). The 3D coordinates of the nodes representing brain regions was available, allowing us to construct a geometric graph for comparison. The sparsity of the network posed a significant confounding factor in this instance as only those links which already existed could be chosen in the the resulting 5NN graph. Nonetheless, we considered three measurements of the geometric appropriateness of the resulting depth factor—i) the percentage of overlapping links with the 5NN graph...
of the geometric network, ii) the proportion of symmetric nodes across brain hemispheres appearing in the same module, and iii) the average largest distance within modules. Details of these analyses are in the supplementary material section i.d. In all cases the estimated depth factor outperformed the original network. The depth factor achieved consistently greater geometric overlap and module symmetry and smaller average largest distance within modules. This again clearly demonstrates the enhanced geometric appropriateness of an estimated depth factor.

**LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK**

The theory put forward is topologically accurate in modelling most of the complex networks studied here, yet me made no attempt to take into account dynamically changing networks and network evolution. That being said, evolution and dynamics of networks can be easily accounted for in our theory by shifts occurring in shallow and deep factors. For instance, a node may take on different values of its latent variables thus changing the nodes to which it is most similar which would result in a change to the links the node makes. Otherwise, the node may increase or decrease its surface factor value giving it a higher/lower tendency to make connections, again resulting in a dynamic change of the network. New nodes could be assumed to appear somewhere within the latent variable space but with an initially low tendency to make the connections.

Also there are evident limitations in the modelling of the depth factor. New methods would be required for more accurate depth factors and the fusion of different types of latent variables, including categorical variables, to improve the model’s accuracy, particularly to help explain networks with very low clustering coefficients. The proposal that a depth factor of weight similarities can be extracted has clear implications in terms of geometric deep learning [25]. Along similar lines, a recent study considered using machine learning approaches on a hyperbolic network model [26]. It seems that such methods can be fairly straightforwardly translated to the geometries of the proposed depth factor and we expect our study will open up interesting future research along these lines. Immediate applications of the theory include surface inversion to other weighted networks and the con-
sideration of this theory to advance efforts in important network problems such as community detection and link prediction.

METHODS

Data

Two datasets of networks were used. The first consisted of 25 networks taken from the network repository across different domains [27]. This consisted of eight social networks—karate club, hi-tech firm, dolphins, wikivote, Hamsterster, Enron email, Dublin contact, and Uni email; six biological networks—mouse brain, macaque cortex, c elegans metabolism, mouse, plant, and yeast proteins; three ecological networks—Everglades, Mangwet and Florida; three infrastructure networks—US airports, euromarshes and power grid; and three economic networks—global city network (binarised at 20% density), US transactions 1979 commodities and industries. Many of these were classic benchmark networks.

The second network dataset was the corpus used in [28]. Of this dataset, we looked at the 184 static networks and, for the sake of computational time, chose to look only at those between 20 and 500 nodes in size. Further, we discarded bipartite networks as these have 0 clustering and thus obviously need a different depth factor consideration than the random geometric graph which has a large clustering coefficient. We thus ended up with 85 networks.

Model optimisation

Five topological measurements were chosen on which to base the optimisation of the model to a real world network. These were the clustering coefficient, $C$, global efficiency $E$, normalised degree variance $V$, Louvain’s modularity $Q$, and assortativity $r$. Each metric was chosen on the basis that i) it covered a distinctly formulated topological aspect, and ii) its value was appropriately normalised with maximum possible magnitude of 1 so that the minimisation was not evidently biased to any particular index. This kind of minimisation has been previously used in e.g. [32][33]. We assumed that for a node to exist in a sparse binary network, it would be required to be connected within it—consider that isolated nodes could exist in a system without the knowledge of the network constructor. Thus models (with the same number of nodes as their corresponding real-world networks) were ensured to have all nodes with at least degree 1 by including the nearest neighbours for each node. The rest of the links were then selected simply from the links with highest weights across all model weights until the number of links matched the real network.

The parameters of surface-depth models were then optimised to the real-world networks by the following algorithm

Algorithm 1 Modelling a network

1: Compute indices $C$, $E$, $V$, $Q$ and $r$ of network $G$
2: for $q \in \{1,2,\ldots,10\}$ do
3: \quad Compute 20 realisations, $G_{s-d}(q,\sigma)$, of model with the same size and density as $G$ with $\sigma$ ranging from 0.05 up to 1 in steps of 0.05
4: \quad Compute $C$, $E$, $V$ $Q$ and $r$ of each of these models and take the mean over realisations for each
5: \quad Compute the RMSE between indices of $G$ and mean of $G_{s-d}(q,\sigma)$
6: \quad Take $\sigma'$ as the $\sigma$ parameter of minimum RMSE model
7: \quad Compute 20 realisations of each surface-depth model with $\sigma$ within 0.05 of $\sigma'$ in steps of 0.01
8: \quad Take the model with the minimum RMSE value from this step as the minimum for the model with $q$ dimensions
9: The minimum across $q$ of the minimum RMSEs across $\sigma$ is then taken as the model of best fit to $G$

Note, we took a maximum of $q = 10$ arbitrarily to save on time as we assume the topological properties of the model are asymptotic with $q$, as demonstrated in the supplementary material, so if it is still far away by $q = 10$ it is unlikely to ever get too close. Figure C in section 1.b of the supplementary material plots the index values of 10 networks and their models alongside results obtained for models utilising surface and depth factors separately, illustrating how the model adapts to each network.

The same algorithm was used for power-law attachment and spherical surface geometry by substituting the log-normal parameter, $\sigma$ $\in [0,1]$, for a power-law parameter, $\gamma$ $\in [2,3]$, and by substituting $N$-dimensional geometric random graphs for $N$-dimensional spherical surfaces, respectively. In the latter case, random samples of an $N$-dimensional spherical surface were generated where coordinates for a single sample were obtained from normalising $N$ normally distributed samples and distances between two samples, $x = [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N]$ and $y = [y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_N]$, computed per the formula

$$d(x, y) = \cos\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i y_i\right).$$

Surface factor optimisation

For a weighted network with adjacency matrix $W$, the shape parameter of a log-normal surface factor was estimated, up to two decimal places, by the following algorithm
Algorithm 2 Estimating the surface factor

1: for \( \sigma \in \{0.01, 0.02, \ldots, 1\} \) do
2: Compute 1000 realisations, \( \{s_k\}_{k=1}^{1000} \), of \( n \) samples from log-normal distribution \( LN(0.5, \sigma) \)
3: For each \( s_k \), order the samples according to the ranks of the weighted degrees of \( W \) (e.g. largest sample goes in position \( i \) where node \( i \) has largest weighted degree)
4: For newly arranged \( s_k \), compute the matrix, \( S \), whose entries \( s_{ij} = s_k(i) + s_k(j) \)
5: Compute the depth factor estimation matrix, \( D \), with entries \( d_{ij} = w_{ij}/s_{ij} \)
6: Compute the skewness of the entries of \( D \)
7: For each \( \sigma \), average the skewness over the 1000 realisations
8: The value of \( \sigma \) which achieves minimum average skewness is taken as the optimised estimate of the surface factor of \( W \)
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