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Abstract

The Barabasi-Albert model is a very popular model for creating random scale-free graphs. Despite its widespread use, there is a subtle ambiguity in the definition of the model and, consequently, the dependent models and applications. This ambiguity is a result of the model’s tight relation with the field of unequal probability random sampling, which dictates the exact process of edge creation after a newborn node has been added. In this work, we identify the ambiguity, assess its impact and propose a more precise definition of the Barabasi-Albert model that is expressed as an application of unequal probability random sampling.
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1. Introduction

The Barabasi-Albert model (BA model) \(^2\) is a very popular model for generating undirected scale-free networks, i.e. graphs with power-law degree distribution. This property is achieved via a growing scheme with a preferential attachment mechanism, in which each newborn node gives links to existing nodes and the more connected a node is the more likely it is to receive a new link. More formally, at each time step \(t\) the new node \(t\) that is born gains \(m\) different edges to existing nodes. According to the original paper, for the selection of the \(m\) different nodes we (quoted with adjusted notation)
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randomly select a vertex \( i \) and connect it with probability \( m \cdot d_i(t) / \sum_{j=1}^{t} d_j(t) \) to vertex \( t \) in the system,

where \( d_i(t) \) is the degree of vertex \( i \) at time \( t \).

The BA model is also described in textbooks, for example Jackson [13] offers a slight variation of the original definition:

the probability that an existing node \( i \) gets a link from the new born node at time \( t \) is \( m \) times \( i \)'s degree relative to the overall degree of all existing nodes at time \( t \), or \( m \cdot d_i(t) / \sum_{j=1}^{t} d_j(t) \).

The model is widely used in research works with tens of thousands of citations and is implemented in popular network libraries, such as NetworkX (Python), jGraphT (Java) and iGraph (C++).

In this paper, we show that there exists an ambiguity in the definition of the BA model by identifying the process of selecting \( m \) nodes from the population based on their degrees. This process is called unequal probability random sampling or weighted random sampling, which more formally consists in selecting \( m \) items from a population of \( t \) items where the probability of selecting any two items may not necessarily be equal. Typically, in the preferential attachment models, these probabilities are functions of the elements’ sizes, in the case of the BA model the elements’ degrees. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that the growing preferential attachment model is studied in relation to the unequal probability random sampling schemes and, as a result, the first time that preferential attachment is identified as an application of unequal probability random sampling.

There exist, however, many unequal probability random sampling designs and each one may interpret the relevant probabilities in a different way. In particular, concerning the common definitions of the BA model, the expression “select node \( i \) with probability \( p_i \)” may be interpreted in at least 3 different ways:

1. Each individual node \( i \) gets a link with an independent probability \( p_i \).
2. Each node \( i \) has a selection probability \( p_i \) in a scheme where the \( m \) nodes are selected one by one.
3. The inclusion probability of \( i \) appearing in the collection of \( m \) nodes is \( p_i \).

These interpretations are just 3 examples that are not equivalent to each other but all abide by the “probability proportional to degree” requirement imposed by the BA model. As a result, this distinction is affecting the BA
algorithm because different random sampling designs can lead to graphs with different expected properties.

This distinction among the weighted random sampling designs appears to be less known in this scientific field, where most of the work is based on the assumption that the proportionality refers to the interpretation (2) of the above list. For example, Bollobás et al. [5] state that

\[ \text{for } m > 1 \text{ we add } m \text{ edges from } u_t \text{ one at a time . . . ,} \]

which points to a variation of interpretation (2), as the edges are being added one by one with consecutive draws. In the same paper, the authors identify an ambiguity in the BA model:

it is not clear how the process is supposed to get started,

referring to the situation of the starting \( m_0 \) nodes. This ambiguity, however, is not related to the fundamental method of edge selection during the growing process. In addition, Batagelj and Brandes [3] attempt a connection of the BA model with random sampling but not unequal probability random sampling. They propose a very efficient algorithm for scale-free graphs which is in use in all major open source frameworks and also refers to the interpretation (2). Another efficient implementation of the BA model is presented in [10]. The authors mention that

the computationally intensive part of the algorithm is the degree-proportionate selection, a.k.a. \textit{roulette wheel selection}.

Random sampling does not necessarily imply roulette wheel selections; in fact only one particular type of weighted random sampling is equivalent to this: the selection probabilities of interpretation (2).

For these reasons, we explore the unequal probability random sampling designs, we demonstrate their differences in respect to the BA model, and provide a clarification that addresses its ambiguity by incorporating random sampling terminology. Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

1. We associate two scientific fields: unequal probability random sampling and growing preferential attachment models as an application of the former.
2. Using this association, we identify a subtle ambiguity on the definition of the BA model and demonstrate its impact.
3. We establish a strict definition of the BA model that considers unequal probability random sampling.
With this work, we deliver a perspective of the preferential attachment process around unequal probability random sampling and hope to motivate their further integration in future studies.

2. Unequal Probability Random Sampling

Initially, we establish the notation by defining the problem of unequal probability random sampling as selecting $m$ elements from a population of $t$ elements based on their sizes $x_1, x_2, ..., x_t$. The values $x$ are also called parameters or weights and in this context they refer to vertex degrees. In addition, the definitions and abbreviations in the rest of this paper are commonly found in the literature [12, 15, 16].

The weighted random sampling designs can be categorized based on differences found on multiple levels. In the case of growing preferential attachment, during time $t$ when there are $t$ elements in the system, we have to select exactly $m$ discrete elements based on their existing sizes (degrees). It is, therefore, evident that this refers to a random sampling without replacement and with fixed sample size. As stated earlier, however, a major difference among the designs is the exact process via which the parameters $x_1, x_2, ..., x_t$ are being utilized. In particular, each design interprets the sizes $x_i$ in a different way which leads to differences in the respective inclusion probabilities. More formally, the value $\pi_i$ is defined as the first order inclusion probability of element $i$ in the sample, which is equal to the number of samples that include $i$ over the total number of possible samples. While the inclusion probabilities are a function of the sizes, a special case of random sampling design is the strπps (inclusion probability strictly proportional to size) for which they are exactly proportional $\pi_i \sim x_i$.

Several unequal probability sampling designs are given by Hanif and Brewer [12], Tillé [16], Berger and Tillé [4] and Grafström [9]. In this work, we discuss the preferential attachment mechanism in relation to three relevant designs but our arguments are more general and hold for a larger selection of sampling methods:

2. The draw-by-draw selection [17].
3. The strπps scheme.

These designs all refer to unequal probability sampling without replacement and with constant sample size but the interpretation of the weights is differentiated. Specifically, the conditional Poisson is equivalent to the process of generating Bernoulli samples until the desirable sample size is achieved via...
the rejection of invalid samples. The Yates-Grundy draw-by-draw design is the process of selecting the individual units with unequal probabilities and without replacement until the sample is of the desired size. Efficient algorithms implementing the draw-by-draw design have been suggested, for example in [8] for which the equivalence has been proven by Li [14]. The cases of the draw-by-draw and \( \text{str} \pi \text{ps} \) design are also discussed in [7].

The conditional Poisson and draw-by-draw methods are approximations of the \( \text{str} \pi \text{ps} \) design and, under certain conditions, the sampling design can have negligible consequences on the application. However, depending on the sensitivity of the application, they might not be suitable to use interchangeably. Specifically, Table 1 shows an analytical example of \( n \) elements with sizes \( x_1 = 2 \) and \( x_i = 1, i = 2, \ldots, n \). The table displays the inclusion probability of the heavy node (node 1) and the difference among the sampling designs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Incl. prob. of node 1</th>
<th>Diff. from ( \text{str} \pi \text{ps} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{str} \pi \text{ps} )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{n+1} )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw-by-draw</td>
<td>( \frac{2}{n+1} + \frac{n-1}{4n^2 - n + 2} \cdot \frac{2}{n} )</td>
<td>( \frac{2}{4n^2 + 12} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Poisson</td>
<td>( \frac{4}{n^2 + n + 2} )</td>
<td>( \frac{12}{n^2 + n + 2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: An analytical unequal probability example of \( n \) elements with \( x_1 = 2 \) and \( x_i = 1, i = 2, \ldots, n \). The table displays the inclusion probability of the heavy node (node 1) and the difference among the sampling designs.

Finally, from the designs that were mentioned in Section 1, the correspondence can now be stated: interpretation (1) refers to conditional Poisson, interpretation (2) refers to the draw-by-draw method, and interpretation (3) is a \( \text{str} \pi \text{ps} \) scheme. All three of these interpretations can be fitted into the description of “selecting \( m \) vertices with probability proportional to their degree” but all refer to semantically different probabilities that do not coincide with each other.

3. Preferential Attachment and Random Sampling

These differences are examined in this section in respect to the BA model. In particular, we identify three perspectives under which the properties of
the generated graphs are different and demonstrate their impact in the BA model. Specifically, the divergent properties are the degree distribution (Section 3.1), the expectations of individual nodes occupying specific ranks in the degree hierarchy (Section 3.2), and the probabilities of individual vertices overthrowing other vertices during the growing BA model process (Section 3.3). These perspectives are experimentally studied in detail and the findings provide evidence that the ambiguity of the BA model has an impact on both a theoretical level and practical applications.

For our experiments, the exact algorithms that we use for the three sampling designs mentioned are the method directly produced by the definition of conditional Poisson, the algorithm of Batagelj and Brandes [3] for the draw-by-draw design and Chao’s algorithm [6] as the strπps scheme. We also use the abbreviations CP, DbD and πPS to refer to these in respective order. Lastly, regarding the initial state of the algorithm, we start the process with a complete graph of \( m_0 = m \) nodes. This is important to specify as it addresses another ambiguity that has been previously identified [5].

3.1. Degree Distribution

The first impact of the BA model ambiguity is on the degree distribution of the resulting graph. It is known that the expected degree distribution of the BA model follows a power law; an experimental demonstration is shown in Figure 1. The figure is a log-log plot of the complementary cumulative
Figure 2: Plot of frequencies of smallest (left) and largest (right) degrees for $n = 100$ and $m = 3$.

degree distributions for $m = 3$ and three values for the number of vertices $n$: 100, 1000 and 10000 which are displayed from bottom to top. The plot also displays the reference distribution $x^{-2}$ as the complementary cumulative distribution of the theoretical $x^{-3}$ power law because with a continuum approximation it holds that the cumulative distribution $P(x)$ of $c \cdot x^{-\gamma}$ is

$$P(x) = \int_x^{\infty} c \cdot x^{-\gamma} = \frac{c}{\gamma - 1} x^{-(\gamma - 1)} \sim x^{-(\gamma - 1)}.$$ 

The same plot also displays the results for the 3 different random sampling designs with the tail (the values below 3.5 y-value) being impacted by the very few occurrences.

The differences among the random sampling designs can be better observed in Figure 2, which shows in a zoom level the distribution for $n = 100$ and $m = 3$ in linear axes. The distributions exhibit an interesting behavior regarding the probability mass of the lower, intermediate and higher degrees. In particular, the conditional Poisson design appears to have more vertices with very low or very high degree while the draw-by-draw method results in a distribution with more intermediate degree vertices. Overall, the experiment demonstrates the existence of minor differences on the degree distributions of BA graphs when different random sampling designs are applied on it.

3.2. Rank Probabilities

Nodes in the BA model graph are usually anonymous, i.e. only the degree distribution is relevant or important. However, there are many graphs that correspond to the same degree distribution and each one has distinct
properties. Often, it is desirable to study the graph in the individual vertex level. In this experiment we measure how the degrees are allocated in vertices, and more specifically the degrees of the older nodes, which are usually more important. This scenario would, for example, be applicable when studying the most influential nodes in a social network.

According to the BA model, the older nodes are expected to have higher degrees than newly born nodes. We treat the oldest as named nodes and experimentally measure their probabilities to occupy the highest degree rank (the node with the most amount of connections) in respect to the different sampling schemes. We used the settings $n = 1000$, $m = m_0 = 2$, performed 1,000,000 iterations of the experiment in order to achieve statistical stability, and display the average probabilities in Table 2.

The results provide evidence that the probabilities of the oldest nodes to occupy specific degree ranks is dependent upon the sampling scheme. As a result, in certain cases, for example where the subject of study is the most influential nodes, it is important that there is no ambiguity on the graph generation process. The first 3 nodes have approximately the same probability due to symmetry produced by the initial clique. The table displays only the first 6 nodes to demonstrate the differences of the most important vertices; the probability drops rapidly as the node ID increases. Profound differences can be observed in these results, as conditional Poisson sampling appears to generate graphs with “heavier” old nodes, i.e. nodes that are more likely to remain in the top degree rank after the arrival of newer vertices. Moreover, the same pattern of \( \pi \) being in-between emerges here as well regarding the ranks of the oldest nodes, while the draw-by-draw design results in the “lightest” old nodes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>DbD Top Node Prob.</th>
<th>( \pi ) Top Node Prob.</th>
<th>CP Top Node Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.8922%</td>
<td>24.7511%</td>
<td>26.5150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.5828%</td>
<td>24.5591%</td>
<td>26.2667%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.4610%</td>
<td>24.0638%</td>
<td>26.1037%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.2638%</td>
<td>07.7320%</td>
<td>09.5224%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>06.2067%</td>
<td>05.6924%</td>
<td>04.5706%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>03.7253%</td>
<td>03.3494%</td>
<td>02.5317%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Probabilities of older nodes to occupy the highest degree rank
3.3. Overthrow probabilities

Another subtle perspective via which we study the differences among the random sampling designs is targeting the growing component of the process and, more specifically, how the highest degree node changes over time. First, we define a random variable which shows the number of vertices in the growing graph at the point of an overthrow. An overthrow indicates a change in the top degree rank and is, more formally, the situation where the vertex with the highest degree is unique (clear heaviest node) and at the exact previous time step there was more than one vertex occupying the highest degree rank (tied heaviest nodes). As a result, an overthrow, as defined here, also includes the situations where a unique top rank of the same node is repeated directly after a tied top rank.

It is our expectation that the probability of an overthrow will decline in respect to time. This is because as the node with the highest degree accumulates more edges, the probability of it gaining more edges is further increased and, as a result, the probability of an overthrow is declining over time. Our hypothesis is confirmed by the experiments for \( n = 1000, m = 2 \) and 2,000,000 repetitions for statistical stability, the results of which are shown in Figure 3. The figure shows the probability distribution of an overthrow (y-axis) occurring at specific time points (x-axis) of the BA model.
growing process. The momentary fluctuations, which are especially noticeable on very small \( x \) values are because of the definition of an overthrow that disallows the existence of consecutive overthrows. It is possible that an alternative definition that is not bound by this property would not have this impact on the distribution. Furthermore, the figure also highlights the differences among the random sampling designs with the draw-by-draw design resulting in more “unstable” process, i.e. a process with relatively more overthrows. The strπ design is again in the intermediate position, which is consistent with the previous findings, and the conditional Poisson generates a BA growing with the least amount of overthrows.

Interestingly, the overthrow probability distribution is also a power law. In fact, the distribution corresponding to the strπ design appears remarkably close to the power law distribution \( c \cdot x^{-1} \) with a correlation of \( \rho = 0.9999 \) between them. The correlation has been measured for the \( x \) values greater or equal than 20 to avoid interference from the initial fluctuations mentioned previously. This observation deserves some attention as, if true, such a complicated process involving the BA model, the weighted random sampling scheme and the overthrow mechanic, produces such a simple and intuitive outcome.

Another interesting property of the approximation -1 of the exponent is that it constitutes a strict boundary on the behavior of another measure, the expected number of overthrows in the asymptotic state, i.e. when \( t \) approaches infinity, which is given by

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} c \cdot t^{-\gamma},
\]

where \( \gamma \) is the exponent of the overthrow distribution. This expectation converges when \( \gamma > 1 \) but diverges when \( \gamma \leq 1 \). As a result, the value of the hypothesis that \( \gamma = 1 \) lies directly on the boundary of asymptotically finite or infinite number of overthrows in a BA graph creation process. We leave the relation of the overthrow distribution with the power law distribution \( x^{-1} \) as an open problem; whether they can be analytically linked should be pursued in some future study.

4. Concise definition of the BA model

Our experimental study shows that, to a certain extent, the choice of the unequal probability random sampling design has an impact on the outcome of the BA model. A natural question is whether there exists a “correct”
scheme that has to be applied on the BA model. According to Jackson [13, Section 5.2] the rate at which a node gains edges is

$$\frac{dd_i(t)}{dt} = \frac{d_i(t)}{2t},$$

which points to the strπps model as it implies that the inclusion probability is strictly proportional to the degree of the respective vertex. The same can be concluded via the master equation approach mentioned by Albert and Barabási [1, Section VII.B] where the probability of a vertex gaining an edge after a newborn node has been added is proportional to its degree. This observation implies that the majority of the BA algorithms do not follow the BA model strictly as imprinted in the analytical formulation of the model; most of the theoretical algorithms in the literature as well as the implementations in major open source frameworks consider the draw-by-draw scheme.

Despite non-strπps models resulting in graphs with different properties, there is no basis in labeling them wrong. It is instead appropriate to consider them producing unexpected results if not properly specified, rather than wrong. Thus, we propose that the BA model, and the preferential attachment mechanism in general, be defined more strictly in order to account for the different sampling designs. Typically, the BA model is defined via the parameters $n, m, m_0$ and less commonly, in non-linear models, the $a$ parameter. This definition is not sufficient to adequately describe the process and is open to interpretation. As a result, it is required that the BA model be extended with another parameter, the exact unequal probability random sampling design used in the edge selection after a newborn node has been added. Typically, the sampling design is without replacement and with constant sample size in order to abide by the constant $m$ parameter and result in a simple graph, i.e. a graph without loops or multiple edges.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have identified a subtle ambiguity in the definition of the Barabasi-Albert model by taking into consideration the field of unequal probability random sampling. We showed that the definition of the model, in particular the part where $m$ nodes are selected based on their degrees, is open to interpretation and can lead to graphs with unexpected properties. For this reason, we proposed an extension to the definition in the form of a new parameter that dictates the exact weighted random sampling scheme. We
ultimately hope to inspire the use of unequal probability random sampling in the preferential attachment model in general.

Future lines of research may focus on the asymptotic analysis of the random sampling scheme when applied to the BA model. An example would be whether different random sampling schemes would converge to the same degree distribution as the number of vertices increases. This perspective is particularly interesting because traditionally the BA model has been thought as a stationary distribution model [1]. This work may also give rise to the algorithmic study of the BA model in a random sampling context and the development of efficient algorithms besides the draw-by-draw method, which appears to be dominant in both a theoretical level and open source implementations. Regarding the latter, unexpected implications of existing implementations on practical applications should also be assessed, even if their impact is negligible.
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