

Cost-effective Network Disintegration through Targeted Enumeration

Zhi-Gang Wang^{1,2}, Ye Deng¹, Zeng-Ru Di^{1,2}, and Jun Wu^{1,*}

¹International Academic Center of Complex Systems, Beijing Normal University at Zhuhai, 519087, P. R. China

²School of Systems Science, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, P. R. China

*junwu@bnu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Although we are in a hyper-connected world, this connectivity has undesirable aspects in nature and society. Finding an optimal subset of nodes or links to disintegrate harmful networks is a fundamental problem in network science, with potential applications to anti-terrorist, epidemic control, and many other fields. The challenge of the network disintegration problem is to balance the effectiveness and efficiency of strategies. In this paper, we propose a cost-effective targeted enumeration method for network disintegration. Our approach includes two stages: searching the candidate objects and identifying the optimal solution. In the first stage, we employ the rank aggregation method to generate a comprehensive node importance ranking, based on which we determine a small-scale candidate set of nodes to remove. In the second stage, we use the enumeration method to find the optimal combination among the candidate nodes. The extensive experimental results on synthetic and real-world networks demonstrate that our method achieves a satisfying trade-off between effectiveness and efficiency. The introduced two-stage targeted enumeration framework can be further extended to other combinatorial optimization problems.

Introduction

Exploring the internal correlation structure of complex networks is an important research paradigm for understanding complex systems.^{1,2} In the majority of cases, we hope to ensure network connectivity, which promotes the research on network robustness in the past decades.^{3–8} However, suppose a network is harmful, such as terrorist networks,⁹ criminal networks,¹⁰ epidemic spreading networks,¹¹ financial contagion networks¹² and cancer networks.¹³ How to efficiently disrupt the structure and function of the network is a meaningful and challenging task, which is referred to as the network disintegration problem and has attracted growing attention.^{14–20}

The core of the network disintegration problem is determining the node or link set to be removed under certain constraints and various disintegration goals,^{21,22} and it is typically NP-hard for general graphs.²³ Its mathematical essence is a combinatorial optimization problem. Apart from the early research based on mathematical programming models to find the optimal network disintegration solution,^{24–27} researchers also try to calculate the centrality measures of nodes and then remove them one by one starting from the nodes with the highest centrality values to obtain the network disintegration strategy.^{3,14,28,29} However, the set composed of a single important node may not be the most critical set of nodes, and with the increased availability of the large-scale network, novel heuristic or approximate algorithms have been proposed to find vital nodes in complex networks.^{30–33} A recent study has suggested an iterative algorithm for selecting multiple controlled nodes based on the spectral properties of the grounded Laplacian matrix obtained by deleting specific rows and columns in the Laplacian matrix of the network.³⁴ Furthermore, some studies introduced evolutionary algorithms into the network disintegration problem and attempted to find a near-optimal strategy from the considerable solution space.^{35,36} Inspired by the advances in artificial intelligence for solving many practical problems, some works developed deep reinforcement learning or machine learning to search the influential nodes in complex networks.^{37,38}

Despite the fact that considerable progress has been made in the study of network disintegration, it is still challenging to provide a good balance between effectiveness and efficiency. Methods with good effectiveness, such as mathematical programming methods, evolutionary algorithms, and machine learning algorithms, have poor efficiency, limiting their applications in large-scale networks. On the other hand, many methods with high efficiency, such as centrality methods and heuristic algorithms, are usually unsatisfactory in the aspect of effectiveness, which is far from the optimal solution. In principle, one can find the optimal disintegration strategy through the exhaustive method, but it is no doubt that there will be a combinatorial explosion for large-scale networks. To weigh the effectiveness and efficiency of network disintegration, we propose a targeted enumeration method in this paper. We first extract a small-scale candidate set of nodes to reduce the enumeration scope and then find the optimal combination among the candidate nodes through enumeration. The core and difficulty of the method are to determine the candidate set efficiently. We propose to solve it by rank aggregation. The two-stage targeted enumeration method

has a highly flexible framework that requires no domain-specific knowledge and leads to a cost-effective network disintegration strategy.

Results

Network disintegration model

Consider an undirected and unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$ with finite nonempty node set V and link set E . Let $N = |V|$ and $W = |E|$ be the number of nodes and links, respectively. We define different nodes as v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N . This paper focuses on the node removal and assumes that all links connected to the node will be deleted after the node is removed. Let $\hat{V} \subseteq V$ denote the set of nodes to be removed, then $\hat{G} = (V - \hat{V}, \hat{E})$ is the network that remains after removing nodes in \hat{V} , and $n = |\hat{V}|$ is the disintegration strength. We denote the network disintegration strategy as $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]$, its elements being $x_i = 1$ if the corresponding i th node satisfies $v_i \in \hat{V}$, otherwise $x_i = 0$, so we can get the disintegration strength as $n = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$. No matter what type and scale of attacks the network is subjected to, it will inevitably damage its inherent structure and functions, which will also be reflected in the measure function of the network performance. Based on this, we introduce the following evaluation function to measure the disintegration effect:

$$\Phi(X) = \frac{\Gamma(G) - \Gamma(\hat{G})}{\Gamma(G)}, \quad (1)$$

where Γ represent the measure function of the network performance, and $\Phi(X)$ is abbreviated as Φ . If $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ is a subgraph of $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$, that is, $V_1 \subseteq V_2$ and $E_1 \subseteq E_2$, we assume that $\Gamma(G_1) \leq \Gamma(G_2)$. The monotonicity of Φ guarantees that the network performance decreases with the process of network disintegration. It is easy to know that $0 \leq \Phi \leq 1$. From Eq. (1), we can see that the goal of the network disintegration is to design a node removal strategy, that is, a subset of nodes to be removed, which can maximize the disintegration effect Φ . In summary, the optimization model for the disintegration strategy can be described as the following general mathematical model:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \Phi(X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]), \\ & \text{s.t.} \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i = n \\ x_i = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In the present paper, we employ the natural connectivity (NC)^{39,40} (for details see Methods) as the measure function Γ among a variety of alternative ways. Natural connectivity has an intuitive physical meaning and a simple mathematical formulation. It has been proved that natural connectivity decreases strictly monotonically with the removal of nodes or links.

Searching the candidate objects by rank aggregation

From the viewpoint of mathematics, network disintegration is a typical combinatorial problem, i.e., taking n nodes from N nodes without repetition. For the small network size N , one can directly obtain the optimal solution by enumerating all $C_N^n = \frac{N!}{n!(N-n)!}$ combinations. However, for large-scale networks, there will be a problem of combinatorial explosion. Intuitively, the selected n nodes should be important based on some criterion. If we extract a small-scale candidate set of vital nodes in advance and then enumerate all combinations only among the candidate set, it will dramatically improve the enumeration efficiency. Denote by \tilde{N} the size of candidate set, where $n \leq \tilde{N} \leq N$. Then, the range of enumeration can be reduced from C_N^n to $C_{\tilde{N}}^n$. Now the core problem is to search the candidate objects. There are numerous criteria to characterize the importance of nodes. If we only use a single criterion, some potential key nodes may be missed. Therefore, we here consider multiple node importance criteria simultaneously by rank aggregation (RA). In network science, node centrality is a common approach to evaluate the importance of nodes.^{28,29} Thus we first generate multiple node rankings based on various centrality measures. Then we combine these individual rankings into a consensus ranking using the rank aggregation method. Lastly, we determine the \tilde{N} candidate objects based on the consensus ranking.

Consider M rankings of N nodes given by M node importance criterion. Denote by $R_i = [r_{i1}, r_{i2}, \dots, r_{iN}]$ the node importance ranking given by the criterion c_i , where r_{ij} represents the rank of the node v_j based on the criterion c_i . In this study, among a variety of alternative methods, we choose the graph-based rank aggregation method^{41,42} to aggregate these individual rankings into a single consensus ranking \hat{R} . The graph-based rank aggregation method has been shown to outperform other rank aggregation methods, especially for high-dimensional ranking (for details see Methods).

In principle, a greater M will include more vital nodes but low computational efficiency. We show in Fig. 1 the Venn diagram of candidate sets obtained through aggregating different centrality measure rankings in three real-world networks.

Table 1 shows the basic topological features of these networks. Set the size of the candidate set \tilde{N} to 10. We can observe from Fig. 1 that even if there are differences between the candidate sets, as M increases, the intersection of nodes between the candidate sets is stable, such as social networks and metabolic networks. Furthermore, for the combination of different centrality measure rankings in the same M , there is no significant difference between the candidate sets, especially in the social network.

Table 1. Basic topological features for the three real-world networks under consideration, where N and W are the numbers of nodes and links, respectively. $\langle k \rangle$ is the average degree of the network; d is the network density; D is the network diameter, and C is the clustering coefficient.

Networks	N	W	$\langle k \rangle$	d	D	C
Social network	70	274	7.83	0.1135	6	0.4649
Metabolic network	453	2025	8.94	0.0198	7	0.6465
Air network	1226	2408	3.928	0.0032	17	0.0675

To better understand the process of searching the candidate objects, an illustration is given in Fig. 2. Consider a sample network, which contains 10 nodes and 23 links, and its network topology is shown in Fig. 2a. We employ three common centrality measures: degree centrality (DC),³ betweenness centrality (BC),⁴³ eigenvector centrality (EC).⁴⁴ The individual rankings of nodes based on the three centrality measures are shown in Fig. 2 b, c and d, respectively. The aggregated ranking $\hat{R} = [8, 1, 2, 7, 5, 10, 9, 4, 3, 6]$ is shown in Fig. 2 e. The detailed results are presented in Table 2. We set the disintegration strength n as 2 and the size of the candidate set \tilde{N} as 4, and then obtain the candidate set $\{v_2, v_3, v_8, v_9\}$ based on the aggregated ranking, as shown in the orange node in Fig. 2 e. The comparison results of the node rankings with different centrality measures are visualized in Fig. 2 f. Each curve represents a node, and the height of the curve represents the node ranking under the corresponding criterion. The wavy curves suggest that there are distinct differences among the three individual rankings. For example, the node v_2 ranks first with DC but fifth with BC; the node v_{10} ranks first with EC but sixth with DC. At the far right of Fig. 2, the aggregated ranks are also presented. We observe that the RA method integrates all information from the individual rankings and achieves a comprehensive ranking, which effectively overcomes the one-sidedness of the individual measure. To a certain extent, it is to take the “average” of multiple rankings.

Table 2. The ranking of nodes in the sample network based on different centrality measures.

Node ID	DC		BC		EC		RA	
	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	ROID
v_1	7	4	10	0.0093	7	0.3002	8	0.3182
v_2	1	5	5	0.0694	2	0.3483	1	3.8333
v_3	2	5	2	0.0926	4	0.3431	2	3.8333
v_4	8	4	6	0.0648	8	0.2717	7	0.4500
v_5	3	5	4	0.0880	6	0.3165	5	1.6364
v_6	9	4	9	0.0278	10	0.2557	10	0.1154
v_7	10	4	8	0.0324	9	0.2689	9	0.1600
v_8	4	5	3	0.0926	5	0.3324	4	1.9000
v_9	5	5	1	0.1065	3	0.3459	3	3.1429
v_{10}	6	5	7	0.0556	1	0.3591	6	1.4167

Identifying the optimal solution by targeted enumeration

In the previous part, we propose selecting \tilde{N} candidate nodes by rank aggregation. Next, we need to find the optimal combination among the candidate set through enumeration. It is obvious that the size of the candidate set \tilde{N} will affect the effectiveness and efficiency of our method directly. Considering that $n \leq \tilde{N} \leq N$, we suppose that $\tilde{N} = n + (N - n)\alpha$, where $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ is the redundancy coefficient. When α reaches the maximum value 1, it becomes an ordinary enumeration. While $\alpha < 1$, we call it targeted enumeration (TE).

It is easy to obtain that greater α will lead to better effectiveness but worse efficiency. We show in Fig. 3 the disintegration effect Φ as the function of the redundancy coefficient α on three typical synthetic networks: the Erdős-Rényi (ER) model of random network,⁴⁵ the Newman-Watts (NW) model of small-world network,^{46,47} and the Barabási-Albert (BA) model of scale-free network.⁴⁸ We observe that the curve has a clear trend of increasing first and then flattening. It means that a small value of redundancy coefficient is enough for the targeted enumeration. Increasing α further contributes little to the




Figure 1. The Venn diagram of candidate sets obtained through aggregating different centrality measure rankings in real-world networks, including the social network (a, b, c), the metabolic network of the roundworm *Caenorhabditis Elegans* (d, e, f), and the air network (g, h, i), where D, B, E, C, and K represent degree centrality, betweenness centrality, eigenvector centrality, closeness centrality and Katz centrality, respectively.




Figure 2. The illustration of searching the candidate set through ranking aggregation, where $N = 10$, $W = 23$, $n = 2$ and $\tilde{N} = 4$. **a**, The sample network. **b**, **c**, **d** The individual rankings of nodes based on degree centrality, betweenness centrality, and eigenvector centrality, respectively. The node size is proportional to its ranking. **e**, The aggregated ranking of nodes. The orange nodes constitute a candidate set. **f**, Comparison of the ranking of nodes with various centrality measures. The height of the curve represents the node ranking under the corresponding criterion.

disintegration effect. This also suggests that the process of selecting candidate objects is effective to some extent. In practical applications, one can determine the value of α according to the actual needs.

The algorithmic process of the TE is summarized as follows. First, we choose \tilde{N} candidate nodes based on the comprehensive node ranking. Then we enumerate all possible combinations among the candidate set. Last, we find the optimal solution corresponding to the largest disintegration effect Φ . In the example shown in Fig. 2, if the redundancy coefficient is taken as $\alpha = 0.25$, and then there are $C_{\tilde{N}}^n = C_4^2 = 6$ combinations, among which the combination $\{v_2, v_8\}$ is the optimal solution.




Figure 3. The network disintegration effect Φ under different redundancy coefficient α . **a**, The results for ER network with the size $N = 100$, and the average degrees of $\langle k \rangle = 5.0$. For comparison, the horizontal dashed line represents the disintegration effect when $\tilde{N} = n$. **b**, The results for NW network with the size $N = 100$. NW network starts from a regular network with local connections of range $K = 5$, with probability $p = 0.25$ adding a new link between a randomly selected unconnected pair of nodes. **c**, The scale-free network with the size $N = 100$ is generated by the BA preferential attachment algorithm. The network starts with a fully connected network with $m = 3$ nodes and is grown by attaching a new node, each with $m = 3$ links preferentially attached to existing nodes with a high degree. The results take the average of 10 network instances under the same parameters.

Experimental analysis on synthetic and real-world networks

To demonstrate the applicability of our proposed method, we next evaluate its performance on three kinds of typical synthetic networks: the ER network, the NW network, and the BA network. We use five other methods as comparison: degree centrality, betweenness centrality, eigenvector centrality, collective influence (CI)³¹ and tabu search (TS).⁴⁹

We show in Fig. 4 the disintegration effect Φ as a function of disintegration strength n with different network disintegration methods. Here, we set α as 0.1. As shown in Fig. 4, the disintegration effect increases as the disintegration strength is increased. It indicates that the disintegration strength is a critical factor for network disintegration. Meanwhile, we find that our method is almost closed to the TS algorithm, which is acknowledged as a method with a good disintegration effect. And both methods consistently outperform other methods on all synthetic networks. In addition to the advantage of effectiveness, the TE is also remarkably efficient. In Fig. 5, we show the computation time of different methods as a function of network size (note that Fig. 5 omits the computation time of the TS method under the large N to avoid cluttering of the plot scale). As can be seen in Fig. 5 that with the increase of network scale, the growth rate of the TS method is significantly higher than other methods. In contrast, our method is more efficient.

Since synthetic networks cannot completely summarize the typical properties of real-world networks, we apply the TE method to several realistic scenarios using the aforementioned methods. The real-world networks include the social network, the metabolic network of the roundworm *Caenorhabditis Elegans*, and the air network, which are used in Fig. 1. We show the disintegration effect Φ and the disintegration efficiency η of the six methods in Fig. 6. The disintegration efficiency η is defined as the normalized computation time using the TS method as a reference as follows

$$\eta = \frac{Time(TS) - Time}{Time(TS)}. \quad (3)$$

We can see that our method along with the TS method shows superiority over conventional methods in disintegration effect. Yet, the TS algorithm leads to good effectiveness but poor efficiency. In other words, our method uses less time to obtain a




Figure 4. The disintegration effect Φ as a function of disintegration strength n . We set the geodesic distance ℓ as 2 for the CI algorithm. And for the TS algorithm, we assign the tabu list length to 5, the number of candidate solutions to 5, and the maximum number of iterations without improving the optimal solution will be 2000. The numerical results take the average of 10 different network instances under the same parameters. **a**, The results for ER network with the size $N = 100$ of varying average degrees, and the three graphs from left to the right show the average degrees of $\langle k \rangle = 3.5$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, and $\langle k \rangle = 15$. **b**, The results for NW network with the size $N = 100$ of varying neighbour numbers K and connection probability p . Here, the three graphs from left to the right show the parameters of $K = 4, p = 0.01$, $K = 6, p = 0.3$ and $K = 10, p = 0.5$. **c**, The results for BA network with the size $N = 100$. The three graphs from left to the right show the parameters of $m = 2, m = 4$, and $m = 8$ in the simulations.




Figure 5. The computation time of different methods as a function of network size N . We set the disintegration strength n as 5. The network parameters of each subgraph are consistent with the corresponding subgraphs in Fig. 4. The simulation results are obtained on a desktop computer with an Intel Core i7-9700 CPU having 3.00GHz and 16.0 RA of RAM. **a**, The results for ER network of varying average degrees. The three graphs from left to the right show the average degrees of $\langle k \rangle = 3.5$, $\langle k \rangle = 8$, and $\langle k \rangle = 15$. **b**, The results for NW network of varying neighbour numbers K and connection probability p . The three graphs from left to right show the parameters of $K = 4, p = 0.01$, $K = 6, p = 0.3$ and $K = 10, p = 0.5$. **c**, The results for BA network of varying m . The three graphs from left to the right show the parameters of $m = 2, m = 4$, and $m = 8$.

disintegration effect close to the TS method. Compared with conventional methods, the efficiency of our method is entirely acceptable. It indicates that our method can achieve a satisfying balance between effectiveness and efficiency.




Figure 6. The disintegration effect Φ versus the disintegration efficiency η . **a**, The friendship network. **b**, The power network. **c**, The air network. We set the disintegration strength n as 5 for the social network, 10 for the metabolic network and 20 for the air network.

Discussion

To summarize, we propose a cost-effective network disintegration method called targeted enumeration (TE). Specifically, the TE method is divided into two stages. In the first stage, we employ the rank aggregation method to transform multiple rankings of nodes into a comprehensive ranking. We then select the top \tilde{N} nodes based on the aggregated ranking as the candidate set. The second stage is the targeted enumeration. Unlike enumerating the complete set in the general sense, we enumerate within the scope of the candidate set. The optimal solution is the node combination corresponding to the largest Φ . Numerical experiments on synthetic and real-world networks have demonstrated that the TE significantly outperforms the conventional method, and the disintegration effect is close to the intelligent algorithm. Moreover, in terms of efficiency, the computation time of the TE is entirely acceptable compared to the intelligent algorithm. The critical point of our method is determining a valid candidate set. In this study, the introduction of rank aggregation ensures the validity of the candidate set. The aggregated ranking combines multiple node importance criteria and then avoids the missing of potential key nodes from the candidate set.

The proposed TE method has a highly flexible framework requiring no domain-specific knowledge. One can adopt various node importance criteria and rank aggregation methods, and different levels of redundancy coefficient α according to the actual situation. As a typical combinatorial optimization problem, selecting n objects among N objects ($n \ll N$) is a common task in many application scenarios, including human resource management, portfolio investment and drug design. Our method provides a new approach to solve these problems.

Methods

Natural Connectivity

We call the alternating sequence $v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 \cdots e_l v_l$ of nodes and links in the graph G a walk, where $v_i \in V$ and $e_i = (v_{i-1}, v_i) \in E$, and k is the length of the walk ω . If $v_0 = v_l$, then ω is a closed walk. We can calculate the number of walks n_{ij}^k whose length is equal to k between any node pair $v_i \leftrightarrow v_j$, and add up i, j and k :

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} n_{ij}^k. \quad (4)$$

Let n_i^k denote the number of closed walks with start and end points of v_i and the length is equal to k , and then add i and k , i.e.,

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} n_i^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^N n_i^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} n_k, \quad (5)$$

where n_k represents the number of all closed walks with length k in the network. Note that the length of the closed walk can be arbitrary, so weighting n_k can get $S = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{n_k}{k!}$, and then simplify the formula according to the lemma in graph theory to obtain $n_k = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^k$. Substituting n_k into S yields

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{n_k}{k!} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^k}{k!} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_i^k}{k!} = \sum_{i=1}^N e^{\lambda_i}, \quad (6)$$

which shows that the weighted sum of the closed walk numbers can be directly obtained through the characteristic spectrum. Define the adjacency matrix of the network as $A(G) = (a_{ij})_{N \times N}$, where $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 1$ if node v_i and node v_j are connected. Re-scale S and call it NC , then:

$$NC = \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e^{\lambda_i} \right), \quad (7)$$

where λ_i is the eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix $A(G)$ of network G .

The core idea of natural connectivity is to use the number of closed walks in the network to describe the redundancy of the alternative links in the network. Natural connectivity can reasonably measure the small changes of the network before and after the node is removed. In addition, natural connectivity can accurately and clearly describe the difference in the effects of different network disintegration strategies compared with other measure functions.

Graph-based rank aggregation method

Consider a network with N nodes, and give the ranking of M criteria. Define $R_i = [r_{i1}, r_{i2}, \dots, r_{iN}]$ as a node importance ranking, where r_{ij} is the rank of node v_j given by criterion $c_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, M)$. The transition matrix for criterion c_i is denoted by $P^{c_i} = (p_{st}^{c_i})_{N \times N}$, where $p_{st}^{c_i} = 1$ if node v_s outranks node v_t under the criterion c_i ; otherwise, $p_{st}^{c_i} = 0$. As an example, $R_i = [2, 3, 1]$ means that the three nodes marked 1, 2, and 3 are ranked 2nd, 3rd, and 1st respectively according to c_i , and the transition matrix for R_i is

$$P^{c_i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Based on the transition matrix, denote by $A = (a_{st})_{N \times N}$ the adjacency matrix for a competition graph, where $a_{st} = \sum_{i=1}^M p_{st}^{c_i}$. Furthermore, based on the adjacency matrix A , we can define the competition graph of network nodes as G_c . The nodes in the directed and weighted graph G_c represent the nodes in the actual network, and each directed edge e_{st} represents an outranking relation from the node v_s to v_t . The weight of the directed edge e_{st} represents the number of times the node v_s is ranked ahead of the node v_t in all aggregated measure rankings. Denote by $d_j^- = \sum_{s=1}^N a_{sj}$ and $d_j^+ = \sum_{t=1}^N a_{jt}$ the in-degree and out-degree of node v_j in the competition graph G_c . Thus, we can define the ratio of out-in degrees as follows:

$$\alpha_j = \frac{d_j^+ + 1}{d_j^- + 1}, \quad (9)$$

which can be used to quantify the strength of the node v_j and rank all nodes based on their ROID. The larger the value of ROID, the higher the ranking of nodes.

Data availability

The data used in this paper are all publicly accessible. The social network, the air network, and the metabolic network are available online at <http://konect.cc/>.

References

1. Newman, M. E. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Rev.* **45**, 167–256 (2003).
2. Barabási, A.-L. Scale-free networks: a decade and beyond. *Science* **325**, 412–413 (2009).
3. Albert, R., Jeong, H. & Barabási, A.-L. Error and attack tolerance of complex networks. *Nature* **406**, 378–382 (2000).
4. Shargel, B., Sayama, H., Epstein, I. R. & Bar-Yam, Y. Optimization of robustness and connectivity in complex networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 068701 (2003).

5. Sahasrabudhe, S. & Motter, A. E. Rescuing ecosystems from extinction cascades through compensatory perturbations. *Nat. Commun.* **2**, 1–8 (2011).
6. Schneider, C., Moreira, A., JS, A., Havlin, S. & Herrmann, H. Mitigation of malicious attacks on networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 3838 (2011).
7. Gao, J., Buldyrev, S. V., Havlin, S. & Stanley, H. E. Robustness of a network of networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 195701 (2011).
8. Liu, X. *et al.* Robustness and lethality in multilayer biological molecular networks. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1–12 (2020).
9. Eiselt, H. Destabilization of terrorist networks. *Chaos Solit. Fract.* **108**, 111–118 (2018).
10. Calderoni, F., Brunetto, D. & Piccardi, C. Communities in criminal networks: A case study. *Soci. Net.* **48**, 116–125 (2017).
11. Pastor-Satorras, R. & Vespignani, A. Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3200 (2001).
12. Kobayashi, T. & Hasui, K. Efficient immunization strategies to prevent financial contagion. *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 3834 (2014).
13. Quayle, A. P., Siddiqui, A. S. & Jones, S. J. M. Preferential network perturbation. *Physica A* **371**, 823–840 (2006).
14. Holme, P., Kim, B. J., Yoon, C. N. & Han, S. K. Attack vulnerability of complex networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 056109 (2002).
15. Wang, H., Huang, J., Xu, X. & Xiao, Y. Damage attack on complex networks. *Physica A* **408**, 134–148 (2014).
16. Tan, S.-Y., Wu, J., Lü, L., Li, M.-J. & Lu, X. Efficient network disintegration under incomplete information: the comic effect of link prediction. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 1–9 (2016).
17. Ren, X.-L., Gleinig, N., Helbing, D. & Antulov-Fantulin, N. Generalized network dismantling. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **116**, 6554–6559 (2019).
18. Bellingeri, M., Cassi, D. & Vincenzi, S. Efficiency of attack strategies on complex model and real-world networks. *Physica A* **414**, 174–180 (2014).
19. Wandelt, S., Sun, X., Feng, D., Zanin, M. & Havlin, S. A comparative analysis of approaches to network-dismantling. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 1–15 (2018).
20. Kaiser, F., Latora, V. & Witthaut, D. Network isolators inhibit failure spreading in complex networks. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1–9 (2021).
21. Li, J., Pardalos, P. M., Xin, B. & Chen, J. The bi-objective critical node detection problem with minimum pairwise connectivity and cost: Theory and algorithms. *Soft. Comput.* **23**, 12729–12744 (2019).
22. Ventresca, M. & Aleman, D. A derandomized approximation algorithm for the critical node detection problem. *Comput. Oper. Res.* **43**, 261–270 (2014).
23. Lalou, M., Tahraoui, M. A. & Kheddouci, H. The critical node detection problem in networks: A survey. *Comput. Sci. Rev.* **28**, 92–117 (2018).
24. Wollmer, R. Removing arcs from a network. *Operations Research* **12**, 934–940 (1964).
25. Corley Jr, H. & Chang, H. Finding the n most vital nodes in a flow network. *Management Science* **21**, 362–364 (1974).
26. Arulselvan, A., Commander, C. W., Elefteriadou, L. & Pardalos, P. M. Detecting critical nodes in sparse graphs. *Comput. Oper. Res.* **36**, 2193–2200 (2009).
27. Veremyev, A., Boginski, V. & Pasiliao, E. L. Exact identification of critical nodes in sparse networks via new compact formulations. *Optim. Lett.* **8**, 1245–1259 (2014).
28. Lü, L. *et al.* Vital nodes identification in complex networks. *Phys. Rep.* **650**, 1–63 (2016).
29. Oldham, S., Fulcher, B., Parkes, L., Arnatkevičiūt, A. & Fornito, A. Consistency and differences between centrality measures across distinct classes of networks. *PloS one* **14**, e0220061 (2019).
30. Zhou, H.-J. Spin glass approach to the feedback vertex set problem. *Eur. Phys. J. B* **86**, 1–9 (2013).
31. Morone, F. & Makse, H. A. Influence maximization in complex networks through optimal percolation. *Nature* **524**, 65–68 (2015).
32. Braunstein, A., Dall’Asta, L., Semerjian, G. & Zdeborová, L. Network dismantling. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 12368–12373 (2016).
33. Zdeborová, L., Zhang, P. & Zhou, H.-J. Fast and simple decycling and dismantling of networks. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 1–6 (2016).

34. Liu, H., Xu, X., Lu, J.-A., Chen, G. & Zeng, Z. Optimizing pinning control of complex dynamical networks based on spectral properties of grounded laplacian matrices. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst* **51**, 786–796 (2021).
35. Lozano, M., García-Martínez, C., Rodríguez, F. J. & Trujillo, H. M. Optimizing network attacks by artificial bee colony. *Inf. Sci.* **377**, 30–50 (2017).
36. Deng, Y. *et al.* Optimal disintegration strategy with heterogeneous costs in complex networks. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst* **50**, 2905–2913 (2018).
37. Fan, C., Zeng, L., Sun, Y. & Liu, Y.-Y. Finding key players in complex networks through deep reinforcement learning. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* **2**, 317–324 (2020).
38. Grassia, M., Domenico, M. & Mangioni, G. Machine learning dismantling and early-warning signals of disintegration in complex systems. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1–10 (2021).
39. Jun, W., Barahona, M., Yue-Jin, T. & Hong-Zhong, D. Natural connectivity of complex networks. *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **27**, 078902 (2010).
40. Wu, J., Barahona, M., Tan, Y.-J. & Deng, H.-Z. Spectral measure of structural robustness in complex networks. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst.* **41**, 1244–1252 (2011).
41. Xiao, Y., Deng, H.-Z., Lu, X. & Wu, J. Graph-based rank aggregation method for high-dimensional and partial rankings. *J. Oper. Res. Soc.* 1–10 (2019).
42. Zhang, Y., Xiao, Y., Wu, J. & Lu, X. Comprehensive world university ranking based on ranking aggregation. *Comput. Stat.* **36**, 1139–1152 (2021).
43. Abbasi, A., Hossain, L. & Leydesdorff, L. Betweenness centrality as a driver of preferential attachment in the evolution of research collaboration networks. *J Informetr* **6**, 403–412 (2012).
44. Roddenberry, T. M. & Segarra, S. Blind inference of eigenvector centrality rankings. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **69**, 3935–3946 (2021).
45. Erdos, P. & Rényi, A. On the evolution of random graphs. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci* **5**, 17–60 (1960).
46. Watts, D. J. & Strogatz, S. H. Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks. *Nature* **393**, 440–442 (1998).
47. Newman, M. E. & Watts, D. J. Renormalization group analysis of the small-world network model. *Phys. Lett. A* **263**, 341–346 (1999).
48. Barabási, A.-L. & Albert, R. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* **286**, 509–512 (1999).
49. Deng, Y., Wu, J., Qi, M. & Tan, Y. Optimal disintegration strategy in spatial networks with disintegration circle model. *Chaos* **29**, 061102 (2019).

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 71871217 and 71731002 and the Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province under Grant No. 2019JJ20019.

Author contribution statement

Z.-G.W. and Y.D. designed the research. Z.-G.W., J.W., Y.D. and Z.-R.D performed the research. Z.-G.W., J.W. and Y.D analyzed data. All authors contributed to writing the manuscript.

Additional information

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.