

# Random networks with $q$ -exponential degree distribution

Cesar I. N. Sampaio Filho, Marcio M. Bastos, Hans J. Herrmann, André A. Moreira, and José S. Andrade Jr.  
*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Ceará, 60451-970 Fortaleza, Brazil*

We use the configuration model to generate networks having a degree distribution that follows a  $q$ -exponential,  $P_q(k) = (2 - q)\lambda[1 - (1 - q)\lambda k]^{1/(q-1)}$ , for arbitrary values of the parameters  $q$  and  $\lambda$ . We study the assortativity and the shortest path of these networks finding that the more the distribution resembles a pure power law, the less well connected are the corresponding nodes. In fact, the average degree of a nearest neighbor grows monotonically with  $\lambda^{-1}$ . Moreover, our results show that  $q$ -exponential networks are more robust against random failures and against malicious attacks than standard scale-free networks. Indeed, the critical fraction of removed nodes grows logarithmically with  $\lambda^{-1}$  for malicious attacks. An analysis of the  $k_s$ -core decomposition shows that  $q$ -exponential networks have a highest  $k_s$ -core, that is bigger and has a larger  $k_s$  than pure scale-free networks. Being at the same time well connected and robust, networks with  $q$ -exponential degree distribution exhibit scale-free and small-world properties, making them a particularly suitable model for application in several systems.

In a large variety of fields one finds experiments, numerical results and theoretical models that fairly well agree with  $q$ -exponentials. This includes applications in fully developed turbulence [1], anomalous diffusion in plasmas [2], statistics of cosmic rays [3], econometrics [4, 5], biophysics [6] and many others. In particular, many empirical complex networks have been found to follow  $q$ -exponential degree distributions [7–9]. The same behavior has also been detected in several proposed model networks [10], most of them generated through growth models based on the preferential attachment principle [11–14]. These models produce empirically  $q$ -exponential distributions, which in some cases can even be confirmed analytically [8, 14]. But what is still missing is a systematic way of producing random networks with arbitrarily chosen  $q$ -exponential degree distributions. Here we present such a method based on the configuration model [15] and study the properties of the resulting networks.

In a network the degree  $k$  of a node is defined as the number of connections it has with other nodes. Networks are called scale-free when the distribution of degrees follows a power law with exponent  $\gamma$ ,  $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ . The  $q$ -exponential distribution given by,

$$P_q(k) = (2 - q)\lambda[1 - (1 - q)\lambda k]^{1/(q-1)}, \quad (1)$$

has two parameters,  $q \geq 1$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$ . It is a generalization of a power-law distribution, since for large  $k$  ( $k \gg \lambda^{-1}$ ) it decays like  $k^{-\gamma}$  with  $\gamma = 1/(q - 1)$ . For small degrees ( $k \ll \lambda^{-1}$ ), however, it tends to a plateau distribution of height  $2 - q$ . The parameter  $\lambda^{-1}$  therefore determines the crossover between these two regimes. The distribution Eq. 1 represents a fundamental ingredient in the mathematical formalism of the generalized thermostatistics and its applications [16–24].

Although most properties observed in complex networks with heavy-tailed distributions are determined by the shape of the tail, deviations from the power law at smaller degrees alter the occurrence of the least connected nodes, resulting in structural changes that can

affect processes taking place on these networks. In what follows, we take a closer look at these effects.

Different from previous works based on preferential attachment models of growth to obtain networks with degree distributions mimicking the  $q$ -exponential behavior, here, as already mentioned, we employ the configuration model [15] to build our random networks. In this way, we assure that the particular topological properties observed, including intrinsic node correlations, are not induced by the growth process, but are rather a direct consequence of the  $q$ -exponential form of the degree distribution.

We start by assigning to each node  $i$  a prescribed degree  $k_i$ , drawn from a  $q$ -exponential distribution. More precisely, since the degrees are integers, we chose randomly a number  $x_i$  from a  $q$ -exponential distribution and define  $k_i$  as the largest integer smaller than  $x_i$ . To avoid obtaining many small disconnected clusters, we only consider nodes with degree  $k_i \geq 2$ , i.e.,  $k_{min} = 2$ . We visualize the yet unconnected  $k_i$  degrees on node  $i$  by  $k_i$  “stubs”. Then we proceed to connect nodes pairwise. To do this, we choose two different nodes with probabilities proportional to their number of stubs. If these two nodes are not yet connected, a link is placed between them, and the number of stubs is decreased for each of the two nodes by one. This process continues until all stubs have been connected, or, in case that at the end some stubs remain that could not be connected, these stubs are removed and the degree originally assigned to the corresponding nodes is adjusted accordingly. Furthermore, a maximum degree  $k_{max}$  exists due to the fact that the number of nodes in the network is finite. When  $\gamma < 3$ , the second moment  $\langle k^2 \rangle$  of the distribution diverges and one can show that  $\langle k^2 \rangle \sim k_{max}^{3-\gamma}$ , i.e., that the second moment is controlled by the most connected node. This property can have profound effects on dynamical processes taking place on the network, including fragility to targeted attacks and resilience to random failure [25–27].

As we show in Fig. 1, the degree distributions obtained by this method follow very closely the expected  $q$ -exponential form of Eq.(1). For  $\lambda \ll 1$  one observes




Figure 1. Degree distribution of  $q$ -exponential networks (symbols) compared with the expected distribution of Eq. 1 (solid lines) for  $q = 1.4$  and for  $\lambda = 0.01$  (blue stars),  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangles),  $\lambda = 1$  (red squares), and  $\lambda = 100$  (black circles). The inset shows a comparison between the degree distributions of a  $q$ -exponential with  $\lambda = 100$  and a pure scale-free distribution (dashed black line) with  $q = 1.4$  ( $\gamma = 2.5$ ). The results are obtained for networks with size  $N = 500000$  by averaging over 100 samples. As can be seen, for small  $\lambda$  the distributions attain a plateau at small degrees and the power-law regime becomes larger with increasing  $\lambda$ .

a pronounced plateau for small  $k$ . On the other hand, when  $\lambda \gg 1$ , effectively, our degree distribution will be identical to a scale-free distribution with the same  $k_{min}$ . Therefore, by decreasing the parameter  $\lambda$ , we can continuously move away from a scale-free degree distribution and widen the plateau. Thus varying  $\lambda$  will allow us to identify the effect of the deviations from pure scale-freeness that are particular to  $q$ -exponential distributions.

As already mentioned, the difference between the  $q$ -exponential and the simple (power-law) scale-free distribution, is that at a given scale the  $q$ -exponential crosses over to a plateau of constant height. Therefore, on one hand scale-free networks have many more least connected nodes than networks having  $q$ -exponential degree distribution with small  $\lambda$ . The smaller  $\lambda$ , the denser the networks become, increasing the number and degree of their hubs, which as we will see next, makes the networks more robust. Topological differences like these can lead to substantial changes in structural properties of complex networks as well as in the static and dynamical behavior of models when implemented on these substrates. Next, we investigate targeted attacks and random failure in  $q$ -exponential networks. We also measure the intrinsic assortativity of these networks and their average minimum path. Finally, we employ the  $k$ -core method to determine the different structural configurations of the  $q$ -exponential networks.




Figure 2. Dependence of the average nearest-neighbor degree  $k_{nn}$  of vertices on the degree  $k$  for networks with size  $N = 10^7$  nodes,  $q = 1.4$ , and  $\lambda = 100$  (black circle),  $\lambda = 1$  (red square),  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangle), and  $\lambda = 0.01$  (blue star). The baseline of each curve corresponds to the value  $\langle k^2 \rangle / \langle k \rangle$ . All curves point towards intrinsic dissortative behavior for sufficiently large values of  $k$ .




Figure 3. Size dependence of the mean length of the shortest path  $\langle \ell \rangle$  for  $q = 1.33$  and for  $\lambda = 0.01$  (blue stars),  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangles),  $\lambda = 1$  (red squares), and  $\lambda = 100$  (black circles). The results are obtained by averaging over  $10^5, 10^4, 10^4, 10^4, 10^4, 10^3$ , and  $10^3$  samples of size  $N = 5000, 10000, 20000, 40000, 80000, 160000$ , and  $320000$ , respectively.

It has been shown [28–30] that random networks with heavy-tailed degree distribution often display intrinsic assortativity. This is also the case for  $q$ -exponential networks. In Fig. 2, we show the expected average degree  $k_{nn}(k)$  of the nearest neighbors of a given node of degree  $k$ . As can be seen, the most connected nodes have a smaller  $k_{nn}$ , pointing towards negative intrinsic assortativity. The reason for this dissortative behavior in ran-




Figure 4. The scaling exponent  $\alpha$  as a function of  $q$ , for  $\lambda = 100$  (black circles),  $\lambda = 1$  (red squares), and  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangles). Each point is obtained from a least-squares fit to the data,  $\langle \ell \rangle \sim \alpha \log N$ , with error bars being smaller than symbols. The continuous lines represent guides to the eye.

dom networks is that the most connected nodes can neither connect to themselves nor have multiple connections between them. We also see from Fig. 2 that  $k_{nn}$  is the larger the more the distribution deviates from a purely scale-free one. Remarkably, in fact, the average nearest-neighbor degree grows monotonically with  $\lambda^{-1}$ . One can conclude that the more the distribution resembles a pure power-law, the less well connected are the nodes, which might explain why  $q$ -exponentials are so ubiquitous.

Random  $q$ -exponential networks also exhibit small-world behavior, which means that their average shortest path increases logarithmically with network size,  $\langle \ell \rangle \sim \alpha \log N$ , as shown in Fig. 3. Clearly the shortest path becomes considerably shorter as the degree distributions systematically deviate from the pure power-law, namely, for sufficiently large values of  $\lambda$ . Figure 4 shows the variation of the pre-factor  $\alpha$  for different values of  $q \equiv (1+\gamma)/\gamma$  in the range  $1.25 \leq q \leq 1.4$ , and  $\lambda = 0.1, 1$ , and  $100$ . For all practical purposes, this range of  $q$ , which corresponds to  $2.5 \leq \gamma \leq 4.0$ , covers all interesting power-law decays. As already mentioned, the case  $\lambda = 100$  is equivalent to a scale-free network with  $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$  and  $k_{min} = 2$ .

A particularly important property for practical purposes is the robustness of networks against random failures. In Fig. 5 we plot the number of nodes in the largest cluster  $S(f)$  as a function of the fraction  $f$  of randomly removed nodes, for  $N = 320000$ , for  $q = 1.25$ , and various values of  $\lambda$ . Our results show that, for this specific value of  $q$ , sufficiently large networks generated with  $\lambda \leq 0.1$  are completely robust, in the sense that they always exhibit a finite fraction of nodes  $S(f)$  in the largest cluster when subjected to a random attack, namely,  $f_c = 1$ . On the other hand, for  $q$ -exponential networks with  $\lambda > 1$ , there exists a threshold  $f_c < 1$  above which the structure




Figure 5. The number of nodes in the largest cluster  $S(f)$  as a function of the fraction  $f$  of removed nodes for random failures in  $q$ -exponential networks with  $q = 1.25$ ,  $\lambda = 0.01$  (blue stars),  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangles),  $\lambda = 1$  (red squares), and  $\lambda = 100$  (black circles). The results are obtained for networks of size  $N = 320000$  by averaging over 200 samples. The continuous lines for  $\lambda = 0.01, 0.1$ , and  $\lambda = 1$  represent guides to the eye, while for  $\lambda = 100$  the black solid line corresponds to the result for random attacks on a pure power-law network. The inset shows the corresponding values of the fraction for which the largest cluster becomes negligibly small, namely, the critical fraction  $f_c$  for random failures as a function of  $q$ .

is completely disrupted,  $S(f) = 0$  for any value of  $f \geq f_c$ . In the inset of Fig. 5 we see how  $f_c$  depends on  $q$  for different values of  $\lambda$ . Clearly, the closer a  $q$ -exponential network resembles a purely scale-free one, namely, for large values of  $\lambda$ , the more it is fragile against random failures. Furthermore, this effect is dramatically amplified with the increase of the parameter  $q$ .

In Fig. 6 we show the variation of the size of the largest cluster  $S$  as a function of the fraction  $f$  of removed nodes, in the case of malicious attack for  $q = 1.4$  ( $\gamma = 2.5$ ) and different values of  $\lambda$ . As depicted, the  $q$ -exponential networks become less and less resilient as the crossover  $\lambda$  increases, since a larger fraction of nodes needs to be removed before the critical point is achieved. This behavior persists up to a point at which the value of  $\lambda$  is sufficiently large, so that the scale-free behavior of the degree distribution dominates. As a result, the  $q$ -exponential curve  $S$  versus  $f$  for  $\lambda = 100$  and the corresponding one generated from networks with pure scale-free distribution are perfectly coincident.

Figure 7 shows the dependence of the critical fraction  $f_c$  on the parameter  $q$ , as determined by Molloy-Reed's criterion [31] and for different values of  $q$ . It is interesting to note that the behavior of  $f_c$  changes substantially with  $\lambda$ . For instance, considering  $\lambda = 0.1$  we see a plateau up to  $q \approx 4/3$ , followed by a decay. On the other hand, for  $\lambda = 100$  we observe a clear a maximum in  $f_c$  at  $q \approx 4/3$ . As mentioned, for  $\lambda = 100$  the degree distribution ap-




Figure 6. The number of nodes in the largest cluster  $S(f)$  as function of the fraction  $f$  of removed nodes for malicious attacks for  $q = 1.4$ , for  $\lambda = 0.01$  (blue stars),  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangles),  $\lambda = 1$  (red squares), and  $\lambda = 100$  (black circles). The continuous lines for  $\lambda = 0.01, 0.1$ , and  $\lambda = 1$  represent guides to the eye, while for  $\lambda = 100$  the black solid line corresponds to the result for malicious attack on a pure power-law network. The results are obtained for networks of size  $N = 320000$  by averaging over 200 samples.

proaches the form of a power-law, and this maximum in the critical condition is consistent with the expected for one purely scale-free networks [32]. We note that this maximum is due to a compromise between two effects. For  $q > 4/3$  the degree distribution decays asymptotically as a power-law with controlling exponent  $\gamma < 3$ , reaching  $\gamma = 2$  as  $q$  approaches  $3/2$ . At this limit removing just a few hubs results in a total breakdown of the network. At the other limit, as  $\gamma$  diverges when  $q \rightarrow 1$ , the degree distribution is no longer heavy-tailed, decreasing rapidly. Moreover, if we set  $k_{min} = 2$ , the generated network is already near the critical state. This behavior can be suppressed by imposing  $k_{min} \geq 3$  in the case of pure scale-free networks [32], or by using small values of  $\lambda$  in  $q$ -exponential networks.

Next we extend the analysis of the topology of  $q$ -exponential networks by investigating their hierarchical structure in terms of the  $k_s$ -core decomposition method [33–39]. The  $k_s$ -core of a graph  $G$  is the largest connected subgraph in which all its nodes have a degree larger than or equal to  $k_s$ . To obtain the  $k$ -core, we remove all nodes with a degree less than  $k$ . Next, we scan if some nodes still have a current degree less than  $k$  and remove them. We repeat this check until no additional removal is possible. From this decomposition, we can define for each node a rank in the network, such that a node will be the more peripheral the smaller is its  $k_s$ .  $k_s$ -cores subgraphs are resilient against failure, since they preserve their convexity after  $(k - 1)$  random rewirings of edges or nodes. This kind of robustness tends to increase for




Figure 7. The critical fraction  $f_c$  for malicious attacks as a function of  $q$ , for  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangles),  $\lambda = 1$  (red squares), and  $\lambda = 100$  (black circles). The results are obtained for networks of size  $N = 500000$  by averaging over 2000 samples. The fraction from which the largest cluster does not obey Molloy-Reed's criterion is the critical fraction  $f_c$ . The  $q$ -exponential networks with smaller values of  $\lambda$  are clearly more robust, as a larger fraction of nodes needs to be removed to attain the critical point. The continuous lines represent guides to the eye.

the innermost nodes. Here we analyse the finite-size dependence of the highest  $k_s$ -core and its mass for different values of the parameter  $\lambda$ . From Ref. [38], we expect to obtain finite-size scaling as

$$k_h \sim N^\delta, \quad (2)$$

for the highest  $k_s$ -core, and

$$M_h \sim N^\Delta, \quad (3)$$

for the mass of the highest  $k_s$ -core. We find that the exponents  $\delta$  and  $\Delta$  are functions of the distribution parameters  $q$  and  $\lambda$ . Figure 8a shows the finite-size dependence on the network size  $N$  of the highest  $k_s$ -core in a double-logarithmic plot for  $q = 1.4$  and different values of  $\lambda$ . While the exponent  $\delta$  does not seem to depend noticeably on  $\lambda$ , the prefactor of the relation of Eq.(2) exhibits a considerable increase with  $\lambda^{-1}$ . As shown in Fig. 8b, the dependence of the mass of the highest  $k_s$ -core on the system size indicates that both the exponent  $\Delta$  and the prefactor of Eq.(3) decrease substantially with  $\lambda$ . This shows that networks with a larger plateau (smaller  $\lambda$ ) have a highest  $k_s$ -core that is bigger and has a larger  $k_s$ . This is in accordance with our previous findings that  $q$ -exponential networks become more robust the smaller  $\lambda$ .

In conclusion, we have for the first time generated unbiased complex networks exhibiting  $q$ -exponential degree distributions with arbitrary parameter values. These networks have several practical advantages with respect to




Figure 8. (a) Highest  $k_s$ -core and (b) mass of the highest  $k_s$ -core versus  $N$  for  $q = 1.4$  and  $\lambda = 0.01$  (blue stars),  $\lambda = 0.1$  (green triangles),  $\lambda = 1$  (red squares), and  $\lambda = 100$  (black circles). The results are obtained by averaging over  $10^5, 10^4, 10^4, 10^4, 10^3$ , and  $10^3$  samples of size  $N = 5000, 10000, 20000, 40000, 80000, 160000$ , and  $320000$ , respectively.

pure scale-free networks, namely, on one hand their nodes tend to be more homogeneously connected and on the other hand they are more robust against failure, notably malicious attacks. These advantages might explain why  $q$ -exponential networks are so ubiquitous and found in so many situations. In the future it would be interesting to also study dynamical properties of these networks, like synchronization, epidemic spreading and opinion formation.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Constantino Tsallis for helpful discussions and the Brazilian agencies CNPq, CAPES, FUNCAP and the National Institute of Science and Technology for Complex Systems (INCT-SC) for financial support.

---

[1] C Beck, GS Lewis, and H L Swinney, “Measuring non-extensivity parameters in a turbulent couette-taylor flow,” *Phys. Rev. E* **63**, 035303(R) (2001).  
[2] B Liu and J Goree, “Superdiffusion and non-gaussian statistics in a driven-dissipative 2d dusty plasma,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 055003 (2008).  
[3] C Beck, “Generalized statistical mechanics of cosmic rays,” *Physica A* **331**, 173 (2004).  
[4] J de Souza, LG Moyano, and SMD Queiros, “On statistical properties of traded volume in financial markets,” *Euro. Phys. J. B* **50**, 165 (2006).  
[5] E.P. Borges, “Empirical nonextensive laws for the county distribution of total personal income and gross domestic product,” *Physica A* **334**, 255 (2004).  
[6] A Upadhyaya, J.-P. Rieu, J.A. Glazier, and Y. Sawada,

“Anomalous diffusion and nongaussian velocity distribution of hydra cells in cellular aggregates,” *Physica A* **293**, 549 (2001).  
[7] A. Carro, R. Toral, and M. San Miguel, “Coupled dynamics of node and link states in complex networks: a model for language competition,” *New J. Phys.* **18**, 113056 (2016).  
[8] S. Thurner and C. Tsallis, “Nonextensive aspects of self-organized scale-free gas-like networks,” *Europhys. Lett.* **72**, 197–203 (2005).  
[9] R.S. Wedemann, R. Donangelo, and L.A.V. de Carvalho, “Nonextensivity in a memory network access mechanism,” *Braz. J. Phys.* **39**, 2a Aug. (2009).  
[10] S. Thurner, F. Kyriakopoulos, and C. Tsallis, “Unified model for network dynamics exhibiting nonextensive

- statistics,” *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 036111 (2007).
- [11] D.J.B. Soares, C. Tsallis, A.M. Mariz, and L.R. da Silva, “Preferential attachment growth model and nonextensive statistical mechanics,” *Europhys. Lett.* **70**, 70–76 (2005).
  - [12] S. Brito, L.R. da Silva, and C. Tsallis, “Role of dimensionality in complex networks,” *Scientific Rep.* **6**, 27992 (2016).
  - [13] Samurá Brito, Thiago C. Nunes, Luciano R. da Silva, and Constantino Tsallis, “Scaling properties of  $d$ -dimensional complex networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 012305 (2019).
  - [14] T. Ochiai and J.C. Nacher, “On the construction of complex networks with optimal tsallis entropy,” *Physica A* **388**, 4887–4892 (2009).
  - [15] M.E. Newman, *Networks: An Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2010).
  - [16] Constantino Tsallis, “Introduction to nonextensive statistical mechanics: approaching a complex world,” *Springer* **1**, 2–1 (2009).
  - [17] Artur B Adib, André A Moreira, José S Andrade Jr, and Murilo P Almeida, “Tsallis thermostatics for finite systems: a hamiltonian approach,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **322**, 276–284 (2003).
  - [18] J. S. Andrade, M. P. Almeida, A. A. Moreira, and G. A. Farias, “Extended phase-space dynamics for the generalized nonextensive thermostatics,” *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 036121 (2002).
  - [19] Hideo Hasegawa, “Bose-einstein and fermi-dirac distributions in nonextensive quantum statistics: Exact and interpolation approaches,” *Physical Review E* **80**, 011126 (2009).
  - [20] Hideo Hasegawa, “The interpolation approach to nonextensive quantum statistics,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **389**, 2358–2375 (2010).
  - [21] J. S. Andrade, G. F. T. da Silva, A. A. Moreira, F. D. Nobre, and E. M. F. Curado, “Thermostatics of overdamped motion of interacting particles,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 260601 (2010).
  - [22] Fernando D Nobre, Marco Aurelio Rego-Monteiro, and Constantino Tsallis, “Nonlinear relativistic and quantum equations with a common type of solution,” *Physical review letters* **106**, 140601 (2011).
  - [23] Rudolf Hanel and Stefan Thurner, “A comprehensive classification of complex statistical systems and an axiomatic derivation of their entropy and distribution functions,” *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **93**, 20006 (2011).
  - [24] FD Nobre, MA Rego-Monteiro, and C Tsallis, “A generalized nonlinear schroedinger equation: Classical field-theoretic approach,” *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **97**, 41001 (2012).
  - [25] Reuven Cohen, Daniel ben Avraham, and Shlomo Havlin, “Percolation critical exponents in scale-free networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 036113 (2002).
  - [26] André A. Moreira, José S. Andrade, Hans J. Herrmann, and Joseph O. Indekeu, “How to make a fragile network robust and vice versa,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 018701 (2009).
  - [27] C M Schneider, A A Moreira, J S Andrade Jr, S Havlin, and H J Herrmann, “Mitigation of malicious attacks,” *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 3838 (2011).
  - [28] M. E. J. Newman, “Mixing patterns in networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 026126 (2003).
  - [29] M. E. J. Newman, “Assortative mixing in networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 208701 (2002).
  - [30] Michele Catanzaro, Marián Boguná, and Romualdo Pastor-Satorras, “Generation of uncorrelated random scale-free networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 027103 (2005).
  - [31] M. Molloy and B. Reed, “A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence,” *Random Structures and Algorithms* **6**, 161–180 (1995).
  - [32] Albert-László Barabási, “Network science book,” *Network Science* **625** (2014).
  - [33] J Ignacio Alvarez-Hamelin, Luca Dall’Asta, Alain Barrat, and Alessandro Vespignani, “Large scale networks fingerprinting and visualization using the k-core decomposition,” in *Advances in neural information processing systems* (2006) pp. 41–50.
  - [34] Maksim Kitsak, Lazaros K Gallos, Shlomo Havlin, Fredrik Liljeros, Lev Muchnik, H Eugene Stanley, and Hernán A Makse, “Identification of influential spreaders in complex networks,” *Nature Physics* **6**, 888–893 (2010).
  - [35] Sen Pei, Lev Muchnik, José S Andrade Jr, Zhiming Zheng, and Hernán A Makse, “Searching for super-spreaders of information in real-world social media,” *Scientific Rep.* **4**, 1–12 (2014).
  - [36] Flaviano Morone, Gino Del Ferraro, and Hernán A Makse, “The k-core as a predictor of structural collapse in mutualistic ecosystems,” *Nature Physics* **15**, 95–102 (2019).
  - [37] Kate Burleson-Lesser, Flaviano Morone, Maria S Tomasone, and Hernán A Makse, “K-core robustness in ecological and financial networks,” *Scientific Rep.* **10**, 1–14 (2020).
  - [38] S N Dorogovtsev, A V Goltsev, and J F F Mendes, “k-core organization of complex networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 040601 (2006).
  - [39] Matteo Serafino, Higor S Monteiro, Shaojun Luo, Saulo DS Reis, Carles Igual, Antonio S Lima Neto, Matías Travizano, José S Andrade Jr, and Hernán A Makse, “Digital contact tracing and network theory to stop the spread of covid-19 using big-data on human mobility geolocalization,” *PLoS Computational Biology* **18**, e1009865 (2022).