

Exact scaling properties of a hierarchical network model

Jae Dong Noh

Theoretische Physik, Universität des Saarlandes, 66041, Saarbrücken, Germany

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

We report on exact results for the degree K , the diameter D , the clustering coefficient C , and the betweenness centrality B of a hierarchical network model with a replication factor M . Such quantities are calculated exactly with the help of recursion relations. Using the results, we show that (i) the degree distribution follows a power law $P_K \sim K^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma = 1 + \ln M = \ln(M+1)$, (ii) the diameter grows logarithmically as $D \sim \ln N$ with the number of nodes N , (iii) the clustering coefficient of each node is inversely proportional to its degree, $C \sim 1/K$, and the average clustering coefficient is nonzero in the infinite limit, and (iv) the betweenness centrality distribution follows a power law $P_B \sim B^{-2}$. We discuss a classification scheme of scale-free networks into the universality class with the clustering property and the betweenness centrality distribution.

PACS numbers: 89.75.-k, 89.75.Da, 05.10.-a

A network structure of complex systems has been attracting much research interest [1]. Since the works in Refs. [2, 3], it has been recognized that complex systems have neither a regular nor a random network structure. Instead, complex networks found in various areas have a scale-free (SF) structure characterized with a power-law distribution of the degree, see Ref. [1] and references therein. A possible mechanism for the emerging SF structure is suggested by the Barabasi-Albert (BA) model [4]. However, the BA network lacks the clustering property which is observed in many real networks. To fill this gap, a hierarchical (H) network model was introduced as a model for SF networks with a clustering property [5]. It is observed that the H network displays a scaling law $C \sim K^{-1}$ between the clustering coefficient C of a node and its degree K and that the average value of C does not vanish in the infinite size limit. The clustering property is also observed in some metabolic networks [6], which is regarded as an evidence for a hierarchical structure [5, 7].

On the other hand, the clustering property does not necessarily imply a hierarchical structure. Some SF network models [8, 9, 10, 11] have the clustering property, but it is not apparent whether they have a hierarchical structure. Therefore, it is desirable to study other scaling properties of the H network model to establish the universality class for the hierarchical network. This is the purpose of the current work. We derive analytically exact scaling laws for the degree distribution, the diameter D , and the clustering coefficient (abbreviated to CC), and the betweenness centrality (abbreviated to BC) B [5]. The CC is a measure of local connectivity or modularity, while the BC reflects a global property [12, 13]. The scaling property of both quantities characterizes the universality class for the H network.

The H network is characterized by G (the number of generations) and M (a replication factor). The network of the G th generation, denoted as N_G , has $N = M^G$ nodes, which will be labelled by the coordinate G -tuple of integers $[x_G] = [x_G, \dots, x_1]$ with $0 \leq x_i < M$. The network is defined recursively. The first generation consists of one central node $[0]$, which will be referred to as a hub,

and $(M-1)$ peripheral nodes $[y]$ with $1 \leq y < M$. All nodes are fully connected with each other. Suppose one has N_{G-1} , each node of which is assigned to a coordinate $[x_{G-1}]$. In the next generation, $(M-1)$ copies are added to the network and all their peripheral nodes are connected to the hub of the original unit. Nodes in the original unit are assigned to $[0x_{G-1}]$, and the copies to $[yx_{G-1}]$ with $y = 1, \dots, M-1$, respectively. It leads to the network N_G . Nodes $[y_{G-1}]$ with $y_i \neq 0$ for all i are the peripheral nodes and $[0_G]$ is the hub of N_G .

With the coordinate system, geometrical properties of the network can be studied combinatorially. In general, the node connectivity follows the rule:

$$C1: [x_G, \dots, x_{l+1}y_l, \dots, x_1] \text{ is } y_l \text{ times } [x_G, \dots, x_{l+1}x_l, \dots, x_1] \text{ for } l = 1, \dots, G \text{ and } 1 \leq x_i < M$$

$$C2: [x_G, \dots, x_2y_1, \dots, x_1] \text{ is } y_1 \text{ times } [x_G, \dots, x_2y_1^0, \dots, x_1] \text{ for } y_1 \neq y_1^0$$

Above and hereafter, we use x for a dummy variable ranging from 0 to $(M-1)$ and y for one ranging from 1 to $(M-1)$. The rule C1 comes from the fact that all peripheral nodes of N_k are connected to the hub 0_k during the replication, and C2 from the fact that all peripheral nodes of N_1 are fully inter-connected.

For a convenience, we classify nodes into four sets: (a) P for peripheral nodes $[y_{G-1}]$, (b) LPL (stands for Locally Peripheral) ($1 \leq l < G$) for nodes of a form $[x_G, \dots, x_{l+2}y_{l+1}, \dots, x_1]$, (c) LHL (Local Hub) ($1 \leq l < G$) for nodes of a form $[x_G, \dots, x_{l+2}y_{l+1}0_l, \dots, x_1]$, and (d) H for the hub $[0_G]$. The size S of each set is given in Table I.

Degree distribution | Using the connection rules, one can easily enumerate the degree, which is the number of neighbors, of each node. All nodes in the same set have the same degree, which are presented in Table I. The nodes in P and H contribute to the degree distribution P_K at isolated points of K . For nodes in LPL, it is given by $P_K = M^{-G} S_{[l=K-1]} = K^{-1}$ with $l = 1$ and $K = K_{l+1} - K_l = 1$. Using K and S in Table I, we find that $P_K \sim \exp[K \ln(1 - 1/M)]$. On the other hand, nodes in LHL has $K_1 = (M-1)$ and $S_1 = M^{-1}$. Hence, the degree distribution follows a power law $P_K \sim K^{-1}$ for $M > 2$.

TABLE I: The degree K , the clustering coefficient C , the partial betweenness centrality B^0 , and the betweenness centrality B of a node in each set and the number of nodes S in each set.

| set | S | K | C | B^0 | B |
|-----|--------------------|------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| P | $(M-1)^G$ | $G + (M-2)$ | $\frac{(M-2)(2G+M-3)}{(G+M-2)(G+M-3)}$ | $\frac{M}{M-1}^{G-1} 1$ | $2M^G \frac{M(M^2-1)}{M^3+1} \frac{M}{M-1}^{G-1} 1$ |
| LPL | $(M-1)M^{G-(1+1)}$ | $1 + (M-2)$ | $\frac{(M-2)(21+M-3)}{(1+M-2)(1+M-3)}$ | $\frac{M}{M-1}^{1-1} 1$ | $2M^G \frac{M}{M-1}^{1-1} 1$, for $1 \leq G$ |
| LHL | $(M-1)M^{G-(1+1)}$ | $\sum_{n=1}^P (M-1)^n$ | $\frac{(M-2)}{\sum_{n=1}^P (M-1)^n - 1}$ | $M^{1-1} 1$ | $2M^G (M^{1-1} 1)$, for $1 \leq G$ |
| H | 1 | $\sum_{n=1}^P (M-1)^n$ | $\frac{(M-2)}{\sum_{n=1}^P (M-1)^n - 1}$ | 0 | $\frac{2}{M+1} + \frac{M^2(M-2)}{M^2-1} \ln \frac{M^2}{M^2+1} M^{2G}$ |

with $\beta = 1 + \frac{\ln M}{\ln(M-1)}$. The nodes in LHL have larger degrees than those in LPL. Therefore, the total degree distribution follows the power law with the exponent in the tail region. In particular, the hub has the largest degree, which scales as $K_{\text{hub}} \sim N^{1/(1-\beta)}$.

Shortest path and diameter | We first consider a shortest path from an arbitrary node $[x_G \dots x_1]$ to the hub $[0_G]$. One can reach the hub by flipping the coordinate using the rules C1 and C2 successively. The shortest path has the minimum number of steps, which is called the distance. Note that a step using C2 always leads to a detour. Hence it must not be used in finding a shortest path to the hub. Following C1, one may flip the consecutive lowest (including x_1) figures that are all zero to nonzero values, or vice versa. The whole consecutive lowest figures $x_{i-1} \dots x_1$ with $x_{i-1} \dots x_1 = 0$ ($x_{i-1} \dots x_1 \neq 0$) and $x_{i+1} \neq 0$ ($x_{i+1} = 0$) will be referred to as a zero (nonzero) domain. Then, one can reach the hub in minimal steps by flipping a zero/nonzero domain to a nonzero/zero domain successively. The domain size increases at each flip until one reaches the hub, a zero domain of size G . Since a zero domain can be flipped to any nonzero domain, the shortest path has large degeneracy in general.

The process resembles domain-coarsening in magnetic systems. To complete this analogy, we map the coordinate $[x_G \dots x_1]$ onto a spin state of the $(Q = M)$ -state Potts model in one-dimensional lattice of size G and assign the energy with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^G \sum_{j=i+1}^G \delta(x_i, x_j) g; \quad (1)$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Kronecker delta symbol and $x_{G+1} = 0$ is a fixed ghost spin. Then the distance between a node to the hub is given by the energy of the spin state. Therefore the mean node-to-hub distance is given by the average energy of the spin system in the infinite temperature limit: $D_H(G) = \frac{1}{G} \ln Z(\cdot; G) = \frac{1}{G} \ln Z(\cdot; G)_{\beta=0}$ with the partition function $Z(\cdot; G) = \sum_{\{x\}} e^{-\beta H[x_G]}$. It can be calculated using a transfer matrix method. After some algebra, we obtain that

$$D_H(G) = \frac{2(M-1)}{M^2} G + \frac{(M-1)(M-2)}{M^2}; \quad (2)$$

A shortest path between arbitrary nodes $[x_G] = [x_G \dots x_1]$ and $[x_G^0] = [x_G^0 \dots x_1^0]$ can be found recursively. If $x \neq x^0$, all paths connecting them pass through the hub $[0_G]$. So, the shortest path is given by a shortest path from one node to $[0_G]$ followed by a shortest path from $[0_G]$ to the other. If $x = x^0$, one can restrict the shortest path within a sub-network of all nodes $[x^0 \dots x_G^0]$ with $x^0 = x$, for a path utilizing other nodes with $x^0 \neq x$ does not reduce a path length [14]. Note that the sub-network with all links to other nodes in N_G disabled has that same structure as N_{G-1} . Therefore, the distance satisfies the recursion relation

$$d([x_G]; [x_G^0]) = \delta(x; x^0) d([x_G]; [0_G]) + d([x_G^0]; [0_G]) g + \delta(x; x^0) d([x_G]; [x_G^0]) \quad (3)$$

where $\delta(\cdot) = 1$ ($\delta(\cdot) = 0$) for short. Summing up over all node pairs, we obtain the recursion relation $D(G) = 2M^{-1}(M-1)D_H(G) + M^{-1}D(G-1)$ for the diameter (mean node-to-node distance) with the solution

$$D(G) = \frac{4(M-1)G}{M^2} + \frac{2(M-3)}{M} \frac{(M^2-M-4)}{M^{G+1}}; \quad (4)$$

In the infinite $N = M^G$ limit, we find that $D \sim 2D_H$ and that the diameter scales logarithmically with N . It is a characteristic of the hierarchical network. For conventional (non-hierarchical) SF networks, the diameter scales sub-logarithmically for $\beta > 3$ [15, 16].

Clustering coefficients | The CC of a node with K neighbors is given by $C = 2N_e/K(K-1)$, where N_e is the number of existing edges between K neighbors. Using the connection rules, it is straightforward to calculate the CC of each node. Nodes in the same set have the same value of C , which are presented in Table I.

Using the results in Table I, the degree dependence of the CC is easily obtained. For nodes in P and LPL, we obtain that $C(K) = (M-2)(2K-M-1) = K(K-1)$ with $M-1 = K-G+(M-2)$. So, for large $K \sim M$, their CC's are inversely proportional to the degrees, $C(K) \sim 2(M-2)/K = K$. The CC's of nodes in LHL and the hub are exactly given by $C(K) = (M-2)/(K-1)$. The scaling law $C \sim K^{-1}$ holds for both cases, but the coefficient differs by a factor of two (cf. Fig. 2(b) in Ref. [5]).

The average CC is given by $C = \frac{1}{M} (S_P C_P + S_L C_L + S_H C_H)$. In the infinite size limit ($G \rightarrow 1$), it converges to a nonzero value

$$C = \left(1 - \frac{2}{M}\right) \sum_{l=1}^X \frac{(2l+M-3)(1-l+M)}{(1+M-2)(1+M-3)} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{M}\right) \sum_{l=1}^X \frac{M-2l^2}{M^2(M-1)^{l+1}(2M+3)}: \quad (5)$$

Numerically $C = 0.719282...$ and $0.741840...$ for $M = 4$ and 5 , respectively. C converges to 1 as $M \rightarrow 1$.

Betweenness centrality | The BC of a node is the sum of weights of shortest paths between all node pairs that pass through the node. For a given node pair, all degenerate shortest paths connecting them are weighted with the inverse of the degeneracy. First of all, we calculate a so-called partial BC B^0 , which is obtained from a partial sum over all shortest paths between the hub and the others. It is calculated easily, since all shortest paths can be constructed using the domain-coarsening picture.

Again, each node in the same set has the same value of B^0 . (a) A node $u = [y_{G-1}]$ in P_m may belong to a shortest path to the hub from nodes $[y_{G-2} x_{1-1}^0]$ with $0 \leq l \leq G-2$ and arbitrary x . The domain-coarsening process leads them to $[y_{G-2} y_{l+1}]$ at an intermediate step. Then, the zero domain 0_{l+1} tips to a nonzero domain in the next step with probability $(M-1)^{(l+1)}$ passing through the node u . Hence, each node contributes $(M-1)^{(l+1)}$ to B_u^0 . Summing up all contributions, we obtain the result in Table I. (b) A node $[x_{G-2} y_{l+1}]$ in L_{P1} may belong to a shortest path from nodes $[x_{G-2} y_{l+1} x_{m+2} x_{m+1}^0]$ with $0 \leq m \leq l-2$ and arbitrary x to the hub. Following the same idea as in (a), one can easily obtain B^0 , see Table I. (c) A node $u = [x_{G-2} y_{l+1} 0_l]$ in L_{H1} belongs to "all" shortest paths from nodes $[x_{G-2} y_{l+1} x_{l+1}^0]$ with arbitrary x_l except for u itself. So, $B_u^0 = M^{l-1} - 1$. (d) Trivially, $B^0 = 0$ for the hub.

By eliminating the parameter l in Table I, we obtain that $B^0(K) = (M-1)^K M^{K+1}$ for nodes in set L_{P1} . It is diverging exponentially with K . On the other hand, P_K for nodes in L_{P1} decays exponentially. So, P_{B^0} decays algebraically. Explicitly it is obtained from $P_{B^0} = M^{-G} S_{1j} = B_{1j}^0$ which yields that

$$P_{B^0} = \frac{M-1}{M} \frac{1}{(B^0+1)^2}: \quad (6)$$

We obtain the relation $B^0(K) = 1 + M^{-1}(1+K(M-2)(M-1)^{-1})^{-1}$ for nodes in the set L_{H1} . So the distribution is given by

$$P_{B^0} = \frac{1}{M^2} \frac{1}{(B^0+1)^2}: \quad (7)$$

Therefore, the partial betweenness centrality has the power-law distribution with the exponent 2 .

The mean node-to-node distance was obtained using the mean node-to-hub distance. We apply a similar idea for the BC. Introduce a character function $g([x_G^0]; [x_G^0]; [x_G])$ to denote the fraction of paths passing through $[x_G]$ among all shortest paths between $[x_G^0]$ and $[x_G^0]$ in N_G . The $[x_G]$ dependence will be assumed implicitly. Then, the BC of a node $[x_P] = [x_{G-1}]$ can be written formally as $B_{[x_G]} = \sum_{x_G^0, x_G^0} g([x_G^0]; [x_G^0])$. The hub will be considered separately later, and we assume that $[x_G]$ is not the hub for the time being. Decompose the sum $\sum_{x_G^0, x_G^0}$ into $\sum_{x^0 \neq x_G^0}$ and similarly for x_G^0 . When $x^0 \neq x_G^0$, all shortest paths between $[x^0 x_{G-1}^0]$ and $[x_G^0 x_{G-1}^0]$ pass through the hub, which yields that $g([x^0 x_{G-1}^0]; [x_G^0 x_{G-1}^0]) = g([x^0 x_{G-1}^0]; [0_G]) + g([x_G^0 x_{G-1}^0]; [0_G])$. When $x^0 = x_G^0$ and $[x_G]$ is not the hub, the summands are nonzero only when $x^0 = x_G^0 = x$. Using these properties, we obtain that

$$B_{[x_G]} = 2(M-1)M^{G-1}B_{[x_G]}^0 + \sum_{x_G^0, x_G^0} g([x_{G-1}^0]; [x_{G-1}^0]): \quad (8)$$

One might be tempted to identify the second term as $B_{[x_{G-1}]}$, i.e., the BC defined on N_{G-1} . However this is not correct for $x \neq 0$, since some pairs of $[x_{G-1}^0]$ and $[x_{G-1}^0]$ may have degenerate shortest paths passing through the hub $[0_G]$ which is not present at N_{G-1} . This was explained when we discussed the diameter. For example, $[y1111]$ and $[y1222]$ with nonzeroy are connected via $[y1000]$ and $[y0000]$, and also via $[00000]$, so each path has the weight $1=3$. However, if one ignores the path via $[00000]$, the other paths would have weight $1=2$, and hence the nodes $[y1000]$ and $[y0000]$ would have larger value of the BC.

Therefore, the second term in Eq. (8) should be written as a sum of $B_{[x_{G-1}]}$ and a quantity that compensates for the change in the degeneracy of the shortest paths. As the example showed, the compensation is necessary only for nodes of the form $[x_G] = [y_{G-1} 0_l]$ with $1 \leq l < G$. For such nodes, after enumerating all degeneracy carefully, Eq. (8) becomes

$$B_{[x_G]} = 2(M-1)M^{G-1}B_{[x_G]}^0 + B_{[x_{G-1}]} + \sum_{k=1}^{X-1} \frac{(M-2)(M-1)^k M^{2(l-k)}}{(G-1+k)(G-1+k-1)}: \quad (9)$$

The hub gains from such degenerate shortest paths, which lead to a similar recursion relation

$$B_{[0_G]} = (M-1)(M^{2G-1} - 2M^{G-1}) + B_{[0_{G-1}]} + (M-2)M^{2G} \sum_{k=2}^{X-1} \frac{(M-1)^k}{kM^{2k}}: \quad (10)$$

For other nodes, we have the simple relation

$$B_{[x_G]} = 2(M-1)M^{G-1}B_{[x_G]}^0 + B_{[x_{G-1}]}: \quad (11)$$

