Exact scaling properties of a hierarchical network model

Jae Dong Noh

Theoretische Physik, Universitat des Saarlandes, 66041, Saarbrucken, Germany

(D ated: M arch 22, 2024)

We report on exact results for the degree K, the diam eter D, the clustering coe cient 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. U sing the results, we show that (i) the degree distribution follows a power law $P_{\rm K}$ K with $=1+\ln M=\ln (M-1)$, (ii) the diam eter grows logarithm ically as D $\ln N$ with the number of nodes N, (iii) the clustering coe cient of each node is inversely proportional to its degree, C / 1=K, and the average clustering coe cient is nonzero in the in nite N \lim it, and (iv) the betweenness centrality distribution follows a power law $P_{\rm B}$ B 2 . We discuss a classi cation scheme of scale-free networks into the universality class with the clustering property and the betweenness centrality distribution.

PACS num bers: 89.75.-k, 89.75 D a, 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 com plex system s 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 powerlaw distribution of the degree, see R ef. [1] and references therein. A possible mechanism for the emerging SF structure is suggested by the Barabasi-A lbert (BA) m odel [4]. However, the BA network lacks the clustering property which is observed in many real networks. To 11 this gap, a hierarchical (H) network m odel was introduced as a model for SF networks with a clustering property [5]. It is observed that the H network displays a scaling law K¹ between the clustering coe cient C of a node C and its degree K and that the average value of C does not vanish in the in nite size lim it. The clustering property is also observed in som e m etabolic networks [6], which is regarded as an evidence for a hierarchical structure [5, 7].

On the other hand, the clustering property does not necessarily in ply 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 diam eter D, and the clustering coe cient (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 re ects 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 $[x_G]$ $[x_G :::x_1]$ with 0 $x_i < M$. The network is de ned recursively. The rst generation consists of one central node [0], which will be referred to as a hub,

and (M 1) peripheral nodes $[y] w \pm 1 \qquad y < M$. All nodes are fully connected with each other. Suppose one has N_G 1, each node of which is assigned to a coordinate $[k_G_{1}]$. 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 $y = 1; \ldots; M$ 1, respectively. It leads to the network N_G. Nodes $[y_{G-1}]$ with $y_i \notin 0$ for all i are the peripheral nodes and $[0_G]$ is the hub of N_G.

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

C1:
$$[k_G \ l+1] x_1 \ 1] \$ y [k_G \ l+1] x_1 \ k+1] w_k \ (1 \ 1 \ G and 1 \ k \ l)$$

C2: $[k_G \ 2 \ y_1 x_1 \$ \ [k_G \ 2 \ y_1^0 x_1 \ for \ y_1 \ for \ y_1^0$

A bove and hereafter, we use x for a dum m y variable ranging from 0 to (M 1) and y for one ranging from 1 to (M 1). The rule C 1 comes from the fact that all peripheral nodes of N_k are connected to the hub 0_k during the replication, and C 2 from the fact that all peripheral nodes of N₁ are fully inter-connected.

For a convenience, we classify nodes into four sets: (a) P for peripheral nodes $[y_G \ 1]$, (y_G) LPl (stands for Locally Peripheral) (1 l < G) for nodes of a form $[x_G \ 1+2$ $(y_1 \ 1]$, (y) LHl (LocalHub) (1 l < G) for nodes of a form $[x_G \ 1+2$ $(y_{1+1} \ 0_1)$, and (d) H for the hub $[0_G]$. The size S of each set is given in Table I.

Degree distribution U sing the connection rules, one can easily enum erate the degree, which is the num ber 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 $P_K = M \quad {}^G S_1 j \models K \quad {}_1 j w \text{ ith } l = 1 \text{ and } K \quad {}_1$ K _{l+ 1} $K_1 = 1. U \operatorname{sing} K$ and S in Table I, we not that exp[Kln(1 1=M)]. On the other hand, nodes in Ρĸ 1^{1} and S_{1} M 1 . Hence, the degree LHlhasK $_1$ (M distribution follows a power law P_K K for M > 2

TABLE I: The degree K, the clustering coe cient 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	С	B ⁰	В
Р	(M 1) ⁶	G + (M 2)	(M 2) (2G + M 3) (G + M 2) (G + M 3)	M G 1 M 1 1	$^{\prime}$ 2M G $\frac{M}{M} \frac{(M^{2} 1)}{M^{3} + 1}$ $\frac{M}{M 1}$ G 1
LPl	(M 1) ¹ M ^G (1+ 1)	l+ (M 2)	(M 2) (21+ M 3) (1+ M 2) (1+ M 3)	$\frac{M}{M-1}$ 1 1	$^{\prime}$ 2M G $\frac{M}{M-1}$ $^{1 1}$ 1, for 1 G
LHl	(M 1)M ^{G (l+ 1)}	$P_{n=1} (M 1)^{n}$	$\frac{(M 2)}{\prod_{n=1}^{l} (M 1)^{n}}$	M ^{1 1} 1	' 2M $^{\rm G}$ (M $^{1 \ 1}$ 1), for 1 G
Н	1	$P_{G_{n=1}}(M 1)^{n}$	$\frac{(M \ 2)}{\prod_{n=1}^{G} (M \ 1)^{n} \ 1}$	0	$n = \frac{1}{M+1} + \frac{M^2 (M-2)}{M^2 1} \ln \frac{M^2}{M^2 M+1} M^{2G}$

with = $1 + \frac{\ln M}{\ln (M-1)}$. 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_{hub} N¹⁼⁽⁻¹⁾.

Shortest path and diameter We rst consider a shortest path from an arbitrary node [x_G $_1$] to the hub $[0_G]$. One can reach the hub by ipping 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 C 2 always leads to a detour. Hence it must not be used in nding a shortest path to the hub. Following C1, one may ip the consecutive low est (including x_1) gures that are all zero to nonzero values, or vice versa. The whole consecutive lowest gures x_i $_{1}$ with x_{1} $_{j}$ $_{i} = 0$ (x_{i} $_{j}$ $_{i} \in 0$) and $x_{i+1} \in 0$ ($x_{i+1} = 0$) will be referred to as a zero (nonzero) dom ain. Then, one can reach the hub in minim al steps by ipping a zero/nonzero dom ain to a nonzero/zero domain successively. The domain size increases at each ip until one reaches the hub, a zero dom ain of size G . Since a zero dom ain can be ipped to any nonzero dom ain, the shortest path has large degeneracy in general.

The process resembles dom ain-coarsening in magnetic systems. To complete this analogy, we map the coordinate $[x_G 1]$ onto a spin state of the (Q = M)-state Potts model in one-dimensional lattice of size G and assign the energy with the H am iltonian

$$H = \int_{i=1}^{X^{G}} f1 \quad ((x; 0); (x_{i+1}; 0))g; \quad (1)$$

where (;) is the K ronecker delta symbol and $x_{G+1} = 0$ is a xed 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 in nite temperature limit: $D_H(G) = [2 \ln Z \ (;G)=0]_{=0}$ with the partition function Z $(;G) = x_G e^{-H[X_G]}$. It can be calculated using a transfer matrix method. A fler som e algebra, we obtain that

$$D_{H} (G) = \frac{2 (M - 1)}{M^{2}} G + \frac{(M - 1) (M - 2)}{M^{2}}$$
(2)

$$d([k_G]; [k_G^0]) = {}^{0}(x; x^0) fd([k_G]; [0_G]) + d([k_G^0]; [0_G])g + (x; x^0) d([k_G_1]; [k_G^0] 1])$$
(3)

where ${}^{0}(;)$ 1 (;) 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 (m ean node-to-node distance) with the solution

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

In the in nite $N = M^G$ limit, we not that $D' 2D_H$ and that the diam eter scales logarithm ically with N. It is a characteristics of the hierarchical network. For conventional (non-hierarchical) SF networks, the diam eter scales sub-logarithm ically for 3 [15, 16].

Clustering ∞ cients | 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.

U sing 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 1 K 2). So, for large K М G + (M M , their CC's are inversely proportional to the degrees, C (K) ' 2)=K. The CC's of nodes in LH land the hub are 2 **(**M exactly given by C (K) = (M = 2) = (K = 1). The scaling law C ' cK 1 holds for both cases, but the coe cient c diers by a factor of two (cf. Fig. 2 (b) in Ref. [5]).

P The average CC is given by C M G (S_PC_P + $_{1}$ (S_{LP1}C_{LP1} + S_{LH1}C_{LH1}) + S_HC_H). In the in nite size limit (G ! 1), it converges to a nonzero value

$$C = (1 \quad \frac{2}{M})^{\frac{X^{1}}{1}} \frac{(21 + M \quad 3)(1 \quad 1 = M^{\frac{1}{2}})}{(1 + M \quad 2)(1 + M \quad 3)} + (1 \quad \frac{1}{M})^{\frac{X^{1}}{1}} \frac{(M \quad 2)^{2}}{M^{\frac{1}{1}}(M \quad 1)^{\frac{1}{2} + 1} \quad 2M + 3)}; \quad (5)$$

Num erically C = 0.719282...and 0.741840...for M = 4and 5, respectively. C converges to 1 as M ! 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 dom ain-coarsening picture. A gain, each node in the sam e set has the sam e value of B^0 . (a) A node $u = [y_G]$ 1] inyP m ay belong to a short- $_{1+2}0$ \mathbf{x}_{1}^{0} ⁰]wxith est path to the hub from nodes $[y_G]$ 2 and arbitrary & The dom ain-coarsening 1 G 0 process leads them to $[y_G]$ 1+20 y+1] at an intermediate step. Then, the zero dom ain 0_{1+1} ips 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_{ll}^{0} . Summing up all contributions, we obtain the result in Table I. (b) A node $[x_G _{l+2} 0 y_1 _1]$ in LPl may belong to a shortest path from nodes [x_G 1+20xy1 $m + 2\mathcal{D}\mathbf{x}_{m}^{0}$ 0 1] wxith 0 m 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 $u = [x_G]$ ₁₊₂yx₊₁0₁] in LHl belongs to \all" shortest paths from nodes $1 + 2 \mathbf{x}_{i+1} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{x}_{1-1}^{0}$ ⁰] with arbitrary \mathbf{x}_{i}^{0} except for $[\mathbf{x}_{G}]$ u itself. So, $B_{11}^{0} = M^{11}$ 1. (d) Trivially, $B^{0} = 0$ for the hub.

By eliminating the parameter l in Table I, we obtain that B⁰(K) = $(M = (M - 1))^{K - M + 1}$ for nodes in set LP1. It is diverging exponentially with K. On the other hand, P_K for nodes in LP1 decays exponentially. So, P_{B⁰} decays algebraically. Explicitly it is obtained from P_{B⁰} = M ^G S₁j = B ¹₀ j which yields that

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

We obtain the relation B⁰ (K) = $1 + M^{-1} (1 + K M^{-1})^{-1}$ for nodes in the set LHl. So the distribution is given by

$$P_{B^{0}} = \frac{1}{M^{2}} \frac{1}{(B^{0} + 1)^{2}} :$$
 (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 sim ilar idea for the BC. Introduce a character function $_{\rm G}$ ([x $^0_{\rm G}$]; [x $^{00}_{\rm G}$]; [x $_{\rm G}$]) to denote the fraction of paths passing through [x_G] among all shortest paths between $[x_{G}^{0}]$ and $[x_{G}^{00}]$ in N_G. The $[x_{G}]$ dependence will be assumed implicitly. Then, the BC of a node $[x_{\oplus}] = [xx_{G_1}]$ can be written formally as $B_{[X_G]} = \begin{bmatrix} x_0^0 ; x_0^{00} & G \end{bmatrix} ([x_G^0]; [x_G^0]).$ The hub will be considered separately later, and we assume that $[x_G]$ is not, the hub for the time being. Decompose the into x_{G}^{0} and similarly for x_{G}^{00} . sum \mathbf{x}_{G}^{0} W hen $x^0 \in x^{00}$, all shortest paths between $[x^0 x^0_{G_{1}}]$ and $\begin{bmatrix} x^{0} \times_{G}^{0} & _{1} \end{bmatrix}$ pass through the hub, which yields that $_{G} (\begin{bmatrix} x^{0} \times_{G}^{0} & _{1} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} x^{0} \times_{G}^{0} & _{1} \end{bmatrix}) = _{G} (\begin{bmatrix} x^{0} \times_{G}^{0} & _{1} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} 0_{G} \end{bmatrix}) + _{G} (\begin{bmatrix} x^{0} \times_{G}^{0} & _{1} \end{bmatrix}; \begin{bmatrix} 0_{G} \end{bmatrix})$. When $x^{0} = x^{0}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} x_{G} \end{bmatrix}$ is not the hub, the sum m ands are nonzero only when $x^0 = x^{00} = x$. U sing these properties, we obtain that

$$B_{[X_G]} = 2 (M_{1})M^{G_1}B_{[X_G]}^{0} + G_{G_1}([x_G^{0}_{G_1}]; [x_G^{00}_{G_1}]): (8)$$

O ne m ight be tem pted to identify the second term as B $_{[X_G \ 1]}$, i.e., the BC de ned on N $_G \ 1$. However this is not correct for x 6 0, since some pairs of $[x_G^0 \ 1]$ and $[x_G^0 \ 1]$ may have degenerate shortest paths passing through the hub $[D_G]$ which is not present at N $_G \ 1$. This was explained when we discussed the diam eter. For example, [y1111] and [y1222] with nonzero y 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 compensate for the change in the degeneracy of the shortest paths. As the example showed, the compensation is necessary only for nodes of the form $[x_G] = [y_G \ 1+10y]$ with 1 1< G. For such nodes, after enumerating all degeneracy carefully, Eq. (8) becomes

$$B_{[X_G]} = 2 (M - 1)M^{G-1}B^{0}_{[X_G]} + B_{[X_G-1]}$$

$$\frac{\overset{\circ}{X}^{1}}{\frac{(M - 2)(M - 1^{h}M^{-2(1-k)})}{(G - 1 + k)(G - 1 + k - 1)}; \qquad (9)$$

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

$$B_{[0_G]} = M \qquad 1) M^{2G^{-1}} 2M^{G^{-1}} + B_{[0_{G^{-1}}]} + M \qquad 2) M^{2G^{-1}} \frac{M^{-1}}{k^{2G^{-1}}} (10)$$

For other nodes, we have the sim ple relation

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

W ith the recursion relations, we now readily calculate the BC of all nodes exactly. Since the exact expressions are lengthy, we present only the leading order contribution in the large G lim it in Table I. Note that B ' 2M $^{G}B^{0}$ form ost nodes in LPl and LH l in the large G lim it. The proportionality relation in plies that the BC follows the same power-law distribution as B⁰:

$$P_{\rm B} = B^{-2}$$
: (12)

Sum m ary and discussions | We have studied the exact scaling properties of the H network introduced in Ref. [5]. We have shown that the H network has the clustering property: The average value of the CC is nonzero in the in nite network size limit and the CC exhibits the scaling law C K with = 1. We have also shown that the BC follows the power-law distribution P_B B with = 2. Both scaling properties characterize the H network model.

The BC proved to be useful in classifying SF networks into the universality class. The BC distribution exponent is universal and has the value either ′ 2:2 in ' 2:0 in the class II [13]. Combining the class I or the scaling properties of the CC and the BC, we suggest that there exist four classes, that is, I-C , I-N C , II-C , and II-NC (\C " for clustered and \NC " for non-clustered networks) [17]. The H network model then belongs to the class II-C. The Internet at the autonom ous system level and some metabolic networks of archaea display both scaling behaviors with '1:0 [5] and '2:0 [13]. So they belong to the same class II-C, which is a stronger evidence for a hierarchical structure [5]. The BA network with m = 1 [4] and the determ inistic tree network [18] have C = 0 and = 2 [19], thus they are m em bers of the class II-NC. The BA network with m 2 has vanishing CC [9, 10] and 22 [13], and belongs to the class IHNC.

Literatures suggest that the m etabolic networks of bacteria and eukaryotes [7, 13] and the coauthorship network in the eld of neuroscience [13, 20] m ight belong to the class I-C. W ith the existence of the class I-C, the clustering property does not necessarily in ply the hierarchical structure. Therefore, it is in portant to establish the class I-C m ly. Further studies on the BC distribution in m odel networks with the clustering property, such as the H olm e-K in m odel [8] and K kmm -E guiluz m odel [9], are required. Further studies are also necessary to reveal the sim ilarity/dissim ilarity between the m etabolic networks of archaea and those of bacteria and eukaryotes, which have di erent BC distributions.

G oh et al. [13] suggested that the topology of shortest pathways be a universal characteristics of SF networks. They found a chain-like structure for networks in the class Π (= 2). It was presumed that the chainlike structure leads to a linear mass-distance relation m (d) ' Ad where m (d) is the mean number of nodes along all shortest paths between a node pair separated by a distance d. W e also found that the shortest pathways of the H network have a chain-like structure. For example, a set of all shortest paths from [001010] to the hub in N₆ is given by $[001010]!^1$ $[00101y]!^2$ $[0010_3]!^3$ [001yyy]!⁴ $[0_6]$ with arbitrary nonzero y's. It has a chain-like structure, but the steps 1 and 3 introduce blobs whose size increases exponentially as one proceeds. We could show that m (d), averaged over all nodes separated by the distance d from the hub, satis es an inequality m (d) аM 1) with a positive constant a [21]. So a topological characterization other than the mass-distance relation is necessary to characterize the chain-like structure observed in the class II-C .

This work has been nancially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). The author thanks H.Rieger and B.Kahng for useful discussions.

- R.Albert and A.L.Barabasi, Rev. Mod. Phys. 74, 47 (2002).
- [2] D J.W atts and S H .Strogatz, N ature (London) 393, 440 (1998).
- [3] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A.-L. Barabasi, Nature 401, 130 (1999).
- [4] A.-L.Barabasi and R.Albert, Science 286, 509 (1999).
- [5] E.R avasz and A.-L.Barabasi, cond-m at/0206130 (2002).
- [6] H. Jeong, B. Tombor, R. Albert, ZN. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabasi, Nature 407, 651 (2000).
- [7] E.Ravasz, A.L. Somera, D.A. Mongru, Z.N. Olivai, and A.-L.Barabasi, Science 297, 1551 (2002).
- [8] P.Holm e and B.J.K im, Phys.Rev.E 65,026107 (2002).
- [9] K.Klemm and V M.Eguiluz, Phys.Rev.E 65, 036123 (2002); ibid. 65, 057102 (2002).
- [10] G.Szabo, M.Alava, and J.Kertesz, cond-m at/0208551.
- [11] SN. Dorogovtæv, A.V. Goltæv, and JFF. Mendes, cond-mat/0112143 (2001).
- [12] M E J. Newman, Phys. Rev. E 64, 016131 (2001); ibid.

64,016132 (2001).

- [13] K.-I. Goh, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 278701 (2001); K.-I. Goh, E.S. Oh, H. Jeong, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 99, 12583 (2002).
- [14] If $x = x^0 \in 0$, there m ay exist degenerate shortest paths passing through the hub which does not belong to the sub-network. As far as the distance is concerned, such degenerate paths can be ignored.
- [15] B.Cohen and S.Havlin, cond-m at/0205476 (2002).
- [16] J.D. N oh and H. Rieger, cond-m at/0208428 (2002).
- [17] A clustered network may have the exponent \notin 1 [5].
- [18] S.Jung, S.K im , and B.K ahng, Phys. Rev. E 65, 056101 (2002).
- [19] E.S.Oh, B.Kahng, and D.Kim, unpublished.
- [20] K.-I. Goh, E. Oh, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, condmat/0210224 (2002).
- [21] J.D. Noh, unpublished.