arXiv:cond-mat/0406152v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 7 Jun 2004

Scalable Percolation Search in Power Law Networks

Nima Sarshar, P. Oscar Boykin, and Vwani Roychowdhury*
Department of Electrical Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles

We introduce a scalable searching algorithm for finding nodes and contents in random networks with Power-Law (PL) and heavy-tailed degree distributions. The network is searched using a probabilistic broadcast algorithm, where a query message is relayed on each edge with probability just above the bond percolation threshold of the network. We show that if each node caches its directory via a short random walk, then the total number of *accessible contents exhibits a first-order phase transition*, ensuring very high hit rates just above the percolation threshold. In any random PL network of size, N, and exponent, $2 \leq \tau < 3$, the total traffic per query scales sub-linearly, while the search time scales as $O(\log N)$. In a PL network with exponent, $\tau \approx 2$, *any content or node* can be located in the network with *probability approaching one* in time $O(\log N)$, while generating traffic that scales as $O(\log^2 N)$, if the maximum degree, k_{max}, is unconstrained, and as $O(N^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon})$ (for any $\epsilon > 0$) if $k_{max} = O(\sqrt{N})$. Extensive large-scale simulations show these scaling laws to be precise. We discuss how this percolation search algorithm can be directly adapted to solve the well-known scaling problem in unstructured Peer-to-Peer (P2P) networks. Simulations of the protocol on sample large-scale subnetworks of existing P2P services show that overall traffic can be reduced by almost two-orders of magnitude, without any significant loss in search performance.

PACS numbers:
Keywords: Scalable Search, Unstructured Peer-To-Peer Networks, Power Law, Heavy-Tailed degree distributions, Distributed database

I. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Scale-free networks with heavy-tailed and Power-Law (PL) degree distributions have been observed in several different fields and scenarios (see, e.g., [7] and references therein). In a PL degree distribution, the probability that a randomly chosen node has degree k is given by $P(k) \sim k^{-\tau}$, where $\tau > 0$ is referred to as the exponent of the distribution. For $2 \leq \tau \leq 3$ a network with N nodes has constant or at most $O(\log N)$ average degree, but the variance of the degree distribution is unbounded. It is in this regime of τ that the PL networks display many of the advantageous properties, such as small diameter [14], tolerance to random node deletions [9], and a natural hierarchy, where there are sufficiently many nodes of high degree.

The searching problem in random power-law networks can be stated as follows[4]: Starting from a randomly selected node, *the source*, find another randomly selected node, *the destination*, through only *local communications*. Equivalently, this can be cast into a messaging problem, where it is desirable to transfer a message from an arbitrary node to another randomly chosen node through local (i.e., first neighbor) communications. Since a searcher has no idea about the location of the destination node in the network (unless, each node somehow has path information for all other nodes cached in it), the problem is indeed that of transferring a message from a node to *all* other nodes in the network.

Another equivalent version of this problem appears in *unstructured P2P networks*, such as Gnutella[10], Limewire[16], Kazaa[1], Morpheus[2], and Imesh [3], where the data objects *do not have global unique ids*, and *queries are done via a set of key words*. The reasons that search in PL networks is important for such unstructured P2P networks, include: (i) A number of recent studies have shown that the structure of these existing networks has complex network characteristics [15, 17], including approximate power law degree distributions. Thus PL networks, or at least networks with heavy-tailed degree distributions, seem to naturally emerge in the existing services. (ii) Systematic P2P protocols that will lead to the emergence of PL networks with tunable exponents, even when nodes are deleted randomly, have been proposed recently [18]. This makes it possible to systematically design robust and random P2P networks that admit PL degree distributions, and that can exploit several properties of PL graphs that are extremely useful for networking services, e.g., low diameter, which allows fast searches, a randomized hierarchy, which allows optimal usage of heterogeneous computing and networking resources without the intervention of a global manager, and extreme tolerance to random deletions of nodes, which provides robustness.

In a straightforward parallel search approach in P2P networks, each query is given a unique id, and then each node on receiving the query message sends it out to all of its neighbors, unless the node has already processed the query, which the node can identify by checking the id's of the queries it has already processed. This leads to $O(N)$ total queries in the network for every single query, and results in significant scaling problems. For example, Ripeanu et.al.[15] estimated that in December of 2000 Gnutella traffic accounted for 1.7% of Internet backbone

*Electronic address: nima,boykin,vwani@ee.ucla.edu

traffic.

As reviewed later in Section V, a number of ad hoc measures, ranging from forcing an ultra-peer structure on the network, to a random-walk based approach, where it is assumed that a constant fraction of the nodes in the network caches each content's location, have been proposed in the P2P community. But none of these measures provides a provably scalable and decentralized solution, where any content, even if it is located in only one node, is guaranteed to be found. The only systematic work on searches in random PL networks reported so far [4], employs a *serial search technique* based on random walks and caching of content-lists of every node on all its neighbors (or on all its first and second neighbors), and is reviewed in greater detail in Section II.

We present a parallel, but scalable, search algorithm that exploits the structure of PL networks judiciously, and provides precise scaling laws that can be verified via extensive large-scale simulations (Section III). The key steps in our search algorithm are: (i) *Caching or Content Implantation:* Each node executes a short random walk and caches its content list or directory on the visited nodes. For example, for $\tau \approx 2$, this one-time-only random walk is of length $O(\log N)$, and thus the average cache size per node is $O(\log N)$. (ii) *Query Implantation*: When a node wants to make a query, it first executes a short random walk and implants its query request on the nodes visited. (iii) *Bond Percolation:* All the implanted query requests are propagated independently through the network *in parallel* using a probabilistic broadcast scheme. In this scheme, a node on receiving a query message for the first time, relays the message on each of its edges with a certain probability q, which is vanishingly greater than the percolation threshold, q_c, of the underlying PL network (see [19] for a review of bond percolation in PL graphs).

The physics of how and why percolation search algorithm works efficiently, can be described as follows. The bond percolation step, executed just above the percolation threshold, guarantees that a query message is received by all nodes in a giant connected component of diameter $O(\log N)$ and consisting of high-degree nodes. The content and query implantation steps ensure that the content list of every node is cached on at least one of the nodes in this giant component with probability approaching one, and that one of the nodes in the giant connected component receives a query implantation with probability approaching one. Thus with $O(\langle k \rangle N q_c)$ traffic (which scales sublinearly for PL graphs, as shown in Section III and [19]), any content (*even if it is owned by a single node in the network*) can be located with *probability approaching one* in time $O(\log N)$.

An interesting outcome pertaining to the physics of networking is that the accessible contents/nodes *exhibit a first-order phase transition* as a function of the broadcast or percolation probability q, showing a sharp rise as soon as q exceeds the percolation threshold q_c. In contrast to the accessible contents, the *number of nodes and edges* in the giant connected component *exhibits only a second order phase transition.* One of the *primary appeals of the percolation search algorithm* is that by combining serial random walks (i.e., content and query implantations) with bond percolation *it engineers a second-order phase transition into a first-order*, allowing query-hits approaching 100%, even when $\lim_{N\to\infty}(q - q_c) = 0$.

While the proof that the percolation search algorithm leads to scalable traffic and low latency is based on fairly involved concepts, the *algorithm itself can be easily implemented* and *directly adapted to solve the scaling problem plaguing unstructured P2P networks.* In Section V, we discuss such applications, and present simulation results which show that even on sample large-scale subnetworks of existing P2P services, the overall traffic can be reduced by almost two-orders of magnitude, without any significant loss in search performance, by a direct implementation of percolation search. We also consider *heterogeneous networks* in Section VI, where the degree distribution is a mixture of heavy-tailed and light-tailed PL distributions. Such mixture distributions can model networks, such as the popular P2P services, where nodes belong to only few types, and each type has its own capability and hence, its own degree distribution. We provide both simulation and analytical studies of the improvements to be accrued from the percolation search algorithms when implemented on random heterogeneous networks (Section VI).

II. PRIOR WORK AND COMPARISON

The search algorithm by Adamic et. al. [4] can be described as follows: To convey a message from node A to B, A sends a message that goes on a random walk through the network. When arriving at a new node, the message requests it to scan all its neighbors for the destination node B. If B is not found among the neighbors of the current node, then the message is sent to one of the neighbors of the current node picked randomly.

This algorithm exploits the skewed degree distribution of the nodes in PL networks: The random walk naturally gravitates towards nodes with higher degree, and therefore, by scanning the neighbors of these high degree nodes, the random walker is expected to soon be able to scan a large fraction of the network. One could also *scan both the first and the second neighbors* of a node visited through the random walk (rather than just scanning its first neighbors), in order to find the destination node B.

Estimates for both search time and the number of messages created (i.e., traffic) per query can be obtained as follows: For a power-law random graph with exponent τ, the expected degree of a node arrived at via a random link is $z_a \propto k_{max}^{3-\tau} \propto N^{\frac{3}{\tau}-1}$, assuming that $k_{max} = N^{1/\tau}$. Also, the expected number of the second neighbors of a node randomly arrived at by following a link is around $z_b \propto N^{2(\frac{3}{\tau}-1)}$. Therefore, assuming that nodes are not scanned multiple times during the random

walk, the whole network is expected to be scanned after around:

$$A_a \approx N/z_a = N^{2-\frac{3}{\tau}} \quad (1)$$

hops if only the first neighbors are scanned, and

$$A_b \approx N/z_b = N^{3-\frac{6}{\tau}} \quad (2)$$

if the second neighbors are scanned as well. For $\tau = 2$, and the case where *both first and second neighbors* of a node are scanned, the predicted scaling is polylogarithmic in the size of the network.

While this technique is an *important first step towards exploiting the hierarchical structure of PL networks* and provides a sublinear scaling of traffic, there are several drawbacks that need to be addressed:

(i) The actual performance of the algorithm *is far worse than the theoretically predicted scaling laws.* The primary reason for this discrepancy is that the estimates in Eqs. (1) and (2) are based on the assumption that the nodes scanned during a walk are unique, i.e., no node is scanned more than once. As pointed out by the authors in [4], while this is a good approximation at the start of the walk, it quickly becomes invalid when a good fraction of the nodes have been scanned. Extensive simulations in [4] show that actual scaling is significantly worse than the predicted values: For example, for $\tau = 2.1$, Eq. (1) predicts a scaling of $N^{0.14}$, but the actual scaling observed is more than a power of 5 worse (i.e., $N^{0.79}$). The same is true for (2), where a scaling of $N^{0.1}$ is predicted for $\tau = 2.1$ while $N^{0.71}$ is observed.

(ii) *The random-walk search is serial* in operation, and even assuming that the predicted scalings are accurate, the search time for finding any node or its content in the network is polynomially long in N. As an example, for $\tau = 2.3$, a value observed in early Gnutella networks, the predicted search time scalings are: $A_a = N^{0.66}$ or $A_b = N^{0.39}$.

However, as mentioned before, these scalings are going to be significantly worse and we know that they will be at least larger than $N^{0.71}$.

(iii) In order to obtain the best traffic scalings, one needs to scale cache (storage) size *per node* polynomially; e.g., for $\tau \approx 2$, the cache size per node should increase as $O(\sqrt{N})$. Recall that the search strategy requires every node to answer if the node/content satisfying the query message is in any of its first neighbors or in any of its first and second neighbors. This scanning can be performed in two ways: (1) *Without caching:* For each query message, the node queries all its first (or first and second) neighbors. *This strategy is then at least as bad as flooding*, since for each independent search, all the links have to be queried at least once which results in a traffic per search of at least $O(N)$. (2) *With Caching:* Each node caches its content-list on all its neighbors, or on all of its first and second neighbors, as required by the protocol. Through the random walk, the walker can scan the contents of the neighbors (or both first and second neighbors) by observing the content lists in the current node without having to query the neighbors. The total cache size required per node in the case of the first-neighbor-only caching scheme is exactly the average degree of nodes (i.e., $O(\log N)$ for $\tau = 2$), and $N^{3/\tau-1}$ (i.e., $O(\sqrt{N})$ for $\tau = 2$) when scanning of both the first and second neighbors are required. Thus the least traffic and equivalently, shortest search times, are obtained at the expense of an increased cache size requirements per node.

As noted in the introduction and elaborated in the later sections, we build on the basic ideas in [4], and exploit the hierarchical structure of PL networks more efficiently to successfully resolve many of the above-mentioned issues. In particular, our results have the following distinctive features: (1) The actual performance of the algorithm matches the theoretical predictions. (2) The algorithm takes $O(\log N)$ time and is parallel in nature. (3) The average cache size increases with the exponent τ, and is minimum for $\tau = 2$, when the traffic scaling is the most favorable. For example, for a random PL network with exponent, $\tau = 2$, and maximum degree k_{max}, we show that any content in the network can be found with probability approaching one in time $O(\log N)$, while generating only $O(N \times \frac{2 \log k_{max}}{k_{max}})$ traffic per query. Moreover, the content and query implantation random walks are $O(\log N)$ in size, *leading to the average cache size of* $O(\log N)$. Thus, if $k_{max} = cN$ (as is the case for a randomly generated PL network with no a priori upper bound on k_{max}) then the overall traffic scales as $O(\log^2 N)$ per query, and if $k_{max} = \sqrt{N}$ (as is the usual practice in the literature) then the overall traffic scales as $O(\sqrt{N} \log^2 N) = O(N^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon})$ (for any $\epsilon > 0$) per query.

III. THE PERCOLATION SEARCH ALGORITHM AND ITS SCALING PROPERTIES

The percolation search algorithm can be described as follows:
(i) *Content List Implantation:* Each node in a network of size N duplicates its content list (or directory) through a random walk of size $L(N, \tau)$ starting from itself. The exact form of $L(N, \tau)$ depends on the topology of the network (i.e., τ for PL networks), and is in general a sublinear function of N. Thus the total amount of directory storage space required in the network is $NL(N, \tau)$, and the average cache size is $L(N, \tau)$. Note that, borrowing a terminology from the Gnutella protocol, *the length of these implantation random walks will be also referred to as the TTL (Time To Live).*

(ii) *Query Implantation:* To start a query, a query request is *implanted* through a random walk of size $L(N,\tau)$ starting from the requester.
(iii) *Bond Percolation:* When the search begins, each node with a query implantation starts a *probabilistic broadcast search*, where it sends a query to each of its neighbors with probability q, with $q = q_c/\gamma$ where q_c is the percolation threshold[19].

We next derive scaling and performance measures of the above algorithm. Our derivations will follow the following steps:

- First we define high degree nodes and compute the number of high degree nodes in a given network.
- Second, we show that after the probabilistic broadcast step (i.e., after performing a bond percolation in the query routing step), a query is received by all members of connected component to which an implant of that query belongs. We also see that the diameter of all connected components is $O(\log N)$, and thus the query propagates through it quickly.
- Third, we show that *a random walk of length* $L(N,\tau)$ starting from any node will *pass through a highly connected node, with probability approaching one*. This will ensure that (i) a pointer to any content is owned by at least one highly connected node, and (ii) at least one implant of any query is at one of the high degree nodes.
- Finally, we examine the scaling of the maximum degree of the network k_{max} and give the scaling of query costs and cache sizes in terms of the size of the entire network N. We show that both cache size and query cost scale sublinearly for all $2 \le \tau < 3$, and indeed can be made to scale $O(\log^2 N)$ with the proper choice of τ and k_{max}.

A. High Degree Nodes

In this section we define the notion of a high degree node. For any node with degree k, we say it is a high degree node if $k \ge k_{max}/2$. We assume that we deal with random power-law graphs which have a degree distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &= Ak^{-\tau}, \\ \text{where } A^{-1} &= \sum_{k=2}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau} \approx \zeta(\tau) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and $\zeta(\cdot)$ is the Riemann zeta function. A approaches the approximate value quickly as k_{max} gets large, and thus can be considered constant. Thus the number of high degree nodes, H is given by:

$$H = N\left(A\sum_{k=k_{max}/2}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau}\right).$$

Since for all decreasing, positive,$f(k)$ we have $\sum_{k=a}^{b} f(k) > \int_a^{b+1} f(k)dk > \int_a^b f(k)dk$ and $\sum_{k=a}^{b} f(k) < \int_{a-1}^{b} f(k)dk$, we can bound H from above and below:

$$\begin{aligned} H &> \frac{A}{\tau-1}\left(\frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2})^{\tau-1}} - 1\right)\frac{N}{k_{max}^{\tau-1}}, \text{ and} \\ H &< \frac{A}{\tau-1}\left(\frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2})^{\tau-1}(1-\frac{1}{k_{max}/2})} - 1\right)\frac{N}{k_{max}^{\tau-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $k_{max} \to \infty$ we have that $\frac{1}{k_{max}/2} \to 0$ thus:

$$H \approx \frac{A}{\tau-1}\left(2^{\tau-1}-1\right)\frac{N}{k_{max}^{\tau-1}}.$$

We have shown that $H = O(\frac{N}{k_{max}^{\tau-1}})$. As we discuss in section III E, there are two choices for scaling of k_{max}. If we put no prior limit on k_{max} it will scale like $O(N^{1/(\tau-1)})$. As we will discuss, we may also consider $k_{max} = O(N^{1/\tau})$. We should note that the first scaling law gives $H = O(1)$, or a constant number of high degree nodes as the system scales. The second gives $H = O(N^{1/\tau})$. For all $\tau \ge 2$, we have H scaling sublinearly in N.

In the next sections we will show that without explicitly identifying or arranging the high degree nodes in the network, we can still access them and make use of their resources to make the network efficiently searchable.

B. High Degree Nodes are in the Giant Component

In conventional percolation studies, one is guaranteed that as long as $q - q_c = \epsilon > 0$, where ϵ is a constant independent of the size of the network, then there will be a giant connected component in the percolated graph. However, in our case, i.e., PL networks with $2 \le \tau \le 3$, $\lim_{N\to\infty} q_c = 0$ (for example, $q_c = \frac{\log(k_{max})}{k_{max}}$ for a PL network with exponent $\tau = 2$ [6]), and since the traffic (i.e., the number of edges traversed) scales as $O(\langle k\rangle Nq)$, we cannot afford to have a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that $q = \epsilon + q_c$: the traffic will then scale linearly.

Hence, we will percolate not at a constant above the threshold, but at a multiple above the threshold: $q = q_c/\gamma$. We consider this problem in detail in a separate work[19]. The result is that if we *follow a random edge in the graph, the probability it reaches an infinite component is* $\delta = z/k_{max}$ *for a constant* z *which depends only on* τ *and* γ*, but not* k_{max}.

Thus, since each high degree node has at least $k_{max}/2$ degree, the average number of edges of a high degree node that connect to the infinite component (k_{inf}) is at least:

$$k_{inf} \ge \delta\frac{k_{max}}{2} = \frac{z}{k_{max}}k_{max}/2 = \frac{z}{2}.$$

The probability that a high degree node has at least one link to the infinite component is at least:

$$\begin{aligned} P &\geq 1-(1-\delta)^{k_{max}/2} \\ &= 1-(1-\frac{z}{k_{max}})^{k_{max}/2} \\ &\geq 1-e^{-z/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus both the average number of degrees that a high degree node has to the giant component, and the probability that a high degree node has at least one edge to the giant component are independent of k_{max}. So as we scale up k_{max}, we can expect that the high degree nodes stay connected to the giant component. We can make z larger by decreasing γ, particularly, if $1/\gamma > 2/(3-\tau)$ we have $z > 1$ [19].

It remains to be shown that the diameter of the connected component is on the order of $O(\log N)$. To see this, we use the approximate formula $l \approx \frac{\log M}{\log d}$ [14] of the diameter of a random graph with size M and average degree d. We know that the size of the percolated graph is $\frac{Nz}{k_{max}}\langle k\rangle$ and that the average degree is approximately 2[19]. Thus the diameter of the giant component is:

$$\begin{aligned} l &= \frac{\log(\frac{Nz}{k_{max}}\langle k\rangle)}{\log(2)} \\ &= \frac{\log\frac{N}{k_{max}}+\log z+\log\langle k\rangle}{\log(2)} = O(\log N). \end{aligned}$$

At this point we have presented the main result. If we can cache content on high degree nodes, and query by percolation *starting from* a high degree node, we will always find the content we are looking for. We have not yet addressed how each node can find a high degree node. In the next section we show that by taking a short random walk through the network we will reach a high degree node with high probability, and this gives us the final piece we need to make the network searchable by all nodes.

C. Random Walks Reach High Degree Nodes

Consider a random PL network of size N and with maximum node degree k_{max}. We want to compute the probability that following a randomly chosen link one arrives at a high degree node. To find this probability, consider the generating function $G_1(x)$[19] of the degree of the nodes arrived at by following a random link:

$$G_1(x) = \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau+1}x^{k-1}}{C}, \tag{3}$$

where $C = \sum_{k=2}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau+1}$. This results in the probability of arriving at a node with degree greater than $\frac{k_{max}}{2}$ to be:

$$P_\tau = \frac{\sum_{k=k_{max}/2}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau+1}}{C}.$$

Since the degrees of the nodes in the network are independent, each step of the random walk is an independent sample of the same trial. The probability of reaching a high degree node within $\frac{\alpha}{P_\tau}$ steps is:

$$1-(1-P_\tau)^{\alpha/P_\tau} \geq 1-e^{-\alpha}.$$

Therefore, after $O(1/P_\tau)$ steps, a high degree node will be encountered in the random walk path with high (constant) probability. Now we need to compute P_τ for $\tau = 2$ and $2 < \tau < 3$. Since for all decreasing, positive, $f(k)$ we have $\sum_{k=a}^{b} f(k) > \int_a^{b+1} f(k)dk > \int_a^b f(k)dk$ and $\sum_{k=a}^{b} f(k) < \int_{a-1}^{b} f(k)dk$, we can bound the following sums.

If $\tau = 2$, we have the probability of arriving at a node with degree greater than $\frac{k_{max}}{2}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 &= \frac{\sum_{k=k_{max}/2}^{k_{max}} k^{-1}}{C} \\ &> \frac{\log(k_{max})-\log(k_{max}/2)}{C} = \frac{-\log 2}{C}, \end{aligned}$$

and $C = \sum_{k=2}^{k_{max}} k^{-1} < \log(k_{max})$. We finally get:

$$P_2 > \frac{-\log 2}{\log(k_{max})}. \tag{4}$$

For $\tau = 2$, then in $O(1/P_2) = O(\log k_{max})$ steps we have reached a high degree node.

If $2 < \tau < 3$, we have the probability of arriving at a node with degree greater than $\frac{k_{max}}{2}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\tau &= \frac{\sum_{k=k_{max}/2}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau+1}}{C} \\ &> \frac{1}{\tau-2}(2^{\tau-2}-1)\frac{1}{Ck_{max}^{\tau-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and $C = \sum_{k=2}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau+1} < \frac{1}{\tau-2}(1-\frac{1}{k^{\tau-2}})$. We finally get:

$$P_\tau > \frac{2^{\tau-2}-1}{k_{max}^{\tau-2}-1}. \tag{5}$$

For $2 < \tau < 3$, then in $O(1/P_\tau) = O(k_{max}^{\tau-2})$ steps we have reached a high degree node, which is polynomially large in k_{max} rather than logarithmically large, as in the case of $\tau = 2$.

A sequential random walk requires $O(k_{max}^{\tau-2})$ time steps to traverse $O(k_{max}^{\tau-2})$ edges, and hence, the query implantation time will dominate the search time, making the whole search time scale faster than $O(\log N)$. Recall that the percolation search step will only require $O(\log N)$ time, irrespective of the value of τ. A simple parallel query implantation process can solve the problem. To implement $k_{max}^{\tau-2}$ query seeds for example, a random walker with time to live (TTL) of $K = \log_2 k_{max}^{\tau-2}$ will initiate a walk from the node in question and at each step of the walk it implants a query seed, and also initiates a second

random walker with time to live $K-1$. This process will continue recursively until the time to live of all walkers are exhausted. The number of links traversed by all the walkers is easily seen to be:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{K-1} 2^i = 2^K - 1 = k_{max}^{\tau-2} - 1.$$

Figure 3 gives simulation results to show that the parallel walk is effective, and thus search time scales as $O(\log N)$ for all $2 \leq \tau < 3$. In practice, for values of τ close to two, the quality of search is fairly insensitive to how the number of query implants are scaled.

D. Communication Cost or Traffic Scaling

Each time we want to cache a content, we send it on a random walk across $L(N,\tau) = O(1/P_\tau)$ edges. When we make a query, if we reach the giant component, each edge passes it with probability q (if we don't reach a giant component only a constant number of edges pass the query). Thus, the total communications traffic scales as $qE = q_c\langle k\rangle N/\gamma$. Since $q_c = \langle k\rangle/\langle k^2\rangle$ we have $\mathcal{C}_\tau = O(\frac{\langle k\rangle^2 N}{\langle k^2\rangle})$. For all $2 \leq \tau < 3$, $\langle k^2\rangle = O(k_{max}^{3-\tau})$. For $\tau = 2$, $\langle k\rangle = \log k_{max}$ which gives

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = O\left(\frac{\log^2 k_{max} N}{k_{max}}\right) \tag{6}$$

For $2 < \tau < 3$, $\langle k\rangle$ is constant which gives

$$\mathcal{C}_\tau = O\left(k_{max}^{\tau-3} N\right) \tag{7}$$

In section III A, we showed that the number of high degree nodes $H = O(N/k_{max}^{\tau-1})$. We also know that $L(N,\tau) = \alpha/P_\tau$ and $P_2 = O(1/\log k_{max})$ and $P_\tau = O(1/k_{max}^{\tau-2})$. Thus we can rewrite the communication scaling in terms of the high degree nodes, $\mathcal{C}_\tau = O(L(N,\tau)^2 H)$. So we see that communication costs scales linearly in H, but as the square of the length of the walk to the high degree nodes. This meets with our intuition since the high degree nodes are the nodes that store the cache and answer the queries.

In the next section we discuss explicit scaling of k_{max} to get communication cost scaling as a function of N. Tables I and II show the scaling of the cache and communication cost in N. We see that for all $\tau < 3$, we have sublinear communication cost scaling in N.

E. On Maximum Degree k_{max}

There are two ways to generate a random PL network: (i) Fix a k_{max} and normalize the distribution, i.e.,

$$p_k = Ak^{-\tau}, 0 < k \leq k_{max}\ , \tag{8}$$

$$\text{where } A^{-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{k_{max}} k^{-\tau}\ . \tag{9}$$

To construct the random PL graphs, N samples are then drawn from this distribution. For several reasons, the choice $k_{max} = O(N^{1/\tau})$ is recommended in the literature [5], and in our scaling calculations (e.g., Table I) we follow this upper bound.
(ii) No a priori bound on the maximum is placed, and N samples are drawn from the distribution $p_k = Ak^{-\tau}$, where $A^{-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-\tau}$. It is quite straightforward to show that almost surely, $k_{max} = O(N^{\frac{1}{\tau-1}})$. Thus, when $\tau = 2$, $k_{max} = cN$ $(1 > c > 0)$ in this method of generating a random PL graphs.

A potential problem with using the larger values of k_{max}, as given by method (ii), is that the assumption that the links are chosen independently might be violated. Random graph assumptions can be shown to still hold when the maximum degree of a power-law random graph is $k_{max} = O(N^{1/\tau})$ [5]. This however does not necessarily mean, that the scaling calculations presented in the previous section do not hold for $k_{max} = O(N^{\frac{1}{\tau-1}})$. In fact, extensive large-scale simulations (see Section IV) suggest that one can indeed get close to poly-logarithmic scaling of traffic (i.e., $O(\log^2 N)$), as predicted by the scaling calculations in this section.

There are several practical reasons for bounding k_{max}, as well. First, in most grown random graphs, k_{max} scales as $N^{1/\tau}$. While grown random graphs display inherent correlations, we would like to compare our scaling predictions with performance of the search algorithm when implemented on grown graphs. Hence, the scaling laws that would be relevant for such P2P systems correspond to the case of bounded k_{max}. Second, since the high degree nodes end up handling the bulk of the query traffic, it might be preferable to keep the maximum degree low. For example, for $\tau = 2$, the traffic generated is of the same order as the maximum degree, when $k_{max} = c\sqrt{N}$, thus providing a balance between the overall traffic and the traffic handled by the high degree nodes individually.

	Cache Size (TTL)	Query Cost
$\tau = 2$	$O(\log N)$	$O(\log^2 N)$
$2 < \tau < 3$	$O(N^{\frac{\tau-2}{\tau-1}})$	$O(N^{\frac{2\tau-4}{\tau-1}})$

TABLE I: The scaling properties of the proposed algorithm when $k_{max} = O(N^{\frac{1}{\tau-1}})$.

	Cache Size (TTL)	Query Cost
$\tau = 2$	$O(\log N)$	$O(\log^2(N)N^{1/2})$
$2 < \tau < 3$	$O(N^{1-2/\tau})$	$O(N^{2-3/\tau})$

TABLE II: The scaling properties of the proposed algorithm when $k_{max} = O(N^{1/\tau})$.

Hit Rate	50%	75%	90%	98%
Unique Replicas	1.3e-3	2.4e-3	3.2e-3	6.8e-3
10 Replicas	N/A	N/A	2.0e-4	4.7e-4

TABLE III: The fraction of edges (i.e., the ratio of the traffic generated by the percolation search and the traffic generated by the straight-forward search where queries are relayed on every edge) involved in a search for various hit-rates when (i) Each node has a unique content, and (ii) 10 replicas of each content are distributed randomly in the network. The results are for a power-law network with $\tau = 2$, $N = 30K$, and TTL=25 for both query and content implants (see Figs. 1, and 5).




FIG. 1: The hit-rate as a function of the fraction of links used in search, for networks with $\tau = 2, 2.3$. The number of nodes is 30000 and the TTL is 25 for both query and content implants. For the case of $\tau = 2$. For the case of $\tau = 2$, $k_{max} = 2N^{0.5} \approx 350$, while for the PL network with $\tau = 2.3$ the maximum degree is $k_{max} = 2N^{1/2.3} \approx 176$.

IV. SIMULATIONS ON RANDOM PL NETWORKS

For all the simulations reported in this section, a random power-law graph is generated with the method reported in [13]. The minimum degree of the nodes are enforced to be two so that any node is part of the giant connected component with probability one (see [13]) . Note that in the simulations, TTL refers to the length of the random walks performed for content-list replication and query implantation. The scaling enforced (if any) on the maximum degree (k_{max}) is also reported for each simulation.

A. Hit-rate vs. Traffic

Fig. 1 shows the hit rates achieved assuming that each node has a unique content. As expected, for the same traffic (i.e., the number of links used in the bond percolation stage of the algorithms) the hit rate for $\tau = 2$ is greater than that for $\tau = 2.3$. Some of the statistics for hit rates and corresponding traffic are listed in Table III.

Fig. 2 illustrates the *first-order phase transition* of query hit-rates, as opposed to the second-order phase transition of the size of the largest connected component, as a function of the percolation probability. As noted in the introduction, this first-order phase transition is a key aspect of the proposed algorithm.

Fig. 3 shows the performance of the search algorithm, when the query-implantation step for the case of $\tau > 2$ is executed in parallel vs. when it is executed serially. Recall that for $\tau > 2$ the number of independent queries required to ensure that one of the implanted queries is on a node that is part of the giant connected component,




FIG. 2: The hit-rate, fraction of links and fraction of nodes used in the search as a function of the percolation probability plotted together for comparison. While there is a sudden jump in the hit-rate just above the percolation threshold (an indication of a first order transition), the number of links and nodes participating in the search increases much more gracefully (an indication of a second order transition, also manifested in the linear growth of these parameters just above the percolation threshold). $\tau = 2$ and number of nodes is 30000 with $k_{max} = 400$.

scales faster than $O(\log N)$. Since, the query implantation time, if the implantations were carried out by a serial random walk, would dominate the desired search time of $O(\log N)$, we introduced a parallel query implantation process (branching random walk), where the walker constructs a binary tree, such that the total number of nodes in the tree is the number of required query implantations. As shown in Fig.3, the performance of the branching random walk is as good as a serial random walk.




FIG. 3: Comparison of the hit-rate in parallel (circles) and serially (squares) implanted queries. In each case the total number of queries are 16. The parallel implant uses four branching random walks each of size 4 and hence the total implantation time is 8. While the serial implantation is a simple random walk of size 16 and takes 16 time units. The network has $\tau = 2.3$ and $N = 10000$.




FIG. 4: The fraction of contents found as a function of the number of times the search was repeated: Suppose a fraction r of contents were not found at the first try. If successive queries were independent, the fraction of contents after the K'th try should be around $1-r^K$. The actual fraction is plotted along with what one expects from random tries. The network has size $N = 30,000$ and $\tau = 2$. *TTL's are deliberately chosen to be very low* (=5), so that r is large ($> 70\%$).

B. Repeated Trials

The results of Section III guarantee that every content will be found with probability approaching one, as long as the content and query implantation steps are long enough. However, in practice, at any percolation probability we will get a hit rate that is < 1, and the issue is what the behavior of the search algorithm would be if one repeated the query a few times. If each search is independent of the others, then we expect the hit rate to behave as $1-(1-p)^r$, where p is the hit rate for a single attempt, and r is the number of attempts. Fig. 4 shows simulation results verifying this aspect of each query attempt being almost independent of others. The fact that the hit rate can be increased by repeated trials, is very important from an implementation perspective: one does not need to know the percolation threshold and the exact scaling of TTL's in order to obtain very high hit rates. As shown in our simulations (Fig. 4), even *if we start with only a 30% hit rate*, the hit rate can be *increased to almost 90% in only seven attempts.*




FIG. 5: The hit-rate as a function of the fraction of links used in search, for $\tau = 2$ for the case when 10 copies of each content is in the network, along with the case of unique contents for comparison. The number of nodes is 30000, $k_{max} = 375$ and the average degree is 6 and the TTL is 25 for both query and content implants.

C. Content Replication

Next we consider another relevant issue: *what would be the improvement in performance if multiple nodes in the network had the same content.* As part of the percolation search algorithm, we already execute a caching or a content implantation step that makes sure that a subsequent query step would find *any content* with probability approaching one. Now, if l nodes share the same content, then it will be implanted via l different independent random walks. In the case of random PL graphs, the l different random walks for content implantation is equivalent to looking for a content l times independently (i.e., performing the query implantation and bond percolation steps l times), while performing the content implantation random-walk only once. Hence, in our percolation search algorithm, content replication (due to nodes having the same content), *improves the hit rate exponentially closer to 1.* The hit rates for unique vs. 10 copies of contents are shown in Fig. 5.




FIG. 6: Scaling behavior of the percolation probability required for a fixed hit-rate of 95% as a function of the network size for networks with $\tau = 2, \tau = 2.3$. The TTL is increased according to Table II and the maximum degree is forced to be $N^{1/\tau}$. The scaling predictions according to the Table II are also shown for comparison.




FIG. 7: Scaling behavior of the *fraction of links* required for a fixed hit-rate of 90% as a function of the network size for a network with $\tau = 2$. The TTL is increased according to Table II and the maximum degree is forced to be $2\sqrt{N}$. The scaling is slightly improved to $O\left(N^{-0.5}\right)$ for the fraction of links required.




FIG. 8: Scaling behavior of the percolation probability required for a fixed hit-rate of 95% as a function of the network size for a PL network with $\tau = 2$, on a log-log basis. The TTL is increased according to Table I. The maximum degree however is forced to be $2N^{3/4}$. The predicted scaling is also depicted for comparison.

D. Traffic Scaling

Fig. 6 shows actual scalings observed in our simulations for various choices of τ and k_{max}. The predicted scaling laws provide a good fit for the observed data when k_{max} is chosen to be $O(N^{1/\tau})$. The scaling for the percolation probability required for a high hit rate matches those predicted for the traffic reported in Table II. On the other hand, while Fig. 6 shows the scaling of the percolation probability necessary to obtain a given target hit-rate, the actual number of links traversed is in fact even less. If each and every link had the chance to be traversed with the percolation probability, then the actual traffic would directly correspond to the percolation probability. A broadcast started from a query implant, however, might end up at dead-end nodes close to this implant. That results in *the actual scaling of the traffic to be slightly better* than the scaling of the required percolation probability. For $\tau = 2$, for example, the $O\left(\log^2 N/\sqrt{N}\right)$ scaling verified in Fig. 6 has been modified to $O\left(1/\sqrt{N}\right)$ as experimentally verified in Fig. 7.

More significantly, even when k_{max} scales faster than $N^{1/\tau}$, the same theoretical scaling laws seem to hold. As an example of how the traffic scaling laws are we have provided simulations for the case of $k_{max} \sim N^{3/4}$ (Fig. 8), and $k_{max} \sim N$ (Fig. 9) for $\tau = 2$.

V. MAKING UNSTRUCTURED P2P NETWORKS SCALABLE

As noted in the introduction, a number of schemes have been proposed to address the scaling problem in unstructured P2P networks, and the following are a few of the more important ones:

1. Ultra-peer Structures and Cluster-Based Designs: A non-uniform architecture with an explicit hierarchy




FIG. 9: The scaling of the percolation probability required for a hit rate of 95%,when $k_{max} = N/4$ and $\tau = 2$ and $TTL = 25$. The scaling for $\log^2 N N^{-0.85}$ is also depicted for comparison. It is important to note that simulations for such large values of k_{max} are fraught with difficulties. This simulation however confirms the fact that while the scaling results are precise when $k_{max} = O(N^{1/\tau})$ they still closely match the simulations even in the extreme case of $k_{max} = O(N)$.

seems to be the quickest fix. This structure was also motivated by the fact that the nodes in the network are not homogeneous; a very large fraction of the nodes have small capacity (e.g. dial-up modems) and a small fraction with virtually unbounded capacity. The idea is to assign a large number of low capacity nodes to one or more Ultra-peers. The Ultra-peer knows the contents of its leaf nodes and sends them only the relevant queries. Among the Ultra-peers they perform the usual broadcast search, where each query is passed on every edge.

The Ultra-peer solution helps shield low bandwidth users; however, the design is non-uniform, and an explicit hierarchy is imposed on the nodes. In fact, the two-level hierarchy is not scalable in the strict sense. After more growth of the network, the same problem will start to appear among the Ultra-peers, and the protocol should be augmented to accommodate a third level in the hierarchy, and so on. In a more strict theoretical sense, the traffic still scales linearly, but is always a constant factor (determined by the average number of nodes per ultra-peer) less than the original Gnutella system. Cluster-based designs [11] are more centralized versions of practically the same idea, and therefore suffer from the same issues.

Note that *the percolation search algorithm naturally distills an Ultra-peer-like subnetwork* (i.e., the giant connected component that remains after the bond percolation step), and no external hierarchy needs to be imposed explicitly. Moreover, we show in Section VI that even if the random graph's degree distribution is a mixture of two different distributions (e.g., a heavy-tailed PL with $\tau \approx 2$, and a light tailed PL with $\tau > 4$), the percolation search algorithm naturally shields the category of nodes with light-tailed degree distribution, and most of the traffic is handled by the nodes with heavy-tailed degree distributions.

2. Random Walk Searches with Content Replication: Lv et.al.[12] analyze random walk searches with content replications, and their strategy is close to the work of Adamic et. al, which was reviewed in Section II . The idea is very simple: for each query, a random walker starts from the initiator and asks the nodes on the way for the content until it finds a match. If there are enough replicas of every content on the network, each query would be successfully answered after a few steps. In [12] it is assumed that a fraction λ_i of all nodes have the content i. They consider the case where λ_i might depend on the probability (q_i) of requesting content i. They show that under their assumptions, performance is optimal when $\lambda_i \propto \sqrt{q_i}$.

This scheme has several disadvantages. Since high connectivity nodes have more incoming edges, random walks gravitate towards high connectivity nodes. *A rare item on a low connectivity node will almost never be found.* To mitigate these problems, [12] suggests avoiding high degree nodes in the topology.

Moreover, this scheme is not scalable in a strict sense either: even with the uniform caching assumption satisfied, the design requires $O(N)$ replications per content, and thus, assuming that each node has a unique content, it will require a total of $O(N^2)$ replications and an average $O(N)$ cache size. The above scaling differs only by a constant factor from the straightforward scheme of all nodes caching all files. Finally, it is a serial search algorithm, thus compromising the speed of query resolution.

Clearly, the percolation search algorithm has several advantages over this scheme and they are almost identical to the one's stated in Section II, where the percolation search and the random-walk based searches were compared. Moreover, the percolation search algorithm finds any content, *even if only one node in the network has it*, while the above algorithm relies on the fact that a constant fraction of the nodes must have a content, in order to make the search efficient.

A. Percolation Search on Limewire Crawls

We next address the issue of how well would the percolation search algorithm work on the existing P2P networks. For our simulations we have used a number of such snapshots taken by Limewire [16]. In particular, we have used snapshots number 1,3,5 from [20] with $N = 64K, 44K, 30K$ respectively.

There are two important features about these snapshot networks that are relevant to our discussions:
(i) Because of how one crawls the network, the resulting snap-shot subnetworks are inherently networks obtained after bond percolation, where the percolation probability is high but not unity. The scaling laws of the percolation search algorithm suggest that the performance of the search on the actual graphs to be even better than those reported here.

Hit Rate	50%	75%	90%	98%
Unique Replicas	3.1e-3	7.1e-3	1.3e-2	2.8e-2
10 Replicas,2 tries	1.1e-3	1.3e-3	2.5e-3	6.3e-3
10 Replicas,1 tries	1.3e-3	2.3e-3	2.5e-2	4.6e-2

TABLE IV: For the Limewire crawl# 5: the fraction of original Gnutella traffic required for various hit-rates when all contents are unique as well as the case where 10 replicas of each content are in the network. The case of two tries with 10 replicas is also quoted.




FIG. 10: The hit-rate as a function of the fraction of links used in search, for Limewire crawl#5, #3, #1. The ratio of the variance to the mean for different crawls are indicated. The performance of the percolation search algorithm is seen to be dependent on this ratio, the higher the variance to mean, the better the performance of the percolation search algorithm. The TTL used for both query and content implant has length 25 for all cases.

(ii) The degree distributions of these networks are not ideal power-laws, and at best they can be categorized as heavy-tailed degree distributions. A good measure of heavy-tailed degree distribution is the ratio of the variance and the mean. In PL networks with heavy tails, i.e., $2 \leq \tau \leq 3$, this ratio is unbounded and goes to infinity as the network size grows. However, *one does not need these ideal conditions* for the percolation search algorithm to provide substantial reduction in traffic (see Figs. 10 and 11). Recall that the search traffic generated in the percolation search algorithm is approximately $\langle k \rangle N q_c$, and hence is directly proportional to $\langle k \rangle q_c$. We further know that $\langle k \rangle q_c \approx \frac{\langle k \rangle^2}{\langle k^2 \rangle}$. Thus, as long as the graph has a high root-mean-squared (RMS) to mean ratio, we expect the percolation search algorithm to show substantial gains. This is indeed the case in the implementations of our algorithm in the crawl networks. Table IV shows that the overall traffic can be reduced by 2 to 3 orders of magnitude without compromising the performance.




FIG. 11: For the Limewire crawl# 5: the hit-rate as a function of the fraction of the links required, when all contents are unique as well as the case where 10 replicas of each content are in the network. The case of two tries with 10 replicas is also quoted for comparison.

VI. PERCOLATION SEARCH IN HETEROGENEOUS PL RANDOM GRAPHS

So far, we have assumed a uni-modal heavy tailed distribution for the networks on which percolation search is to be performed. In reality, however, most networks are heterogeneous, consisting of categories of nodes with similar capabilities or willingness to participate in the search process; e.g., *the dominant categories in existing P2P networks are, modems, DSL subscribers, and those connected via high-speed T-1 connections.* Thus, the degree distribution in a real network is expected to be a mixture of heavy-tailed (for nodes with high capacity) and light-tailed (for nodes with lower capacity) distributions. We now show that the superior performance of the percolation search algorithm is not limited to the case of a uni-modal power-law random graph. In fact, as discussed before *the percolation search performs well as long as the variance of the degree distribution is much larger than its mean.*

Consider as an example, the case of a bi-modal network, where a fraction x of the nodes have degree distribution P_k with a heavy tail, while the rest have a light-tailed degree distribution Q_k. Assume that the average degree of the two categories of nodes are the same for the sake of simplicity. The percolation threshold q_c^{bi} of this graph is then related to q_c the percolation threshold of a graph with the same degree distribution as of P_k as: $q_c^{bi} \approx q_c/x$. Therefore, as long as a good fraction of all the nodes have a heavy tail, all observations of this paper still hold for a heterogeneous network. As far as the overall traffic is concerned, the total number of links traversed is at most $(xN)p_c^{bi} = Np_c$ or the same as the case where all nodes had a heavy tailed distribution P_k. The query and content implantation times are however a bit longer in this case.

Percolation search on heterogeneous networks, on the

other hand, naturally provides traffic shielding to low capabilities nodes. Consider again a network with say two categories of nodes. The percolation search works by cutting out many links of the network, and *therefore almost all nodes participating in the search* process are the ones that are *highly connected*, which are almost surely part of the heavy tailed group. For instance, if the light tailed group has exponential degree distribution, then the probability of any of node of the light tailed category participating in the search process is exponentially small. Naturally then, *the nodes of the light tailed category are exempted from participation in the search process.* See the following table for a typical simulation result.

heavy tailed	light tailed	overall
3.50e-2	2.22e-5	6.12e-3

TABLE V: The fraction of *nodes* that participated in a search for a hit rate of 98%, in a network consisting of two power-law modes: 4000 nodes (called the heavy tailed mode) have a power-law exponent $\tau = 2$ while 20000 others (called the light tailed mode) have an exponent $\tau = 4$. TTL of 20 was used for both query and content implants.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have presented a scalable search algorithm that uses random-walks and bond percolation on random graphs with heavy-tailed degree distributions to provide access to any content on any node with probability one. *While the concepts involved in the design of our search algorithm have deep theoretical underpinnings, any implementation of it is very straightforward.* Our extensive simulation results using both random PL networks and Gnutella crawl networks show that unstructured P2P networks can indeed be made scalable.

Moreover, our studies show that even in networks with different categories of nodes (i.e., graphs where the degree distribution is a mixture of heavy-tailed and light-tailed distributions) the search algorithm exhibits the favorable scaling features, while shielding the nodes with light-tailed degree distribution from the query-generated traffic. Our recent results [21] indicate that it is indeed possible to have local rules, that will enforce a desired category of the nodes in the network to have either a heavy or light tailed degree distribution. One can thus make sure that the subgraph consisting of the nodes with low capacity has a light tail, and is thus exempted from the search traffic with high probability. On the other hand, the high capability nodes evolve into a subgraph with a heavy tail degree distribution and hence will carry the majority of the search load.

Together with the new algorithms for building heavy-tailed growing graphs, even in the presence of extreme unreliability of the nodes, and a heterogeneous sets of nodes (in terms of connectivity and bandwidth capacities), the percolation search algorithm can provide an end-to-end solution for constructing a large scale, highly scalable, and fault tolerant distributed P2P networking system.

[1] *How peer-to-peer (p2p) and kazaa media desktop work*, Kazaa Website:http://www.kazaa.com/us/help/guide-aboutp2p.htm, 2003.

[2] *homepage*, homepage: http://www.morpheus.com/index.html, 2004.

[3] *homepage*, homepage: http://www.imesh.com/, 2004.

[4] L. Adamic, R. Lukose, A. Puniyani, and B. Huberman, *Search in power-law networks*, Phys. Rev. E **64** (2001), 046135.

[5] William Aiello, Fan Chung, and Linyuan Lu, *A random graph model for massive graphs*, Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, ACM Press, 2000, pp. 171–180.

[6] William Aiello, Fan Chung, and Linyuan Lu, *Random evolution in massive graphs*, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2001.

[7] Réka Albert and Albert-László Barabási, *Statistical mechanics of complex networks*, Reviews of Modern Physics **74** (2002), 47–97.

[8] Albert-Lázló Barabási, Réka Albert, and Hawoong Jeong, *Mean-field theory for scale-free random networks*, Physica A **272** (2000), 173–187.

[9] S. H. Strogatz D. S. Callaway, M. E. J. Newman and D. J. Watts, *Network robustness and fragility: Percolation on random graphs*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000), 5468–5471.

[10] T. Klingberg and R. Manfredi, *Rfc-gnutella*, http://rfc-gnutella.sourceforge.net.

[11] Balachander Krishnamurthy, Jia Wang, and Yinglian Xie, *Early measurements of a cluster-based architecture for p2p systems*, Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Workshop, 2001.

[12] Qin Lv, Pei Cao, Edith Cohen, Kai Li, and Scott Shenker, *Search and replication in unstructured peer-to-peer networks*, Proceedings of the 16th international conference on Supercomputing, ACM Press, 2002, pp. 84–95.

[13] Michael Molloy and Bruce Reed, *A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence*, Random Structure and Algorithms **6** (1995), 161–179.

[14] M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, *Random graphs with arbitrary degree distributions and their applications*, Phys. Rev. E **64** (2001), 026118.

[15] Matei Ripeanu, Ian Foster, and Adriana Iamnitchi, *Mapping the gnutella network: Properties of large-scale peer-to-peer systems and implications for system design*, IEEE Internet Computing Journal **6** (2002), no. 1.

[16] Christopher Rohrs, *Limewire design*, lime wire documents:http://www.limewire.org/project/www/design.html, 2001.

[17] S. Saroiu and S.D. Gribble P. Krishna Gummadi, *A mea-*

surement study of peer-to-peer file sharing systems, Proceedings of the Multimedia Computing and Networking (MMCN), January 2002.

[18] Nima Sarshar and Vwani Roychowdhury, *Scale-free and stable structures in complex ad hoc networks*, Phys. Rev. E **69** (2004), no. 026101.

[19] Nima Sarshar and P. Oscar Boykin and Vwani P. Roychowdhury,*Percolation at a multiple of the threshold*, 2004

[20] homepage, *http://crawler.limewire.org*, 2003

[21] Nima Sarshar and Vwani P. Roychowdhury, *Scale Free Structures in Heterogeneous Ad hoc Networks.*, 2004.