

# Perturbation: the Catastrophe Causer in Scale-Free Networks

Tao Zhou and Bing-Hong Wang\*

*Nonlinear Science Center and Department of Modern Physics,  
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, PR China*

(Dated: December 23, 2021)

A new model about cascading occurrences caused by perturbation is established to search after the mechanism because of which catastrophes in networks occur. We investigate the avalanche dynamics of our model on 2-dimension Euclidean lattices and scale-free networks and find out the avalanche dynamic behaviors is very sensitive to the topological structure of networks. The experiments show that the catastrophes occur much more frequently in scale-free networks than in Euclidean lattices and the greatest catastrophe in scale-free networks is much more serious than that in Euclidean lattices. Further more, we have studied how to reduce the catastrophes' degree, and have schemed out an effective strategy, called targeted safeguard-strategy for scale-free networks.

PACS numbers: 05.65.+b, 05.10.-a, 45.70.Ht, 89.75.Hc

Many social, biological, and communication systems can be properly described as complex networks with vertices representing individuals or organizations and edges mimicking the interactions among them. Recently, the ubiquity of a power-law degree distribution in real-life networks has attracted a lot of attention[1]. Examples of such networks (scale-free networks or SF networks for short) are numerous: these include the Internet, the World Wide Web, social networks of acquaintance or other relations between individuals, metabolic networks, integer networks, food webs, etc.[2]. The ultimate goal of the study of the topological structure of networks is to understand and explain the workings of systems built upon those networks, for instance, to understand how the topology of the World Wide Web affects Web surfing and search engines, how the structure of social networks affects the spread of diseases, information, rumors or other things, how the structure of a food web affects population dynamics, and so on.

The catastrophes in real-life networks can be seen everywhere, such as the traffic jams taking place in road-networks, the communication congestions taking place in internet, the economic crisis taking place in the network of financial institutions, and so on. Therefore, it is not only of major theoretic interest, but also of great practical significance to understand the mechanism because of which those catastrophes occur. Intuitively, one may consider the breakdown of plentiful vertices or edges at the same time in networks to be the reason[3]. He is undoubtedly right as it is easy to imagine the damage of roads or the failure of servers lead to a serious traffic jam or communication congestion, respectively. However, in most situations, the catastrophes surrounding us are not like that. In the present letter, a man named “**Perturbation**” is caught, who is indicted to be the causer in most catastrophes.

*Bianconi* and *Marsili* referred to an example about

the catastrophe caused by perturbation[4]. The example they mentioned is routing tables in the internet, which can be considered as a dynamic communication network. In the beginning, a change (perturbation) in some router's table may inadvertently cause congestion at some node downstream. This may trigger several other changes in that local neighborhood, as routers try to avoid the congested node. But these changes may, in their turn, cause further congestion elsewhere, and the problem may expand even further, as a large avalanche (catastrophe), to a wider region. Similar phenomena may take place in various networks.

*Bak*, *Tang* and *Wiesenfeld* introduced a so-called sand-pile model (BTW model) to explain such cascading occurrences on networks, which is considered as a prototypical theoretical model exhibiting the catastrophes (avalanche behavior) caused by perturbation[5]. However, BTW model is based on the Euclidean lattices, which are very different from the reality for the real-life networks that have power-law degree distribution. In addition, the open boundary conditions make it hard to directly extend BTW model onto SF networks. *Olami*, *Feder* and *Christensen* established a model (OFC model) of earthquakes in nonconservative systems[6], which may be more appropriate to mimic the catastrophes in SF networks than BTW model for all the real-life systems are nonconservative.

Recently, a few interesting and significant works about how the topological structure of networks affects self-organized criticality (SOC) based on BTW model or OFC model have been achieved. *Lise*, *et al* investigated the OFC model on annealed and quenched random networks[7], *Arcangelis* and *Herrmann* studied the BTW model on small-world networks[8]. *Motter* and *Lai* studied the cascade-based attacks on SF networks and have found that a large-scale cascade may be triggered by removing a single key vertex[9]. *Goh*, *et al* investigated the avalanche dynamics on SF networks using BTW model and obtained the exponent  $\tau$  for the power-law avalanche size distribution and the dynamic exponent  $z$ [10]. Their work concentrated on the existence of SOC, thus they

---

\*Electronic address: bhwang@ustc.edu.cn, Fax: +86-551-3603574.

did not discuss whether the catastrophes occur more frequently in SF networks than Euclidean lattices. In addition, since the threshold value of each vertices is assigned to be equal to its degree, one can not make sure which (the power-law degree distribution, the power-law threshold height distribution or both) is the main reason that lead to the power-law distribution of avalanche size.

In the present letter, a model similar to OFC's is established to mimic the catastrophes occurring in networks. We have found that the catastrophes occur much more frequently in SF networks than in Euclidean lattices and the greatest catastrophe in SF networks is much more serious than that in Euclidean lattices. Further more, we have studied how to reduce the catastrophes' degree, and have schemed out an effective safeguard-strategy for SF networks.

In our model, to each vertices of the network is associated a real variable  $F_x$ , which initially takes the value 0 and can be considered as energy, tension, flux or some other things. At each time step, a perturbation  $\delta$  is added to a randomly chosen vertex  $x$ , which means the variable  $F_x$  increases by  $\delta$ , where  $\delta$  is randomly selected in the interval  $(0, 1)$ . If  $F_x$  reaches or exceeds the threshold value  $Z_x$ , then the vertex  $x$  becomes unstable and the  $(1 - \varepsilon)Z_x$  energies topple to its neighbor-nodes, with a small fraction  $\varepsilon$  of energies being lost:  $F_x \rightarrow F_x - Z_x$ , and  $F_y \rightarrow F_y + (1 - \varepsilon)Z_x/d(x)$  for all vertices  $y$  adjacent to  $x$ , where  $d(x)$  is the degree of vertex  $x$  that denotes the number of neighbor-vertices of  $x$ . The parameter  $\varepsilon$  controls the level of conservation of the dynamics and it takes values between 0 and 1, where  $\varepsilon = 0$  corresponds to the conservative case. Here, to avoid the system being overloaded in the end,  $\varepsilon$  is always set to be larger than 0. If this toppling causes any of the adjacent vertices receiving energies to be unstable, subsequent toppling follow on those nodes in parallel until there is no unstable node left. This process defines an avalanche.

In some networks like the internet, the vertex with greater degree may have more throughput, thus Goh's designation for threshold value of vertices is reasonable[10]. But in other networks (such as neural networks, social networks and so on), there are not any evidences that the individual having more neighbors is of greater endurance, thus it is worthy to study the case that heterogeneous vertices are of the same threshold value. Therefore, in our model, the threshold values are assigned to be the same as  $Z_x = Z = 1$  for all vertices  $x$ , which is different from Goh's. It is notable that our designation for threshold value is helpful to clearly understand how the topology of networks affects the degree of catastrophe.

We are interested in the avalanche size  $S$ , which can be used to measure the degree of catastrophe[11] and defined as the number of toppling events in a give avalanche (We set  $S = 0$  if there is no toppling events occurring). Figure 1 shows a typical result about the distribution of avalanche size. The Euclidean lattice mentioned in this paper is a two-dimensional square lattice with open boundary conditions, and the SF networks here are




FIG. 1: The distribution of avalanche size, where  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ . The red and black curves represent the cases of Euclidean lattice and SF network respectively, where  $P(S)$  denotes the number of avalanches with give size  $S$ . The maximal avalanche size in SF network is 8829 and the corresponding quantity in Euclidean lattice is 1799. Both the two networks are of 4900 vertices. The data shown here is obtained by  $10^6 + 10^5$  iterations exclusive of initial  $10^5$  time steps.

gained by Barabási and Albert's method[12] with parameters  $m_0 = m = 2$ , thus both the two types of networks are of average degree  $\langle d \rangle \simeq 4$ . One can see that the distribution of avalanche size in SF network follows a straight line for more than 3 decades, which indicates that there is SOC in avalanche behavior. But the distribution of avalanche size in Euclidean lattice, which is a power-law curve in the left part followed by an approximately exponential truncation, is not similar to that in SF network. Therefore, the dynamic behaviors in those two types of networks are different. The presence of SOC in the nonconservative OFC model has been controversial since the very introduction of the model[13] and it is still debated[14]. Since the main goal of this letter is to study the catastrophes occurring in networks, we won't give detailed experiment results and analysis on how the network structure affects the existence of SOC, which will be given elsewhere[15].

Getting to business, one can find that although the two networks are of the same network-size[16] and have the same average avalanche size (apparently,  $\langle S \rangle = \frac{\langle \delta \rangle}{\varepsilon Z} = 50$ ), the maximal avalanche size  $S_{max}$  in SF networks is much greater than that in Euclidean lattice, which means the greatest catastrophe in SF network is much more serious than that in Euclidean lattice. In SF networks, the number of avalanches with its size larger than  $C$  is 12291, and the corresponding quantity in Euclidean lattice is 231, which shows that the catastrophes occur much more frequently in SF network than in Euclidean lattice. For the sake of reducing the error, more experiments have been achieved, figure 2a&2b show the dependence of  $S_{max}$  and the number of catastrophes with




FIG. 2: The degree and frequency of catastrophes occurring in the two types of networks. In those two figures, for a fixed  $N$ , the data are obtained by 10 independent experiments, the results anent SF networks and Euclidean lattices are represented by black (upper) dots and the red (lower) stars respectively. **a**, the size of greatest catastrophes in SF networks is much more than that in Euclidean lattices, and the disparity becomes greater and greater as the network-size increases. **b**, the frequency of catastrophes[11] occurring in SF networks is about 50 times higher than that in Euclidean lattices.

the number of vertices  $N$ , which convictively confirm the conclusions mentioned above.

Since there aren't any effective methods to put an end to perturbations, it is worthwhile to study how to reduce the catastrophes' degree. Here, for theoretic simplification, a safeguard-strategy is defined as a vertices set  $V_P$  with its elements being protected and will not topple (mathematically speaking, to protect a vertex  $x$  here means to set its threshold value  $Z_x$  infinite). In this letter, two safeguard-strategies are discussed, one is called random safeguard-strategy (RSS), and the other one is called targeted safeguard-strategy (TSS). In the former case, the vertices belonging to  $V_P$  are randomly chosen; in the latter one, the vertices with greater degree




FIG. 3: The catastrophes in networks under vertex-protecting, where  $N = 4900$  and  $\langle d \rangle = 4$ . For a fixed  $p$ , the values shown here are the average over 10 independent experiments. The red squares(■), blue triangles(▲) and black circles(●) denote the performance of RSS (TSS) in Euclidean lattice, RSS in SF network and TSS in SF network, respectively. Figure **a**, **b** and **c** present the maximal avalanche size  $S_{\max}$ , the number of catastrophes  $D$  ( $C = 1000$ ) and the average avalanche size  $\langle S \rangle$  as functions of protecting rate  $p$ , respectively. The values of  $S_{\max}$  and  $D$  are normalized (divided by  $S_{\max}(0)$  and  $D(0)$ ).

are chosen preferentially. Since almost all the vertices in Euclidean lattice are of the same degree, RSS and TSS in Euclidean lattice are not discriminating.

We can always reduce the catastrophes' degree by protecting more vertices, but this could bring in economical and technical pressures. In order to roughly measure the economical and technical expenses, a parameter  $p$  called protecting rate is defined as the proportion between the number of vertices being protected and the total number of vertices:  $p = |V_P|/N$ . In figure 3, we report the experimental results about the different safeguard-strategies. In figure 3a, one can find that the RSS in SF networks is a little more effective than that in Euclidean lattices, and the TSS in SF networks is much more effective than RSS. For example, if we want to reduce the maximal avalanche size on SF network to a tenth by using TSS, then to protect 0.5% vertices is enough, but if we use RSS, the protecting rate must be larger than 8%. According to the results shown in figure 3b, if one want to eliminate the catastrophes, at least 0.3%, 2% and 7% vertices should be protected by using TSS in SF network, RSS in Euclidean lattice and RSS in SF network, respectively. One can also make out of figure 3c that TSS in SF network is much more effective than RSS, for example, if we set  $p = 0.01$ , then the average avalanche size will reduce to about 5 by using TSS, but the corresponding value is about 30 for RSS. Altogether, the experimental results above indicate that TSS is much more effective

than RSS for SF networks. The heterogeneity of vertices in SF networks is considered to be a possible reason for these results.

In summary, we have found that the avalanche dynamic behaviors are very sensitive to the topological structure of networks and the catastrophes are much more serious in SF networks than in Euclidean lattices. We have studied how to reduce the catastrophes' degree, and have schemed out an effective strategy (TSS) for SF networks, which may be of great significance in practice. However, there are so many unanswered questions that puzzle us. At the end of this letter, we will list part of those.

How does the topological structure of networks affect the existence of SOC?

Is the highly skewed degree distribution the key reason why the catastrophes in SF networks are much more serious than those in Euclidean lattices?

How about the performance of limited safeguard-strategy[17]?

Are there other safeguard-strategies more effective than TSS for SF networks?

This work has been partially supported by the State Key Development Programme of Basic Research (973 Project) of China, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.70271070 and the Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education (SRFDP No.20020358009)

- 
- [1] R. Albert and A. -L. Barabási, *Review of Modern Physics*, **74**, 47 (2002); S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, *Adv. Phys.*, **51**, 1079 (2002); M. E. J. Newman, Preprint cond-mat/0303516 (2003).
  - [2] A. Vazquez, R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, Preprint cond-mat/0303516 (2003); R. Albert, H. Jeong and A. -L. Barabási, *Nature*, **401**, 130 (1999); H. Jeong, B. Tombor, R. Albert, Z. N. Oltvai and A. -L. Barabási, *Nature*, **407**, 651 (2000); J. M. Montya and R. V. Solé, *J. Theor. Biol.*, **214**, 405 (2002); T. Zhou, B. -H. Wang, P. -Q. Jiang, Y. -B. Xie and S. -L. Bu, Preprint cond-mat/0405258 (2004).
  - [3] R. Albert, H. Jeong and A. -L. Barabási, *Nature*, **406**, 378 (2000).
  - [4] G. Bianconi and M. Marsili, Preprint cond-mat/0312537 (2003).
  - [5] P. Bak, C. Tang and K. Wiesenfeld, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **59**, 381 (1987); P. Bak, C. Tang and K. Wiesenfeld, *Phys. Rev. A*, **38**, 364 (1988).
  - [6] Z. Olami, H. J. S. Feder and K. Christensen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **68**, 1244 (1992); K. Christensen and Z. Olami, *Phys. Rev. A*, **46**, 1829 (1992).
  - [7] S. Lise and H. J. Jensen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **76**, 2326 (1996); S. Lise and M. Paczuski, Preprint cond-mat/0204491 (2002).
  - [8] L. de Arcangelis and H. J. Herrmann, Preprint cond-mat/0110239 (2001).
  - [9] A. E. Motter and Y. -C. Lai, *Phys. Rev. E*, **66**, 065102 (2002).
  - [10] K. -I. Goh, D. -S. Lee, B. Kahng and D. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **91**, 148701 (2003); D. -S. Lee, K. -I. Goh, B. Kahng and D. Kim, Preprint cond-mat/0401531 (2004).
  - [11] A catastrophe here is defined as the avalanche with its size larger than an experiential lower bound  $C$ . Although in this letter we suppose  $C = 1000 = 20\langle S \rangle$ , one can easily check that the phenomena are almost the same when a proper value of  $C$  is given ( $C$  should be big enough but not too big, the value between  $10\langle S \rangle$  and  $40\langle S \rangle$  is preferable), thus our discussion do not depend upon the value of  $C$ .
  - [12] A. -L. Barabási and R. Albert, *Science*, **286**, 509 (1999); A. -L. Barabási, R. Albert and H. Jeong, *Physica A*, **272**, 173 (1999).
  - [13] W. Klein and J. Rundle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **71**, 1288 (1993); K. Christensen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **71**, 1289 (1993).
  - [14] J. X. Carvalho and C. P. C. Prado, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **84**, 4006 (2000); K. Christensen, D. Hamon, H. J. Jensen and S. Lise, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **87**, 039801 (2001); J. X. Carvalho and C. P. C. Prado, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **87**, 039802 (2001).
  - [15] T. Zhou, et al, unpublished.
  - [16] Networks are of the same network-size means they have the same number of vertices and the same number of edges.
  - [17] Limited safeguard-strategy means for any vertex  $x \in V_P$ , the threshold value  $Z_x$  is not infinite.