

A note on \Weighted Evolving Networks: Coupling Topology and Weight Dynamics"

R.V.R.Pandya

Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez,
Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, PR 00680, USA

December 23, 2021

PACS number(s): 89.75.Hc, 05.40.-a, 87.23.Kg

In a recent Letter [1], Barrat, Barthélemy and Vespignani (BBV) have proposed a model for the evolution of weighted network when new edges and vertices are continuously established into the network while causing dynamic behavior of the weights. Their model dynamics starts from some initial number of vertices connected by links or edges with assigned weights and at each time step, addition of a new vertex n with m edges and subsequent modification in weights are governed by the following two rules:

1. The vertex n is attached at random to a previously existing vertex i according to the probability distribution

$$P_{n \rightarrow i} = \frac{S_i}{\sum_j S_j} : \quad (1)$$

2. The induced total increase in strength s_i of the i th vertex is distributed among the weights w_{ij} of its neighbors j according to

$$w_{ij} \rightarrow w_{ij} + \frac{w_{ij}}{S_i} : \quad (2)$$

This second rule, though could be one possibility, does not follow the same mechanism of the first rule. Here we discuss these rules in the context of

Email: rvrpturb@uprm.edu

worldwide airport network and suggest an alternative to the second rule which is consistent with the mechanism of the first rule.

In BBV's own words, the first rule can be described as "busy get busier" [2]. It can be written more explicitly as "busy airports get busier". The Eq. (1) suggests that it is more probable that a new airport (vertex) n will be attached to the airport i which handles more traffic represented by strength s_i . The second rule (Eq. 2) does not follow the same mechanism, instead it can be described by "busy routes get busier". According to the second rule, the route i to j having more traffic as indicated by w_{ij} would handle larger portion of the induced traffic given by $\frac{w_{ij}}{s_i}$. That does not necessarily mean that the airport j , in the neighbor of i , with largest value for w_{ij} is also the airport with maximum strength or traffic in comparison with other neighboring airports of i . Now, as an alternative to Eq. (2), consider

$$w_{ij} \rightarrow w_{ij} + \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in V(i)} s_k} \quad (3)$$

where $V(i)$ indicates set of all neighboring airports (vertices) of i and $k \in n$. The last term of Eq. (3) indicates that it is more probable that the induced traffic would go towards the airport j which handles maximum traffic s_j among the neighboring airports $V(i)$ of i . Thus, this mechanism is in consistency with the mechanism of the first rule, i.e. busy airports get busier.

Also, it should be noted that the second rule of BBV does not consider further redistribution of $\frac{w_{ij}}{s_i}$ among the weights of the neighbors of neighbors of airport i . And BBV's weighted model is limited to the case where passengers prefer direct flights or/and flights with one connection. In order to include the flights with two intermediate connections and in accordance with the first rule, $\sum_{k \in V(i)} \frac{w_{ij}}{s_i} s_k$ should be redistributed among the weights w_{jl} of the neighbors l of j according to

$$w_{jl} \rightarrow w_{jl} + \frac{\sum_{k \in V(i)} \frac{w_{ij}}{s_i} s_k}{\sum_{k \in V(j)} s_k} \quad (4)$$

where $V(j)$ indicates the set of neighbors of j and $k \in i$.

A detailed computational study on the newly proposed mechanism in this note will be considered in our future work.

References

- [1] A . Barrat, M . Barthélémy, and A . Vespignani, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 228701 (2004).
- [2] A . Barrat, M . Barthélémy, and A . Vespignani, arXiv:cond-mat/0406238.