

Self-avoiding walks on scale-free networks

Carlos P. Herrero

Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), Campus de Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid, Spain
(March 22, 2024)

Several kinds of walks on complex networks are currently used to analyze search and navigation in different systems. Many analytical and computational results are known for random walks on such networks. Self-avoiding walks (SAWs) are expected to be more suitable than unrestricted random walks to explore various kinds of real-life networks. Here we study long-range properties of random SAWs on scale-free networks, characterized by a degree distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$. In the limit of large networks (system size $N \rightarrow \infty$), the average number s_n of SAWs starting from a generic site increases as $n^{\gamma-1}$, with $\gamma = \frac{1}{\gamma-1}$. For finite N , s_n is reduced due to the presence of loops in the network, which causes the emergence of attrition of the paths. For kinetic growth walks, the average maximum length, hLi , increases as a power of the system size: $hLi \sim N^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}$, with an exponent increasing as the parameter γ is raised. We discuss the dependence of hLi on the minimum allowed degree in the network. A similar power-law dependence is found for the mean self-intersection length of non-reversal random walks. Simulation results support our approximate analytical calculations.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Fb, 87.23.Ge, 05.40.Fb, 89.75.Da

I. INTRODUCTION

Many natural and artificial systems have a network structure, where nodes represent typical system units and edges represent interactions between connected pairs of units. Thus, complex networks are currently used to model several kinds of real-life systems (social, biological, technological, economic), and to study different processes taking place on them [1,3]. In recent years, new models of complex networks have been designed to explain empirical data in several fields. This is the case of the so-called small-world [4] and scale-free networks [5], which incorporate various aspects of real systems. These complex networks provide us with the underlying topological structure to analyze processes such as spread of infections [6,7], signal propagation [4,8], and random spreading of information [9,10]. They have been also employed to study statistical physical problems as percolation [6,11] and cooperative phenomena [12,13].

In a scale-free (SF) network the degree distribution $P(k)$, where k is the number of links connected to a node, has a power-law decay $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$. This kind of networks have been found in social systems [14], for protein interactions [15], in the internet [16], and in the world-wide web [17]. In both natural and artificial networks, the exponent γ controlling the degree distribution is usually in the range $2 < \gamma < 3$ [3,18]. The origin of such power-law degree distributions was addressed by Barabási and Albert [5], who argued that two ingredients are sufficient to explain the scale-free character of many real-life networks, namely: growth and preferential attachment. They found that the combination of both criteria yields non-equilibrium SF networks with an exponent $\gamma = 3$. One can also study equilibrium SF networks, defined as statistical ensembles of random networks with a given degree distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ [3],

for which one can analyze several properties as a function of the exponent γ . SF networks display the so-called small-world effect, and they have been found to be ultra-small, in the sense that the mean distance between sites increases with the network size N slower than $\log N$ [19].

Social networks form the substrate where dynamical processes such as disease propagation and information spreading take place. These networks have the property of being searchable, i.e. people (nodes in a network) can direct messages through their network of acquaintances to reach a distant specific target in only a few steps [20,22]. It is clear that the structure of such networks will play an important role in these dynamical processes, which are usually studied by means of stochastic dynamics and random walks. Several characteristics of random walks on complex networks have been analyzed in connection with diffusion and exploration processes [23,25]. In this context, it is known that some processes, such as navigation and exploratory behavior are neither purely random nor totally deterministic [26], and can be described by walks on graphs [27,28].

Self-avoiding walks (SAWs) can be more effective than unrestricted random walks in exploring a network, since they cannot return to sites already visited. This property has been used by Adamic et al. [28] to define local search strategies in scale-free networks. However, the self-avoiding property causes attrition of the paths, in the sense that a large fraction of paths generated in a stochastic manner have to be abandoned because they are overlapping. This can be a serious limitation to explore networks with pure SAWs.

SAWs have been traditionally used to model structural and dynamical properties of macromolecules [29,30]. They are also useful to characterize complex crystal structures [31] and to study critical phenomena in lattice models [32]. Universal constants for SAWs on regular

lattices have been discussed by Privan et al. [33]. In our context of complex networks, the asymptotic properties of SAWs have been studied recently in small-world networks [34].

Here we study long-range properties of SAWs on equilibrium scale-free networks, and discuss the ‘attrition problem’. The number of surviving walks to a given length n is obtained by an approximate analytical procedure, and the results are compared with those obtained from numerical simulations. In particular, we find that the number of surviving walks after n steps scales as a power of the system size N . We note that the term ‘length’ is employed throughout this paper to indicate the (dimensionless) number of steps of a walk, as usually in the literature on networks [3].

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we give some definitions and concepts related to SAWs, along with details on our computational method. In Sec. III we calculate the number and end-to-end separation of SAWs in (uncorrelated) scale-free networks. In Sec. IV we analyze the length at which non-reversal random walks intersect themselves in these networks (self-intersection length), and in Sec. V we calculate the average attrition length of kinetic growth SAWs, at which they cannot continue without violating the self-avoidance condition. The paper closes with some conclusions in Sec. VI.

II. BASIC DEFINITIONS AND METHOD

A selfavoiding walk (SAW) is defined as a walk along the bonds of a given network which can never intersect itself. The walk is restricted to moving to a nearest-neighbor site during each step, and the self-avoiding condition constrains the walk to occupy only sites which have not been previously visited in the same walk.

The simplest procedure to obtain SAWs consists just in generating ordinary random walks and stop when they arrive at a node already visited. A problem with this sampling algorithm in regular lattices is the exponentially rapid attrition for long walks, since the probability of an n -step walk being selfavoiding behaves for large n as e^{-n} , where λ is the so-called attrition constant [35]. Due to this limitation, more sophisticated schemes based on Monte Carlo sampling, have been employed to generate SAWs with the correct weight, and to obtain ensemble averages of several quantities [35]. This has allowed, for example, to model the equilibrium statistics of linear polymers in dilute solutions. In general, for networks including nodes with different degrees (contrary to usual regular lattices), sampling by using simple random walks introduces a bias in the weight of different SAWs.




FIG. 1. Schematic diagram showing a non-reversal random walk of length $n = 5$ on a realization of a random graph. Open and black circles represent unvisited and visited nodes, respectively. The starting node is indicated by a larger circle. The non-reversal condition allows in principle for the next (sixth) step three possible nodes (denoted A, B, and C). The self-avoiding condition excludes node C for the sixth step. For a non-reversal SAW one chooses among nodes A, B, and C. If C is selected, then the walk stops. For a kinetic growth walk, one chooses A or B.

One can also consider kinetically grown SAWs, which can be more adequate to analyze dynamic processes. Such walks are well-suited to study, for example, search or navigation processes on networks, where they are assumed to grow step by step in a temporal sequence. In the following we will consider two kinds of growing walks. The first kind will be ‘non-reversal’ selfavoiding walks [35]. In these walks one randomly chooses the next step from among the neighboring nodes, excluding the previous one. If it happens that one chooses an already visited node, then the walk stops (see Fig. 1). These walks will allow us to study the ‘self-intersection length’ (see Sec. IV). The second kind of walks considered here are kinetic growth walks [36], in which one randomly chooses the next step among the neighboring unvisited sites and stops growing when none are available. These walks were studied to describe the irreversible growth of linear polymers [36], and will allow us to consider the ‘attrition length’ for a walk on a given network (see Sec. V). Note that kinetic growth walks are less sensitive to attrition than non-reversal SAWs, since in the former the walker always escapes whenever a way exists.

We consider SF networks with degree distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$. They are characterized, apart from the exponent γ and the system size N , by the minimum degree k_0 , which affects markedly some characteristics of SAWs in these networks (see below). We assume that $P(k) = 0$ for $k < k_0$. Our networks are uncorrelated, in the sense that degrees of nearest neighbors are statistically independent. This means that the joint probability $P(k; k^0)$ fulfills the relation [3]

$$P(k; k^0) = \frac{k k^0}{h k^2} P(k) P(k^0) : \quad (1)$$

For the numerical simulations we have generated networks with several values of γ , k_0 , and N . To generate

a network, once defined the number of nodes N_k with degree k , we ascribe a degree to each node according to the set $\{N_k\}$, and then connect at random ends of links (giving a total of $L = \sum_k k N_k = 2$ connections), with the conditions: (i) no two nodes can have more than one bond connecting them, and (ii) no node can be connected by a link to itself. We have checked that networks generated in this way are uncorrelated, i.e. they fulfill Eq. (1). All networks considered here contain a single component, i.e. any node in a network can be reached from any other node by traveling through a finite number of links. For each set of parameters (γ, k_0, N) , we considered different network realizations, and for a given network we selected at random the starting nodes for the SAWs. For each considered parameter set, the total number of generated SAWs amounted to about 5×10^5 .

For regular lattices, the number s_n of different SAWs starting from a generic site has an asymptotic dependence for large n [33]: $s_n \sim n^{-1-\nu}$, where ν is a critical exponent which depends on the lattice dimension, and is the so-called 'connective constant' or effective coordination number of the considered lattice [37]. In general, for a lattice with connectivity k_0 , one has $\nu = k_0 - 1$. This parameter can be obtained as the limit

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_n}{s_{n-1}} : \quad (2)$$

The connective constant depends upon the particular topology of each lattice, and has been determined very accurately for two- and three-dimensional lattices [35].

For poissonian and scale-free networks the number of SAWs of length n depends on the considered starting node of the network. In the sequel we will call s_n the average number of SAWs of length n , i.e. the mean value obtained (for each n) by averaging over the network sites and over different network realizations (for given γ, k_0 , and N). For Erdos-Renyi random networks with poissonian distribution of degrees, one has $s_n^{\text{rd}} = k_0^n$ [34], and therefore the connective constant is $\nu = k_0 - 1$. In connection with this, we note that for a Bethe lattice (or Cayley tree) with connectivity k_0 , the number of SAWs is given by $s_n^{\text{BL}} = k_0(k_0 - 1)^{n-1}$, and one has $\nu_{\text{BL}} = k_0 - 1$.

III. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAWS

A. Number of walks

We calculate first the average number, r_n , of different n -step unrestricted walks starting from a node chosen at random. One trivially has $r_1 = k_0$. To calculate r_n for $n > 1$, one needs the degree distribution for nodes at which one arrives following a random edge. Thus, given a generic node and a link starting on it, we call $Q(k)$ the degree distribution for the other end of the link. The probability of reaching a node with connectivity k is proportional to k ; therefore

$$Q(k) = \frac{k}{\langle k \rangle} P(k); \quad (3)$$

where $\langle k \rangle$ in the denominator is a normalization factor. Then, the average number of two-step random walks is given by $r_2 = r_1 \langle k \rangle$, where the subscript Q indicates that the average value is taken with the probability distribution $Q(k)$. We find $r_2 = \langle k^2 \rangle$ [average values without subscripts are taken with the degree distribution $P(k)$]. For $n > 2$ we have $r_n = r_{n-1} \langle k \rangle$, and then

$$r_n = \langle k \rangle \frac{\langle k^2 \rangle^{n-1}}{\langle k \rangle^{n-1}} : \quad (4)$$

We have checked that this expression for r_n and those given below for SAWs coincide with those derived by using a generating function for the degree distribution [28,38].

We now calculate the average number, s_n , of different self-avoiding walks of n steps starting from a node taken at random, in uncorrelated networks. We will first consider the case $n \rightarrow \infty$ (thermodynamic limit). For $n = 1$, one has $s_1 = \langle k \rangle$. For $n > 1$ we take into account that each $(n-1)$ -step walk arriving at a node with degree k , gives rise to $k-1$ n -step walks. Thus, we have $s_n = s_{n-1} \langle k-1 \rangle$, which yields

$$s_n = \langle k \rangle \frac{\langle k^2 \rangle^{n-1}}{\langle k \rangle^{n-1}} : \quad (5)$$

Then, the connective constant ν for $N \rightarrow \infty$ is given by

$$\nu = \frac{\langle k^2 \rangle}{\langle k \rangle} - 1 : \quad (6)$$

This is consistent with the fact that uncorrelated networks are locally tree-like, and the ratio $\langle k^2 \rangle / \langle k \rangle$ is the average degree of a randomly-chosen end node of a randomly chosen link [3]. For SF networks with $\gamma > 3$, it diverges as $N \rightarrow \infty$, as a consequence of the divergence of $\langle k^2 \rangle$. For $\gamma > 3$, we can approximate the average values in Eq. (6) by replacing sums by integrals, and find

$$\nu = k_0 \frac{\gamma-2}{\gamma-3} - 1 : \quad (7)$$

Note that the ratio s_n / r_{n-1} does not depend on n for system size $N \rightarrow \infty$. This is equivalent to assume that nodes in different steps of a non-reversal random walk are different. This means, in other words, that the probability of finding loops with $n^0 < n$ in a n -step walk is negligible. For finite networks, however, there will appear loops of any size [39], introducing corrections to the number of SAWs, and s_n will be lower than given by Eq. 5. These corrections will be of order n^{-N} for $n \rightarrow \infty$. The effects of this reduction in the number of random SAWs in scale-free networks will be considered in Sections IV and V.

As indicated above, the number of SAWs on regular lattices scales for large n as $s_n \sim n^{1-\frac{1}{D}}$, where $\frac{1}{D}$ is a critical exponent which depends on the lattice dimension D , and one has $\frac{1}{D} = 1$ for $D > 4$ [33,35]. For the SF networks studied here we find $s_n \sim n^{\frac{1}{2}}$, indicating that $\frac{1}{D} = 1$, the same exponent as for regular lattices in many dimensions.

B. End-to-end separation

For walks on regular lattices, one usually considers an end-to-end Euclidean distance. Our SF networks, however, lack a metric and a true distance is not defined. Thus, we will consider the end-to-end separation for SAWs on SF networks as a function of the walk length n , the separation between two nodes being the number of links along the shortest path connecting them. In Fig. 2 we present the average separation $\langle d_n \rangle$ from the n 'th node in a SAW to the starting one ($n = 0$) for SF networks with $\gamma = 3$, $k_0 = 3$, and several sizes N . This average separation $\langle d_n \rangle$ increases first linearly with n and finally saturates to a finite value that depends on the system size. This is logical if one takes into account that these networks are locally tree-like, and for the first steps the minimum separation between nodes n and 0 is $d_n = n$. As n increases, there appear shorter ways connecting nodes n and 0 , and finally $\langle d_n \rangle$ becomes independent of n . This saturation for relatively small values of n is consistent with the small average separation between pairs of nodes (diameter) in this kind of networks. In fact, it is known that the diameter increases slowly as $\ln N$ for $\gamma = 3$, and even more slowly as $\ln \ln N$ for $\gamma < 3$ [19]. The limit of $\langle d_n \rangle$ for large n in our SAWs is lower than the diameter of the considered networks, because nodes with larger k have a higher probability of being visited than those with smaller k , as indicated above. Since the average separation of a node to all other nodes in a network decreases for increasing degree of the selected node, the average separation $\langle d_n \rangle$ for large n in SAWs is lower than the diameter of the network. For example, for two of the system sizes represented in Fig. 2 ($N = 2.1 \cdot 10^3$ and $7.7 \cdot 10^4$) we have for large n , $\langle d_n \rangle = 4.60$ and 5.88 vs diameters of 4.77 and 6.07 , respectively.

For regular lattices, the mean squared end-to-end distance of SAWs scales for large n as n^2 , $\frac{1}{D}$ being a dimension-dependent critical exponent. The upper critical dimension for these walks is $D = 4$, [40] which means that above this dimension one has $\frac{1}{D} = \frac{1}{2}$, as for Brownian motion (Markovian random walks). On the other side, for the SF networks studied here, the mean squared end-to-end separation scales as n^2 in the thermodynamic limit, i.e., with an exponent $\frac{1}{D} = 1$. This exponent coincides with that corresponding to $D = 1$, reflecting the fact that loops become irrelevant in the considered networks as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (networks become tree-like). This behavior is, however, not captured by SAWs on finite SF

networks, for which $\langle d_n^2 \rangle$ converges to a constant, and therefore gives a null exponent for sufficiently large n .




FIG. 2. Average separation between the n 'th node and the starting one, for kinetically-grown SAWs on scale-free networks with $\gamma = 3$ and $k_0 = 3$. Symbols correspond to different system sizes. From bottom to top: $N = 2.1 \cdot 10^3$; $9.6 \cdot 10^3$; $7.7 \cdot 10^4$ and $6.2 \cdot 10^5$. Dotted lines are guides to the eye.

IV. SELF-INTERSECTION LENGTH

As indicated above, finite-size effects on SAWs on any (finite) network will be appreciable as soon as the walks are long enough, as a consequence of the presence of loops in the network. Thus, SAWs are a suitable tool to probe the large-scale topological structure of complex networks. In particular, the probability of a walk intersecting itself will depend on the system size, as well as on the topology of the network under consideration. To study this probability, we consider here non-reversal self-avoiding walks [35], that stop when they try to visit a node already visited in the same walk. The number of steps of a given walk before intersecting itself will be called 'self-intersection length' of the walk, and will be denoted l .

To obtain the mean self-intersection length h_l of these walks, we will calculate the probability that a walk stops at step n ($n < N$). Let us consider for the moment nodes with a given degree k . The average number of nodes with degree k visited after n steps is

$$V_k = n Q(k); \quad (8)$$

and the average number of those yet unvisited is

$$U_k = N_k - V_k = N P(k) - n Q(k); \quad (9)$$

Then, the probability of reaching in step n an unvisited node is $u_k / k U_k$, and that of finding one already visited is $v_k / (k - 2) V_k$. This is due to the fact that a visited node has $k - 2$ possible links to reach it, as two of

its connections are not available because they were employed earlier: one for an incoming step and one for an outgoing step. Therefore, the probability p_n of finding in step n a visited node with any degree is

$$p_n = \frac{P}{k} \frac{\sum_k V_k}{(V_k + U_k)} ; \quad (10)$$

Inserting into Eq. (10) expressions (8) and (9) for V_k and U_k , and keeping terms linear in n/N one has

$$p_n = \frac{n}{hkiN} \sum_k (k-2)Q(k) ; \quad (11)$$

and finally

$$p_n = \frac{n}{N} w ; \quad (12)$$

where

$$w = \frac{hk^2i - 2hki}{hki^2} ; \quad (13)$$

Note that for the networks considered here $w > 0$. In fact, $hk^2i - 2hki > 0$ is the condition to have a giant component in a network [41].




FIG. 3. Fraction of non-reversal SAWs that survive after n steps, without intersecting them selves. Results are plotted for SF networks with $\gamma = 3$, $k_0 = 3$, and several system sizes N . From left to right: $N = 3.3 \cdot 10^3$; $6 \cdot 10^4$; $7 \cdot 10^4$, and $2.1 \cdot 10^5$. Solid and dashed lines indicate results of numerical simulations and analytical calculations, respectively.

To calculate the probability distribution for the self-intersection length l , we consider M_0 random walks starting from nodes taken at random. We call $M_1(n)$ the number of non-reversal SAWs that remain after n steps (i.e., those which did not find any node visited earlier). Thus, $M_1(n) - M_1(n+1) = p_n M_1(n)$, and considering n as a continuous variable x , we have a differential equation for $M_1(x)$:

$$\frac{1}{M_1} \frac{dM_1}{dx} = - \frac{w}{N} ; \quad (14)$$

which yields for integer n :

$$M_1(n) = M_0 \exp \left(- \frac{w}{2N} n^2 \right) ; \quad (15)$$

In Fig. 3 we present results for the fraction of surviving walks $M_1(n)/M_0$ for SF networks with $\gamma = 3$. We compare the curves derived from Eq. (15) (dashed lines) with those obtained from numerical simulations for networks with $k_0 = 3$ (solid lines). Both sets of results agree with one another in the sensitivity region of our numerical procedure (down to 10^{-6}). For larger n (and lower $M_1(n)/M_0$) one expects terms of higher order in n/N to become relevant, and Eq. (15) to be less reliable.




FIG. 4. Mean self-intersection length hli as a function of system size, for SF networks with $k_0 = 3$ and several values of the exponent γ . From top to bottom: $\gamma = 5, 3, 2.5$, and 2 . Symbols are results of numerical simulations and dashed lines were obtained from Eq. (17). Error bars of simulation results are less than the symbol size.

The average self-intersection length of these walks can be obtained as hli , with the probability distribution

$$R(l) = w \frac{1}{N} \exp \left(- \frac{w}{2N} l^2 \right) ; \quad (16)$$

which gives the probability of returning to a visited site in step l . Treating l as a continuous variable, we replace sums by integrals and find

$$hli = \frac{\int_0^\infty l R(l) dl}{\int_0^\infty R(l) dl} = \frac{N}{2w} ; \quad (17)$$

For large N and $\gamma > 2$, hki converges to a finite value, and $w = hk^2i$; therefore, the mean self-intersection length scales as $hli \propto (N = hk^2i)^{1/2}$. For $\gamma > 3$, hk^2i does not

diverge for large N , and then $\langle l_i \rangle \sim N^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$. Mean self-intersection lengths derived from Eq. (17) are shown in Fig. 4, along with those found in numerical simulations for several exponents γ . Both methods give results agreeing with one another within the error bars of the numerical simulations. In general, we find $\langle l_i \rangle \sim N^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$, with an exponent $\frac{1}{\gamma}$ that decreases from 0.5 to 0.25 as γ decreases from 3 to 2. From the distribution for l given by Eq. (16) one finds a mean-square deviation for the self-intersection length of the walks: $\langle l_i^2 \rangle = C N^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}$, with a constant $C = 2^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} = 2$. This means that $\langle l_i^2 \rangle = 2 \langle l_i \rangle^2$.

We note that the probability distribution $R(l)$ (and therefore the average value $\langle l_i \rangle$) is independent of the minimum degree k_0 . It depends, apart from the system size, on the exponent γ of the degree distribution through the mean values $\langle k \rangle$ and $\langle k^2 \rangle$. In Fig. 5 we present the mean self-intersection length for SF networks with $\gamma = 2.5$ and several values of k_0 , as derived from numerical simulations. Different k_0 values give a unique N -dependence of $\langle l_i \rangle$. Thus, the dependence of $\langle l_i \rangle$ on k_0 , which should appear in Eq. (17) through the dependence of w on k_0 , is negligible for our purposes. However, the minimum degree k_0 affects strongly other properties of SAWs, such as the attrition length studied in the following section.




FIG. 5. Mean self-intersection length $\langle l_i \rangle$ as a function of system size for SF networks with $\gamma = 2.5$ and several values of the minimum degree k_0 : squares, $k_0 = 3$; circles, $k_0 = 5$; triangles, $k_0 = 7$.

V. ATTRITION LENGTH

In this section we consider random SAWs, that travel on the network until they arrive at a node (called hereafter blocking node'), where they cannot continue because all adjacent nodes have been already visited and are not available for the walk. These are kinetic growth walks, as defined by Majid et al. [36]. The number of steps of a given walk until being blocked will be called attrition length of the walk, and will be denoted L .

We now calculate the average attrition length of kinetic growth walks, and obtain its asymptotic dependence for large system size N . To find this average length we will derive a probability distribution for L , in a way similar to that employed above for the self-intersection length. With this purpose we note that a blocking node for a kinetic growth walk is characterized by the fact that all its links except one (employed for an incoming step) connect it with nodes previously visited. Then, for step n of a walk and for a given degree k , the average number N_k^0 of blocking nodes present in the network is given by the binomial formula:

$$N_k^0 = k N_k p_n^{k-1} (1 - p_n)^{N-k} \approx k N_k p_n^{k-1}; \quad (18)$$

where p_n (≈ 1 for $n \ll N$) is the average fraction of links joining a generic node with nodes visited earlier, as given in Eq. (12). This means that $N_k^0 \approx k^{k-1} p_n^{k-1}$, and then one has $N_k^0 \approx N_{k_0}^0$ for $k > k_0$. Thus, the average number of links connecting the n 'th node in a walk with nodes already visited coincides, within our approximation, with $N_{k_0}^0$. (Note that there is one such link available for each of those $N_{k_0}^0$ nodes.)

The probability of finding a blocking node in step n is given by the ratio $q_n = N_{k_0}^0 / N_{\text{end}}$, where $N_{\text{end}} = \langle k \rangle N$ is the total number of ends of links in the network. Then, to order $n \ll N$, we have $q_n \approx N_{k_0}^0 / \langle k \rangle N$. This approximation relies on the fact that $p_n \approx w n / N \ll 1$, which may be unfulfilled when the minimum degree k_0 is large and the average attrition length can be on the order of the system size N (see below).

To derive the probability distribution for the attrition length L , we consider M_0 kinetic growth walks starting from nodes taken at random. We call $M_2(n)$ the number of walks that survive after n steps. Then, the number of walks finishing at step n (for which n is a blocking one) is $M_2(n) - M_2(n+1) = q_n M_2(n)$. Considering again n as a continuous variable x , one has a differential equation for $M_2(x)$:

$$\frac{1}{M_2} \frac{dM_2}{dx} = -Y \frac{x^{k_0-1}}{N}; \quad (19)$$

with the network-dependent constant

$$Y = \frac{N_{k_0}}{N} \frac{k_0}{\langle k \rangle} w^{k_0-1}; \quad (20)$$

and w given in Eq. (13). Then, for integer n we have

$$M_2(n) = M_0 \exp \left(-Y \frac{n^{k_0}}{x_0^{k_0}} \right); \quad (21)$$

which gives the number of walks that remain after n steps, i.e. $M_2(n) = M_0$ is the probability of surviving to length n . Here x_0 is a number (dimensionless length) given by $x_0^{k_0} = k_0 N^{k_0-1} = Y$.

Therefore, the probability distribution $Z(L)$ for the attrition length of these walks is

$$Z(L) = \frac{k_0}{L} \left(\frac{L}{x_0} \right)^{k_0} \exp \left(- \frac{L}{x_0} \right)^{k_0} : \quad (22)$$

This distribution is strongly dependent on the minimum degree k_0 , since nodes with this degree are in fact controlling the maximum length of kinetic growth walks in scale-free networks. The distribution $Z(L)$ is displayed in Fig. 6 for $\gamma = 3$, $k_0 = 3$, and different system sizes. Dashed lines were obtained from Eq. (22), and solid lines were derived from numerical simulations. Both sets of results follow the same trend, but the numerical results seem to be larger than the analytical ones for large L . This difference is larger than the noise of the simulation results, and shows the validity limit of our approximation for large L .




FIG. 6. Distribution probability $Z(L)$ for the attrition length L of kinetic growth walks on scale-free networks with $\gamma = 3$, $k_0 = 3$, and different system sizes. From left to right: $N = 3:3 \cdot 10^3$; $2:6 \cdot 10^4$; $7:7 \cdot 10^4$, and $2:1 \cdot 10^5$. Solid and dashed lines indicate results of numerical simulations and analytical calculations, respectively.

From the distribution $Z(L)$ we obtain an average attrition length

$$hLi = \frac{x_0}{k_0} \frac{1}{k_0} ; \quad (23)$$

being Euler's gamma function. Thus, the dependence of hLi on N for large systems is controlled by x_0 . To obtain the asymptotic dependence of x_0 , we note that Y in Eq. (20) scales for $\gamma > 2$ as $Y \sim w^{k_0-1}$, because $N_{k_0} \sim N$ converges to a constant for large N . In addition, $w \sim h^2 i$, and therefore $x_0^{k_0} (N \sim h^2 i)^{k_0-1}$. For $\gamma > 3$, $h^2 i$ converges to a finite value as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and the average attrition length increases as $hLi \sim N^{1-1/k_0}$. For $\gamma = 3$, $h^2 i \sim \ln N$, and $hLi \sim (N \sim \ln N)^{1-1/k_0}$. This means that for a given system size, the average number of nodes visited in kinetic growth walks rises with increasing k_0 , as a consequence of the increase in the average

degree $h^2 i$. For $\gamma < 3$, we have $hLi \sim N$, with an exponent that decreases from $1-1/k_0$ to $1-1/k_0=2$ as γ decreases from 3 to 2.

In Fig. 7 we show the average attrition length hLi as a function of the system size N for $\gamma = 3$. Symbols correspond to results of numerical simulations for several values of the minimum degree k_0 , and dashed lines were obtained by using Eq. (23). For the largest k_0 , hLi derived from simulations increases with N slightly faster than the analytical result. This difference is not strange if one observes that for $k_0 = 9$, hLi is on the order of N (in fact, for $N = 10^5$, $N \approx hLi \cdot 3$), and our assumption that $n \ll N$ for all steps of SAWs is not true. However, even in this case Eq. (23) gives a rather good approximation for the average length hLi (see Fig. 7).




FIG. 7. Mean attrition length hLi as a function of system size for SF networks with $\gamma = 3$ and several values of k_0 . From top to bottom: $k_0 = 9, 5$, and 3 . Symbols are results of numerical simulations, and dashed lines were obtained by using Eq. (23). Error bars of simulation results are less than the symbol size.

In order to define strategies to search in this kind of networks, it is clear that nodes with low degree limit the effectiveness of the process. Thus, actual strategies based on SAWs have to include additional conditions to improve their efficiency. In this line, Adamic et al. [28] have proposed an algorithm based on SAWs that prefer high-degree nodes to low-degree ones. In any case, the long-range properties of pure SAWs give us direct insight into the structure of SF networks, further than the local neighborhood of a node, where the structure of links is tree-like. On a larger scale, one always finds loops sooner or later in finite networks, which is in fact probed by SAWs. In particular, the average self-intersection length hli given in Eq. (17) is a measure of the typical size of loops in equilibrium SF networks. The presence of loops in a network is responsible for attrition of the walks. Then, the mean attrition length hLi given in Eq. (23) is a measure of the 'long-range bpenness' of a network (the

longer hLi, the less loops contains a network). In this sense, our SF networks become more 'open' as their size N increases, and eventually are loop-free (or tree-like) in the thermodynamic limit, where both hLi and hLi diverge to infinity.

As a result, we find that the efficiency of SAWs to explore scale-free networks increases for increasing exponent γ . This is a consequence of the fact that for a given system size N , the fraction of nodes with high degree increases for decreasing γ . High-degree nodes are visited more probably than low-degree ones, and once visited the former are more effective to block a SAW in later steps (they have more connections), thus reducing the mean self-intersection and attrition lengths.

V I. C O N C L U S I O N S

Selfavoiding walks provide us with an adequate tool to study the long-range characteristics of SF networks. In particular, they allow us to study the quality of a network to be explored without returning to sites already visited. For large networks, the number of SAWs increases as $s_n = s_{n-1} \cdot h_k^2 = h_k^2 \cdot h_{k-1}$, provided that $n \ll N$. For a given n , s_n decreases with decreasing system size, as a consequence of the presence of loops in the networks. These finite-size effects affect strongly the maximum length of kinetic growth walks on scale-free networks.

We have calculated self-intersection and attrition lengths by using an approximate probabilistic method, which yields results in good agreement with those derived from numerical simulations. Both, the average self-intersection length and attrition length scale as a power of the system size N . For the mean self-intersection length of non-reversal SAWs we have $hLi \propto N^\alpha$, with α depending on the exponent γ of the degree distribution. In particular, for $\gamma > 3$ one has $\alpha = 0.5$, and decreases as γ is lowered. The length of kinetic growth walks in scale-free networks is limited by attrition of the paths, and the mean attrition length follows a dependence $hLi \propto N^\beta$, with β depending on γ and the minimum degree k_0 . For $\gamma > 3$, one has $\beta = 1 - 1/k_0$. This dependence of the exponent β on k_0 is remarkable, reflecting the fact that the length of SAWs is limited by attrition at sites with the minimum degree k_0 .

Acknowledgments: Thanks are due to M. Saboya for critically reading the manuscript. This work was supported by CICYT (Spain) under Contract No. BFM 2003-03372-C03-03.

- [1] S. H. Strogatz, *Nature* 410, 268 (2001).
- [2] R. Albert and A. L. Barabasi, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 74, 47 (2002).
- [3] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, *Adv. Phys.* 51, 1079 (2002); S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, *Evolution of Networks: From Biological Nets to the Internet and WWW* (Oxford University, Oxford, 2003).
- [4] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, *Nature* 393, 440 (1998); D. J. Watts, *Small Worlds* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1999).
- [5] A. L. Barabasi and R. Albert, *Science* 286, 509 (1999).
- [6] C. Moore and M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* 61, 5678 (2000).
- [7] M. Kuperman and G. Abramson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 2909 (2001); Y. Moreno, J. B. Gomez, and A. F. Pacheco, *Phys. Rev. E* 68, 035103 (2003); R. Cohen, S. Havlin, and D. ben-Avraham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 247901 (2003).
- [8] C. P. Herrero, *Phys. Rev. E* 66, 046126 (2002); Y. Moreno, M. Nekovee, and A. F. Pacheco, *cond-mat/0312131*.
- [9] S. A. Pandit and R. E. Amritkar, *Phys. Rev. E* 63, 041104 (2001).
- [10] J. Lahtinen, J. Kertesz, and K. Kaski, *Phys. Rev. E* 64, 057105 (2001).
- [11] M. E. J. Newman and D. J. Watts, *Phys. Rev. E* 60, 7332 (1999).
- [12] A. Barrat and M. Weigt, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 13, 547 (2000); M. Gitterman, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 33, 8373 (2000); C. P. Herrero, *Phys. Rev. E* 65, 066110 (2002).
- [13] M. Leone, A. Vazquez, A. Vespignani, and R. Zecchina, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 28, 191 (2002); A. V. Goltsev, S. N. Dorogovtsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, *Phys. Rev. E* 67, 026123 (2003); S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, *Phys. Rev. E* 66, 016104 (2002); C. P. Herrero, *Phys. Rev. E* 69, 067109 (2004).
- [14] M. E. J. Newman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 98, 404 (2001).
- [15] H. Jeong, S. P. Mason, A. L. Barabasi, and Z. N. Oltvai, *Nature* 411, 41 (2001).
- [16] G. Siganos, M. Faboutsos, P. Faboutsos, and C. Faboutsos, *IEEE ACM Trans. Netw.* 11, 514 (2003).
- [17] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A. L. Barabasi, *Nature* 401, 130 (1999).
- [18] K. I. Goh, E. S. Oh, H. Jeong, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 99, 12583 (2002).
- [19] R. Cohen and S. Havlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90, 058701 (2003).
- [20] D. J. Watts, P. S. Dodds, and M. E. J. Newman, *Science* 296, 1302 (2002); P. S. Dodds, R. Muhamad, and D. J. Watts, *Science* 301, 827 (2003).
- [21] R. Guimera, A. Daz-Guilera, F. Vega-Redondo, A. Cabrales, and A. Arenas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 248701 (2002).
- [22] B. J. Kim, C. N. Yoon, S. K. Han, and H. Jeong, *Phys. Rev. E* 65, 027103 (2002).
- [23] S. Jespersen and A. Blumén, *Phys. Rev. E* 62, 6270 (2000); F. Jasch and A. Blumén, *Phys. Rev. E* 64, 066104 (2001).
- [24] B. Tadic, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 23, 221 (2001); E. A. Imbas, R.

- V. Kulkarni, and D. Stroud, *Phys. Rev. E* 68, 056105 (2003).
- [25] M. E. J. Newman, cond-mat/0309045; B. Tadic, cond-mat/0310014; J. D. Noh and H. Rieger, cond-mat/0307719.
- [26] G. F. Lin, A. S. Martinez, and O. K. Inouchi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 010603 (2001).
- [27] S. B. Santra, W. A. Seitz, and D. J. Klein, *Phys. Rev. E* 63, 067101 (2001).
- [28] L. A. Adam, R. M. Lukose, A. R. Puniyani, and B. A. Huberman, *Phys. Rev. E* 64, 046135 (2001).
- [29] P. G. de Gennes, *Scaling Concepts in Polymer Physics* (Cornell University, Ithaca, 1979).
- [30] S. B. Lee, H. Nakanishi, and Y. Kim, *Phys. Rev. B* 39, 9561 (1989).
- [31] C. P. Herrero, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 7, 8897 (1995).
- [32] K. Kremer, A. Baumgärtner, and K. Binder, *J. Phys. A* 15, 2879 (1981).
- [33] V. Privman, P. C. Hohenberg, and A. Aharony, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, vol. 14, edited by C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz (Academic, London, 1991).
- [34] C. P. Herrero and M. Saboya, *Phys. Rev. E* 68, 026106 (2003).
- [35] A. D. Sokal, in *Monte Carlo and Molecular Dynamics Simulations in Polymer Science*, edited by K. Binder (Oxford University, Oxford, 1995).
- [36] I. Majid, N. Jan, A. Coniglio, and H. E. Stanley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 52, 1257 (1984).
- [37] D. C. Rapaport, *J. Phys. A* 18, 113 (1985).
- [38] D. S. Callaway, M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85, 5468 (2000); M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, *Phys. Rev. E* 64, 026118 (2001).
- [39] G. Bianconi and A. Capocci, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90, 078701 (2003).
- [40] G. Slade, *J. Phys. A* 21, L417 (1988); T. Hara and G. Slade, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 147, 101 (1992); A. L. Owczarek and T. Prellberg, *J. Phys. A* 34, 5773 (2001).
- [41] M. Molloy and B. Reed, *Random Struct. Algorithms* 6, 161 (1995).