

Evolving Model of Weighted Networks Inspired by Scientific Collaboration Networks

Menghui Li¹, Jinshan Wu², Dahui Wang¹, Tao Zhou³, Zengru Di¹, Ying Fan¹

1. Department of Systems Science, School of Management,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, P.R. China.

2. Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, B.C. Canada, V6T 1Z1.

3. Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China,
Hefei Anhui, 230026, P.R. China

December 26, 2021

Abstract

Inspired by scientific collaboration networks, especially our empirical analysis of the network of econophysicists, an evolutionary model for weighted networks is proposed. Both degree-driven and weight-driven models are considered. Compared with the BA model and other evolving models with preferential attachment, there are two significant generalizations. First, besides the new vertex added in at every time step, old vertices can also attempt to build up new links, or to reconnect the existing links. The reconnection between both new-old and old-old nodes are recorded and the connecting times on every link is converted into the weight of the link. This provides a natural way for the evolution of edge weight. Second, besides degree and the weight of vertices, a path-related local information is also used as a reference in the preferential attachment. The path-related preferential attachment mechanism significantly increases the clustering coefficient of the network. The model shows the scale-free phenomena in degree and weight distribution. It also gives well qualitatively consistent behavior with the empirical results.

Pacs: 89.75.Hc 05.40.-a 87.23.Kg

A author for correspondence: yfan@bnu.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Network analysis is now widely used in many fields [1, 2]. Recently more and more works on weighted networks appears in both empirical and modelling analysis. In a weighted network, the weight on the edges provides a natural way to take into account the interaction strength, while in a binary network, the edges only represents the presence or absence of interaction. This capability will probably carry more information about the interaction.

The first problem before any analysis can be applied to the weighted networks is how to assign the weight to edges. This problem is quite non-trivial. Several ways to assign the weight have been introduced. One is to transfer some quantities from non-weighted networks into the weight of edges. They are usually related to the degree or other intrinsic quantities of the nodes [3, 4, 5]. As in [5], the weight of an edge is measured by the point degree of its two ends, which are defined phenomenologically from binary networks. It is helpful to describe new properties of the binary networks, but it includes no more information than the origin binary networks. Sometimes, the real-world phenomena investigated provide a typically natural measurement of the weight, such as the number of flights or seats between any two cities in airport networks [6, 7, 8], the reaction rate in metabolic networks [9] and so on. In the works of modelling weighted networks, weights on edges are generated from priori distribution [10, 11, 12]. From the view point of empirical study, we never know such models already acquire the real structure of weighted networks or not.

However, some weighted networks such as scientific collaboration networks are different with the above networks. In the collaboration networks, the connection times is a natural quantity which is related very closely to the weight. But there is no explicitly expression between this quantity and weight. Let's think about the times of coauthoring between two scientists. Obviously, more times represents closer relationship in the sense of transportation of scientific ideas. Therefore, in scientific collaboration networks, usually the happening times of the event is converted as the weight of the edge. Yet different authors may use different expressions [7, 13, 14, 15, 16]. As to which definition behaviors better, and whether or not there are some general rules to define weight, we do not have the final answer yet.

The second problem related to the weighted networks is how to extract information from weighted networks constructed by the above ways. Especially one may concern about what's the role of weight, or what's the significant difference brought by weights compared with binary networks. In order to answer the above questions raised from those two aspects, we

have to consider the third problem, modelling the weighted networks.

For instance, by investigation of modelling works, if we find that in order to construct a well-behavior model of weighted networks, the degree is the only variable directly coupled with evolution, while the weight is never needed to directly be brought into the evolutionary process, then we may think that the weight just relies on a higher level structure. The weight is not crucial in network analysis although it is important and necessary. Or quite the contrary, if in order to get weighted network behaviors consistently with real phenomena in the modelling work, the weight must be coupled directly with the evolution. Then the weight should play a significant role in the way to extract information from weighted networks.

In this paper, we tried both degree-referred preferential attachment and weight-referred preferential attachment in our evolving model and compared the results with the empirical analysis from [14, 15, 16].

Actually, there are already many evolving models for weighted networks. Some models introduced prior weights into edges with the evolution of networks. In [3], each link $j \rightarrow i$ from the newly added node j is assigned a weight as $w_{ji} = \frac{p_{ji} k_i}{\sum_{i \in G} k_i}$, where $\sum_{i \in G}$ represents a sum over the existing nodes to which the new node j is connected. Zheng [4] has improved this idea. In his model, the weight of a link depends not only on total degree of the existing nodes, but also on some intrinsic quality ("fitness") of the nodes. In [17], the weight of a link depends on randomly modified intervals between the time at which linked vertices are connected to the system. In [12], the weight w_{ij} of a link l_{ij} connecting a pair of nodes (i and j) is defined as $w_{ij} = (w_i + w_j)/2$, and w_i is defined as i node's assigned number (from 1 to N) divided by N . In some evolving models [10, 11], the weight w is assigned to the link when it is created and it is drawn from a certain distribution. As pointed out in [18], most models here are not really evolutionary models in the sense of weight. The weight keeps the same value after it was assigned onto its edge. Or some extra quantities are introduced to drive the evolution of networks.

Recently, some evolving models are set up in which the weights are coupled directly with the network evolution. In the paper [18], a weight-driven model was proposed and the weight of link changes with the network evolution. In this paper, the new edges starting from the new vertex added in at every time step are preferentially attached to old vertices determined by their strength, or vertex weight. After the attachment, an increase of weight is distributed among all the edges connecting to the chosen old vertices. The model yields a nontrivial time evolution of vertices' properties and

scale-free behavior for the weight, strength, and degree distributions. In the paper [19], Bianconi has presented a model with co-evolution of link weight and strength. In his weighted fitness network model, the fitness of node and link and results in the structural phase transition of the network are introduced. In [20], the network evolves with connectivity-driven topology and with the weight assigned from a special distribution $p_k(x)$ of weights.

Although the models mentioned above coupled the weight and network evolution, we think that the dynamical process of the weight in Barrat's model [18] is quite artificial or say not very general, or like in the other two, extra quantities not rooted in network has to be used. The authors of [18] gave some arguments for this as to justify the process from the background of airport network [18]. But they took weight as a quantity independent on connecting. However, as we have mentioned before, weight usually related closely to connecting times. Especially for the actors and scientists collaboration networks, using weight converted from connecting times is a convenient way to construct weighted networks. Therefore, it seems that such a pure weight-driven model depends too much on this artificial dynamical process of weight. Now, our empirical investigation on scientific collaboration networks give us some hints on modelling weighted networks.

In our model, we keep the relationship between weight and connecting times, and only quantities directly rooted in networks are used. So the picture of the evolution looks like the connecting times evolve according to weight, and then the new connecting times comes into the weight, which drives the evolution of the system again. Or in our degree-driven model, connecting times evolve according to degree, and degree increase due to connecting, and then all the connecting times are recorded and converted into weight.

Another important improvement of our model is the introduction of local-path-related preferential attachment, the γ term in our model. This mechanism works for the network evolution in the real world but is neglected by other models. It is helpful to increase the clustering coefficient of the networks. One major difference between empirical results and most models is about the clustering coefficient. Usually, BA model [21] or similar models [18], given a quite low clustering coefficient while in reality, real phenomena show highly clustered behavior. Of course, the WS model of small world network [22] gives high clustering coefficient because it starts from a regular network, not on the way of evolutionary network models. Some evolutionary models do give high clustering coefficient [23, 24, 27]. In [23], if an edge between v and w was added, then add one more edge from v to a randomly chosen neighbor of w . In [24], one randomly chosen per-

son introduces two random acquaintances to each another who haven't met before. Another idea is to introduce an extra Euclidean distance, and vertices prefer to interact with nearby vertices. Therefore, in order to increase the clustering coefficient, new mechanisms which are not rooted directly in the network have been introduced. Now, we introduce the mechanism, where all quantities still comes directly from the topological structure. This requires no more extra information, but just a little knowledge about the local structure. Here 'a little' means one only need to know the information about the second, or third nearest neighbors, not any more.

The detailed comparison will be done between the results from the models and our empirical results from [15, 16]. The description of the general model is given in Section 2. The asymptotic distributions of vertex weights for the weight-driven case is also given analytically in Section 3, and they are well consistent with results of numerical simulations. In Section 4, in order to compare with the empirical study of econophysists collaboration network, we extend our model onto directed weighted networks. In this comparison, they show nice agreement.

2 Models and theoretical analysis

2.1 The model

A N -vertex weighted network is defined by a $N \times N$ matrix w_{ij} , which represents the weight on the edge from vertex i to j . Similarity weight is used here. So the larger the weight is, the closer the relation between the two ends nodes are. $w_{lm} = 0$ means no relation between vertex l and m . Suppose the edge weight w_{ij} is related to the connecting times T_{ij} between vertex i and j , by

$$w_{ij} = f(T_{ij}); \quad (1)$$

such as the tanh function $w_{ij} = \tanh(T_{ij})$ we used in [15, 16], or just linear relation $w_{ij} = T_{ij}$ used by other authors [7, 14].

Our most general model is given as follow. Starting from a fully connected n_0 initial network, with initial times $T_{ij} = 1$ (and initial weight $w_{ij} = f(1)$), at every time step,

1. One new vertex is added into this network, and l old vertices are randomly chosen from the existing network.
2. Every one (denoted as vertex n) of them can initially activate a temptation to build up m connections. The probability for every link from

n connecting onto vertex i is given by

$$n \rightarrow i = (1 - p) \frac{k_i}{\sum_j k_j} + (p - \alpha) \frac{w_i}{\sum_j w_j} + \frac{\alpha l_{ni}}{\sum_{j \in @_{ni}^{1,2}} l_{nj}}; \quad (2)$$

where k_i is the degree of vertex i , $w_i = \sum_j w_{ji}$ is the "onto" vertex weight of vertex i , l_{ni} is the similarity distance [16] from n to i , and $@_n^d$ means the d th neighbors of vertex n . For example, $@_n^1$ is the set of nearest neighbors, $@_n^2$ means the second nearest neighbors, so that $@_n^{1,2}$ in the expression refers to both of them. Intuitively, similarity distance means the maximum distance between two vertices because the weight is defined here in the way that the larger the closer. Usually, in calculation of network analysis, the dissimilarity distance corresponding to the shortest distance is used more often.

3. After we got an end node i chosen from all vertices over the existing network by the probability above in equ (2), the connecting times between vertex n and i increased by

$$T_{ni}(t+1) = T_{ni}(t) + 1; \quad (3)$$

4. The weight of the edges changes as

$$w_{ni}(t+1) = f(T_{ni}(t+1)); \quad (4)$$

Although our general model defined above can be applied to directed networks, in the following analysis we assume that $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$. An increase on T_{ij} immediately reflects another increase on T_{ji} . Except for the comparison with empirical results, on most cases, the linear function is used for the relationship between connecting times and weight for the simplicity,

$$w_{ij} = T_{ij}; \quad (5)$$

2.2 Analytic results of the weight distribution

Now we try to get the analytical results for the vertex weight distribution under the simplest weight-driven model. For the link weight given by equ (5), the weight of vertex is given by

$$w_i = \sum_j T_{ji} \quad (6)$$

we suppose that the newly added vertex and the old vertices are informed of the weight of the other vertices and the network is pure weight-driven. In this case it is attached with preferential linking described by $p = 1$ and $m = 0$ in equ (2), that is the connection probability is

$$p_{ij} = \frac{w_i}{\sum_j w_j} \quad (7)$$

Then master equation for the evolution of the average number of vertices with weight w at time t is

$$\frac{dN(w; t)}{dt} = N(w; t) + m \left[(1 + \frac{1}{w}) \frac{N(w-1; t)}{N} - \frac{w N(w; t)}{N} \right] \quad (8)$$

Here $\sum_w w N(w; t) = 2E$ is the total weight and $N = n_0 + t$ is the size of system at time t . The equation describes the increasing of preferential linking since the new vertex is added and old vertices are selected. The first term reflects the preferential attachment (7) used to select the other end of the link, while the following two items correspond to the random selection of old vertices. When E_0 and n_0 are much smaller than t , the size of the network N is approximately the time steps t . Then the master equation (8) can be written as

$$\frac{dN(w; t)}{dt} = t \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dw} \left[w^2 p(w; t) \right] + \left[\frac{1}{w} p(w-1; t) - p(w; t) \right] \right] \quad (9)$$

where $p(w; t) = \frac{N(w; t)}{N}$ is the density of vertices with strength w at time t [25]. When t is larger ($t \gg 1$) enough,

$$\frac{dN(w; t)}{dt} = t \frac{d}{dw} \left[w^2 p(w; t) \right] = p(w; t) \quad (10)$$

We get from equ (9)

$$\begin{aligned} p(w) &= \frac{d}{dw} \left[w^2 p(w) \right] + \left[\frac{1}{w} p(w-1) - p(w) \right] \\ &= \frac{d}{dw} \left[w^2 p(w) \right] + \left[\frac{1}{w} p(w-1) + p(w-1) - p(w-2) \right] \\ &+ p(w-2) + p(w-m+1) - p(w-m)] + \\ &= \frac{d}{dw} \left[w^2 p(w) \right] + m \frac{dp(w)}{dw} + \frac{1}{w} p(w) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$




Figure 1: Comparison between the numerical solution results from eq(8) and the analytical results of eq(14) for different l . Other parameters are $n_0 = 10, m = 5$.

This is further written as

$$p(w) + \frac{d}{dw} \left[\frac{1}{2} w p(w) + \frac{1}{2} m p(w) \right] = 0 \quad (12)$$

For $w \ll m$, we get

$$(2 - l - m + w) \frac{dp(w)}{dw} = -3 p(w) \quad (13)$$

We arrive at the final vertex weight distribution

$$p(w) \propto (w + 2 - l - m)^{-3} \quad (14)$$

In Fig(1), we compare the numerical solution of eq(8) with the analytical results eq(14), it shows a nice consistence. We can find that the lower end of strength is obviously affected by the parameter l and m and departure from power-law, while the upper end is still distributed as power-law. In the section 3.2, we will compare the analytical results with that of computer simulation in Fig(??). They are also consistent very well.

3 Numerical results

3.1 Degree-driven Model

First, we consider a special case, $p = 0$ and $\beta = 0$. In this case, our model is fairly similar with BA model, except now, besides the new vertex added

in, the old vertices can also be activated. This assumption has been used already in several evolving models especially for the modelling of cooperation networks [26, 27, 28]. Another difference between this case and BA model is that the reconnection of link is allowed and recorded. Later on, it will be converted as the weight of link. Fig (2) shows the typical behavior of degree and vertex weight distribution. The weight distribution of links obeys also power law as shown in Fig (3). These results are consistent with the typical result from empirical studies qualitatively, such as distribution of vertex weight for airline networks [6, 7, 8] and collaboration networks [7].

Compared with BA model, the introduction of parameter l is new, so how l will effect the behavior of the model? One limit situation is when $l = 0$. All the contributions to the weight come only from the new vertices. So our model comes back to BA model except some new links may be repeated. The degree distribution is the same as BA model. The vertex weight distribution is almost the same as degree distribution but there is no power-law distribution of edge weight at all. The increasing of l will affect the degree distribution. The lower end will departure from the power-law distribution but show the "droop head" shape observed in many empirical studies. Another limit situation is $l = 1$. In that case, the increase of internal links has much more effects on the network evolution compared with the growth of the network. The network will lose the power-law behavior in the lower end, although in a quite large domain of l , the power-law behavior of degree and weight distributions are robust, especially in the upper end. The effect of l is shown in Fig (4).

All the results are the average of 10 simulations for different realization of networks under the same set of parameters. The network sizes are all reach 10000 nodes. We have compared the distribution with that of the network with 50000 nodes. They are almost the same so that a network with 10000 nodes can give us a nice description for asymptotic distribution.

3.2 Purely weight-driven model

Now we assume that the vertex weight plays the most significant role in the evolution so that $p = 1$ and $\alpha = 0$. This means the scientists choose their cooperators according to the weight, instead of focusing on degree. Therefore, weight is the fundamental character of vertices. Intuitively, the meaning of the degree looks like the extensiveness of the working style while the weight considering both extensiveness and intensiveness. So it's not very surprised that weight can unconsciously be used as a scale to attract more cooperators. In fact, the same idea of this weight-driven mechanism has




Figure 2: Degree (a) and vertex weight (b) distribution from degree-driven model. They are both power-law distribution with almost the same exponent, $\gamma = 2.7$. The difference between these two distributions in upper tail is shown in (c) by Zipf plot. But most points are in the lower region. In this simulation, $n_0 = 10, m = 5, l = 1$.




Figure 3: Edge weight distribution. Empirical results from Newman's data of scientific collaboration networks (a) and collaboration network of Economists (b). Simulation result of the model is shown in (c).




Figure 4: (a) Degree distribution affected by the parameter l . (b) Larger l ($l = 10; 40$) makes the power-law behavior lose at the lower end. Other parameters are $n_0 = 10, m = 5$.

been used in Barrat's paper[18]. As we mentioned in introduction, the only difference between Barrat's model and this model is the evolution mechanism of weight. In Barrat's model, it evolves directly by a phenomenological rule as a γ -increase, while in our model, it evolves indirectly through the connecting times T_{ij} .

The numerical results are given in Fig(5). They are consistent with the theoretical analysis. It has been found that those two limit cases seem to have the similar qualitative behavior. However, as we mentioned in the introduction, the difference between those two cases, and the conclusion that which one behaves better, implies the answer to the question that which quantity is the more fundamental one between degree and weight. Or put it in another way, should weight be a high-level quantity defined by degree, betweenness, whatever the basic network quantities, or directly from event represented by the network? Therefore, a conclusion about this comparison is essential for this issue. However, so far those two models under the limit cases provide the similar behavior. In the next section 4, when the models are extended onto multilevel relationships to do a comparison between models and empirical results, at first we extended both those two limit cases. Both of them provide consistent behavior with the empirical results. After the similar results are found, only weight-driven model is compared with empirical results further. Of course, one can even try to study the behavior for a general p besides those two limit cases. However, since we have no way to make significant difference between the special




Figure 5: Vertex weight distribution for the purely weight-driven model: (a) comparison of the simulation results with analytical results; (b) the effects of different values of l . Other parameters are $n_0 = 10, m = 5$.




Figure 6: Comparison between purely degree-driven and purely weight-driven models on weight distribution. We could see that those two models behave very similarly (a) except for the upper tail in Zipf plot (b). The parameters for two simulations are the same: $n_0 = 10, m = 5, l = 1$.

cases, no further investigation about the general model has been done in this paper. To compare those two models with more empirical results and find the significant difference between them is really valuable for network analysis.

3.3 Clustering structure when $\alpha \neq 0$

The mechanism represented by the α term in our model has taken the local information of the network into account. When a connection is built up by the active vertex, the probability of a vertex being chosen as the end vertex is higher if it has the closer relation with the attempting one. Therefore, hopefully, this will increase the clustering coefficient. In the original BA model, this mechanism is neglected. So it's interesting to just keep the degree term and the α in our model, and explore whether such mechanics increase clustering coefficient or not.

3.3.1 α mechanism applied onto model of non-weight networks

For the non-weighted networks, every edge has the weight 1. The l_{ni} in α term is the similarity distance, which is the reciprocal of the shortest distance between vertex n and i . For the first link from new attempting vertices, just the BA rule of preferential attachment is applied, but for the links afterwards and the links from old vertex, the end point is determined preferential by both its degree and closeness with starting point. In Fig(7), the simulations show this mechanism significantly increases the clustering coefficient while the power-law distribution of degree still holds.

3.3.2 α mechanism in weighted network

For the weighted networks, l_{ni} in α term is the similarity distance as mentioned before. In this case, just for simplicity, we consider the purely weight-driven model, which means $p = 1$, $\alpha \neq 0$ in equ (2). Its effects on clustering coefficient are also shown in Fig(7). The clustering coefficient under this mechanism reaches a stable value after a period of evolution. We can see that under some value of α , for example, $\alpha = 0.8$, the clustering coefficient is near 0.25, which is much higher than BA model, and even comparable with empirical results[13, 16, 27] and results from other models[23, 24].

Since we have already shown that the α mechanism can increase the clustering coefficient, from now on, we will focus only on the comparison between simulation and empirical results on the distribution of degree and




Figure 7: Clustering coefficient for degree-driven (a) and weight-driven (b) model. Parameters are $n_0 = 10$, $m = 5$, $l = 1$.

weight, instead of on the clustering coefficient. So in the following discussion, δ is set to be 0 again.

4 Extended model and comparison with empirical results

In the real world, relations of nodes usually are more than one levels and different relations have different contributions to the weight of link. For instance, in the empirical analysis in [15, 16], we consider both co-authorship and citation as the ways of scientific idea transportation with different contributions. Even the worse is that citation is a directed network. So in order to compare the results from our models with the empirical studies, we must extend our current model into a multilevel directed networks model. There are two kinds of connecting times T_{ij} , where $i = 1; 2$ refers to co-authorship and citation respectively. Here the relation between connecting times and the link weight is given by a tanh function. The reason we prefer the tanh function in empirical studies is that, first, it has the saturation effect, which makes the contribution less for larger connecting times; second, it normalizes the maximum value to 1, which is the usual strength of edge in non-weight networks. So the two T_{ij} are converted into a single weight by

$$w_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tanh \left(\frac{T_{ij}}{T_0} \right) + 1 \right); \quad (15)$$

so that w_{ij} is normalized to 1. And the probability distribution to choose the end vertex is consistently transformed as

$$p_{n \rightarrow i} = \frac{w_i}{\sum_j w_j}; \quad (16)$$

while $\sum_i p_{n \rightarrow i} = 1$. Or in degree-driven model,

$$p_{n \rightarrow i} = \frac{k_i}{\sum_j k_j}; \quad (17)$$

After vertex i is chosen as the end vertex of a relation between n and i according to above probability distribution, the connecting time evolves as

$$T_{ni}(t+1) = T_{ni}(t) + 1; \quad (18)$$

For $\alpha = 1$, after that we need to set $T_{i \rightarrow n}^1(t+1) = T_{ni}^1(t+1)$. For $\alpha = 2$, we skip this step. From its definition equ (15), the weight here is an integrated variable. This implies those two events can be triggered by each other, not developed separately.

As it will be shown in Fig(8), we have not found any significant difference between those two models, so later on, when we compare models with empirical results, only weight-driven model are used there. As explained in the introduction section 4.1, measuring the role of weight by evolutionary models is one of the goals of our research which has not been achieved so far. We hope more comparisons between the behaviors of those two models and more empirical results will give an conclusive answer for this question.

For directed network, the degree is divided into three quantities: out degree, in degree and total degree. For example, the in degree k_i^{in} is the sum of edges ending at vertex i , that is $k_i^{\text{in}} = \sum_j \text{sign}(w_{ji})$. The out degree and weight are calculated similarly and the total degree and weight are the sum of in and out. The same situation happens to vertex weight, so there are out weight, in weight and total weight of vertices. From the simulation results, we can find that the total, in, and out degree and weight are all of power law distribution, as shown in Fig(8).

The more important comparison we want to do is between simulation and empirical results, especially on link and vertex betweenness, because they are global properties related with the whole structure of the networks. The link and vertex betweenness and their distribution could be gotten from the set of effective paths between any two nodes. The average distance d




Figure 8: Typical distributions of degree and weight (the three curves are In, Out and Total respectively) from pure degree-driven model (a), (b) and pure weight-driven model (c), (d). Again, the pure weight-driven model gives very similar results.

is defined as before as,

$$d = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i,j} d_{ij} \quad (19)$$

in which, d_{ij} is the similarity distance of an effective path between vertex $i; j$, the larger the closer and equals to 0 if no path exists. In fact, the above formula is not exactly the same as the one for non-weighted networks. First, because of the direction of edges, the number of total edges are now $N(N-1)$ instead of $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$. Second, the algorithm to search for such d_{ij} is slightly different with the usual shortest path in non-weighted networks. One way to make use of the shortest path algorithm is to transform the similarity into dissimilarity weight, so that the shorter the closer, and then use the usual shortest path algorithm to find all the distance. After that, transform it back into similarity distance. However, this is just an algorithm problem, has nothing to do with the structure analysis.

In order to check the model, we compare the results with empirical results from Econophysicists network, which has mostly been given in [15, 16]. We compare the distribution of quantities of Econophysicists networks with numerical simulations, such as degree, vertex weight, vertex betweenness and link betweenness. It is interesting that the results are consistent well. It seems that the model reveals some basic mechanisms of the evolution of collaboration network. The parameters we used here for this comparison are $l=1; p^1=0.2; p^2=0.8$.

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we presented an evolutionary model for weighted network, which integrates the contributions from both new vertices and old vertices. The two mechanisms, degree-driven and weight-driven preferential attachment are discussed, and both show a good consistence with empirical results from network of econophysicists. Also a new mechanism, named as local-path-related preferential attachment, which makes use of some locality information is introduced here to increase the clustering coefficient of the network. Weight has been assigned to each link according the connecting times of the link, so the weight of link changes as network evolves. Including the behaviors from the old vertices, recording all the connecting times and converting them into weight, are the most essential steps in our model. The way to incorporate locality information into network evolution by the mechanism is also one point of this paper.




Figure 9: Zipf plot of degree and weight from empirical studies and simulations. (a) and (c) are the empirical results of degree and weight distribution. (b) and (d) are the simulation results of the model. The model is simulated under the parameters: $n_0 = 10; m = 5; l = 1; p^1 = 0.2; p^2 = 0.8; p^1 = 0.7; p^2 = 0.3$ in eq15. The size of simulated network is $N = 819$ that is the same as empirical studies.




Figure 10: Zipf plot of betweenness for empirical studies and simulations. (a) Link betweenness. (b) Vertex betweenness.

However, one of the most important tasks of this paper, which is to determine the role of weight and comparing it with the role of degree, has not been done yet. Although the comparison so far could not distinguish the degree-driven model and weight-driven model, we hope further comparison with empirical results will give a conclusive answer for this question.

6 Acknowledgments

We thank Prof. Dinghua Shi, Dr. Yiming Ding, Dr. Qiang Yuan for their helpful discussions and comments on this paper. The work is partially supported by NSFC under the grant No.70431002 and No.70471080.

References

- [1] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabasi, Rev. Mod. Phys. 74, 47 (2002).
- [2] S.N. Dorogovtsev and J.F.F. Mendes, Adv. Phys. 51, 1079 (2002).
- [3] S.H. Yook, H. Jeong, A.-L. Barabasi and Y. Tu, Phys. Rev. Lett., 86, 5835 (2001).
- [4] D. Zheng, S. Trimper, B. Zheng, and P.M. Hui, Phys. Rev. E 67, 040102(R) (2003).

- [5] P. J. Macdonald, E. Almas, and A.L. Barabasi, arXiv:cond-mat/0405688.
- [6] W. Li and X. Cai, Phys. Rev. E 69 046106 (2004).
- [7] A. Barrat, M. Barthélemy, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani, PNAS vol. 101 (11), 3747-3752 (2004).
- [8] G. Bagler, arXiv:cond-mat/0409773.
- [9] E. Almas, B. Kovacs, T. Vicsek and A.L. Barabasi, Nature, 427, 839 (2004).
- [10] T. Antal and P.L. Krapivsky, arXiv:cond-mat/0408285.
- [11] K.-I. Goh, J.D. Noh, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, arXiv:cond-mat/0410317.
- [12] Kwangho Park, Ying-Cheng Lai, and Nong Ye, Phys. Rev. E 70, 026109 (2004).
- [13] Newman, M. E. J., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 98, 404 (2001).
- [14] Newman, M. E. J., Phys. Rev. E 64, 016131, 016132 (2001).
- [15] Y. Fan, M. Li, J. Chen, L. Gao, Z. Di and J. Wu, Int. J. of Mod. Phys. B, 18 (17-19), 2505-2512 (2004).
- [16] M. Li, Y. Fan, J. Cheng, L. Gao Z. Di and J. Wu, to be published in Physica A, doi:10.1016/j.physa.2004.11.039.
- [17] W. Jezewski, Physica A 337, 336 (2004).
- [18] A. Barrat, M. Barthélemy and A. Vespignani, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 228701 (2004); M. Barthélemy, A. Barrat, R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Vespignani, Physica A 346 34-43 (2005); A. Barrat, M. Barthélemy and A. Vespignani, Phys. Rev. E 70, 066149 (2004).
- [19] G. Bianconi, arXiv:cond-mat/0412399.
- [20] W. Jezewski, arXiv:cond-mat/0412196.
- [21] A.L. Barabasi and R. Albert, Science 286, 509 (1999).
- [22] D.J. Watts and S.H. Strogatz, Nature (London) 393, 440 (1998).
- [23] P. Holme and B.J. Kim, Phys. Rev. E. 65, 026107 (2002).

- [24] J. Davidse, H. Ebel, and S. Bomholdt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 128701 (2002).
- [25] S.N. Dorogovtsev and J.F.F. Mendes. Evolution of Networks (Oxford, Oxford Press, 2003).
- [26] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabasi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 5324 (2000).
- [27] A.-L. Barabasi, H. Jeong, Z. Neda, E. Ravasz, A. Schubert, T. Vicsek, Physica A, 311, 590 (2002).
- [28] M. Catanzaro, G. Caldarelli, L. Pietronero, Physica A 338, 119 (2004).

