

Random field Ising model and community structure in complex networks

Seung-Woo Son,¹ Hawoong Jeong,¹ and Jae Dong Noh^{2,*}¹Department of Physics, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon 305-701, Korea²Department of Physics, Chungnam National University, Daejeon 305-764, Korea

We propose a method to find out the community structure of a complex network. In this method the ground state problem of a ferromagnetic random field Ising model is considered on the network with the magnetic field $B_s = +1$, $B_t = -1$, and $B_{i \notin s,t} = 0$ for a node pair s and t . The ground state problem is equivalent to the so-called maximum flow problem, which can be solved exactly numerically with the help of a combinatorial optimization algorithm. The community structure is then identified from the ground state Ising spin domains for all pairs of s and t . Our method provides a criterion for the existence of the community structure, and is applicable to unweighted and weighted networks equally well. We demonstrate the performance of the method by applying it to the Barabasi-Albert network, Zachary karate club network, the scientific collaboration network, and the stock price correlation network.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 89.65.-s, 05.10.-a, 05.50.+q

I. INTRODUCTION

The network theory is a useful tool for the study of complex systems. Universal features of some biological, social, and technological systems have been studied through their network structure [1, 2, 3]. Recent studies have revealed that some complex networks have the community structure, which means that highly interconnected nodes are clustered in distinct parts. The community may represent functional modules in biological networks [4, 5, 6, 7], industrial sectors in economic networks [8, 9], and cliques of intimate individuals in social networks [10].

Recently various methods have been suggested for finding out the community structure in a given network [11]. Girvan and Newman proposed an algorithm based on iterative removal of links with the highest betweenness centrality [10, 11, 12]. The betweenness centrality of an edge is given by the number of the pathways passing through it among shortest paths between all node pairs [13]. Nodes in different communities, if any, would be connected through rare inter-community links. Hence one could isolate communities by removing links with the highest betweenness centrality repeatedly. Similar methods were also considered in Refs. [14, 15, 16]. Optimization techniques were also considered to find out the community structure. In those approaches, the community structure is found by optimizing an auxiliary quantity, such as the modularity [17, 18]. Some physical problems turned out to be useful in detecting the community structure. For example, the q -state Potts model [19], the random walks [20], and the electric circuit problem [21] were studied.

Those methods proved to be successful in detecting existing communities. On the other hand, it would be desirable to develop a method which can not only detect

the community structure but also verify its existence. Most algorithms developed are suitable for unweighted networks, whereas many real-world networks of interest are weighted [22]. One may modify and generalize the algorithms developed for unweighted networks. However, such a generalization may not be straightforward [22]. So it would also be desirable to develop a method that works for unweighted and weighted networks equally well.

In this paper we propose a method for finding out the community structure, which fulfills the requirements described above. Our approach is motivated from the observation on the Zachary network, a classical example of social networks with the community structure [10]. It is an acquaintance network of 34 members in a karate club. Once there arose a conflict between two influential members, which resulted in the breakup of the club into two. It is reasonable to think that the members would tend to minimize the number of broken ties, which can be accomplished by the breakup in accordance with the community structure. In fact, the resulting shape after the breakup coincides with the community structure of the original karate club network [10]. It suggests that the community structure of a given network may be found by simulating the breakup caused by an enforced frustration among nodes.

We simulate the breakup by studying the ferromagnetic random field Ising model (FRFIM): The Ising spins $s_i = \pm 1$ are assigned to all nodes $i = 1; \dots; N$, they interact ferromagnetically through links, and the quenched random magnetic field B_i is applied to each spin. The ferromagnetic interaction represents the cost for broken ties, and the random field is to introduce the frustration. In particular, we consider the case where the positive infinite magnetic field is applied to one spin and the negative infinite magnetic field to another. It amounts to imposing the boundary condition that the two spins are in the opposite state. It simulates the conflict as raised by the two members in the Zachary network. Then, we will identify the community structure from the ground state spin domain pattern of the FRFIM.

*Corresponding author: [noh@cnu.ac.kr]

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce the FRFIM in general weighted networks. The ground state problem of the FRFIM can be solved exactly with a numerical algorithm, which will be explained in Appendix. Then the method for finding out the community structure is presented. In Sec. III, we apply the method to several networks and present the results. We conclude the paper with summary and discussion in Sec. IV.

II. METHOD

Consider a weighted network G of N nodes. Connectivity of G can be represented with the weight matrix f_{ij} ; $j = 1, \dots, N$, where f_{ij} is a prescribed weight or strength of a link between nodes i and j if they are connected or $J_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. We assume that the weights are non-negative, $J_{ij} \geq 0$, and that the weights are symmetric, $J_{ij} = J_{ji}$. For an unweighted network, the matrix elements take the binary value 0 or 1, and the weight matrix reduces to the usual adjacency matrix.

The FRFIM on the network is defined with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_i B_i \sigma_i; \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma_i = \pm 1$ is the Ising spin variable at each node i . The spins interact ferromagnetically with the coupling strength $f_{ij} J_{ij}$. They are also coupled with the quenched random magnetic field B_i .

The FRFIM model has been studied extensively in dimensional regular lattices in order to investigate the nature of the glass phase transition (see Ref. [23] and references therein). It has also been studied to investigate the disorder-driven roughening transition of interfaces in disordered media [24]. The phase transition in the FRFIM on complex networks would also be interesting, which has not been studied so far. The issue will be studied elsewhere [25].

The specific feature of the FRFIM depends on the distribution of the random field B_i . In this work, we consider the simple yet informative magnetic field distribution given by

$$B_i = \begin{cases} +1 & , \text{for } i = s \\ -1 & , \text{for } i = t \\ 0 & , \text{for } i \notin \{s, t\} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

for certain two nodes s and t . It amounts to imposing the boundary condition that $\sigma_s = +1$ and $\sigma_t = -1$, which induces frustration among nodes. This specific random field distribution is adopted in order to mimic the conflict as in the Zachary network. In the ground state nodes are separated into different spin domains, which will be related to the community structure of the underlying network.




FIG. 1: Zachary karate club network. The links connecting nodes that are (not) in the same community are represented with solid (dashed) lines. The dotted lines separate the communities.

As an explicit example, we consider the Zachary karate club network which is illustrated in Fig. 1. The node labeled as 1 (34) corresponds to the club instructor (administrator). They had a conflict, which resulted in the breakup. Nodes in the side of the administrator and the instructor after the breakup are denoted with circular and rectangular symbols, respectively. With $J_{ij} = 1$ for all links and the magnetic field given by Eq. (2) with $s = 1$ and $t = 34$, one can study the FRFIM on the network. Solving the ground state problem, we found that it has the degenerate ground states: The black (white) nodes belong to the $+$ ($-$) spin domain in all ground states, while the gray nodes (3, 10, 29) may belong to either domain. Note that the spin domains almost coincide with the actual shape of the network after the breakup; all black (white) nodes are in the side of the administrator (instructor). The gray nodes are in the marginal state. It is reasonable to think that they do not belong to any community. In the previous work [10], the node 3 was misclassified. Our result hints that it is due to the marginality.

The example clearly shows that the FRFIM is useful in finding out the community structure. For general application, (i) one needs to know the ground state(s) of the FRFIM of Eq. (1) with the quenched random magnetic field given in Eq. (2) for any node pair of s and t . Then, one needs to identify the set of all nodes that belong to the same spin domain as s and t in all ground states. Those sets will be called the cliques and denoted by C_s and C_t , respectively. The number of nodes in the clique C will be called the clique size and denoted by $|C|$. (ii) More importantly, one needs to specify the node pair s and t which is relevant to the community structure. An arbitrary choice of s and t will not provide any information on the community structure. For example, if we take $s = 12$ and $t = 15$ in the Zachary network in Fig. 1, we obtain that $C_s = \{12\}$ and all other nodes are in C_t . This merely means that the node 12 is a peripheral node.

For (i), the ground state problem of the FRFIM can be

solved exactly with the help of a numerical combinatorial optimization algorithm (see Appendix). This is achieved by mapping the ground state problem onto the minimum cut problem or the maximum flow problem [26]. The algorithm allows us to find all ground states, with which we can find the cliques C_s and C_t for any pair of s and t . We explain the detailed procedure in Appendix.

For (ii), the community structure can be found from the distribution of the clique sizes for all pairs of s and t . For a certain pair of s and t , one may have that $|C_s|, |C_t| = O(1) \ll N$. It happens when s and t are peripheral nodes of the network; most nodes are not influenced by them. Such a pair does not provide any information on the community structure. One may have that $|C_s| = O(1) \ll |C_t| = O(N)$. This happens when s is a peripheral node while t is inside the bulk. The cliques C_s and C_t do not correspond to a community either. On the contrary, one may have that $O(1) \ll |C_s|, |C_t| = O(N)$. This happens only when there exist communities whose sizes are of the order of N , s and t are chosen among "influential" nodes in different communities. In this case, we will regard the cliques C_s and C_t as the communities in the network.

In order to distinguish the different cases, we define the "separability" D_{st} for a node pair s and t as the product of the clique sizes,

$$D_{st} = |C_s| |C_t|. \quad (3)$$

It ranges in the interval $1 \leq D_{st} \leq N^2=4$. We propose that the community structure be detected with the distribution of the separability D_{st} for all pairs of s and t . If $D_{st} = O(N)$ for all pairs of s and t , then we conclude that the network has no community structure. On the other hand, if $D_{st} = O(N^2)$ for a certain pair of s and t , then we conclude that the network consists of communities that can be identified from the cliques C_s and C_t . Moreover, the nodes s and t may be regarded as "influential" nodes of the communities. Therefore, in our method, the existence of the community structure is verified with the scaling behavior of the maximum value of the separability with the network size.

For a given network size N , the scaling can be examined with the quantity $\ln D_{st} = \ln N$. Without the community structure, it would be close to or much less than 1 for all node pairs. A node pair with $\ln D_{st} = \ln N > 1$ indicates the presence of the community structure.

III. RESULTS

We test the method by applying it to the Barabasi-Albert (BA) network [27], the Zachary karate club network [10], the scientific collaboration network [10], and the stock price correlation network [28]. In each network, the separability was calculated for all node pairs, and the separability distribution was examined with a so-called rank plot, where $[\ln D = \ln N]$ is plotted against a normalized rank of each node pair. The rank is assigned to each




FIG. 2: The rank plot for the separability distribution for the BA network (a), the Zachary karate club network (b), the scientific collaboration network (c), and the stock price correlation network (d).

node pair in the ascending order of the separability. It is then normalized so that the rank of the pair with the maximum value of the separability is equal to 1.

The BA network is an unweighted network. It is known that the BA network does not have a community structure. We grew a BA network of $N = 100$ nodes, and calculated the separability D_{st} for all node pairs. The separability distribution is presented with the rank plot in Fig. 2 (a). We find that the separability is clustered at $D_{st} = 1$ and near $D_{st} = N$ for all pairs of s and t , hence $\ln D_{st} = \ln N \approx 1$. This confirms that the BA network does not have the community structure (see Fig. 3 (a)), and demonstrates what the separability distribution looks like for networks without the community structure.

Next we study the separability distribution of the Zachary karate club network of $N = 34$ nodes, which is presented in Fig. 2 (b). We found that $D_{st} = N$ for all node pairs but (1;34) and (1;33). For the pairs $(s;t) = (1;33)$ and $(1;34)$, we obtained the same cliques, C_s of 15 nodes and C_t of 16 nodes, which are marked with the black and the white symbols in Fig. 1, respectively (see also Fig. 3 (b)). Therefore we can conclude that there exist two communities in the network and that the node 1 is an influential node of one community and the nodes 33 and 34 are of the other community. In fact the nodes 1 and 34 correspond to the club instructor and the administrator, respectively. The detected communities are in good agreement with the network shape after the breakup.

We also investigate the community structure of a larger and more complex network. We examine the unweighted collaboration network of $N = 118$ scientists in the Santa Fe Institute [10]. In this network, two nodes (scientists) are linked if they coauthored at least one article. The rank plot is presented in Fig. 2 (c). One can see that the separability is distributed broadly, which indicates that

the network has multiple (more than two) communities.

In such a case, the communities can be identified by applying our method hierarchically: First of all, one can find the node pair $(s_0; t_0)$ with the largest separability, and the corresponding cliques C_{s_0} and C_{t_0} . The clique may consist of a single community or be the union of several sub-communities. In order to investigate the sub-structure, one constructs the sub-network which consists of all nodes and links within each clique. Then, one can apply the method to the sub-networks. This can be performed hierarchically until a sub-network does not have the community structure any more. Or one may proceed with the iteration only when the subnetwork size is equal to or larger than a threshold value m . The resulting cliques can then be identified as communities up to a resolution m .

With the hierarchical application of our method, we find the community structure of the scientific collaboration network as shown in Fig. 3 (c). Here, we identify all communities whose size are equal to or larger than $m = 5$. The community structure is in good agreement with that found in Ref. [10].

Our method is also applicable to weighted networks. As an example of weighted networks, we study the economic network of 137 companies in the New York Stock Exchange market. The network is constructed through the stock price return correlation between the companies for the 21 year period from 1983 to 2003 [28]. With the stock price $P_i(t)$ of a company i at time t , the return is given by $R_i(t) = \ln P_i(t + \Delta t) - \ln P_i(t)$ with the unit time interval Δt taken to be one day. Then, the stock price correlation is given by

$$C_{ij} = \frac{\langle R_i(t) R_j(t) \rangle - \langle R_i(t) \rangle \langle R_j(t) \rangle}{\sqrt{(\langle R_i^2(t) \rangle - \langle R_i(t) \rangle^2)(\langle R_j^2(t) \rangle - \langle R_j(t) \rangle^2)}};$$

where the angular bracket indicates the time average over the period. Its value ranges in the interval $-1 \leq C_{ij} \leq 1$, and is large for strongly correlated company pairs. It has been shown that the structural information of the economic system is encoded in the correlation matrix C_{ij} [8, 29].

In order to apply our method, all weights are required to be non-negative. Hence, we assume that the weight is given by $J_{ij} = e^{a C_{ij}}$ with a positive constant a taken to be 20. The weights are positive for all pairs of nodes, and the economic network is fully connected. The separability distribution is shown in the rank plot in Fig. 2 (d). As in the collaboration network, there are several non-trivial separability levels. We identify all communities whose size is equal to or larger than 3 with the same hierarchical method as in the collaboration network. The resulting shape of the network is illustrated in Fig. 3 (d). We conclude that the communities are formed by companies in the same industrial sector. For example, the largest community consists of 13 companies in the energy sector. This study shows that our method works well for weighted networks. We note that many nodes (white




FIG. 3: (Color online) The community structure of (a) the BA model network ($N = 100$), (b) the Zachary karate club network ($N = 34$), (c) the scientific collaboration network ($N = 118$), and (d) the stock correlation network ($N = 137$). Nodes in different communities are distinguished with color. The white symbols represent the marginal nodes.

symbols) remain unclassified. We attribute it to the fully-connectedness of the network.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have proposed the method for finding out the community structure of general networks. It is achieved by studying the ground state problem of the FRFIM on the networks with the magnetic field distribution given in Eq. (2) for two arbitrary nodes s and t . The cliques C_s and C_t are defined as the sets of all nodes that belong to the same spin domains as s and t in all possible degenerate ground states, respectively. The community structure is then manifested in the clique pattern for the pair with the maximum value of the separability D_{st} defined in Eq. (3). Our method is motivated from the observation on the Zachary karate club network, which shows that the resulting shape of the network after breakup is determined by the underlying community structure. In our method, the response of the networks subject to schism is simulated with the FRFIM.

In our method one can verify the existence of the community structure of a given network with the scaling property of the separability: If the separability scales as $D_{st} \sim O(N)$ for all node pairs as in the BA network, the network does not have the community structure. On the other hand, if $D_{st} \sim O(N^2)$ for a certain pair of s and t , one can conclude that the network has the community structure and that the nodes s and t are in different communities. Another advantage of our method is that it can be applied to both unweighted and weighted networks. Figure 3 shows the performance of the method in real-world networks.

One of the weak points of our method is the time com-

plexity. Practically the ground state problem of the FRFIM in sparse networks of N nodes has the time complexity of $O(N^2)$ with $\gamma = 1/2$ [26]. Since one has to solve the ground state problems for all magnetic field distributions, the total time complexity scales as $O(N^{2+})$. Hence, in the practical sense, our method is limited to networks of up to a few thousands of nodes. One may avoid the time complexity problem if the important nodes are known a priori. In the network theory, importance of nodes can be measured by, e.g., the degree or the betweenness centrality. Hopefully the community structure of large networks can be studied if one incorporates such importance measure into our method.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Korea Research Foundation Grant (KRF-2003-003-C00091). JDN would like to thank KIAS for the hospitality during the visit.

*

APPENDIX A: MINIMUM CUT AND MAXIMUM FLOW PROBLEM

This Appendix is intended to introduce the combinatorial optimization algorithm solving the ground state problem of the FRFIM. For more rigorous description, we refer the readers to Ref. [26].

Consider a network G of N nodes with the symmetric weight matrix f_{ij} ($i, j = 1; \dots; N$). The ferromagnetic random field Ising model on G is defined by the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) with the quenched random magnetic field f_i . The ground state is the spin configuration that has the minimum energy among all 2^N configurations. One might find the ground state by enumerating all spin configurations, which is obviously time consuming and inefficient. We will explain the efficient way for solving the ground state problem.

It is useful to introduce a capacitated network denoted by G^0 : Having all nodes and links of G , G^0 contains two additional nodes S , called the source, and T , called the sink, and additional links between the source (sink) and the nodes with the positive (negative) magnetic field. G^0 is also a weighted network with the symmetric weight matrix c_{ij} ($i, j = S; T; 1; \dots; N$). For a link (ij) from the original network G , the weight is given by $c_{ij} = 2J_{ij}$. For the additional link the weight is given by $c_{Si} = B_i$ for all i with $B_i > 0$ and $c_{iT} = -B_i$ for all i with $B_i < 0$. The weight of the network G^0 is usually called the capacity. Figure 4 illustrates the relation between a network G of four nodes $a; b; c; d$ and the corresponding capacitated network G^0 .

In the capacitated network G^0 we define a ST -cut as a decomposition of all nodes into two disjoint sets S and T with $S \cap T = \emptyset$ and $S \cup T = V$. It will be denoted by $[S; T]$. For a given $[S; T]$, some links connect nodes in the different




FIG. 4: (a) A network G with 4 nodes (labeled circles) and 4 links (lines) for the FRFIM. Figures represent the magnetic fields and the interaction strengths, respectively. (b) The corresponding capacitated network G^0 with the link capacities. (c) The maximum flow configuration with $v^2 = 8$. The dotted lines represent saturated links with $x^2 = c$. The dashed lines X, Y , and Z represent boundaries associated with ST -cuts.

sets. The set of such links forms the boundary of the cut, which is denoted by $(S; T) = f([S; T] \setminus S; [S; T] \setminus T)$. The cut capacity $C[S; T]$ is then defined as the total sum of the capacity of the boundary links, that is,

$$C[S; T] = \sum_{(i,j) \in (S; T)} c_{ij} \quad (A1)$$

Figure 4 shows some examples of the cut. The boundary denoted by X is associated with a cut $[S; a; b; c; T; d]$, whose cut capacity is 14.

There exists one-to-one correspondence between the Ising spin configuration on the weighted network G and the cut $[S; T]$ of the capacitated network G^0 . It is achieved by assigning $s_i = +1$ (-1) for all nodes i in S (T) and vice versa. Hence, the sets S and T correspond to up and down spin domains, respectively, and the boundary $(S; T)$ corresponds to the spin domain wall. Furthermore, one can easily verify that the energy E of the FRFIM of a spin configuration f_i and the cut capacity $C[S; T]$ satisfy the relation

$$E(f_i) = C[S; T] + E_0 \quad (A2)$$

where $E_0 = \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} s_i s_j = \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} s_i s_j$. Therefore, solving the ground state of the FRFIM on G is equivalent to finding the optimal ST -cut on G^0 whose cut capacity is minimum. It is called the minimum cut problem.

The minimum cut problem can be further mapped on to the maximum flow problem: On the capacitated network G^0 , a flow is to denote a set of flow variables f_{ij} defined for all links in G^0 which are subject to a capacity constraint

$$0 \leq f_{ij} \leq c_{ij} \quad (A3)$$

and a mass balance constraint

$$\sum_{j \in V} f_{ij} - \sum_{j \in V} f_{ji} = v_i \quad (i \in S) \quad v_i \leq 0 \quad (i \in T) \quad (A4)$$

Here $\sum_{j \in V}$ means a sum over all adjacent nodes of i , δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker symbol, and v is a non-negative

parameter. The mass balance constraint allows us to interpret the flow g as a conserved flux configuration of a, e.g., fluid which is originated from the source S by the amount of v and targeted to the sink T through the network G^0 .

Due to the capacity constraint, there exists the upper bound in v , beyond which a flow satisfying Eqs. (A 3) and (A 4) does not exist. Then, the question that arises naturally is to find the maximum value v^* and the corresponding flow g^* that can be delivered. This is the maximum flow problem.

The celebrated max-flow/min-cut theorem of Ford and Fulkerson [30] states that for a given capacitated network G^0 , the maximum flow v^* is equal to the minimum cut capacity, that is to say,

$$v^* = \min_{[S;T]} C[S;T] : \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

The rigorous proof of the theorem can be found elsewhere [26]. Intuitively the theorem states that the maximum flow is limited by the bottleneck in the network whose capacity is given by the minimum cut capacity.

The maximum flow problem can be solved numerically in a polynomial time with the augmenting path algorithm or the pre-flow-push/relabel algorithm [26, 30]. In the augmenting path algorithm, one repeatedly searches for a path from S to T via unsaturated ($x^* < c$) links and updates g by augmenting flows along the path. When the augmenting path does not exist any more, the resulting flow corresponds to the maximum flow configuration. The pre-flow-push/relabel algorithm is a more sophisticated and efficient algorithm.

Once the maximum flow configuration g^* is found, the minimum cut is constructed easily. Let S_S be the set of all nodes of G^0 that can be reachable from the source S only through unsaturated ($x^* < c$) links. Trivially, S_S does not include the sink T , since there does not exist any augmenting path in the maximum flow configuration. Hence, the set S_S and its complement $\overline{S_S}$ defines a cut $[S_S; \overline{S_S}]$, which is indeed a minimum cut of G^0 .

One may find the minimum cut alternatively. Let T_T be the set of all nodes of G^0 that can be reachable from the sink T only through unsaturated links. Then, T_T and its complement $\overline{T_T}$ defines a cut $[\overline{T_T}; T_T]$, which is also

the minimum cut.

The two cuts $[S_S; \overline{S_S}]$ and $[\overline{T_T}; T_T]$ may be different, which implies that the corresponding FRFIM has degenerate ground states. In that case, all degenerate ground states can be found systematically [26]. In this work, we are interested in the spins that are fixed in all ground states. One can easily verify that all nodes $i \in S_S$ (T_T) except for S (T) are in the spin state $s_i = +1$ (-1) in all ground states. The other nodes $j \notin S_S$ and T_T may be in either state $s_j = \pm 1$.

We provide an example illustrating the mapping between the FRFIM and the maximum flow or the minimum cut problem in Fig. 4. The maximum flow configuration is depicted in Fig. 4 (c) with the maximum flow $v^* = 8$. The links drawn with dotted lines are saturated ($x^* = c$). The sets of all nodes that are reachable from S and T through unsaturated links are given by $S_S = \{f, s, a, g\}$ and $T_T = \{f, t, b, d, g\}$. They yield the minimum cuts $[S_S; \overline{S_S}]$ and $[\overline{T_T}; T_T]$ whose boundaries are Y and Z , respectively. Hence, one finds that $s_a = +1$ and $s_b = s_d = -1$ in all degenerate ground states. The node c does not belong to neither S_S nor T_T . Hence s_c may be either $+1$ or -1 .

In the present work, we consider the FRFIM on a weighted network G with the specific magnetic field distribution given in Eq. (2) for a certain node pairs s and t . Then, we need to find the clique C_s (C_t) of s (t) which is the set of all nodes that are in the same spin state as s (t) in the ground state. We summarize the method to find the cliques:

1. Construct the capacitated network G^0 .
2. Find the maximum flow configuration g^* using the numerical algorithms.
3. Find the set S_S (T_T) of all nodes that are reachable from S (T) through unsaturated links with $x^* < c$.
4. Then, the cliques are given by $C_s = S_S - \{f, s, g\}$ and $C_t = T_T - \{f, t, g\}$.

After finding the cliques, the community structure can be investigated with the method explained in Sec. II.

[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] M.E.J. Newman, *SIAM Rev.* **45**, 167 (2003).
[4] H. Jeong, B. Tombor, R. Albert, Z.N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabasi, *Nature (London)* **407**, 651 (2000).
[5] P. Holme, M. Huss, and H. Jeong, *Bioinformatics* **19**, 532 (2003).
[6] D.W. Wilkinson and B.A. Huberman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **101**, 5241 (2004).

[7] E. Ravasz, A.L. Somera, D.A. Malmgren, Z.N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabasi, *Science* **297**, 1551 (2002); E. Ravasz and A.-L. Barabasi, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 026112 (2003).
[8] R.N. Mantegna, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **11**, 193 (1999); G. Bonanno, G. Caldarelli, F. Lillo, and R.N. Mantegna, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 046130 (2003).
[9] J.-P. Onnela, A. Chakraborti, K. Kaski, J. Kertesz, and A. Kanto, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 056110 (2003).
[10] M. Girvan and M.E.J. Newman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **99**, 7821 (2002).
[11] M.E.J. Newman, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **38**, 321 (2004).

