

Enhance synchronizability by structural perturbations

Ming Zhao*, Tao Zhou*, Bing-Hong Wang,[†] and Wen-Xu Wang

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

(Dated: October 3, 2018)

In this paper, we investigate the collective synchronization of system of coupled oscillators on Barabási-Albert scale-free network. We propose an approach of structural perturbations aiming at those nodes with maximal betweenness. This method can markedly enhance the network synchronizability, and is easy to be realized. The simulation results show that the eigenratio will sharply decrease to its half when only 0.6% of those hub nodes are under 3-division processes when network size $N = 2000$. In addition, the present study also provides a theoretical evidence that the maximal betweenness plays a main role in network synchronization.

PACS numbers: 89.75.-k, 05.45.Xt

I. INTRODUCTION

Many social, biological and communication systems can be properly described as complex networks with nodes representing individuals or organizations and edges mimicking the interactions among them[1, 2, 3]. One of the ultimate goals of the current studies on topological structure of networks is to understand and explain the workings of systems built upon those networks: for instance, to understand how the topology of Internet affects the spread of computer virus[4, 5, 6], how the structure of power grids affects the cascading behavior[7, 8, 9], how the connecting pattern of intercommunication networks affects traffic dynamics[10, 11, 12], and so on.

In the past few years, with the computerization of data acquisition process and the availability of high computing powers, scientists have found that many real-life networks share some common statistic characteristics, the most important of which are called small-world effect[13, 14] and scale-free property[15]. The recognition of small-world effect involves two facts, small average distance[16](as $L \sim \ln N$, where N is the number of nodes in the network) and large clustering coefficient[17]. The number of edges incident from a node x is called the degree of x . The scale-free property means the degree distribution of the network obeys power-law form, that is $p(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$, where k is the degree and $p(k)$ is the probability density function for the degree distribution. γ is called the power-law exponent, and usually between 2 and 3 in real world[1, 2, 3]. This power-law distribution falls off much more gradually than an exponential one, allowing for a few nodes of very large degree to exist. Networks with power-law degree distribution are referred to as scale-free networks, although one can and usually does have scales present in other network properties.

Synchronization is observed in a variety of natural, so-

cial, physical and biological systems[18, 19, 20, 21]. To understand how the network structure affects the synchronizability of the network is of not only theoretical interest, but also practical value. There are many previous studies about collective synchronization, with a basic assumption that the dynamic system of coupled oscillators evolves either on regular networks[22, 23, 24], or on random ones[25, 26]. Very recently, scientist focus on synchronization on complex networks, and find that the networks of small-world effect and scale-free property may be easier to synchronize than regular lattices[27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32].

Since there are countless topological characters for networks, a natural question is addressed: what is the most important factor by which the synchronizability of the networks is mainly determined? some previous works indicated the average distance L is one of the key factors, the smaller L will lead to better synchronizability[28, 29, 31]. Other researchers focus on the role degree heterogeneity plays. They found greater heterogeneity will result in poorer synchronizability, and demonstrated that the maximal betweenness[33, 34] B_{\max} may be a proper quantity to estimate the network synchronizability. With smaller B_{\max} , the network synchronizability will be better[35, 36]. However, the above results and conclusions are still debated.

In this paper, we investigate the collective synchronization of system of coupled oscillators on Barabási-Albert scale-free networks(BA networks for short)[15]. We propose an approach of structural perturbations, which can markedly enhance the network synchronizability, and is easy to be realized. It also provides a theoretical evidence that the maximal betweenness plays a main role in network synchronization.

This paper is organized as follow: in section 2, the conception of synchronizability will be briefly introduced. In section 3, we will describe the approach of structural perturbations. Next, the simulation results will be given. Finally, in section 5, the conclusion is drawn, and the relevance of this approach to some real-life problems is discussed.

*They contributed equally to this work.

[†]Electronic address: bhwang@ustc.edu.cn




FIG. 1: The sketch maps for 3-division process on x_0 . The solid circle in left side is the node x_0 with degree 6. After 3-division process, the x_0 is divided into 3 nodes x_0, x_1 and x_2 that are fully connected. The six edges incident from x_0 redistribute over these three nodes.

II. SYNCHRONIZABILITY

We introduce a generic model of coupled oscillators on networks and the master stability function[37], which is often used to test the stability of the complete synchronized states.

Each node of a network is located an oscillator, a link connecting two nodes represents coupling between the two oscillators. The state of the i th oscillator is described by \mathbf{x}^i , we get the set of equations of motion governing the dynamics of the N coupled oscillators:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}^i = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^i) + \sigma \sum_{j=1}^N G_{ij} \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}^j), \quad (1)$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^i = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^i)$ governs the dynamics of individual oscillator, $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}^j)$ is the output function and σ the coupling strength. The $N \times N$ coupling matrix \mathbf{G} is given by

$$G_{ij} = \begin{cases} -k_i & \text{for } i = j \\ 1 & \text{for } j \in \Lambda_i. \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

All the eigenvalues of matrix \mathbf{G} are nonpositive reals because \mathbf{G} are negative semidefinite, and the biggest eigenvalue γ_0 is always zero because the rows of \mathbf{G} have zero sum. Thus, the eigenvalues can be ranked as $\gamma_0 > \gamma_1 > \dots > \gamma_{N-1}$, and the synchronization manifold is an invariant manifold, that is, the fully synchronized state: $\mathbf{x}^1 = \mathbf{x}^2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}^N = \mathbf{s}$ satisfies $\dot{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{s})$.

Let ξ^i be the variation on the i th node, and the collection of variation is $\xi = (\xi^1, \xi^2, \dots, \xi^N)$, we get the variational equation of (1)

$$\dot{\xi} = [\mathbf{1}_N \otimes \mathbf{DF} + \sigma \mathbf{G} \otimes \mathbf{DH}] \xi. \quad (3)$$

Diagonalizing \mathbf{G} in the second term of (3), a block diagonalized variational equation is obtained and each block has the form

$$\dot{\xi}_k = [\mathbf{DF} + \sigma \gamma_k \mathbf{DH}] \xi_k, \quad (4)$$

where D denotes the Jacobian matrix, γ_k is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{G} , $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$. $k = 0$ corresponds to the

mode that is parallel to the synchronization manifold. Let $\alpha = \sigma \gamma_k$, rewrite (4) as

$$\dot{\zeta} = [\mathbf{DF} + \alpha \mathbf{DH}] \zeta. \quad (5)$$

Since \mathbf{DF} and \mathbf{DH} are the same for each block, the largest Lyapunov exponent λ_{\max} of Equ. (5) only depends on α . The function $\lambda_{\max}(\alpha)$ is named master stability function, whose sign indicates the stability of the mode: the synchronized state is stable if $\lambda_{\max}(\alpha) < 0$ for all blocks.

For many dynamical systems, the master stability function is negative in a single, finite interval (α_1, α_2) the largest Lyapunov exponent is negative[38]. Therefore, the network is synchronizable for some σ when the eigenratio $r = \gamma_{N-1}/\gamma_1$ satisfies

$$r < \alpha_2/\alpha_1 \quad (6)$$

The right-hand side of this equation depends only on the dynamics of individual oscillator and the output function, while the eigenratio r depends only on the coupling matrix \mathbf{G} . The problem of synchronization is then divided into two parts: choosing suitable parameters of dynamics to broaden the interval (α_1, α_2) and the analysis of eigenratio of the coupling matrix. The eigenratio r of coupling matrix indicates the synchronizability of the network, the smaller it is the better the synchronizability and vice versa. In this paper, for universality, we will not address a particular dynamical system, but concentrate on how the network topology affects eigenratio r .

III. STRUCTURAL PERTURBATIONS

As mentioned above, the nodes with very large betweenness, namely hubs, may reduce the network synchronizability. So the present method of structural perturbations aims at these hubs. For a hub x_0 , we add $m-1$ assistant nodes around it, labelled by x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-1} . These m nodes are fully connected. Then, all the edges incident from x_0 will relink to a random picked node $x_i (i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1)$. After this process, the betweenness of x_0 is divided into m almost equal parts associating with those m nodes. We call this process m -division for short. A sketch map of a 3-division process on node x_0 is shown in Fig. 1.

Due to the huge size of many real-life networks, it is usually impossible to obtain the nodes' betweenness. Fortunately, previous studies showed that there exists strongly positive correlation between degree and betweenness in BA networks and some other real heterogeneity networks[39, 40], that is to say, the node with larger degree will statistically have higher betweenness. Therefore, for practical reason, we assume the node with higher betweenness is surely of larger degree in BA networks. So hereinafter, all the judgements and operations are based on the degree of nodes.

In order to enhance the network synchronizability, a few nodes with highest degree will be divided. Rank




FIG. 2: Behavior of the ratio of the eigenratio of network $G(N\rho, m)$ to that of network G versus the number of divided nodes. As the number increases, the ratio is shown to reduce, leading to better synchronization. The average is taken over 50 different network realizations.

each node of a give network G according to its degree, the node that has highest degree is arranged in the top of the queue. Then, the network $G(\rho, m)$ can be obtained by the following $N\rho$ steps. First, carry out m -division on the top node in G , leading to the network $G(\frac{1}{N}, m)$. secondly, calculate all nodes' degree in $G(\frac{1}{N}, m)$, and rank each node according to it. Then, get the network $G(\frac{2}{N}, m)$ by dividing the top node in $G(\frac{1}{N}, m)$. Repeat this process $N\rho$ times, with $N\rho$ nodes have been divided in total, one will reach the network $G(\rho, m)$. Since the randomness is involved in dividing process, $G(\rho, m)$ is not unique. In this letter, we focus on the difference between $G(\rho, m)$ and G .

IV. SIMULATIONS

To explore how the structural perturbations affect network synchronizability, we compare the eigenratio r before and after dividing processes. The BA networks of size $N = 2000$ and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 12$ are used for simulations. In Fig. 2, we report the ratio $R = r'/r$ against the number of nodes that are divided, where r is the eigenratio of the original network and r' after the operation. Here we set $m = 3$. With the probability ρ or the number of divided nodes increasing, the ratio R is observed to decrease, indicating the enhancement of synchronizability. In Fig.2, it can be seen that to divide a very few nodes will sharply enhance the network synchronizability. R decreases to 0.7 when only 5 nodes are divided, and will drop to half after 0.6% nodes (i.e. 12 nodes) are divided. To better understand the underlying mechanism of synchronization and the reason why




FIG. 3: The average distance L' and maximal degree k'_{\max} in $G(\rho, m)$ vs ρ . L and k_{\max} denote the average distance and maximal degree in original network G . We plot the relative changes $\frac{L'}{L}$ and $\frac{k'_{\max}}{k_{\max}}$ using squares and circles, respectively. One could see clearly, the dividing processes reduce the maximal degree while increase the average distance. All the data are obtained by the average over 20 independent runs.

these structural perturbations will greatly enhance network synchronizability, we investigate the behaviors of two extensively studied quantities, the average distance L and maximal degree k_{\max} . In BA networks, the node with maximal degree is most probably the very node having maximal betweenness. As illustrated in Fig. 3, L will increase with ρ , while k_{\max} will decrease. This results provide some evidences how the two factors affect the synchronization of systems. The maximal degree(i.e. the maximal betweenness) may play the main role in determining network synchronizability. It is worthwhile to emphasize that from the simulation results, we can not say anything about how the average distance affects the network synchronizability. L varies slightly, and probably has nonsignificant influence compared with the change of k_{\max} . This results suggest that to reduce the maximal betweenness of networks is a practical and effective approach to enhance the network synchronizability.

V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Motivated by the practical requirement and theoretical interest, numbers of scientists begin to study how to enhance the network synchronizability, especially for scale-free networks[41, 42]. These methods keep the network topology unchanged, while add some weight into the system, thus the coupling matrix is changed. These excellent works do not need any new nodes, new edges or rewiring, but highly enhance the network synchronizability. However, it may require more intelligent system, in which

each node at least should remember its particular linking strengths. In this paper, we propose an approach to enhance the network synchronizability. This approach does not require any intelligence of nodes, but the network structure will be slightly changed. In some real-life communication networks such as Internet, the long length edge may cost much more than node and short length edge[43, 44], so if all the nodes x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-1} are in x_0 's vicinal locations, our method is feasible.

Some recent works about network traffic dynamics reveal that the communication ability of network, called network throughput[11, 12], is mainly determined by the maximal betweenness, thus to steer clear of those hub nodes may enhance the network throughput[12, 45]. This is just the case of network synchronization. Some method that can enhance the network throughput will enhance

the network synchronizability too[11, 41, 42, 45]. Therefore, we guess there may exist some common features between network traffic and network synchronization, although they seem completely irrelevant. We believe our work will enlighten readers on this object, and is also relevance to traffic control on networks.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 10472116, 70471033 and 70271070, and the Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education (SRFDP No.20020358009).

-
- [1] R. Albert and A. -L. Barabási, *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 Review* **45**, 167(2003).
- [4] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3200(2001).
- [5] G. Yan, T. Zhou, J. Wang, Z. -Q. Fu and B. -H. Wang, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **22**, 510(2005).
- [6] T. Zhou, G. Yan and B. -H. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 046141(2005).
- [7] A. E. Motter and Y. -C. Lai, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 065102(2002).
- [8] K. -I. Goh, D. -S. Lee, B. Kahng and D. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 148701(2003).
- [9] T. Zhou and B. -H. Wang, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **22**, 1072(2005).
- [10] B. Tadić, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 036102(2004).
- [11] L. Zhao, Y. -C. Lai, K. Park and N. Ye, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 026125(2005).
- [12] G. Yan, T. Zhou, B. Hu, Z. -Q. Fu and B. -H. Wang, arXiv: cond-mat/0505366.
- [13] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, *Nature* **393**, 440(1998).
- [14] C. -P. Zhu, S. -J. Xiong, Y. -J. Tian, N. Li and K. -S. Jiang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 218702(2004).
- [15] A. -L. Barabási and R. Albert, *Science* **286**, 509(1999).
- [16] In a network, the distance between two nodes is defined as the number of edges along the shortest path connecting them. The average distance L of the network, then, is defined as the mean distance between two nodes, averaged over all pairs of nodes.
- [17] The clustering coefficient C denotes the probability that randomly picked two neighbors of a random selected node are neighbors.
- [18] S. H. Strogatz and I. Stewart, *Sci. Am.* **269**, 102(1993).
- [19] C. M. Gray, *J. Comput. Neurosci.* **1**, 11(1994).
- [20] L. Glass, *Nature*, **410**, 277(2001).
- [21] Z. Neda, E. Ravasz, T. Vicsek, A. L. Barabási, *Phys. Rev. E* **61**, 6987(2000).
- [22] J. F. Heagy, T. L. Carroll and L. M. Pecora, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 1874(1994).
- [23] C. W. Wu and L. O. Chua, *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I* **42**, 430(1995).
- [24] J. Jost and M. P. Joy, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 016201(2001).
- [25] P. M. Gade, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 64(1996).
- [26] S. C. Manrubia and A. S. Mikhailov, *Phys. Rev. E* **60**, 1579(1999).
- [27] L. F. Lago-Fernndez, R. Huerta, F. Corbacho, and J. A. Siguenza, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2758 (2000).
- [28] P. M. Gade and C. -K. Hu, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 6409 (2000).
- [29] X. F. Wang and G. Chen, *Int. J. Bifurcation Chaos Appl. Sci. Eng.* **12**, 187(2002).
- [30] P. -Q. Jiang, B. -H. Wang, S. -L. Bu, Q. -H. Xia, and X. -S. Luo. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **18**, 2674(2004).
- [31] M. Barahona and L. M. Pecora, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 054101(2002).
- [32] P. G. Lind, J. A. C. Gallas, and H. J. Herrmann, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 056207 (2004).
- [33] The betweenness of a given node denotes the probability that a shortest path with random source and destination will pass through this node. One would see ref. [34] for details.
- [34] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 016131(2001).
- [35] T. Nishikawa, A. E. Motter, Y. -C. Lai, and F. C. Hoppensteadt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 014101(2003).
- [36] H. Hong, B. J. Kim, M. Y. Choi, and H. Park, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 067105(2004).
- [37] L. M. Pecora and T. L. Carroll, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2109(1998).
- [38] G. Hu, J. Yang, and W. Liu, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 4440(1998).
- [39] K. -I. Goh, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 278701(2001).
- [40] M. Barthélemy, *Euro. Phys. J. B* **38**, 163(2004).
- [41] A. E. Motter, C. Zhou, and J. Kurths, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 016116(2005).
- [42] M. Chavez, D. -U. Hwang, A. Amann, H. G. E. Hentschel, and Boccaletti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 218701(2005).
- [43] B. Waxman, *IEEE J. Selec. Areas Commun.* **6**, 1617(1998).
- [44] S. -H. Yook, H. Jeong, and A. -L. Barabási, *PNAS* **99**, 13382(2002).
- [45] C. -Y. Yin, B. -H. Wang, W. -X. Wang, T. Zhou, and H. -J. Yang, arXiv: physics/0506204.