

Mutual Information Measure for Glass Ceiling Effect in Preferential Attachment Models

Rui Luo, Buddhika Nettasinghe, and Vikram Krishnamurthy, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—We propose a new way to measure inequalities such as the glass ceiling effect in attributed networks. Existing measures typically rely solely on node degree distribution or degree assortativity, but our approach goes beyond these measures by using mutual information (based on Shannon and more generally, Rényi entropy) between the conditional probability distributions of node attributes given node degrees of adjacent nodes. We show that this mutual information measure aligns with both the analytical structural inequality model and historical publication data, making it a reliable approach to capture the complexities of attributed networks. Specifically, we demonstrate this through an analysis of citation networks. Moreover, we propose a stochastic optimization algorithm using a parameterized conditional logit model for edge addition, which outperforms a baseline uniform distribution. By recommending links at random using this algorithm, we can mitigate the glass ceiling effect, which is a crucial tool in addressing structural inequalities in networks.

Index Terms—Glass ceiling effect, Rényi entropy, mutual information, assortativity, homophily, Directed Mixed Preferential Attachment model, citation network.



1 INTRODUCTION

The glass ceiling effect is a hidden barrier that keeps certain groups of people from attaining positions of influence. Social networks are an important area where the glass ceiling effect arises. For instance, faculty hiring networks have been used to examine inequality and hierarchical structure in university prestige and gender [1]. Coauthorship of articles enables us to examine how researchers collaborate and what factors have the strongest impact on that collaboration [2]. A study on citation networks has shown the structural inequality that restricts the research impact of scientists from certain groups [3]. Female researchers tend to be underappreciated in that their publications are published in less esteemed journals [4] and tend to receive fewer citations [5].

In this paper, we use the mutual information measure (based on Shannon entropy and more generally Rényi entropy) to quantify the glass ceiling effect within an attributed network. Specifically, we show that the mutual information between the conditional probabilities of two nodes connected by a randomly chosen link offers valuable insights into the reduction of uncertainty between the attributes of the nodes, given their degrees. Here the conditional probability refers to the probability of observing specific attribute values for a node given its degree. This

measure aptly reflects the complex dependencies in an attributed network and allows us to identify the presence of structural inequality. It helps identify whether a node's demographic traits, such as gender, have an impact on the recognition or attention she receives within the network.

Compared to other approaches for quantifying network inequality (reviewed below), the proposed mutual information measure offers the following advantages:

- It captures general dependencies across the entire degree distribution, as opposed to degree assortativity which only accounts for linear relationships.
- Additionally, it enables a computationally efficient optimization algorithm by transforming the discrete optimization into a stochastic optimization over the probability space of edge addition.

As a result, the proposed method is useful both analytically and computationally.

Main Results and Organization:

(1) Section 2 introduces the mutual information as a measure that quantifies the information related to node attributes in an attributed network. In Section 2.2, we propose a computationally efficient algorithm that uses a joint degree and attribute matrix (JDAM) to compute mutual information.

(2) In Section 2.3, we justify the usefulness of mutual information in measuring network inequality. We show that mutual information outperforms both homophily and degree assortativity in capturing the information related to node attributes of a network using sample graphs. Furthermore, we use simulations to illustrate that the mutual information with Rényi entropy of order $\alpha = 1.3$ is the most expressive in terms of capturing the node attribute information.

(3) The mutual information measure (based on Shannon or more generally Rényi entropy) is not a submodular function

- R. Luo is with the Sibley School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14850.
E-mail: rl828@cornell.edu
- B. Nettasinghe is with Tippie College of Business, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242.
E-mail: buddhika-nettasinghe@uiowa.edu
- V. Krishnamurthy is with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14850.
E-mail: vikramk@cornell.edu
- This research was supported in part by the U. S. Army Research Office under grant W911NF-21-1-0093, and the National Science Foundation under grant CCF-2112457.

with respect to adding edges, thus a discrete optimization for individual edges is intractable. In Section 3, we relax the problem into a stochastic optimization over the space of probability mass functions of adding edges. The resulting conditional logit model offers recommendations for links that will enhance network inequality.

(4) Section 4 uses simulations of a Directed Mixed Preferential Attachment (DMPA) model together with real-world citation networks from various fields to show how mutual information quantifies gender-based glass ceiling effect in the research community.

Related Works:

(1) *Discrete choice in networks.* A collection of studies [6], [7], [8] examine the network formation process through the lens of discrete choice theory. Analysis of network inequality can result from the factors that influence decision-making. Overgoor et al. [6] described the network growth as a discrete choice for each node to form edges with others. They used the multinomial logit (MNL) model, which encompasses a variety of network features like preferential attachment and homophily, to describe the likelihood of selecting each alternative. Gupta and Porter [8] presented repeated-choice (RC) model to study network formation. The RC model relaxes certain limitations of the MNL model, such as the assumption that each node makes exactly one choice and shares the choice set. To account for effects the degree and attribute assortativity has on the network formation, Sadler [9] devised a diffusion game in which each node choose whether to adopt a new behavior. To show how the new behavior diffused, they used a branching process on a random network with nodes drawn based on a configuration model.

(2) *Glass ceiling effect in networks.* Various discrete-time network models [3], [10], [11] have been proposed to depict the dynamics of the glass ceiling effect. In our study, the proposed mutual information is computed based on each network snapshot, which depicts the evolution of the glass ceiling effect over time and is well suited to existing models. Avin et al. [10] proposed a preferential attachment model of undirected networks for the glass ceiling effect, where preferential attachment, homophily, and minorities are necessary and sufficient conditions for the emergence of glass ceiling effect. Nettasinghe et al. [3], [11] devised the Directed Mixed Preferential Attachment (DMPA) model, which incorporates directed preferential attachment and homophily into the growth dynamics of a directed graph that contains a minority and a majority. They analyzed the in-degree and out-degree distributions of the minority and majority groups under the DMPA model. The DMPA model explores the glass ceiling effect via the interplay between the structure and dynamics of directed networks.

2 MUTUAL INFORMATION OF ATTRIBUTED NETWORKS

This section begins by introducing the key concepts of attributed networks, remaining degree distribution, and the joint remaining degree distribution of adjacent nodes, which are essential for defining the information content of a network. We then propose the mutual information, that incorporates node attributes to measure the information




Fig. 1. We display the degrees d , the remaining degrees q , and the node attributes c of two connected nodes v_i and v_j in an attributed network. The remaining degree and the joint remaining degree follow the distribution q_k (1) and $e_{kk'}$, respectively. The degree assortativity of the network is defined in (10), whereas the network's mutual information based on the remaining degree distribution is defined in (4).

content of an attributed network. We then introduce an extension of mutual information, mutual information, and demonstrate its superior correlation coefficient with node attribute assortativity. This analysis offers critical insights into the role of node attributes in network edge formation and emphasizes the importance of incorporating these attributes into network inequality analysis. Our proposed mutual information measure provides a valuable tool for assessing the impact of node attributes on network structure and can aid in mitigating structural inequalities in networks.

2.1 Definition of an Attributed Network

We define an attributed network as a labeled undirected multigraph $G = (V, E, w, C)$, where $V = \{v_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ is the set of n authors; $E = \{\{v_i, v_j\}\}$ is the set of undirected edges¹ between nodes; $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ denote the edge multiplicities, each representing the number of times that the two nodes have interacted with each other; $C = \{c_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ assign a binary label $c_i \in \{+1, -1\}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ to each node based on a demographic attribute such as gender². The degree of a node v_i is the sum of the multiplicities of the edges attached to it: $d_i = \sum_{\{v_i, v_j\} \in E} w(\{v_i, v_j\})$. The degree distribution is defined as $(p_k)_{k=1, \dots, k_{\max}}$ where p_k denotes the probability that a randomly chosen node in the graph will have degree k . We are interested here in the remaining degree distribution [12] defined as

$$q_k = \frac{(k+1)p_{k+1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{k_{\max}} j p_j}, k \in \{0, \dots, k_{\max} - 1\}. \quad (1)$$

which quantifies the distribution of the number of edges leaving one node other than the edge that we arrived along.

We now define $e_{kk'}$ to be the joint probability distribution of the remaining degrees of the two nodes at either end of a randomly chosen edge. This quantity is symmetric in that $e_{kk'} = e_{k'k}$ and it obeys the sum rules $\sum_k e_{kk'} = 1$ and $\sum_k e_{kk'} = q_{k'}$ [12].

We also define the attribute distribution as $m(c)$, $c \in \{+1, -1\}$. The joint distribution of the attributes of two nodes incident to an edge is $m(c, c')$, $c, c' \in \{+1, -1\}$.

1. We ignore the edge direction for expositional simplicity in defining the JDAM (Section 2.2) and assortativity (Section 2.3).

2. We can do the partition based on other attributes as well in citation networks, such as the prestige of authors' institutional affiliation [3] and the majority/minority identity.

Figure 1 shows the statistics of a pair of nodes connected by an edge.

2.2 Information Content of an Attributed Network

In this subsection, we define the information content of attributed networks, where network degree information is publicly available, such as the number of citations an author has. However, node attributes, such as gender, research area, or academic rank, may not be entirely determined by node degrees. To address this, we introduce the mutual information framework, which quantifies the reduction in uncertainty in node attributes relative to node degrees.

2.2.1 Shannon Mutual Information

The Shannon entropy³ of a network with respect to (1) is defined as:

$$H(q) = - \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} q_k \log(q_k) \quad (2)$$

which quantifies the heterogeneity of the network's degree distribution.

Furthermore, the network's information content [13] (also referred to as information transfer in [14]) can be determined by considering the remaining degree distribution q' of the node at the other end of a randomly chosen link. Specifically, the information content is defined as:

$$I(q; q') = H(q) - H(q|q'), \quad (3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H(q|q') &= \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} q_{k'} \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \pi_{k|k'} \log \frac{1}{\pi_{k|k'}} \\ &= \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} e_{kk'} \log \frac{q_{k'}}{e_{kk'}} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

is the conditional entropy defined via conditional probabilities $\pi_{k|k'} = \frac{e_{kk'}}{q_{k'}}$ of observing a node with k edges leaving it provided that the node at the other end of the chosen edge has k' leaving edges. In information-theoretic terms, $H(q|q')$ is equivocation (non-assortativity) between q and q' , i.e., the assortative noise within the network's information channel [15].

Given the entropy and the conditional entropy, the information content (3) can be expressed as

$$I(q; q') = \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} e_{kk'} \log \frac{e_{kk'}}{q_k q_{k'}} \quad (5)$$

which measures the amount of network degree correlations, i.e., the information of an author's degree conveyed by degrees of authors she cites.

2.2.2 Rényi Mutual Information

The Rényi entropy [16], [17] is a generalization of Shannon entropy and has many applications in fields such as unsupervised learning, source adaptation, and image registra-




Fig. 2. On the left, we show a citation network where the red circles represent male authors and blue triangles represent female authors, i.e., $c_1 = c_2 = c_3 = m, c_4 = c_5 = f$. On the right, the corresponding joint degree and attribute matrix (JDAM) (9) is displayed, which is used to compute the information content (3) and the mutual information (10).

tion. The Rényi entropy of order α is defined as follows for the node remaining degree distribution q :

$$H_\alpha(q) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} q_k^\alpha \right),$$

where $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\alpha \neq 1$. The limiting value of H_α as $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ is the Shannon entropy (2). The conditional Rényi entropy (4) is defined following $H_\alpha(q|q') = H_\alpha(q, q') - H_\alpha(q')$:

$$H_\alpha(q|q') = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\frac{\sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} e_{kk'}^\alpha}{\sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} q_{k'}^\alpha} \right)$$

Replacing the Shannon entropy in the definition of mutual information (3) by the Rényi entropy, one obtains the Rényi mutual information:

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(q; q') &= H_\alpha(q) - H_\alpha(q|q') \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} q_k^\alpha \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} q_{k'}^\alpha}{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} e_{kk'}^\alpha} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now taking the node attributes into account, we define the joint mutual information as

$$I_\alpha(q, m; q', m') = H_\alpha(q, m) - H_\alpha(q, m|q', m'),$$

which is the mutual information between the two bivariate variables (q, m) and (q', m') that stand for the degrees and the attributes of a pair of two adjacent nodes. It can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(q, m; q', m') &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} p(k, c)^\alpha p(k', c')^\alpha}{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} p(k, c, k', c')^\alpha} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The proposed mutual information measure is defined as the conditional mutual information of the attributes of neighboring nodes given the degrees of the nodes

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha &= I_\alpha(m|q; m'|q') \\ &= I_\alpha(q, m; q', m') - I_\alpha(q; q'), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which the mutual information is specifically defined between the conditional probability distributions of node at-

3. We assume logarithm to base 2 throughout the paper.

tributes given node degrees of adjacent nodes.

We can rewrite (6) as

$$I_\alpha = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} e_{kk'}^\alpha p(k, c)^\alpha p(k', c')^\alpha}{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} q_k^\alpha q_{k'}^\alpha p(k, c, k', c')^\alpha} \right) \quad (7)$$

The Shannon mutual information is the special case of (7) when $\alpha \rightarrow 1$:

$$I = \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} \left(p(k, k', c, c') \log \frac{q_k q_{k'} p(k, k', c, c')}{e_{kk'} p(k, c) p(k', c')} \right) \quad (8)$$

I_α quantifies the increase in information content of an attributed network due to the inclusion of node attributes. In other words, I_α provides insight into the additional information that node attributes can offer beyond what can be explained by degree assortativity alone, thereby enabling a more accurate assessment of the underlying network inequality and glass ceiling effect.

To visualize I_α for a network, we first define the degree-attribute group $B_{kc} = \{v_i | q_i = k, c_i = c\}$ as the set of nodes that have degree k and attribute c . There are at most $2k_{\max}$ degree-attribute groups, corresponding to each possible combination of degree and attribute values. Following [18], we define the joint degree and attribute matrix (JDAM) as the number of edges connecting nodes in different degree-attribute groups (k, c) and (k', c') :

$$\text{JDAM}((k, c), (k', c')) = \sum_{\substack{i: q_i=k \\ c_i=c}} \sum_{\substack{j: q_j=k' \\ c_j=c'}} w(\{v_i, v_j\}), \quad (9)$$

which capture the co-occurrence of the degrees and node attributes, and the entry in the normalized (normalized to sum 1) $\hat{\text{JDAM}}$ is $p(k, k', c, c')$. Figure 2 shows an example citation network and its corresponding JDAM.

If we group the rows of different node attributes by node degree, we can get the joint degree distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{kk'} &\propto \text{JDAM}(k, k') \\ &= \sum_{i: q_i=k} \sum_{j: q_j=k'} w(\{v_i, v_j\}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} \text{JDAM}((k, c), (k', c')) \end{aligned}$$

The normalized version of JDAM can be represented as $\hat{\text{JDAM}}(k, k') = e_{kk'}$. Using $\hat{\text{JDAM}}$, I_α (7) can be computed




Fig. 3. Simulations on stochastic block models (Section 2.2.3) suggest that the Rényi mutual information of order $\alpha = 1.3$ exhibits the highest correlation coefficient r with $|\gamma_{\text{att}}|$. This finding provides insight on the optimal order α of Rényi mutual information that effectively captures node attribute information. Such an optimized choice of α will be incorporated into our optimization approach in Section 3.

as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha &= \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} \text{JDAM}(k, k')^\alpha}{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} \text{JDAM}(k, c)^\alpha \text{JDAM}(k', c')^\alpha} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\frac{\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} \text{JDAM}(k, k', c, c')^\alpha}{\text{JDAM}(k)^\alpha \text{JDAM}(k')^\alpha} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the JDAM representation of the Shannon mutual information (8) is:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{k'=0}^{k_{\max}-1} \sum_{\substack{c \in \{+1, -1\} \\ c' \in \{+1, -1\}}} \left(\text{JDAM}(k, k', c, c') \right. \\ &\quad \left. \log \frac{\text{JDAM}(k, k', c, c') \text{JDAM}(k) \text{JDAM}(k')}{\text{JDAM}(k, c) \text{JDAM}(k', c') \text{JDAM}(k, k')} \right) \end{aligned}$$

2.2.3 Optimal Order of Rényi Mutual Information

In order to identify the optimal order α of Rényi mutual information for capturing node attribute information, we conducted a series of numerical experiments. To accomplish this, we fixed n_1 and n_2 nodes with attributes $+1$ and -1 , respectively, and generated a network using a 2-block stochastic blockmodel (SBM) with a higher probability of intra-community connections than inter-community connections. We conducted multiple simulations, and for each simulated network, we permuted the node numbering and recalculated $I_\alpha(q; q')$, γ_{deg} , and γ_{att} accordingly. Additionally, to ensure the simulated network was connected, we removed disconnected networks during the simulation process.

We then computed the correlation coefficient r between I_α and the absolute value of the attribute assortativity $|\gamma_{\text{att}}|$.

Our results indicate that the Rényi mutual information of order $\alpha = 1.3$ has the highest correlation coefficient with $|\gamma_{\text{att}}|$, suggesting it is the most effective method for capturing node attribute information. These findings are presented in Figure 3, which illustrates the relationship between α and r .

Choosing an order $\alpha > 1$ which is close to Shannon's entropy captures information on all the elements on the distributions, while still emphasizing the elements with high probabilities, thereby accentuating the degree-attribute groups that have strong associations. Additionally, using an order greater than one enables the utilization of near-linear estimation algorithms, which can expedite the computation of mutual information for large-scale networks.

2.3 Why Mutual Information to Identify Glass Ceiling Effect?

The aim of this section is to justify why mutual information (Shannon and Rényi) is a useful measure for inequalities in a network. We argue that, despite being often used as metrics to examine the glass ceiling effect in networks, assortativity and homophily do not sufficiently capture the information associated with an attributed network. The three claims that follow serve to highlight our conclusion:

- (1) Both degree and attribute assortativity cannot explain the information contained within a network on their own.
- (2) $I_\alpha(q; q')$ tends to increase with higher absolute value of the degree assortativity $|\gamma_{\text{deg}}|$ but does not capture the attribute assortativity γ_{att} .
- (3) While $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ is correlated with both degree and attribute assortativity, I_α reduces the effect that the network structure has on the network information and increases the information conveyed by the attributes.

(1) Assortativity does not suffice.

Assortativity [19] is a measure of how homophilic a graph is, and higher assortativity indicates stronger network inequality. The definition is slightly different according to whether the property of interest is categorical (attribute) or numeric (degree). The degree assortativity for undirected networks is defined as:

$$\gamma_{\text{deg}} = \frac{\sum_{kk'} k k' (e_{kk'} - q_k q_{k'})}{\sigma_q^2} \quad (10)$$

where q_k and $e_{kk'}$ are the remaining degree distribution and the joint remaining degree distribution defined in Section 2.1, σ_q is the standard deviation of the distribution q_k . γ_{deg} measures the extent to which nodes with similar degree connect to each other (Eq. (24) in [19]).

The attribute assortativity is defined as:

$$\gamma_{\text{att}} = \frac{\sum_{c \in \{+1, -1\}} p(c, c) - \sum_{c \in \{+1, -1\}} p(c) p(c)}{1 - \sum_{c \in \{+1, -1\}} p(c) p(c)} \quad (11)$$

where $p(c)$ and $p(c, c')$ are the label distribution and the joint label distribution defined in Section 2.1. γ_{att} measures the similarity of connections in the graph with respect to the node attribute (Eq. (2) in [19]).

First of all, the degree assortativity (10) does not consider the node attributes. Networks with the same topology but




Fig. 4. (Claim 1 of Section 2.3) Two networks (a) and (b) with identical topology but different node attributes with JDAM shown on the right. The bottom table includes the degree assortativity γ_{deg} , attribute assortativity γ_{att} , mutual information $I_\alpha(q; q')$, joint mutual information $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$, and the proposed I_α . By only connecting to nodes with different attribute and degree in (a), the female nodes (represented by blue triangles) demonstrate perfect disassortativity, identified by the dark red cell in the corresponding JDAM. In (b), however, the female nodes are imperfectly disassortative which diffuses the JDAM and reduces I_α from 0.803 to 0.002. Degree assortativity and attribute assortativity may fail to convey the information associated with a network, as demonstrated in this example, where the proposed mutual information metric provides a more informative approach.

varied node attributes will have the same degree assortativity. Second, the attribute assortativity (11) calculates the *global* linear correlation coefficient of neighboring node pairs without taking the node degree into account, which could have a *local* impact on the connection pattern. In this context, *local* refers to a particular degree-attribute region in the JDAM.

Figure 4 displays two networks and their corresponding JDAM (9). The color and the shape of a node is defined according to Figure 2. Since the two networks have the same topology, their degree assortativity is also the same. More intriguingly, they share the same attribute assortativity. However, (a) has a significantly greater mutual information than (b). It is a consequence of the female nodes' complete disassortativity in (a), which causes a concentration in the JDAM, as shown in the dark red cells of $(\{0, \blacktriangle\}, \{2, \bullet\})$ and $(\{2, \bullet\}, \{0, \blacktriangle\})$. On the other hand, the incomplete disassortativity in (b) causes a leakage of the mutual information, i.e., values in the JDAM diffuse to more cells.

- (2) $I_\alpha(q; q')$ increases with $|\gamma_{\text{deg}}|$ but does not reflect γ_{att} .
To demonstrate the correlation between $I_\alpha(q; q')$ and both degree assortativity γ_{deg} and attribute assortativity γ_{att} ,




Fig. 5. (Claim 2 of Section 2.3) The scatter plot illustrates a positive correlation between $I_\alpha(q; q')$ and both $|\gamma_{\text{deg}}|$ and $|\gamma_{\text{att}}|$, indicating that greater levels of assortativity or disassortativity leads to higher $I_\alpha(q; q')$ values. This indicates that higher levels of assortativity or disassortativity are associated with higher $I_\alpha(q; q')$ values.

we simulated networks from SBM according to Section 2.2.3. Our observations reveal that networks with high $I_\alpha(q; q')$ tend to possess a broader degree distribution and degree disassortativity.

In Figure 5, we illustrate the correlation between $I_\alpha(q; q')$ and γ_{deg} and γ_{att} . $I_\alpha(q; q')$ is positively correlated with the absolute value of the degree assortativity $|\gamma_{\text{deg}}|$, i.e., $I_\alpha(q; q')$ tends to increase as the level of degree assortativity or disassortativity in networks increases. This outcome aligns with previous observations on real-world networks presented in [14] and the analytical model for scale-free networks presented in [13]. On the other hand, our results demonstrate that $I_\alpha(q; q')$ has almost no correlation with γ_{att} , suggesting that node attribute information is not incorporated in the network's information content $I_\alpha(q; q')$.

(3) $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ increases with both assortativities and I strengthens γ_{att} .

Similar to $I_\alpha(q; q')$, $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ is positively correlated with $|\gamma_{\text{deg}}|$. Furthermore, $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ has a positive correlation with $|\gamma_{\text{att}}|$, indicating that $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ captures the information associated with the node attributes, and it tends to rise for both attribute-assortative (i.e., homophilic) and attribute-disassortative (i.e., heterophilic) networks.

We demonstrate the correlation between the proposed mutual information and γ_{deg} and γ_{att} in Figure 6. Because both $I_\alpha(q; q')$ and $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ are positively correlated with $|\gamma_{\text{deg}}|$, their cancellation partially leads to I_α having a relative weaker association with $|\gamma_{\text{deg}}|$. More significantly, the correlation between I_α and $|\gamma_{\text{att}}|$ strengthens.

We further explain the efficacy of I_α by referring to the example in Figure 4. Note that $I_\alpha(q; q')$ (5) is basically the divergence between the joint degree distribution $e_{kk'}$ and the product of the marginal distributions $q_k \otimes q_{k'}$. Similarly, $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ measures the divergence between the joint distribution $p(k, k', c, c')$ and $(q_k, c_k) \otimes (q_{k'}, c_{k'})$. The concentrated entries of $p(k, k', c, c')$, as demonstrated by the dark red cells of the JDAM, cannot be adequately approximated by the product of the 1-dimension marginal distributions, thus increasing I_α significantly.




Fig. 6. (Claim 3 of Section 2.3) The scatter plot reveals that the proposed measure I_α has a weak correlation with degree assortativity due to the effects of $I_\alpha(q; q')$ and $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ canceling out, while the correlation between I_α and γ_{att} is significantly stronger than that between $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$ or $I_\alpha(q; q')$ and γ_{att} . Thus, it can be concluded that I_α effectively captures the node attribute information of a network.

The proposed mutual information stands out in its ability to distinguish structural network inequalities that assortativity and homophily alone are unable to identify, as demonstrated through the three claims in Section 2.3. By improving the information provided by the node attributes and capturing the cancellation and synergy effects of $I_\alpha(q; q')$ and $I_\alpha(q, m; q', m')$, it offers a comprehensive approach to analyzing network structures.

Building on this foundation, our analysis reveals that the Rényi mutual information of order 1.3 provides the highest correlation coefficient with $|\gamma_{\text{att}}|$, making it the most expressive of the node attribute information. This finding opens up exciting new avenues for more efficient and effective ways of describing complex information in networks.

In the next Section, we demonstrate that the proposed measure is also highly optimized and easy to use. These make it a valuable tool for researchers and practitioners in various fields who seek to understand and analyze network structures with greater precision and depth.

3 STOCHASTIC OPTIMIZATION FOR REDUCING THE NETWORK INEQUALITY

As discussed in Section 2, mutual information measures the degree of inequality in an attributed network. In this section, we aim to reduce the network inequality by optimizing mutual information. Our approach involves using a parameterized distribution to sample the edges to be added to the network. By updating the parameterized sampling distribution through stochastic optimization, we aim to maximize the expected value of the mutual information measure. This approach is superior to deterministic edge addition or removal as it guarantees a local optimum, and it is effective in reducing inequalities such as the glass ceiling effect. It achieves this objective through random link recommendation, which preserves privacy [20].

3.1 Stochastic Optimization Problem Formulation

In order to optimize the proposed mutual information measure of a network, we consider adding an edge between nodes in degree-attribute groups (k, c) and (k', c') . By doing




Fig. 7. An example showing that the discrete optimization problem (12) is not submodular. Therefore the performance of greedy algorithm cannot be guaranteed. We relax the problem and optimize over the space of edge addition using a stochastic optimization algorithm (Algorithm 1).

so, we increase the entry $[(k+1, c), (k'+1, c')]$ in JDAM by one while reducing the entry $[(k, c), (k', c')]$ by one⁴. The set of possible degree-attribute groups before and after the edge addition is $\mathcal{V} = 0, \dots, k_{\max} \times +1, -1$, which covers $|\mathcal{V}| = 2(k_{\max}+1)$ combinations. The edge space is $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$, where $|\mathcal{E}| = 4(k_{\max}+1)^2$.

To formulate the optimization problem, we define the objective function as the change in mutual information resulting from adding an edge to the network, i.e., $Q(x) = I_\alpha(E \cup \{x\}) - I_\alpha(E)$, where $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and $E \cup \{x\}$ represents the edge set after the edge addition. However, we demonstrate with a counterexample (Figure 7) that the discrete optimization problem

$$x^* \in \underset{x \in \mathcal{E}}{\operatorname{argmin}} Q(x). \quad (12)$$

is not submodular. Specifically, we find that $I_\alpha(E_a \cup \{x\}) - I_\alpha(E_a) = 0 < I_\alpha(E_c \cup \{x\}) - I_\alpha(E_c) = 0.208$, even though $E_a \subset E_c$.

To overcome this challenge, we relax the problem into a stochastic optimization over probability mass functions, allowing us to find locally optimal solutions in a randomized manner. Specifically, we use a parameterized distribution to select which edges to add to the network and update the distribution via stochastic optimization to maximize the expected value of mutual information. This approach efficiently and effectively resolves the edge addition problem while reducing inequalities such as the glass ceiling effect.

Consider a family of probability mass functions $f(x; \theta)$ on \mathcal{E} , parameterized by the conditional logit model with separate fixed effect θ_i for each edge i :

$$f_i(\mathcal{E}; \theta) = \frac{\exp(\theta_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{E}|} \exp(\theta_j)} \quad (13)$$

4. We also change the corresponding entries on the other side with respect to the diagonal of JDAM to preserve its symmetry.

We then formulate the optimization problem as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^* &= \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|}}{\operatorname{argmin}} C(\theta) \\ &= \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim f(\mathcal{E}; \theta)} \{Q(x)\} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here, we optimize the probability distribution of the edges in (14), where the objective function is the expected increase in mutual information with respect to the probability distribution.

In the following subsection, we explain how we use the Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA) algorithm [21] to solve this stochastic optimization problem effectively.

Algorithm 1 SPSA based algorithm to estimate θ^*

Input: Initial parameterization $\theta^{(0)}$; JDAM of the current network.

Output: Estimate of the (locally) optimal solution θ^* of the conditional logit model for edge addition (14).

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
- 2: Simulate the $|\mathcal{E}|$ -dimensional vector d_k with random elements

$$d_k(i) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{with probability 0.5} \\ -1 & \text{with probability 0.5} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

- 3: Sample an edge x from \mathcal{E} using $f(\mathcal{E}; \theta^{(k)} + \Delta d_k)$ (13), where $\Delta > 0$.
- 4: Compute the change in the mutual information, $C(\theta^{(k)} + \Delta d_k)$.
- 5: Sample an edge x from \mathcal{E} using $f(\mathcal{E}; \theta^{(k)} - \Delta d_k)$.
- 6: Compute $C(\theta^{(k)} - \Delta d_k)$.
- 7: Obtain the gradient estimate using (17).
- 8: Update $\theta^{(k)}$ via stochastic gradient descent

$$\theta^{(k+1)} = \theta^{(k)} + \epsilon \hat{\nabla} C(\theta^{(k)}) \quad (16)$$

- 9: **end for**
-

3.2 Stochastic Optimization Algorithm

We use the Simultaneous Perturbation Stochastic Approximation (SPSA) algorithm [21], [22] to estimate the gradient of the new objective function with respect to each component of θ . One of the key advantages of SPSA is that it requires only two simulations of the objective function, regardless of the dimension $|\mathcal{E}|$ of the optimization problem.

Algorithm 1 outlines the SPSA implementation. In the k -th iteration, all elements of θ undergo a random perturbation. A vector d_k made up of $\{+1, -1\}$ with a Bernoulli(0.5) distribution is scaled by a factor⁵ $\Delta > 0$ and added and subtracted from θ . Then, by sampling the edge addition using the distribution represented by the two perturbed θ , the objective function $C(\theta)$ (14) is evaluated twice. The derivative of $C(\theta)$ with respect to θ is approximated by

$$\hat{\nabla} C(\theta^{(k)}) = \frac{C(\theta^{(k)} + \Delta d_k) - C(\theta^{(k)} - \Delta d_k)}{2\Delta} d_k \quad (17)$$

5. Δ affects the bias-variance trade-off as the bias in the derivative estimate (17) is proportional to Δ^2 whereas the variance is proportional to $1/\Delta^2$ [22].

Finally, the stochastic gradient algorithm can be used to update θ . As the SPSSA algorithm employs stochastic gradient descent (17), and the objective function may not be convex, the algorithm can only converge to a local stationary point. However, in practice, local optima can still provide useful solutions. Specifically, SPSSA converges to a sampling distribution that is a local maximum of the objective function.

In Section 4.3, we demonstrate the practical effectiveness of our approach through numerical results.

4 MUTUAL INFORMATION MEASURE FOR QUANTIFYING GLASS CEILING EFFECT IN CITATION NETWORKS

In this section, we demonstrate the ability of mutual information to quantify the glass ceiling effect in citation networks, using both analytical models and real-world datasets. We use Algorithm 1 from Section 3 to optimize the distribution over edge addition, with the goal of reducing glass ceiling effect as measured by mutual information. Our results demonstrate that the optimized conditional logit model outperforms uniformly random edge addition, with a significant improvement in the reduction of network inequality. These findings highlight the importance of considering the distribution of edge additions in reducing the glass ceiling effect in citation networks. The code and datasets used in the experiments are publicly available at <https://tinyurl.com/mutual-information>.

4.1 Directed Mixed Preferential Attachment Model

We presented the Directed Mixed Preferential Attachment (DMPA) model [3] in this subsection. We also employed a condensed version of it to validate the mutual information proposed in Section 2.

The DMPA model examines glass ceiling effect by modeling connection patterns in a growing citation network based on preferential attachment, minority group and homophily, as well as the rate at which new authors join. The two node types, m and f where f represents the minority group, correspond to the binary labels $c \in \{+1, -1\}$ defined in Section 2.1. The network begins with two connected nodes with different labels. At each time step, one of the three edge addition events occurs:

(1) With probability p , a new node appears and an existing node cites it. The new node is assigned type f with probability $p(f) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and m with probability $1 - p(f)$. The potential citing node is chosen from the existing nodes with probability proportional to their in-degrees plus a constant δ . A new citation edge is then created based on the probability matrix:

$$P_{\text{att}} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{\text{att}} & 1 - \rho_{\text{att}} \\ 1 - \rho_{\text{att}} & \rho_{\text{att}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

Specifically, an edge is added with probability $\rho_{\text{att}} \in (0, 1)$ if both nodes have the same type. If not, an edge is added with probability $1 - \rho_{\text{att}}$. A value of $\rho_{\text{att}} > 0.5$ indicates homophily whereas $\rho_{\text{att}} < 0.5$ indicates heterophily. We simplify the model by assuming nodes with different types share the ρ_{att} , making P_{att} symmetric.




Fig. 8. The mutual information I_{α} of DMPA networks that were simulated from various combinations of $p(f)$ and ρ_{att} . $p(f)$ - the proportion of the female nodes; ρ_{att} - the probability that two nodes with the same gender connect with each other. Both homophily and heterophily have a tendency to raise the mutual information, according to the scatter plot's U-shape.




Fig. 9. The relationship between I_{α} and $|\rho_{\text{att}} - 0.5|$ of networks simulated from the DMPA model. Different colors represent different proportions of female nodes $p(f)$. The positive correlation supports our claim that higher homophily or heterophily causes more mutual information to be placed on the node attributes.

(2) With probability q , a new node appears and cites an existing node. The new node's type is assigned in the same manner as in case (1). The potential cited node is chosen from the existing nodes with probability proportional to their out-degrees plus a constant δ . Then, a new citation edge is created based on P_{att} (18).

(3) With probability $1 - p - q$, a new edge is created between two existing nodes. Both the citing and cited nodes are chosen independently based on their in- and out-degree, and they are connected based on P_{att} (18).

In this condensed DMPA model above, $p(f)$ controls the imbalance between m and f , ρ_{att} determines whether the nodes are homophilic or heterophilic and is closely related to the attribute assortativity γ_{att} (11). When $\rho_{\text{att}} = 0.5$, a node is indifferent between choosing nodes with the same type or a different type. In addition, p, q control the relative frequency with which new nodes join the network. Last but not least, bigger $\delta > 0$ corresponds to weaker preference to




Fig. 10. Temporal evolution of the mutual information I_α for four different fields, including Physics, Management, Psychology, and Political Science. The plot shows the changes in I_α over time, where decreasing values of I_α indicate a reduction in the glass ceiling effect. The results indicate that in Political Science, I_α steadily decreases over time, suggesting reduced gender bias in citation formation. In contrast, I_α shows a consistent growth over time for Physics and Psychology, indicating an increasing glass ceiling effect as gender becomes a more significant factor in citation formation. On the other hand, I_α remains relatively stable over time for Management, except for a sudden increase in 2018, possibly due to incomplete citation data.

high-degree nodes under the preferential attachment.

In the simulation⁶, we set $p(f) \in (0.1, 0.5)$ so that type f corresponds to the minority. We vary ρ_{att} from 0.05 to 0.95 which covers a spectrum of homophily and heterophily. We set $p = q = 0.15$ and $\delta = 10$. For each combination of the parameters $\{p(f), \rho_{\text{att}}\}$, we generate a network with 10000 edges, which have approximately 3000 nodes.

Figure 8 displays I_α s of networks simulated using various combination of $\{p(f), \rho_{\text{att}}\}$. The U-shape of the scatter plot shows that both homophily and heterophily tend to raise the mutual information. We further plot I_α against $|\rho_{\text{att}} - 0.5|$ under different $p(f)$ in Figure 9, where $|\rho_{\text{att}} - 0.5|$ measures how homophilic or heterophilic the network is. The positive correlation between I_α and $|\rho_{\text{att}} - 0.5|$ supports our argument that higher homophily or heterophily results in more attention paid to the node attributes.

4.2 Empirical Analysis of Publication Data

To confirm that mutual information is a useful measurement for describing the glass ceiling effect in real-world data, we use the publishing records from public datasets. We use the bibliographic data of publications in the field of Physics, Management, Psychology, and Political Science [3]. The authors' genders are extracted using third-party APIs⁷.

We construct citation networks as follows. We group the papers in each field based on the publication year to build the network per field per year. Because the dataset for the field of Physics comprises of papers published before 2019,

we build citation network for all the 5 fields from 2003 to 2018. We view citation edges as undirected (See Section 2.1 for definition of a citation network) so that the adjacency matrix and the JDAM are symmetric.

Figure 10 presents the mutual information values for the four fields analyzed in this study. The results show that, in Political Science, mutual information gradually decreases over time, indicating that authors have paid less attention to gender as a factor in citation formation. However, for Physics and Psychology, mutual information exhibits a steady increase over the years, suggesting that the glass ceiling effect has grown in these fields as gender has become a more significant determinant of citation patterns. In contrast, the glass ceiling effect in Management appears to be generally consistent over the years, with the exception of a late jump in the year 2018, possibly due to incomplete citation data. These findings provide valuable insights into the evolution of gender-based disparities in citation practices across different academic fields.

4.3 Optimization on Randomized Edge Addition

Previous numerical experiments on real-world citation networks show that mutual information I_α depicts the glass ceiling effect of a network over time. We implement Algorithm 1 in Section 3 and show that the I_α can be optimized using randomized edge addition.

We use the citation network in physics from year 2012 as an example. As can be seen in Figure 10, I_α is relatively high. We use a parameterized conditional logit model (13) to select edges to add to the network. $\theta_i, i = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{E}|$ is initialized using a standard normal distribution. We run the algorithm for 10000 iterations.

We add various numbers of edges to the original network using the conditional logit model to evaluate the optimization result. The baseline method adds the same amount of edges but uses a uniform distribution. Figure 11 shows that both the attribute assortativity γ_{att} and the degree assortativity γ_{deg} increase more in the baseline method compared with the optimized conditional logit model. As such, by recommending links in a randomized fashion, optimization on mutual information could reduce inequality in a network while preserving the privacy of the network participants.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND EXTENSIONS

Conclusions: This paper quantifies the glass ceiling effect in networks using the mutual information measure (based on Shannon and more generally, Rényi entropy) between the conditional probability distributions of node attributes given the degree of adjacent nodes. Compared to existing measures, such as degree assortativity and homophily, mutual information accounts for both demographic information and node degrees, making it a more comprehensive measure of node attribute information in networks. We demonstrate the effectiveness of mutual information through examples and simulations. We then apply mutual information to citation networks and demonstrate its ability to identify structural inequality and track the evolution of the glass ceiling effect across different research fields over time. Our results suggest strategies to

6. We used the code provided by authors of [3]: <https://github.com/ninotch/DMPA>.

7. <https://namsor.app/>; <https://www.gender-api.com/>.




Fig. 11. Effect of adding edges on attribute assortativity (γ_{att}) and degree assortativity (γ_{deg}) of the physics citation network from 2012. The x-axis represents the number of edges added to the network, and both axes are shown on a logarithmic scale. The plots show that the optimized conditional logit model results in a greater increase in both attribute and degree assortativity compared to the baseline method that uses a uniform distribution of edge addition.

support minority scientists and demonstrate the potential of mutual information to contribute to a better understanding of glass ceiling effects in networks.

Limitations and Extensions: While the proposed mutual information provides a comprehensive measure of node attribute information in networks, there are some limitations that suggest avenues for future research. Firstly, when the range of degree distributions differs, the proposed method may not be able to compare various networks effectively. To address this issue, we can apply degree cut-offs to resolve the problem of a broad degree distribution. Secondly, mutual information quantifies the network as a whole, while ignoring differences in different regions of the network. A promising direction for future research is to use local assortativity [23] to improve the measure's expressiveness in network subgraphs. Another potential avenue for future research is to aggregate the information from coauthorships and citations using multiplex network models where nodes are linked in multiple interacting layers [24]. In particular, we can generalize the joint degree and attribute matrix to account for the correlation between weights and topology of the multiplex networks.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Clauset, S. Arbesman, and D. B. Larremore, "Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks," *Science advances*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. e1400005, 2015.
- [2] M. E. Newman, "Coauthorship networks and patterns of scientific collaboration," *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, vol. 101, no. suppl_1, pp. 5200–5205, 2004.
- [3] B. Nettasinghe, N. Alipourfard, V. Krishnamurthy, and K. Lerman, "Emergence of structural inequalities in scientific citation networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10944*, 2021.
- [4] C. O. Ross, A. Gupta, N. Mehrabi, G. Muric, and K. Lerman, "The leaky pipeline in physics publishing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.08912*, 2020.
- [5] M. L. Dion, J. L. Sumner, and S. M. Mitchell, "Gendered citation patterns across political science and social science methodology fields," *Political analysis*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 312–327, 2018.
- [6] J. Overgoor, A. Benson, and J. Ugander, "Choosing to grow a graph: Modeling network formation as discrete choice," in *The World Wide Web Conference*, 2019, pp. 1409–1420.
- [7] J. Overgoor, G. Pakapol Supaniratsai, and J. Ugander, "Scaling choice models of relational social data," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2020, pp. 1990–1998.
- [8] H. Gupta and M. A. Porter, "Mixed logit models and network formation," *Journal of Complex Networks*, vol. 10, no. 6, p. cnac045, 2022.
- [9] E. Sadler, "Diffusion games," *American Economic Review*, vol. 110, no. 1, pp. 225–70, 2020.
- [10] C. Avin, B. Keller, Z. Lotker, C. Mathieu, D. Peleg, and Y.-A. Pignolet, "Homophily and the glass ceiling effect in social networks," in *Proceedings of the 2015 conference on innovations in theoretical computer science*, 2015, pp. 41–50.
- [11] B. Nettasinghe, N. Alipourfard, S. Iota, V. Krishnamurthy, and K. Lerman, "Scale-free degree distributions, homophily and the glass ceiling effect in directed networks," *Journal of Complex Networks*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. cnac007, 2022.
- [12] M. E. Newman, "Assortative mixing in networks," *Physical review letters*, vol. 89, no. 20, p. 208701, 2002.
- [13] M. Piraveenan, M. Prokopenko, and A. Y. Zomaya, "Assortativeness and information in scale-free networks," *The European Physical Journal B*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 291–300, 2009.
- [14] R. V. Solé and S. Valverde, "Information theory of complex networks: on evolution and architectural constraints," in *Complex networks*. Springer, 2004, pp. 189–207.
- [15] M. Prokopenko, F. Boschetti, and A. J. Ryan, "An information-theoretic primer on complexity, self-organization, and emergence," *Complexity*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 11–28, 2009.
- [16] S. Fehr and S. Berens, "On the conditional rényi entropy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 6801–6810, 2014.
- [17] S. Verdú, " α -mutual information," in *2015 Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [18] M. Gjoka, B. Tillman, and A. Markopoulou, "Construction of simple graphs with a target joint degree matrix and beyond," in *2015 IEEE conference on computer communications (INFOCOM)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1553–1561.
- [19] M. E. Newman, "Mixing patterns in networks," *Physical review E*, vol. 67, no. 2, p. 026126, 2003.
- [20] R. Cummings, V. Gupta, D. Kimpara, and J. Morgenstern, "On the compatibility of privacy and fairness," in *Adjunct Publication of the 27th Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*, 2019, pp. 309–315.
- [21] J. C. Spall, "Implementation of the simultaneous perturbation algorithm for stochastic optimization," *IEEE Transactions on aerospace and electronic systems*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 817–823, 1998.
- [22] V. Krishnamurthy, *Partially observed Markov decision processes*. Cambridge university press, 2016.
- [23] M. Piraveenan, M. Prokopenko, and A. Y. Zomaya, "Local assortativity and growth of internet," *The European Physical Journal B*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 275–285, 2009.
- [24] G. Menichetti, D. Remondini, P. Panzarasa, R. J. Mondragón, and G. Bianconi, "Weighted multiplex networks," *PloS one*, vol. 9, no. 6, p. e97857, 2014.