# Optimal Topological Structure in Social, Technological, and Biological Networks

Yukio Hayashi

yhayashi@jaist.ac.jp

Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology

### It's a Small World

Many real nets  $\neq$  regular(e.g lattice), uniformly random,

positioned between them. Two properties

like regular: highly clustered with triangles

like random: average path length is short by 6-acquaintances, by only 20-clicks

D.J. Watts and S.H. Strogatz, nature, 393, 1998



#### There exists a surprisingly common structure: SF net. the degree dist. exhibits $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ , $2 < \gamma < 3$ .



In A.L. Barabási, LINKED, Perseus, 2002

## Universality

Recently('98-'02), the surprisingly common structure has been found in many real nets

**Social:** acquaintance, world trading, actor-collabo., citation, language

Technological: Internet, WWW, email, power grid

**Biological:** neural net, genome, metabolic pathway, foodweb

Universal evolution mechanism has been elucidated: Growth & Preferential Attachment

A.L. Barabási et al., Physica A, 272, 1999

### **Optimal Topology for Communication**

economy, # of links  $\rho \leftarrow 0 < \lambda < 1 \rightarrow$  efficiency, distance d Random (tree) - Pref. (SF) - Forced (star, clique)



SF appears in random generations for  $\min E(\lambda) = \lambda d + (1 - \lambda)\rho$ ,  $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{i < j} D_{ij}}{{}_{n}C_{2}} / D_{max}$ ,  $\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{i < j} a_{ij}}{{}_{n}C_{2}}$ , with a weight  $\lambda$ 

entropy  $H(\lambda)$  vs. weight  $\lambda$ R.F. i Cancho and R.V. Solé, SantaFe Inst. working paper, 2001

### **Connectivity Correlations**

 Is the connection structure essentially same in social, tech., and bio. networks ?

## **Connectivity Correlations**

- Is the connection structure essentially same in social, tech., and bio. networks ?
- > No ! Besides the common SF, there exist different types of degree-degree correlations

## **Connectivity Correlations**

- Is the connection structure essentially same in social, tech., and bio. networks ?
- → No ! Besides the common SF, there exist different types of degree-degree correlations
- It's classified into
  - Assortative: Social

connections between similar peers

Disassortative: technological or biological hub and peripheral nodes with low degrees
M.E.J Newman, PRE 67, 026126, 2003, A. Vázquez, PRE 67, 056104, 2003.

- Is the connection structure essentially same in social, tech., and bio. networks ?
- > No ! Besides the common SF, there exist different types of degree-degree correlations
- It's classified into
  - Assortative: Social

connections between similar peers

**Disassortative:** technological or biological

hub and peripheral nodes with low degrees

M.E.J Newman, PRE 67, 026126, 2003, A. Vázquez, PRE 67, 056104, 2003.

Let us consider the conditional probability P(k|l) of connection of nodes with deg. k, l for each type.

#### **Oscillatory Epidemic Prevalence**

#### Typically observed, but unknown the mechanism





SARS in Singapore, Sciencexpress May 23, 2003

 $\Rightarrow$  SIR (susceptible-infected-recovered/removed state transition) model <u>on SF nets</u> for epidemic spreading

# Heterogeneous SIR Model on Linearly Growing SF Nets

Epidemic dynamics for the macro. eq. at the MF level

$$\frac{dS_k}{dt} = -bk \underbrace{S_k \Theta_k}_{contact} + a_k, \quad \frac{dI_k}{dt} = -\delta I_k + bk \underbrace{S_k \Theta_k}_{contact},$$

where b and  $\delta$  denote the infection and immune rate,  $a_k = Ak^{-\gamma}$ , A > 0, provides a constant increasing of  $S_k$ , Mean-Field infection:  $\Theta_k(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_l \frac{l-1}{l} P(k|l) \frac{I_l(t)}{N_l(t)}$ . From  $N_k = S_k + I_k + R_k$  and  $\frac{dR_k}{dt} = \delta I_k$ ,  $\frac{dN_k}{dt} = a_k$ , the growing  $N_k(t) \sim a_k t$  gives asymptotic  $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ ,  $N(t) = \sum_{k} N_k \sim \left(\sum_{k} a_k\right) t.$  $\Rightarrow$  linearly growing SF net, and simultaneously

progress of epidemic spreading

## Simulation Result

Different behavior depend on the correlation types Trade-off: persistency and breaking size



Ass: persistently survived with fluctuation

Dis: later outbreaks

Unc: corresponded to the conventional SF models without correlations

 $\Rightarrow$  the behavior on Dis or Unc is also consistent with a stochastic SIR model, but it on Ass has'nt been found

## Summary

- We've briefly reviewed recent studies inspired from a commonly existing SF structure in social, technological, and biological networks.
- The topology (\neq regular, random) is the optimal for minimizing both the # of links and distance as economy and efficiency of communication.
- However, besides the SF, there exist Ass (social, between peers) and Dis (tech. or bio., hub-periph.) connectivity correlations.
   In our simulation of the SIR dynamics, the correlations cause quite different behavior for epidemic spreading.
- $\Rightarrow$  a good struct. will be used for future net. design.

### Appendix 1: GN and BA models





In spite of random node selection, the neighbor hub node has many chance to get duplicate connections (proportional to the degree).

⇒ Biologically plausible networks realize Preferential Attachment in a local rule !

# Appendix 3: Robust and Vulnerable Connectivity

Robust: for random failure, remaining the connectivity

Vulnerable: for targeted attack against hubs, disconnecting into isolated parts



#### **Appendix 4: Variety of Correlations**

estimated from real data of actor-collabo. (Ass), Internet-AS level-, and email (Dis).