Chapter 4

Network Models

In May 2011, Facebook had 721 million users, represented by a graph of 721 million nodes. A Facebook user at the time had an average of 190 friends; that is, all Facebook users, taken into account, had a total of 68.5 billion friendships (i.e., edges). What are the principal underlying processes that help initiate these friendships? More importantly, how can these seemingly independent friendships form this complex friendship network?

In social media, many social networks contain millions of nodes and billions of edges. These complex networks have billions of friendships, the reasons for existence of most of which are obscure. Humbled by the complexity of these networks and the difficulty of independently analyzing each one of these friendships, we can design models that generate, on a smaller scale, graphs similar to real-world networks. On the assumption that these models simulate properties observed in real-world networks well, the analysis of real-world networks boils down to a cost-efficient measuring of different properties of simulated networks. In addition, these models

- allow for a better understanding of phenomena observed in real-world networks by providing concrete mathematical explanations and

- allow for controlled experiments on synthetic networks when real-world networks are not available.

We discuss three principal network models in this chapter: the random graph model, the small-world model, and the preferential attachment model.
These models are designed to accurately model properties observed in real-world networks. Before we delve into the details of these models, we discuss their properties.

4.1 Properties of Real-World Networks

Real-world networks share common characteristics. When designing network models, we aim to devise models that can accurately describe these networks by mimicking these common characteristics. To determine these characteristics, a common practice is to identify their attributes and show that measurements for these attributes are consistent across networks. In particular, three network attributes exhibit consistent measurements across real-world networks: degree distribution, clustering coefficient, and average path length. As we recall, degree distribution denotes how node degrees are distributed across a network. The clustering coefficient measures transitivity of a network. Finally, average path length denotes the average distance (shortest path length) between pairs of nodes. We discuss how these three attributes behave in real-world networks next.

4.1.1 Degree Distribution

Consider the distribution of wealth among individuals. Most individuals have an average amount of capital, whereas a few are considered extremely wealthy. In fact, we observe exponentially more individuals with an average amount of capital than wealthier ones. Similarly, consider the population of cities. A few metropolitan areas are densely populated, whereas other cities have an average population size. In social media, we observe the same phenomenon regularly when measuring popularity or interestingness for entities. For instance,

- Many sites are visited less than a thousand times a month, whereas a few are visited more than a million times daily.
- Most social media users are active on a few sites, whereas a few individuals are active on hundreds of sites.
- There are exponentially more modestly priced products for sale compared to expensive ones.
There exist many individuals with a few friends and a handful of users with thousands of friends.

The last observation is directly related to node degrees in social media. The degree of a node in social media often denotes the number of friends an individual has. Thus, the distribution of the number of friends denotes the degree distribution of the network. It turns out that in all provided observations, the distribution of values follows a power-law distribution. For instance, let $k$ denote the degree of a node (i.e., the number of friends an individual has). Let $p_k$ denote the fraction of individuals with degree $k$ (i.e., frequency of observing $k$). Then, in the power-law distribution

$$p_k = ak^{-b},$$

where $b$ is the power-law exponent and $a$ is the power-law intercept. A power-law degree distribution is shown in Figure 4.1(a).

Taking the logarithm from both sides of Equation 4.1, we get

$$\ln p_k = -b \ln k + \ln a.$$  (4.2)

Equation 4.2 shows that the log-log plot of a power-law distribution is a straight line with slope $-b$ and intercept $\ln a$ (see Figure 4.1(b)). This also reveals a methodology for checking whether a network exhibits a power-law distribution.\footnote{For a more detailed approach refer to [58].} We can do the following:

\[\text{Figure 4.1: Power-Law Degree Distribution and Its Log-Log Plot.}\]
Figure 4.2: Log-Log Plots for Power-Law Degree Distribution in Social Media Networks. In these figures, the $x$-axis represents the logarithm of the degree, and the $y$-axis represents the logarithm of the fraction of individuals with that degree (i.e., $\log(p_k)$). The line demonstrates the linear trend observed in log-log plots of power-law distributions.

- Pick a popularity measure and compute it for the whole network. For instance, we can take the number of friends in a social network as a measure. We denote the measured value as $k$.

- Compute $p_k$, the fraction of individuals having popularity $k$.

- Plot a log-log graph, where the $x$-axis represents $\ln k$ and the $y$-axis represents $\ln p_k$.

- If a power-law distribution exists, we should observe a straight line in the plot.

Figure 4.2 depicts some log-log graphs for the number of friends on real-world networks. In all networks, a linear trend is observed denoting a power-law degree distribution.
Networks exhibiting power-law degree distribution are often called scale-free networks. Since the majority of social networks are scale-free, we are interested in models that can generate synthetic networks with a power-law degree distribution.

### 4.1.2 Clustering Coefficient

In real-world social networks, friendships are highly transitive. In other words, friends of an individual are often friends with one another. These friendships form triads of friendships that are frequently observed in social networks. These triads result in networks with high average [local] clustering coefficients. In May 2011, Facebook had an average clustering coefficient of 0.5 for individuals who had two friends; their degree was 2 [284]. This indicates that for 50% of all users with two friends, their two friends were also friends with each other. Table 4.1 provides the average clustering coefficient for several real-world social networks and the web.

### 4.1.3 Average Path Length

In real-world networks, any two members of the network are usually connected via short paths. In other words, the average path length is small. This is known as the small-world phenomenon. In the well-known small-world experiment conducted in the 1960s by Stanley Milgram, Milgram conjectured that people around the world are connected to one another via a path of at most six individuals (i.e., the six degrees of separation). Similarly, we observe small average path lengths in social networks. For example, in May 2011, the average path length between individuals in the Facebook graph was 4.7. This average was 4.3 for individuals in the United States at the same time [284]. Table 4.2 provides the average path length for real-world social networks and the web.
Table 4.2: Average Path Length in Real-World Networks (from [46, 284, 198])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Flickr</th>
<th>LiveJournal</th>
<th>Orkut</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three properties – power-law degree distribution, high clustering coefficient, and small average path length are consistently observed in real-world networks. We design models based on simple assumptions on how friendships are formed, hoping that these models generate scale-free networks, with high clustering coefficient and small average path lengths. We start with the simplest network model, the random graph model.

4.2 Random Graphs

We start with the most basic assumption on how friendships can be formed:

*Edges (i.e., friendships) between nodes (i.e., individuals) are formed randomly.*

The random graph model follows this basic assumption. In reality, friendships in real-world networks are far from random. By assuming random friendships, we simplify the process of friendship formation in real-world networks, hoping that these random friendships ultimately create networks that exhibit common characteristics observed in real-world networks.

Formally, we can assume that for a graph with a fixed number of nodes \( n \), any of the \( \binom{n}{2} \) edges can be formed independently, with probability \( p \). This graph is called a *random graph* and we denote it as the \( G(n, p) \) model. This model was first proposed independently by Edgar Gilbert [100] and Solomonoff and Rapoport [262]. Another way of randomly generating graphs is to assume that both the number of nodes \( n \) and the number of edges \( m \) are fixed. However, we need to determine which \( m \) edges are selected from the set of \( \binom{n}{2} \) possible edges. Let \( \Omega \) denote the set of graphs with \( n \) nodes and \( m \) edges. To generate a random graph, we can uniformly select one of the graphs in \( \Omega \). The number of graphs with \( n \) nodes and \( m \)
edges (i.e., $|\Omega|$) is
\[
|\Omega| = \binom{n}{2}. \tag{4.3}
\]

The uniform random graph selection probability is $\frac{1}{|\Omega|}$. One can think of the probability of uniformly selecting a graph as an analog to $p$, the probability of selecting an edge in $G(n, p)$.

The second model was introduced by Paul Erdős and Alfred Rényi [83] and is denoted as the $G(n, m)$ model. In the limit, both models act similarly. $G(n, m)$

The expected number of edges in $G(n, p)$ is $\binom{n}{2}p$. Now, if we set $\binom{n}{2}p = m$, in the limit, both models act the same because they contain the same number of edges. Note that the $G(n, m)$ model contains a fixed number of edges; however, the second model $G(n, p)$ is likely to contain none or all possible edges.

Mathematically, the $G(n, p)$ model is almost always simpler to analyze; hence the rest of this section deals with properties of this model. Note that there exist many graphs with $n$ nodes and $m$ edges (i.e., generated by $G(n, m)$). The same argument holds for $G(n, p)$, and many graphs can be generated by the model. Therefore, when measuring properties in random graphs, the measures are calculated over all graphs that can be generated by the model and then averaged. This is particularly useful when we are interested in the average, and not specific, behavior of large graphs.

In $G(n, p)$, the number of edges is not fixed; therefore, we first examine some mathematical properties regarding the expected number of edges that are connected to a node, the expected number of edges observed in the graph, and the likelihood of observing $m$ edges in a random graph generated by the $G(n, p)$ process.

**Proposition 4.1.** The expected number of edges connected to a node (expected degree) in $G(n, p)$ is $(n - 1)p$.

**Proof.** A node can be connected to at most $n - 1$ nodes (via $n - 1$ edges). All edges are selected independently with probability $p$. Therefore, on average $(n - 1)p$ of them are selected. The expected degree is often denoted using notation $c$ or $k$ in the literature. Since we frequently use $k$ to denote degree values, we use $c$ to denote the expected degree of a random graph,

\[
c = (n - 1)p, \tag{4.4}
\]
or equivalently,

\[ p = \frac{c}{n - 1}. \quad (4.5) \]

**Proposition 4.2.** The expected number of edges in \( G(n, p) \) is \( \binom{n}{2} p \).

**Proof.** Following the same line of argument, because edges are selected independently and we have a maximum of \( \binom{n}{2} \) edges, the expected number of edges is \( \binom{n}{2} p \). \qed

**Proposition 4.3.** In a graph generated by \( G(n, p) \) model, the probability of observing \( m \) edges is

\[ P(|E| = m) = \binom{\binom{n}{2}}{m} p^m (1 - p)^{\binom{n}{2} - m}, \quad (4.6) \]

which is a binomial distribution.

**Proof.** \( m \) edges are selected from the \( \binom{n}{2} \) possible edges. These edges are formed with probability \( p^m \), and other edges are not formed (to guarantee the existence of only \( m \) edges) with probability \( (1 - p)^{\binom{n}{2} - m} \). \qed

Given these basic propositions, we next analyze how random graphs evolve as we add edges to them.

### 4.2.1 Evolution of Random Graphs

In random graphs, when nodes form connections, after some time a large fraction of nodes get connected (i.e., there is a path between any pair of them). This large fraction forms a *connected component*, commonly called the *largest connected component* or the *giant component*. We can tune the behavior of the random graph model by selecting the appropriate \( p \) value. In \( G(n, p) \), when \( p = 0 \), the size of the largest connected component is 0 (no two pairs are connected), and when \( p = 1 \), the size is \( n \) (all pairs are connected). Table 4.3 provides the size of the largest connected component (slc values in the table) for random graphs with 10 nodes and different \( p \) values. The table also provides information on the average degree \( c \), the diameter size \( ds \), the size of the largest component slc, and the average path length \( l \) of the random graph.

As shown, in Table 4.3, as \( p \) gets larger, the graph gets denser. When \( p \) is very small, the following is found:
Table 4.3: Evolution of Random Graphs. Here, \( p \) is the random graph generation probability, \( c \) is the average degree, \( ds \) is the diameter size, \( slc \) is the size of the largest component, and \( l \) is the average path length. The highlighted column denotes phase transition in the random graph.

| \( p \) | 0.0 | 0.055 | 0.11 | 1.0 |
| \( c \) | 0.0 | 0.8 | \( \approx 1 \) | 9.0 |
| \( ds \) | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| \( slc \) | 0 | 4 | 7 | 10 |
| \( l \) | 0.0 | 1.5 | 2.66 | 1.0 |

1. No giant component is observed in the graph.
2. Small isolated connected components are formed.
3. The diameter is small because all nodes are in isolated components, in which they are connected to a handful of other nodes.

As \( p \) gets larger, the following occurs:

2. Isolated components become connected.
3. The diameter values increase.

At this point, nodes are connected to each other via long paths (see \( p = 0.11 \) in Table 4.3). As \( p \) continues to get larger, the random graph properties change again. For larger values, the diameter starts shrinking as nodes get connected to each other via different paths (that are likely to be shorter). The point where diameter value starts to shrink in a random graph is called phase transition. At the point of phase transition, the following two phenomena are observed:
Figure 4.3: Nodes Visited by Moving $n$-hops away in a Random Graph. $c$ denotes the expected node degree.

1. The giant component, which just started to appear, starts to grow.

2. The diameter, which just reached its maximum value, starts decreasing.

It is proven that in random graphs phase transition occurs when $c = 1$; that is, $p = 1/(n-1)$.

**Proposition 4.4.** In random graphs, phase transition happens at $c = 1$.

*Proof.* (Sketch) Consider a random graph with expected node degree $c$, where $c = p(n-1)$. In this graph, consider any connected set of nodes $S$ and consider the complement set $\bar{S} = V - S$. For the sake of our proof, we assume that $|S| \ll |\bar{S}|$. Given any node $v$ in $S$, if we move one hop (edge) away from $v$, we visit approximately $c$ nodes. Following the same argument, if we move one hop away from nodes in $S$, we visit approximately $|S|c$ nodes. Assuming $|S|$ is small, the nodes in $S$ only visit nodes in $\bar{S}$, and when moving one hop away from $S$, the set of nodes “guaranteed to be connected” gets larger by a factor $c$ (see Figure 4.3). The connected set of visited nodes gets $c^2$ times larger when moving two hops and so on. Now, in the limit, if we want this component of visited nodes to become
the largest connected component, then after traveling \( n \) hops, we must have
\[
c^n \geq 1 \text{ or equivalently } c \geq 1. \tag{4.7}
\]
Otherwise (i.e., \( c < 1 \)), the number of visited nodes dies out exponentially. Hence, phase transition happens at \( c = 1 \). \( \Box \)

Note that this proof sketch provides an intuitive approach to understand the proposition. Interested readers can refer to the bibliographic notes for a concrete proof.

So far we have discussed the generation and evolution of random graphs; however, we also need to analyze how random graphs perform in terms of mimicking properties exhibited by real-world networks. It turns out that random graphs can model average path length in a real-world network accurately, but fail to generate a realistic degree distribution or clustering coefficient. We discuss these properties next.

### 4.2.2 Properties of Random Graphs

#### Degree Distribution

When computing degree distribution, we estimate the probability of observing \( P(d_v = d) \) for node \( v \).

**Proposition 4.5.** For a graph generated by \( G(n, p) \), node \( v \) has degree \( d \), \( d \leq n - 1 \), with probability
\[
P(d_v = d) = \binom{n - 1}{d} p^d (1 - p)^{n-1-d}, \tag{4.8}
\]
which is again a binomial degree distribution.

**Proof.** The proof is left to the reader. \( \Box \)

This assumes that \( n \) is fixed. We can generalize this result by computing the degree distribution of random graphs in the limit (i.e., \( n \to \infty \)). In this

\[\text{Note that for } c = 1, \text{ the component size is stable, and in the limit, no growth will be observed. The phase transition happens exactly at } c = 1.\]

\[\text{Hint: The proof is similar to the proof provided for the likelihood of observing } m \text{ edges (Proposition 4.3).}\]
case, using Equation 4.4 and the fact that \( \lim_{x \to 0} \ln(1 + x) = x \), we can compute the limit for each term of Equation 4.8:

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} (1 - p)^{n-1-d} = \lim_{n \to \infty} e^{\ln(1 - p)^{n-1-d}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} e^{(n-1-d)\ln(1-p)} \\
= \lim_{n \to \infty} e^{(n-1-d)\ln(1-\frac{c}{n-1})} = \lim_{n \to \infty} e^{-(n-1-d) \frac{c}{n-1}} = e^{-c}. 
\]

(4.9)

We also have

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \binom{n-1}{d} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-1-d)!d!} \\
= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{(n-1) \times (n-2) \times \cdots (n-d)(n-1-d)!}{(n-1-d)!d!} \\
= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{(n-1) \times (n-2) \times \cdots (n-d)}{d!} \\
\approx \frac{(n-1)^d}{d!}. 
\]

(4.10)

We can compute the degree distribution of random graphs in the limit by substituting Equations 4.10, 4.9, and 4.4 in Equation 4.8,

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} P(d_c = d) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \binom{n-1}{d} p^d(1-p)^{n-1-d} \\
= \frac{(n-1)^d}{d!} \left( \frac{c}{n-1} \right)^d e^{-c} = e^{-c} \frac{c^d}{d!}. 
\]

(4.11)

which is basically the Poisson distribution with mean \( c \). Thus, in the limit, random graphs generate Poisson degree distribution, which differs from the power-law degree distribution observed in real-world networks.

**Clustering Coefficient**

**Proposition 4.6.** In a random graph generated by \( G(n,p) \), the expected local clustering coefficient for node \( v \) is \( p \).

Proof. The local clustering coefficient for node \( v \) is

\[
C(v) = \frac{\text{number of connected pairs of } v\text{'s neighbors}}{\text{number of pairs of } v\text{'s neighbors}}. 
\]

(4.12)
However, $v$ can have different degrees depending on the edges that are formed randomly. Thus, we can compute the expected value for $C(v)$:

$$E(C(v)) = \sum_{d=0}^{n-1} E(C(v)|d_v = d) \cdot P(d_v = d). \tag{4.13}$$

The first term is basically the local clustering coefficient of a node given its degree. For a random graph, we have

$$E(C(v)|d_v = d) = \frac{\text{number of connected pairs of } v\text{'s } d \text{ neighbors}}{\text{number of pairs of } v\text{'s } d \text{ neighbors}} = \frac{p(d)}{\binom{d}{2}} = p. \tag{4.14}$$

Substituting Equation 4.14 in Equation 4.13, we get

$$E(C(v)) = p \sum_{d=0}^{d=n-1} P(d_v = d) = p, \tag{4.15}$$

where we have used the fact that all probability distributions sum up to 1.

**Proposition 4.7.** The global clustering coefficient of a random graph generated by $G(n, p)$ is $p$.

**Proof.** The global clustering coefficient of a graph defines the probability of two neighbors of the same node being connected. In random graphs, for any two nodes, this probability is the same and is equal to the generation probability $p$ that determines the probability of two nodes getting connected. Note that in random graphs, the expected local clustering coefficient is equivalent to the global clustering coefficient.

In random graphs, the clustering coefficient is equal to the probability $p$; therefore, by appropriately selecting $p$, we can generate networks with a high clustering coefficient. Note that selecting a large $p$ is undesirable because doing so will generate a very dense graph, which is unrealistic, as in the real-world, networks are often sparse. Thus, random graphs are considered generally incapable of generating networks with high clustering coefficients without compromising other required properties.
Average Path Length

**Proposition 4.8.** The average path length $l$ in a random graph is

$$l \approx \frac{\ln |V|}{\ln c},$$  

(4.16)

*Proof.* (Sketch) The proof is similar to the proof provided in determining when phase transition happens (see Section 4.2.1). Let $D$ denote the expected diameter size in the random graph. Starting with any node in a random graph and its expected degree $c$, one can visit approximately $c$ nodes by traveling one edge, $c^2$ nodes by traveling two edges, and $c^D$ nodes by traveling “diameter” number of edges. After this step, almost all nodes should be visited. In this case, we have

$$c^D \approx |V|. \quad (4.17)$$

In random graphs, the expected diameter size tends to the average path length $l$ in the limit. This we provide without proof. Interested readers can refer to the bibliographic notes for pointers to concrete proofs. Using this fact, we have

$$c^D \approx c^l \approx |V|. \quad (4.18)$$

Taking the logarithm from both sides we get $l \approx \frac{\ln |V|}{\ln c}$. Therefore, the average path length in a random graph is equal to $\frac{\ln |V|}{\ln c}$. \hfill $\Box$

### 4.2.3 Modeling Real-World Networks with Random Graphs

Given a real-world network, we can simulate it using a random graph model. We can compute the average degree $c$ in the given network. From $c$, the connection probability $p$ can be computed ($p = \frac{c}{n-1}$). Using $p$ and the number of nodes in the given network $n$, a random graph model $G(n, p)$ can be simulated. Table 4.4 demonstrates the simulation results for various real-world networks. As observed in the table, random graphs perform well in modeling the average path lengths; however, when considering the transitivity, the random graph model drastically underestimates the clustering coefficient.

To tackle this issue, we study the small-world model.
Table 4.4: A Comparison between Real-World Networks and Simulated Random Graphs. In this table, $C$ denotes the average clustering coefficient. The last two columns show the average path length and the clustering coefficient for the random graph simulated for the real-world network. Note that average path lengths are modeled properly, whereas the clustering coefficient is underestimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Original Network</th>
<th>Simulated Random Graph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Average Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Actors</td>
<td>225,226</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medline Coauthorship</td>
<td>1,520,251</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Coli</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Elegans</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Small-World Model

The assumption behind the random graph model is that connections in real-world networks are formed at random. Although unrealistic, random graphs can model average path lengths in real-world networks properly, but underestimate the clustering coefficient. To mitigate this problem, Duncan J. Watts and Steven Strogatz in 1997 proposed the small-world model.

In real-world interactions, many individuals have a limited and often at least, a fixed number of connections. Individuals connect with their parents, brothers, sisters, grandparents, and teachers, among others. Thus, instead of assuming random connections, as we did in random graph models, one can assume an egalitarian model in real-world networks, where people have the same number of neighbors (friends). This again is unrealistic; however, it models more accurately the clustering coefficient of real-world networks. In graph theory terms, this assumption is equivalent to embedding individuals in a regular network. A regular (ring) lattice is a special case of regular networks where there exists a certain pattern for how ordered nodes are connected to one another. In particular, in a regular lattice of degree $c$, nodes are connected to their previous $c/2$ and following $c/2$ neighbors. Formally, for node set $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, \ldots, v_n\}$, an
edge exists between node $v_i$ and $v_j$ if and only if
\[ 0 < |i - j| \leq c/2. \]  
(4.19)

A regular lattice of degree 4 is shown in Figure 4.4.

The regular lattice can model transitivity well; however, the average path length is too high. Moreover, the clustering coefficient takes the value
\[ \frac{3(c - 2)}{4(c - 1)} \approx \frac{3}{4}; \]  
(4.20)

which is fixed and not tunable to clustering coefficient values found in real-world networks. To overcome these problems, the proposed small-world model dynamically lies between the regular lattice and the random network.

In the small-world model, we assume a parameter $\beta$ that controls randomness in the model. The model starts with a regular lattice and starts adding random edges based on $\beta$. The $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ controls how random the model is. When $\beta$ is 0, the model is basically a regular lattice, and when $\beta = 1$, the model becomes a random graph.
Algorithm 4.1 Small-World Generation Algorithm

Require: Number of nodes $|V|$, mean degree $c$, parameter $\beta$

1: return A small-world graph $G(V,E)$
2: $G =$ A regular ring lattice with $|V|$ nodes and degree $c$
3: for node $v_i$ (starting from $v_1$), and all edges $e(v_i,v_j)$, $i < j$ do
4: $v_k =$ Select a node from $V$ uniformly at random.
5: if rewiring $e(v_i,v_j)$ to $e(v_i,v_k)$ does not create loops in the graph or multiple edges between $v_i$ and $v_k$ then
6: rewire $e(v_i,v_j)$ with probability $\beta$: $E = E - \{e(v_i,v_j)\}$, $E = E \cup \{e(v_i,v_k)\}$;
7: end if
8: end for
9: Return $G(V,E)$

The procedure for generating small-world networks is outlined in Algorithm 4.1. The procedure creates new edges by a process called rewiring. Rewiring replaces an existing edge between nodes $v_i$ and $v_j$ with a non-existing edge between $v_i$ and $v_k$ with probability $\beta$. In other words, an edge is disconnected from one of its endpoints $v_j$ and connected to a new endpoint $v_k$. Node $v_k$ is selected uniformly.

The network generated using this procedure has some interesting properties. Depending on the $\beta$ value, it can have a high clustering coefficient and also short average path lengths. The degree distribution, however, still does not match that of real-world networks.

4.3.1 Properties of the Small-World Model

Degree Distribution

The degree distribution for the small-world model is as follows:

$$P(d_o = d) = \sum_{n=0}^{\min(d-c/2,c/2)} \binom{c/2}{n} (1-\beta)^n \beta^{c/2-n} \frac{(\beta c/2)^d-c^{2-n}}{(d-c/2-n)} e^{-\beta c/2},$$

where $P(d_o = d)$ is the probability of observing degree $d$ for node $v$. We provide this equation without proof due to techniques beyond the scope of this book (see Bibliographic Notes). Note that the degree distribution is quite similar to the Poisson degree distribution observed in random graphs (Section 4.2.2). In practice, in the graph generated by the small-world model,
most nodes have similar degrees due to the underlying lattice. In contrast, in real-world networks, degrees are distributed based on a power-law distribution, where most nodes have small degrees and a few have large degrees.

**Clustering Coefficient**

The clustering coefficient for a regular lattice is \( \frac{3(c-2)}{4(c-1)} \) and for a random graph model is \( p = \frac{c}{n-1} \). The clustering coefficient for a small-world network is a value between these two, depending on \( \beta \). Commonly, the clustering coefficient for a regular lattice is represented using \( C(0) \), and the clustering coefficient for a small-world model with \( \beta = p \) is represented as \( C(p) \). The relation between the two values can be computed analytically; it has been proven that

\[
C(p) \approx (1 - p)^3 C(0). \tag{4.22}
\]

The intuition behind this relation is that because the clustering coefficient enumerates the number of closed triads in a graph, we are interested in triads that are still left connected after the rewiring process. For a triad to stay connected, all three edges must not be rewired with probability \( 1 - p \). Since the process is performed independently for each edge, the probability of observing triads is \( (1 - p)^3 \) times the probability of observing them in a regular lattice. Note that we also need to take into account new triads that are formed by the rewiring process; however, that probability is nominal and hence negligible. The graph in Figure 4.5 depicts the value of \( \frac{C(p)}{C(0)} \) for different values of \( p \).

As shown in the figure, the value for \( C(p) \) stays high until \( p \) reaches 0.1 (10% rewired) and then decreases rapidly to a value around zero. Since a high clustering coefficient is required in generated graphs, \( \beta \leq 0.1 \) is preferred.

**Average Path Length**

The same procedure can be done for the average path length. The average path length in a regular lattice is

\[
\frac{n}{2c}. \tag{4.23}
\]
Figure 4.5: Clustering Coefficient and Average Path Length Change in the Small-World Model (from [298]). In this figure, $C(p)/C(0)$ denotes the clustering coefficient of a small-world model, with $\beta = p$, over the regular lattice. Similarly, $L(p)/L(0)$ denotes the average path length of a small-world model over the regular lattice. Since models with a high clustering coefficient and small average path length are desired, $\beta$ values in range $0.01 \leq \beta = p \leq 0.1$ are preferred.

We denote this value as $L(0)$. The average path length in a random graph is $\frac{\ln n}{\ln c}$. We denote $L(p)$ as the average path length for a small-world model where $\beta = p$. Unlike $C(p)$, no analytical formula for comparing $L(p)$ to $L(0)$ exists; however, the relation can be computed empirically for different values of $p$. Similar to $C(p)$, we plot $\frac{L(p)}{L(0)}$ in Figure 4.5. As shown in the figure, the average path length decays sooner than the clustering coefficient and becomes stable when around 1% of edges are rewired. Since we require small average path lengths in the generated graphs, $\beta \geq 0.01$ is preferred.
Table 4.5: A Comparison between Real-World Networks and Simulated Graphs Using the Small-World Model. In this table $C$ denotes the average clustering coefficient. The last two columns show the average path length and the clustering coefficient for the small-world graph simulated for the real-world network. Both average path lengths and clustering coefficients are modeled properly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Original Network</th>
<th>Simulated Graph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Average Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Actors</td>
<td>225,226</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medline Coauthorship</td>
<td>1,520,251</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Coli</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Elegans</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Modeling Real-World Networks with the Small-World Model

A desirable model for a real-world network should generate graphs with high clustering coefficients and short average path lengths. As shown in Figure 4.5, for $0.01 \leq \beta \leq 0.10$, the small-world network generated is acceptable, in which the average path length is small and the clustering coefficient is still high. Given a real-world network in which average degree $c$ and clustering coefficient $C$ are given, we set $C(p) = C$ and determine $\beta$ using Equation 4.22. Given $\beta$, $c$, and $n$ (size of the real-world network), we can simulate the small-world model.

Table 4.5 demonstrates the simulation results for various real-world networks. As observed in the table, the small-world model generates a realistic clustering coefficient and small average path length. Note that the small-world model is still incapable of generating a realistic degree distribution in the simulated graph. To generate scale-free networks (i.e., with a power-law degree distribution), we introduce the preferential attachment model next.
Algorithm 4.2 Preferential Attachment

Require: Graph \( G(V_0, E_0) \), where \( |V_0| = m_0 \) and \( d_v \geq 1 \ \forall \ v \in V_0 \), number of expected connections \( m \leq m_0 \), time to run the algorithm \( t \)
1: return \( \) A scale-free network
2: //Initial graph with \( m_0 \) nodes with degrees at least 1
3: \( G(V,E) = G(V_0,E_0); \)
4: for 1 to \( t \) do
5: \( V = V \cup \{v_i\}; \) // add new node \( v_i \)
6: \( \) while \( d_i \neq m \) do
7: \( \) Connect \( v_i \) to a random node \( v_j \in V, i \neq j \) (i.e., \( E = E \cup \{e(v_i,v_j)\} \) )
8: \( \) with probability \( P(v_j) = \frac{d_i}{\sum d_k} \).
9: \( \) end while
10: \( \) end for
11: Return \( G(V,E) \)

4.4 Preferential Attachment Model

There exist a variety of scale-free network-modeling algorithms. A well-established one is the model proposed by Barabási and Albert [24]. The model is called preferential attachment or sometimes the Barabási-Albert (BA) model and is as follows:

When new nodes are added to networks, they are more likely to connect to existing nodes that many others have connected to.

This connection likelihood is proportional to the degree of the node that the new node is aiming to connect to. In other words, a rich-get-richer phenomenon or aristocrat network is observed where the higher the node’s degree, the higher the probability of new nodes getting connected to it. Unlike random graphs in which we assume friendships are formed randomly, in the preferential attachment model we assume that individuals are more likely to befriend gregarious others. The model’s algorithm is provided in Algorithm 4.2.

The algorithm starts with a graph containing a small set of nodes \( m_0 \) and then adds new nodes one at a time. Each new node gets to connect to \( m \leq m_0 \) other nodes, and each connection to existing node \( v_i \) depends on the degree of \( v_i \) (i.e., \( P(v_i) = \frac{d_i}{\sum d_j} \)). Intrinsically, higher degree nodes get
more attention from newly added nodes. Note that the initial \( m_0 \) nodes must have at least degree 1 for probability \( P(v_i) = \frac{d_i}{\sum_j d_j} \) to be nonzero.

The model incorporates two ingredients – (1) the growth element and (2) the preferential attachment element – to achieve a scale-free network. The growth is realized by adding nodes as time goes by. The preferential attachment is realized by connecting to node \( v_i \) based on its degree probability, \( P(v_i) = \frac{d_i}{\sum_j d_j} \). Removing any one of these ingredients generates networks that are not scale-free (see Exercises). Next, we show that preferential attachment models are capable of generating networks with a power-law degree distribution. They are also capable of generating small average path length, but unfortunately fail to generate the high clustering coefficients observed in real-world networks.

### 4.4.1 Properties of the Preferential Attachment Model

#### Degree Distribution

We first demonstrate that the preferential attachment model generates scale-free networks and can therefore model real-world networks. Empirical evidence found by simulating the preferential attachment model suggests that this model generates a scale-free network with exponent \( b = 2.9 \pm 0.1 \) [24]. Theoretically, a mean-field [213] proof can be provided as follows.

Let \( d_i \) denote the degree for node \( v_i \). The probability of an edge connecting from a new node to \( v_i \) is

\[
P(v_i) = \frac{d_i}{\sum_j d_j}.
\]  

(4.24)

The expected increase to the degree of \( v_i \) is proportional to \( d_i \) (this is true on average). Assuming a mean-field setting, the expected temporal change in \( d_i \) is

\[
\frac{dd_i}{dt} = mP(v_i) = \frac{md_i}{\sum_j d_j} = \frac{md_i}{2mt} = \frac{d_i}{2t}.
\]  

(4.25)

Note that at each time step, \( m \) edges are added; therefore, \( mt \) edges are added over time, and the degree sum \( \sum_j d_j \) is \( 2mt \). Rearranging and
solving this differential equation, we get

\[ d_i(t) = m \left( \frac{t}{t_i} \right)^{0.5}. \] (4.26)

Here, \( t_i \) represents the time that \( v_i \) was added to the network, and because we set the expected degree to \( m \) in preferential attachment, then \( d_i(t_i) = m \).

The probability that \( d_i \) is less than \( d \) is

\[ P(d_i(t) < d) = P(t_i > m^2t/d^2). \] (4.27)

Assuming uniform intervals of adding nodes,

\[ P(t_i > m^2t/d^2) = 1 - P(t_i \leq m^2t/d^2) = 1 - \frac{m^2t}{d^2} \frac{1}{(t + m_0)}. \] (4.28)

The factor \( \frac{1}{(t+m_0)} \) shows the probability that one time step has passed because, at the end of the simulation, \( t + m_0 \) nodes are in the network. The probability density for \( P(d) \)

\[ P(d) = \frac{\partial P(d_i(t) < d)}{\partial d}, \] (4.29)

is what we are interested in, which, when solved, gives

\[ P(d) = \frac{2m^2t}{d^3(t + m_0)} \]

and the stationary solution (\( t \to \infty \)),

\[ P(d) = \frac{2m^2}{d^3}, \] (4.30)

which is a power-law degree distribution with exponent \( b = 3 \). Note that in real-world networks, the exponent varies in a range (e.g., [2, 3]); however, there is no variance in the exponent of the introduced model. To overcome this issue, several other models are proposed. Interested readers can refer to the bibliographical notes for further references.
Clustering Coefficient

In general, not many triangles are formed by the Barabási-Albert model, because edges are created independently and one at a time. Again, using a mean-field analysis, the expected clustering coefficient can be calculated as

\[ C = \frac{m_0 - 1}{8} \frac{(\ln t)^2}{t}, \]  

(4.31)

where \( t \) is the time passed in the system during the simulation. We avoid the details of this calculation due to techniques beyond the scope of this book. Unfortunately, as time passes, the clustering coefficient gets smaller and fails to model the high clustering coefficient observed in real-world networks.

Average Path Length

The average path length of the preferential attachment model increases logarithmically with the number of nodes present in the network:

\[ l \sim \frac{\ln |V|}{\ln(\ln |V|)}. \]  

(4.32)

This indicates that, on average, preferential attachment models generate shorter path lengths than random graphs. Random graphs are considered accurate in approximating the average path lengths. The same holds for preferential attachment models.

4.4.2 Modeling Real-World Networks with the Preferential Attachment Model

As with random graphs, we can simulate real-world networks by generating a preferential attachment model by setting the expected degree \( m \) (see Algorithm 4.2). Table 4.6 demonstrates the simulation results for various real-world networks. The preferential attachment model generates a realistic degree distribution and, as observed in the table, small average path lengths; however, the generated networks fail to exhibit the high clustering coefficient observed in real-world networks.
Table 4.6: A Comparison between Real-World Networks and Simulated Graphs using Preferential Attachment. C denotes the average clustering coefficient. The last two columns show the average path length and the clustering coefficient for the preferential-attachment graph simulated for the real-world network. Note that average path lengths are modeled properly, whereas the clustering coefficient is underestimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Original Network</th>
<th>Simulated Graph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Average Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Actors</td>
<td>225,226</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medline Coauthorship</td>
<td>1,520,251</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Coli</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Elegans</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Summary

In this chapter, we discussed three well-established models that generate networks with commonly observed characteristics of real-world networks: random graphs, the small-world model, and preferential attachment. Random graphs assume that connections are completely random. We discussed two variants of random graphs: $G(n, p)$ and $G(n, m)$. Random graphs exhibit a Poisson degree distribution, a small clustering coefficient $p$, and a realistic average path length $\frac{\ln|V|}{\ln c}$.

The small-world model assumes that individuals have a fixed number of connections in addition to random connections. This model generates networks with high transitivity and short path lengths, both commonly observed in real-world networks. Small-world models are created through a process where a parameter $\beta$ controls how edges are randomly rewired from an initial regular ring lattice. The clustering coefficient of the model is approximately $(1 - p)^3$ times the clustering coefficient of a regular lattice. No analytical solution to approximate the average path length with respect to a regular ring lattice has been found. Empirically, when between 1% to 10% of edges are rewired ($0.01 \leq \beta \leq 0.1$), the model resembles many real-world networks. Unfortunately, the small-world model generates a degree distribution similar to the Poisson degree distribution observed in random graphs.
Finally, the preferential attachment model assumes that friendship formation likelihood depends on the number of friends individuals have. The model generates a scale-free network; that is, a network with a power-law degree distribution. When $k$ denotes the degree of a node, and $p_k$ the fraction of nodes having degree $k$, then in a power-law degree distribution,

$$p_k = ak^{-b}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.33)

Networks created using a preferential attachment model have a power-law degree distribution with exponent $b = 2.9 \pm 0.1$. Using a mean-field approach, we proved that this model has a power-law degree distribution. The preferential attachment model also exhibits realistic average path lengths that are smaller than the average path lengths in random graphs. The basic caveat of the model is that it generates a small clustering coefficient, which contradicts high clustering coefficients observed in real-world networks.
4.6 Bibliographic Notes

General reviews of the topics in this chapter can be found in [213, 212, 28, 134].

Initial random graph papers can be found in the works of Paul Erdős and Alfred Rényi [83, 84, 85] as well as Edgar Gilbert [100] and Solomonoff and Rapoport [262]. As a general reference, readers can refer to [41, 217, 210]. Random graphs described in this chapter did not have any specific degree distribution; however, random graphs can be generated with a specific degree distribution. For more on this refer to [212, 216].

Small-worlds were first noticed in a short story by Hungarian writer F. Karinthy in 1929. Works of Milgram in 1969 and Kochen and Pool in 1978 treated the subject more systematically. Milgram designed an experiment in which he asked random participants in Omaha, Nebraska, or Wichita, Kansas, to help send letters to a target person in Boston. Individuals were only allowed to send the letter directly to the target person if they knew the person on a first-name basis. Otherwise, they had to forward it to someone who was more likely to know the target. The results showed that the letters were on average forwarded 5.5 to 6 times until they reached the target in Boston. Other recent research on small-world model dynamics can be found in [295, 296].

Price [1965, 1976] was among the first who described power laws observed in citation networks and models capable of generating them. Power-law distributions are commonly found in social networks and the web [87, 198]. The first developers of preferential attachment models were Yule [308], who described these models for generating power-law distributions in plants, and Herbert A. Simon [260], who developed these models for describing power laws observed in various phenomena: distribution of words in prose, scientists by citations, and cities by population, among others. Simon used what is known as the master equation to prove that preferential attachment models generate power-law degree distributions. A more rigorous proof for estimating the power-law exponent of the preferential attachment model using the master equation method can be found in [212]. The preferential attachment model introduced in this chapter has a fixed exponent $b = 3$, but, as mentioned, real-world networks have exponents in the range $[2, 3]$. To solve this issue, extensions have been proposed in [155, 9].
4.7 Exercises

Properties of Real-World Networks

1. A *scale invariant* function $f(.)$ is one such that, for a scalar $\alpha$,

$$f(\alpha x) = \alpha^c f(x), \quad (4.34)$$

for some constant $c$. Prove that the power-law degree distribution is scale invariant.

Random Graphs

2. Assuming that we are interested in a sparse random graph, what should we choose as our $p$ value?

3. Construct a random graph as follows. Start with $n$ nodes and a given $k$. Generate all the possible combinations of $k$ nodes. For each combination, create a $k$-cycle with probability $\frac{\alpha}{\binom{n-1}{2}}$, where $\alpha$ is a constant.
   
   - Calculate the node mean degree and the clustering coefficient.
   - What is the node mean degree if you create a complete graph instead of the $k$-cycle?

4. When does phase transition happen in the evolution of random graphs? What happens in terms of changes in network properties at that time?

Small-World Model

5. Show that in a regular lattice the number of connections between neighbors is given by $\frac{3}{2}c(c - 2)$, where $c$ is the average degree.

6. Show how the clustering coefficient can be computed in a regular lattice of degree $k$. 
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7. Why are random graphs incapable of modeling real-world graphs? What are the differences between random graphs, regular lattices, and small-world models?

8. Compute the average path length in a regular lattice.

**Preferential Attachment Model**

9. As a function of $k$, what fraction of pages on the web have $k$ in-links, assuming that a normal distribution governs the probability of webpages choosing their links? What if we have a power-law distribution instead?

10. In the Barabási-Albert model (BA) two elements are considered: growth and preferential attachment. The growth ($G$) is added to the model by allowing new nodes to connect via $m$ edges. The preferential attachment ($A$) is added by weighting the probability of connection by the degree. For the sake of brevity, we will consider the model as $BA = A + G$. Now, consider models that only have one element: $G$, or $A$, and not both. In the $G$ model, the probability of connection is uniform ($P = \frac{1}{m_0+t-1}$), and in $A$, the number of nodes remain the same throughout the simulation and no new node is added. In $A$, at each time step, a node within the network is randomly selected based on degree probability and then connected to another one within the network.

- Compute the degree distribution for these two models.
- Determine if these two models generate scale-free networks. What does this prove?