

# Online Social Networks and Media

Network Measurements and Models

# Measuring and Modeling Networks

- There are networks everywhere
- What do they look like?
  - How do you measure and describe a billion node network?
- What are the process that generate them?
  - Can we create models for real-life networks?
- These two questions are related: We need to measure the characteristics that we want to model


# Before we start

- Wait, there is a model for generating graphs!
- The Erdős-Renyi  $G_{n,p}$  random graph model:
  - $n$  : the number of vertices
  - $p$  : probability of generating an edge
    - for each pair  $(i,j)$ , generate the edge  $(i,j)$  **independently** with probability  $p$
- A very well studied model in graph theory!
  - As we will see, not good enough in our case

# Measuring Networks

- Degree distributions and power-laws
- Clustering Coefficient
- Small world phenomena
- Components
- Motifs
- Homophily

# Degree distributions



$f_k$  = fraction of nodes with degree  $k$   
= probability of a randomly  
selected node to have degree  $k$

# It all started with some Greeks

- Faloutsos, Faloutsos, Faloutsos, “On the power-law relationships of the internet topology”, SIGCOMM 1999.




Figure 6: The outdegree plots: Log-log plot of frequency  $f_d$  versus the outdegree  $d$ .

- Degree distributions for the internet graph

# Power-law distributions

- The degree distributions of most real-life networks follow a **power law**

$$p(k) = Ck^{-\alpha}$$

- Right-skewed/Heavy-tail distribution
  - there is a non-negligible fraction of nodes that has very high degree (hubs)
  - **scale-free**: no characteristic scale, average is not informative
- In stark contrast with the random graph model!
  - Poisson degree distribution,  $z=np$



$$p(k) = \frac{z^k}{k!} e^{-z}$$

- Concentrated around the mean
- the probability of very high degree nodes is exponentially small

# Power-law signature

- Power-law distribution gives a line in the **log-log plot**



$$\log p(k) = -\alpha \log k + \log C$$








- $\alpha$  : power-law exponent (typically  $2 \leq \alpha \leq 3$ )



# A random graph example



# Power-laws appear in all networks!




Taken from [Newman 2003]

# And not only in networks!

quantity	minimum $x_{\min}$	exponent $\alpha$
(a) frequency of use of words	1	2.20(1)
(b) number of citations to papers	100	3.04(2)
(c) number of hits on web sites	1	2.40(1)
(d) copies of books sold in the US	2 000 000	3.51(16)
(e) telephone calls received	10	2.22(1)
(f) magnitude of earthquakes	3.8	3.04(4)
(g) diameter of moon craters	0.01	3.14(5)
(h) intensity of solar flares	200	1.83(2)
(i) intensity of wars	3	1.80(9)
(j) net worth of Americans	\$600m	2.09(4)
(k) frequency of family names	10 000	1.94(1)
(l) population of US cities	40 000	2.30(5)

TABLE I Parameters for the distributions shown in Fig. 4. The labels on the left refer to the panels in the figure. Exponent values were calculated using the maximum likelihood method of Eq. (5) and Appendix B, except for the moon craters (g), for which only cumulative data were available. For this case the exponent quoted is from a simple least-squares fit and should be treated with caution. Numbers in parentheses give the standard error on the trailing figures.




# Measuring power-laws



- How do we create these plots? How do we measure the power-law exponent?
- Collect a set of measurements:
  - E.g., the degree of each page, the number of appearances of each word in a document, the size of solar flares(continuous)
- Create a value **histogram**
  - For discrete values, this consists of pairs of the form (value, number of times the value appears)
  - For continuous values (but also for discrete):
    - Break the range of values into **bins** of equal width
    - **Sum** the count of values in the bin
    - **Represent** the bin by the **mean (median) value**
  - The histogram consists of pairs (mean bin value, count of values in bin)
- Plot the pairs (x,y) in log-log scale (plot (logx, logy) pairs)

# Discrete Counts

$\log(\text{count of words with this \#appearances})$




# Measuring power laws



Simple binning produces a noisy plot

# Logarithmic binning



- Exponential binning
  - Create bins that grow **exponentially** in size
  - In each bin **divide** the **count** by the **bin length**
    - This is the number of **observations per bin unit**



Still some noise at the tail

# Cumulative distribution

- Compute the **cumulative** distribution
  - $P[X \geq x]$ : fraction (or number) of observations that have value **at least  $x$**
  - It also follows a power-law with exponent  **$\alpha-1$**





# Pareto distribution

- A random variable follows a **Pareto** distribution if

$$P[X \geq x] = C' x^{-\beta} \quad x \geq x_{\min}$$

- Power law distribution with exponent  $\alpha=1+\beta$

# Zipf plot

- There is another easy way to see the power-law, by doing the Zipf plot
  - Order the values in decreasing order
  - Plot the values against their rank in log-log scale
    - i.e., for the  $r$ -th value  $x_r$ , plot the point  $(\log(r), \log(x_r))$
  - If there is a power-law you should see something like a straight line

# Zipf's Law

- A random variable  $X$  follows **Zipf's law** if the  $r$ -th largest value  $x_r$  satisfies



$$x_r \approx r^{-\gamma}$$

- Same as Pareto distribution

$$P[X \geq x] \approx x^{-1/\gamma}$$

- $X$  follows a power-law distribution with  $\alpha=1+1/\gamma$
- Named after Zipf, who studied the distribution of words in English language and found Zipf law with exponent 1

# Zipf vs Pareto



# Computing the exponent

- Maximum likelihood estimation
  - Assume that the set of data observations  $\mathbf{x}$  are produced by a power-law distribution with some exponent  $\alpha$ 
    - Exact law:  $p(x) = \frac{\alpha-1}{x_{min}} \left( \frac{x}{x_{min}} \right)^{-\alpha}$
  - Find the exponent that maximizes the probability  $P(\alpha | \mathbf{x})$

$$\alpha = 1 + n \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \frac{x_i}{x_{min}} \right]^{-1}$$

# Collective Statistics (M. Newman 2003)

	network	type	$n$	$m$	$z$	$\ell$	$\alpha$	$C^{(1)}$	$C^{(2)}$	$r$	Ref(s).
social	film actors	undirected	449 913	25 516 482	113.43	3.48	2.3	0.20	0.78	0.208	20, 416
	company directors	undirected	7 673	55 392	14.44	4.60	–	0.59	0.88	0.276	105, 323
	math coauthorship	undirected	253 339	496 489	3.92	7.57	–	0.15	0.34	0.120	107, 182
	physics coauthorship	undirected	52 909	245 300	9.27	6.19	–	0.45	0.56	0.363	311, 313
	biology coauthorship	undirected	1 520 251	11 803 064	15.53	4.92	–	0.088	0.60	0.127	311, 313
	telephone call graph	undirected	47 000 000	80 000 000	3.16		2.1				8, 9
	email messages	directed	59 912	86 300	1.44	4.95	1.5/2.0		0.16		136
	email address books	directed	16 881	57 029	3.38	5.22	–	0.17	0.13	0.092	321
	student relationships	undirected	573	477	1.66	16.01	–	0.005	0.001	–0.029	45
	sexual contacts	undirected	2 810				3.2				265, 266
information	WWW nd.edu	directed	269 504	1 497 135	5.55	11.27	2.1/2.4	0.11	0.29	–0.067	14, 34
	WWW Altavista	directed	203 549 046	2 130 000 000	10.46	16.18	2.1/2.7				74
	citation network	directed	783 339	6 716 198	8.57		3.0/–				351
	Roget's Thesaurus	directed	1 022	5 103	4.99	4.87	–	0.13	0.15	0.157	244
	word co-occurrence	undirected	460 902	17 000 000	70.13		2.7		0.44		119, 157
technological	Internet	undirected	10 697	31 992	5.98	3.31	2.5	0.035	0.39	–0.189	86, 148
	power grid	undirected	4 941	6 594	2.67	18.99	–	0.10	0.080	–0.003	416
	train routes	undirected	587	19 603	66.79	2.16	–		0.69	–0.033	366
	software packages	directed	1 439	1 723	1.20	2.42	1.6/1.4	0.070	0.082	–0.016	318
	software classes	directed	1 377	2 213	1.61	1.51	–	0.033	0.012	–0.119	395
	electronic circuits	undirected	24 097	53 248	4.34	11.05	3.0	0.010	0.030	–0.154	155
	peer-to-peer network	undirected	880	1 296	1.47	4.28	2.1	0.012	0.011	–0.366	6, 354
biological	metabolic network	undirected	765	3 686	9.64	2.56	2.2	0.090	0.67	–0.240	214
	protein interactions	undirected	2 115	2 240	2.12	6.80	2.4	0.072	0.071	–0.156	212
	marine food web	directed	135	598	4.43	2.05	–	0.16	0.23	–0.263	204
	freshwater food web	directed	92	997	10.84	1.90	–	0.20	0.087	–0.326	272
	neural network	directed	307	2 359	7.68	3.97	–	0.18	0.28	–0.226	416, 421

TABLE II Basic statistics for a number of published networks. The properties measured are: type of graph, directed or undirected; total number of vertices  $n$ ; total number of edges  $m$ ; mean degree  $z$ ; mean vertex–vertex distance  $\ell$ ; exponent  $\alpha$  of degree distribution if the distribution follows a power law (or “–” if not; in/out-degree exponents are given for directed graphs); clustering coefficient  $C^{(1)}$  from Eq. (3); clustering coefficient  $C^{(2)}$  from Eq. (6); and degree correlation coefficient  $r$ , Sec. III.F. The last column gives the citation(s) for the network in the bibliography. Blank entries indicate unavailable data.

# Power Laws - Recap

- A (continuous) random variable  $X$  follows a **power-law** distribution if it has density function

$$p(x) = Cx^{-\alpha}$$

- A (continuous) random variable  $X$  follows a **Pareto** distribution if it has cumulative function

$$P[X \geq x] = Cx^{-\beta} \quad \text{power-law with } \alpha=1+\beta$$

- A (discrete) random variable  $X$  follows **Zipf's law** if the the  $r$ -th largest value satisfies

$$x_r = Cr^{-\gamma} \quad \text{power-law with } \alpha=1+1/\gamma$$

# Average/Expected degree

- For power-law distributed degree

- if  $\alpha \geq 2$ , it is a constant

$$E[X] = \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 2} x_{min}$$

- if  $\alpha < 2$ , it diverges


- The expected value goes to infinity as the size of the network grows

- The fact that  $\alpha \geq 2$  for most real networks guarantees a constant average degree as the graph grows



# The 80/20 rule


- **Top-heavy**: Small fraction of values collect most of distribution mass



- This phenomenon becomes more extreme when  $\alpha < 2$
- 1% of values has 99% of mass
- E.g. name distribution

# The effect of exponent

As the exponent increases the probability of observing an extreme value decreases




# Clustering (Transitivity) coefficient

- Measures the density of **triangles** (local clusters) in the graph
- Two different ways to measure it:

$$C^{(1)} = \frac{\sum_i \text{triangles centered at node } i}{\sum_i \text{triples centered at node } i}$$

- The **ratio of the means**

# Example



$$C^{(1)} = \frac{3}{1+1+6} = \frac{3}{8}$$

# Clustering (Transitivity) coefficient


- Clustering coefficient for node  $i$

$$C_i = \frac{\text{triangles centered at node } i}{\text{triples centered at node } i}$$

$$C^{(2)} = \frac{1}{n} C_i$$

- The **mean of the ratios**
- This is the clustering coefficient that we will use.

# Example



$$C^{(2)} = \frac{1}{5} (1 + 1 + 1/6) = \frac{13}{30}$$

$$C^{(1)} = \frac{3}{8}$$

- The two clustering coefficients give different measures
- $C^{(2)}$  **increases** with nodes with **low degree**

# Collective Statistics (M. Newman 2003)

	network	type	$n$	$m$	$z$	$\ell$	$\alpha$	$C^{(1)}$	$C^{(2)}$	$r$	Ref(s).
social	film actors	undirected	449 913	25 516 482	113.43	3.48	2.3	0.20	0.78	0.208	20, 416
	company directors	undirected	7 673	55 392	14.44	4.60	–	0.59	0.88	0.276	105, 323
	math coauthorship	undirected	253 339	496 489	3.92	7.57	–	0.15	0.34	0.120	107, 182
	physics coauthorship	undirected	52 909	245 300	9.27	6.19	–	0.45	0.56	0.363	311, 313
	biology coauthorship	undirected	1 520 251	11 803 064	15.53	4.92	–	0.088	0.60	0.127	311, 313
	telephone call graph	undirected	47 000 000	80 000 000	3.16		2.1				8, 9
	email messages	directed	59 912	86 300	1.44	4.95	1.5/2.0		0.16		136
	email address books	directed	16 881	57 029	3.38	5.22	–	0.17	0.13	0.092	321
	student relationships	undirected	573	477	1.66	16.01	–	0.005	0.001	–0.029	45
sexual contacts	undirected	2 810				3.2				265, 266	
information	WWW nd.edu	directed	269 504	1 497 135	5.55	11.27	2.1/2.4	0.11	0.29	–0.067	14, 34
	WWW Altavista	directed	203 549 046	2 130 000 000	10.46	16.18	2.1/2.7				74
	citation network	directed	783 339	6 716 198	8.57		3.0/–				351
	Roget's Thesaurus	directed	1 022	5 103	4.99	4.87	–	0.13	0.15	0.157	244
	word co-occurrence	undirected	460 902	17 000 000	70.13		2.7		0.44		119, 157
technological	Internet	undirected	10 697	31 992	5.98	3.31	2.5	0.035	0.39	–0.189	86, 148
	power grid	undirected	4 941	6 594	2.67	18.99	–	0.10	0.080	–0.003	416
	train routes	undirected	587	19 603	66.79	2.16	–		0.69	–0.033	366
	software packages	directed	1 439	1 723	1.20	2.42	1.6/1.4	0.070	0.082	–0.016	318
	software classes	directed	1 377	2 213	1.61	1.51	–	0.033	0.012	–0.119	395
	electronic circuits	undirected	24 097	53 248	4.34	11.05	3.0	0.010	0.030	–0.154	155
	peer-to-peer network	undirected	880	1 296	1.47	4.28	2.1	0.012	0.011	–0.366	6, 354
biological	metabolic network	undirected	765	3 686	9.64	2.56	2.2	0.090	0.67	–0.240	214
	protein interactions	undirected	2 115	2 240	2.12	6.80	2.4	0.072	0.071	–0.156	212
	marine food web	directed	135	598	4.43	2.05	–	0.16	0.23	–0.263	204
	freshwater food web	directed	92	997	10.84	1.90	–	0.20	0.087	–0.326	272
	neural network	directed	307	2 359	7.68	3.97	–	0.18	0.28	–0.226	416, 421

TABLE II Basic statistics for a number of published networks. The properties measured are: type of graph, directed or undirected; total number of vertices  $n$ ; total number of edges  $m$ ; mean degree  $z$ ; mean vertex–vertex distance  $\ell$ ; exponent  $\alpha$  of degree distribution if the distribution follows a power law (or “–” if not; in/out-degree exponents are given for directed graphs); clustering coefficient  $C^{(1)}$  from Eq. (3); clustering coefficient  $C^{(2)}$  from Eq. (6); and degree correlation coefficient  $r$ , Sec. III.F. The last column gives the citation(s) for the network in the bibliography. Blank entries indicate unavailable data.

# Clustering coefficient for random graphs

- The probability of two of your neighbors also being neighbors is  $p$ , independent of local structure
  - clustering coefficient  $C = p$
  - when the average degree  $z=np$  is constant  $C = O(1/n)$

Table 1: Clustering coefficients,  $C$ , for a number of different networks;  $n$  is the number of nodes,  $z$  is the mean degree. Taken from [146].

Network	$n$	$z$	$C$ measured	$C$ for random graph
Internet [153]	6,374	3.8	0.24	0.00060
World Wide Web (sites) [2]	153,127	35.2	0.11	0.00023
power grid [192]	4,941	2.7	0.080	0.00054
biology collaborations [140]	1,520,251	15.5	0.081	0.000010
mathematics collaborations [141]	253,339	3.9	0.15	0.000015
film actor collaborations [149]	449,913	113.4	0.20	0.00025
company directors [149]	7,673	14.4	0.59	0.0019
word co-occurrence [90]	460,902	70.1	0.44	0.00015
neural network [192]	282	14.0	0.28	0.049
metabolic network [69]	315	28.3	0.59	0.090
food web [138]	134	8.7	0.22	0.065



# Small worlds

- **Millgram's experiment:** Letters were handed out to people in Nebraska to be sent to a target in Boston
- People were instructed to pass on the letters to someone they knew on first-name basis
- The letters that reached the destination followed paths of length around **6**
- **Six degrees of separation:** (play of John Guare)
- Also:
  - The Kevin Bacon game
  - The Erdős number

# Measuring the small world phenomenon

- $d_{ij}$  = **shortest path** between  $i$  and  $j$

- **Diameter:**

$$d = \max_{i,j} d_{ij}$$

- **Characteristic path length:**

Problem if no path between two nodes

$$\ell = \frac{1}{n(n-1)/2} \sum_{i>j} d_{ij}$$


- **Harmonic mean**

$$\ell^{-1} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)/2} \sum_{i>j} d_{ij}^{-1}$$

- Also, distribution of all shortest paths

# Effective Diameter

- Disconnected components or isolated long paths can throw off the computation of the diameter.
- **Effective diameter**: the **interpolated value** where 90% of node pairs are reachable



- Computation:
  - $f(d)$ : for **integer**  $d$ , the fraction of pairs in the graph that have distance less or equal to  $D$
  - $f(x)$ : for **real**  $x$ :  $d - 1 < x < d$ ,  $f(x) = \frac{f(d) - f(d-1)}{x - d}$
  - **Effective Diameter**: the **real value**  $x$  such that  $f(x) = 0.9$

# Collective Statistics (M. Newman 2003)

	network	type	$n$	$m$	$z$	$\ell$	$\alpha$	$C^{(1)}$	$C^{(2)}$	$r$	Ref(s).
social	film actors	undirected	449 913	25 516 482	113.43	3.48	2.3	0.20	0.78	0.208	20, 416
	company directors	undirected	7 673	55 392	14.44	4.60	–	0.59	0.88	0.276	105, 323
	math coauthorship	undirected	253 339	496 489	3.92	7.57	–	0.15	0.34	0.120	107, 182
	physics coauthorship	undirected	52 909	245 300	9.27	6.19	–	0.45	0.56	0.363	311, 313
	biology coauthorship	undirected	1 520 251	11 803 064	15.53	4.92	–	0.088	0.60	0.127	311, 313
	telephone call graph	undirected	47 000 000	80 000 000	3.16		2.1				8, 9
	email messages	directed	59 912	86 300	1.44	4.95	1.5/2.0		0.16		136
	email address books	directed	16 881	57 029	3.38	5.22	–	0.17	0.13	0.092	321
	student relationships	undirected	573	477	1.66	16.01	–	0.005	0.001	–0.029	45
sexual contacts	undirected	2 810				3.2				265, 266	
information	WWW nd.edu	directed	269 504	1 497 135	5.55	11.27	2.1/2.4	0.11	0.29	–0.067	14, 34
	WWW Altavista	directed	203 549 046	2 130 000 000	10.46	16.18	2.1/2.7				74
	citation network	directed	783 339	6 716 198	8.57		3.0/–				351
	Roget's Thesaurus	directed	1 022	5 103	4.99	4.87	–	0.13	0.15	0.157	244
	word co-occurrence	undirected	460 902	17 000 000	70.13		2.7		0.44		119, 157
technological	Internet	undirected	10 697	31 992	5.98	3.31	2.5	0.035	0.39	–0.189	86, 148
	power grid	undirected	4 941	6 594	2.67	18.99	–	0.10	0.080	–0.003	416
	train routes	undirected	587	19 603	66.79	2.16	–		0.69	–0.033	366
	software packages	directed	1 439	1 723	1.20	2.42	1.6/1.4	0.070	0.082	–0.016	318
	software classes	directed	1 377	2 213	1.61	1.51	–	0.033	0.012	–0.119	395
	electronic circuits	undirected	24 097	53 248	4.34	11.05	3.0	0.010	0.030	–0.154	155
	peer-to-peer network	undirected	880	1 296	1.47	4.28	2.1	0.012	0.011	–0.366	6, 354
biological	metabolic network	undirected	765	3 686	9.64	2.56	2.2	0.090	0.67	–0.240	214
	protein interactions	undirected	2 115	2 240	2.12	6.80	2.4	0.072	0.071	–0.156	212
	marine food web	directed	135	598	4.43	2.05	–	0.16	0.23	–0.263	204
	freshwater food web	directed	92	997	10.84	1.90	–	0.20	0.087	–0.326	272
	neural network	directed	307	2 359	7.68	3.97	–	0.18	0.28	–0.226	416, 421

TABLE II Basic statistics for a number of published networks. The properties measured are: type of graph, directed or undirected; total number of vertices  $n$ ; total number of edges  $m$ ; mean degree  $z$ ; mean vertex–vertex distance  $\ell$ ; exponent  $\alpha$  of degree distribution if the distribution follows a power law (or “–” if not; in/out-degree exponents are given for directed graphs); clustering coefficient  $C^{(1)}$  from Eq. (3); clustering coefficient  $C^{(2)}$  from Eq. (6); and degree correlation coefficient  $r$ , Sec. III.F. The last column gives the citation(s) for the network in the bibliography. Blank entries indicate unavailable data.

# Small worlds in real networks


- For all real networks there are (on average) **short paths** between nodes of the network.
  - Largest path found in the IMDB actor network: 7
- Is this interesting?
  - **Random graphs** also have **small diameter**  
( $d = \log n / \log \log n$  when  $z = \omega(\log n)$ )
- **Short paths are not surprising** and should be combined with other properties
  - ease of navigation
  - high clustering coefficient

# Connected components



- For undirected graphs, the size and distribution of the **connected components**
  - is there a **giant component** that contains a large fraction of the nodes?
- Most known real undirected networks have a giant component
  - The giant component usually captures more than 80% of the nodes in the graph.
- For directed graphs, the size and distribution of **strongly** and **weakly connected components**

# Connected components – definitions

- Weakly connected components (WCC)
  - Set of nodes such that from any node can go to any node via an **undirected** path
- Strongly connected components (SCC)
  - Set of nodes such that from any node can go to any node via a **directed** path.
  - **IN:** Nodes that can reach the SCC (but not in the SCC)
  - **OUT:** Nodes reachable by the SCC (but not in the SCC)



# The bow-tie structure of the Web





The largest weakly connected component contains 90% of the nodes




# SCC and WCC distribution

- The SCC and WCC sizes follows a power law distribution
  - the second largest SCC is significantly smaller



# Web Cores

- **Cores:** Small complete bipartite graphs (of size  $3 \times 3$ ,  $4 \times 3$ ,  $4 \times 4$ )
  - Similar to the triangles for undirected graphs
- Found more frequently than expected on the Web graph
- Correspond to communities of enthusiasts (e.g., fans of Japanese rock bands)




# Motifs

- Most networks have the same characteristics with respect to **global measurements**
  - can we say something about the **local structure** of the networks?
- **Motifs**: Find small subgraphs that are **over-represented** in the network

# Example

- Motifs of size 3 in a directed graph




# Finding interesting motifs


- Sample a part of the graph of size  $S$
- Count the frequency of the motifs of interest
- Compare against the frequency of the motif in a random graph with the same number of nodes **and** the same degree distribution

# Generating a random graph

- Find edges  $(i,j)$  and  $(x,y)$  such that edges  $(i,y)$  and  $(x,j)$  do not exist, and swap them
  - repeat for a large enough number of times





degrees of  $i,j,x,y$   
are preserved



G-swapped


# The feed-forward loop

- Over-represented in gene-regulation networks
  - a signal delay mechanism




# Homophily

- Love of the same: People tend to have friends with common interests
  - Students separated by race and age





# Measuring Homophily



If the fraction of cross-gender edges is significantly less than expected, then there is evidence for homophily

gender male with probability  $p$  (fraction of males)  
gender female with probability  $q$  (fraction of females)

Probability of cross-gender edge?

$$\frac{\#cross\_gender\_edges}{\#edges} \ll 2pq$$

# Measuring Homophily

- We need to define what we mean by “significantly” less than
- Heterophily may also be interesting: In this case we want the ratio to be significantly larger than  $2pq$
- Characteristics with more than two values:
  - Number of heterogeneous edges (edge between two nodes that are different)

# Mechanisms Underlying Homophily: Selection and Social Influence

**Selection:** tendency of people to form friendships with others who are like them

**Socialization or Social Influence:** the existing social connections in a network are influencing the individual characteristics of the individuals

**Social Influence as the inverse of Selection**

Mutable & immutable characteristics

# The Interplay of Selection and Social Influence

**Longitudinal studies** in which the social connections and the behaviors within a group are tracked over a period of time

## Why?

- Study teenagers, scholastic achievements/drug use (peer pressure and selection)
- Relative impact?
- Effect of possible interventions (example, drug use)

# The Interplay of Selection and Social Influence

Christakis and Fowler on obesity, 12,000 people over a period of 32-years

*People more similar on obesity status to the network neighbors than if assigned randomly*

Why?

- (i) Because of selection effects, choose friends of similar obesity status,
  - (ii) Because of confounding effects of homophily according to other characteristics that correlate with obesity
  - (iii) Because changes in the obesity status of person's friends was exerting an influence that affected her
- (iii) As well -> "contagion" in a social sense

# Tracking Link Formation in Online Data: interplay between selection and social influence

- Underlying social network
- Measure for behavioral similarity

Wikipedia

*Node*: Wikipedia editor who maintains a user account and user talk page

*Link*: if they have communicated with one writing on the user talk page of the other

Editor's behavior: set of articles she has edited

*Neighborhood overlap in the bipartite affiliation network of editors and articles consisting only of edges between editors and the articles they have edited*

$$\frac{|N_A \cap N_B|}{|N_A \cup N_B|}$$

**FACT:** Wikipedia editors who have communicated are significantly more similar in their behavior than pairs of Wikipedia editors who have not (homophily), **why?**

Selection (editors form connections with those have edited the same articles) vs

Social Influence (editors are led to the articles of people they talk to)


# Tracking Link Formation in Online Data: interplay between selection and social influence

Actions in Wikipedia are time-stamped

For each pair of editors A and B who have ever communicated,

- Record their similarity over time
- Time 0 when they first communicated -- Time moves in discrete units, advancing by one “tick” whenever either A or B performs an action on Wikipedia
- Plot one curve for each pair of editors

Average, single plot: average level of similarity relative to the time of first interaction



Similarity is clearly increasing both before and after the moment of first interaction (both selection and social influence)

Not symmetric around time 0 (particular role on similarity): Significant increase before they meet

Blue line shows similarity of a random pair (non-interacting)

# References

- M. E. J. Newman, *Power laws, Pareto distributions and Zipf's law*, *Contemporary Physics*.
- M. E. J. Newman, *The structure and function of complex networks*, *SIAM Reviews*, 45(2): 167-256, 2003
- R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, *Statistical mechanics of complex networks*, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **74**, 47-97 (2002).
- S. N. Dorogovstev and J. F. F. Mendez, *Evolution of Networks: From Biological Nets to the Internet and WWW*.
- Michalis Faloutsos, Petros Faloutsos and Christos Faloutsos. *On Power-Law Relationships of the Internet Topology*. ACM SIGCOMM 1999.
- E. Ravasz, A. L. Somera, D. A. Mongru, Z. N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabási, *Hierarchical organization of modularity in metabolic networks*, *Science* **297**, 1551-1555 (2002).
- R Milo, S Shen-Orr, S Itzkovitz, N Kashtan, D Chklovskii & U Alon, *Network Motifs: Simple Building Blocks of Complex Networks*. *Science*, 298:824-827 (2002).
- R Milo, S Itzkovitz, N Kashtan, R Levitt, S Shen-Orr, I Ayzenshtat, M Sheffer & U Alon, *Superfamilies of designed and evolved networks*. *Science*, 303:1538-42 (2004).



# **NETWORK MODELS**

# What is a network model?

- Informally, a network model is a **process** (randomized or deterministic) for generating a graph of arbitrary size.
- Models of **static** graphs
  - **input**: a set of parameters  $\Phi$ , and the size of the graph  $n$
  - **output**: a graph  $G(\Phi, n)$
- Models of **evolving** graphs
  - **input**: a set of parameters  $\Phi$ , and an initial graph  $G_0$
  - **output**: a graph  $G_t$  for each time  $t$


# Families of random graphs

- A deterministic model  $D$  defines a single graph for each value of  $n$  (or  $t$ )
- A randomized model  $R$  defines a probability space  $\langle G_n, P \rangle$  where  $G_n$  is the set of all graphs of size  $n$ , and  $P$  a probability distribution over the set  $G_n$  (similarly for  $t$ )
  - we call this a family of random graphs  $R$ , or a random graph  $R$

# Why do we care?

- Creating models for real-life graphs is important for several reasons
  - Create data for **simulations** of processes on networks
  - Identify the **underlying mechanisms** that govern the network generation
  - **Predict** the evolution of networks

# Erdős-Renyi Random graphs



Paul Erdős (1913-1996)

# Erdős-Renyi Random Graphs

- The  $G_{n,p}$  model
  - **input**: the number of vertices  $n$ , and a parameter  $p$ ,  $0 \leq p \leq 1$
  - **process**: for each pair  $(i,j)$ , generate the edge  $(i,j)$  independently with probability  $p$
- Related, but not identical: The  $G_{n,m}$  model
  - **process**: select  $m$  edges uniformly at random

# Random graphs degree distributions

- The degree distribution follows a **binomial**

$$p(k) = B(n; k; p) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$$

- Assuming  $z=np$  is fixed, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $B(n,k,p)$  is approximated by a **Poisson** distribution

$$p(k) = P(k; z) = \frac{z^k}{k!} e^{-z}$$

- Highly concentrated around the mean, with a tail that drops **exponentially**

# Other properties

- Clustering coefficient
  - $C = p$
- Diameter (maximum path)
  - $L = \log n / \log z$



# The giant component

- Let  $z=np$  be the average degree
- If  $z < 1$ , then almost surely, the largest component has size at most  $O(\ln n)$
- if  $z > 1$ , then almost surely, the largest component has size  $\Theta(n)$ . The second largest component has size  $O(\ln n)$
- if  $z = \omega(\ln n)$ , then the graph is almost surely connected.

# The phase transition

- When  $z=1$ , there is a phase transition
  - The largest component is  $O(n^{2/3})$
  - The sizes of the components follow a power-law distribution.

# Phase transitions

- **Phase transitions** (a.k.a. Threshold Phenomena, Critical phenomena) are observed in a variety of natural or human processes, and they have been studied extensively by Physicists and Mathematicians
  - Also, in popular science: “**The tipping point**”
- Examples
  - Water becoming ice
  - Percolation
  - Giant components in graphs
- In all of these examples, the transition from one state to another (e.g., from water to ice) happens almost instantaneously when a parameter crosses a **threshold**
- At the threshold value we have **critical phenomena**, and the appearance of **Power Laws**
  - There is no characteristic scale.

# Random graphs and real life

- A beautiful and elegant theory studied exhaustively
- Random graphs had been used as idealized network models
- Unfortunately, they don't capture reality...

# Departing from the ER model

- We need models that better capture the characteristics of real graphs
  - degree sequences
  - clustering coefficient
  - short paths

# Graphs with given degree sequences


- The configuration model
  - input: the degree sequence  $[d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n]$
  - process:
    - Create  $d_i$  copies of node  $i$
    - Take a **random matching** (pairing) of the copies
      - self-loops and multiple edges are allowed
- Uniform distribution over the graphs with the given degree sequence

# Example


- Suppose that the degree sequence is



- Create multiple copies of the nodes



- Pair the nodes uniformly at random
- Generate the resulting network



# Power-law graphs

- The critical value for the exponent  $\alpha$  is

$$\alpha = 3.4788\dots$$

- The clustering coefficient is

$$C \propto n^{-\beta} \quad \beta = \frac{3\alpha - 7}{\alpha - 1}$$

- When  $\alpha < 7/3$  the clustering coefficient **increases** with  $n$



# However...

- The problem is that these models are too contrived
- It would be more interesting if the network structure **emerged** as a side product of a stochastic process rather than fixing its properties in advance.

# Preferential Attachment

- Power-laws are connected with the **rich-get-richer** process
  - Those who already have a lot, are more likely to receive more
- It can be shown mathematically that this will result in power-law distribution.
  - Explains power-laws in income distribution or city population
- In networks this is called “**Preferential Attachment**”:
  - Nodes with high degree are more likely to get more neighbors.

# Preferential Attachment in Networks

- First considered by [Price 65] as a model for citation networks (directed)
  - each new paper is generated with  $m$  citations (mean)
  - new papers cite previous papers with probability proportional to their in-degree (citations)
  - what about papers without any citations?
    - each paper is considered to have a “default”  $a$  citations
    - probability of citing a paper with degree  $k$ , proportional to  $k+a$
- Power law with exponent  $\alpha = 2+a/m$

# Barabasi-Albert model

- The BA model (undirected graph)
  - **input**: some initial subgraph  $G_0$ , and  $m$  the number of edges per new node
  - **the process**:
    - nodes arrive one at the time
    - each node connects to  $m$  other nodes selecting them with probability proportional to their degree
    - if  $[d_1, \dots, d_t]$  is the degree sequence at time  $t$ , the node  $t+1$  links to node  $i$  with probability

$$\frac{d_i}{\sum_i d_i} = \frac{d_i}{2mt}$$

- Results in power-law with exponent  $\alpha = 3$

# The mathematicians point of view

## [Bollobas-Riordan]

- Self loops and multiple edges are allowed
- For the **single edge** problem:
  - At time  $t$ , a new vertex  $v$ , connects to an existing vertex  $u$  with probability
$$\frac{d_u}{2t-1}$$
  - it creates a self-loop with probability
$$\frac{1}{2t-1}$$
- If  $m$  edges, then they are inserted **sequentially**, as if inserting  $m$  nodes
  - the problem reduces to studying the single edge problem.

# Preferential attachment graphs

- Expected diameter
  - if  $m = 1$ , the diameter is  $\Theta(\log n)$
  - if  $m > 1$ , the diameter is  $\Theta(\log n / \log \log n)$
- Expected clustering coefficient is small

$$E[C^{(2)}] = \frac{m-1}{8} \frac{\log^2 n}{n}$$

# Weaknesses of the BA model

- Technical issues:
  - It is not directed (not good as a model for the Web) and when directed it gives acyclic graphs
  - It focuses mainly on the (in-) degree and does not take into account other parameters (out-degree distribution, components, clustering coefficient)
  - It correlates age with degree which is not always the case
- Academic issues
  - the model rediscovers the wheel
  - preferential attachment is not the answer to every power-law
  - what does “scale-free” mean exactly?
- Yet, it was a breakthrough in the network research
  - It reintroduced the preferential attachment process
  - It defined the notion of scale free graphs
  - It popularized Network Science


# Variations of the BA model

- Many **variations** have been considered some in order to address the problems with the vanilla BA model
  - edge rewiring, **appearance** and **disappearance**
  - **fitness** parameters
  - **variable** mean degree
  - **non-linear** preferential attachment
    - surprisingly, only linear preferential attachment yields power-law graphs



# Empirical observations for the Web graph

- In a large scale experimental study by Kumar et al, they observed that the Web contains a large number of small **bipartite cliques** (cores)
  - the **topical** structure of the Web



a  $K_{3,2}$  clique



- Such subgraphs are highly unlikely in random graphs
- They are also unlikely in the BA model
- Can we create a model that will have high concentration of small cliques?

# Copying model

- Input:
  - the out-degree  $d$  (constant) of each node
  - a parameter  $\alpha$
- The process:
  - Nodes arrive one at the time
  - A new node selects uniformly one of the existing nodes as a **prototype**
  - The new node creates  $d$  outgoing links. For the  $i^{\text{th}}$  link
    - with probability  $\alpha$  it copies the  $i$ -th link of the prototype node
    - with probability  $1 - \alpha$  it selects the target of the link uniformly at random

# An example

- $d = 3$



# Copying model properties




- Power law degree distribution with exponent  $\beta = (2-\alpha)/(1-\alpha)$
- Number of bipartite cliques of size  $i \times d$  is  $ne^{-i}$
- The model has also found applications in biological networks
  - copying mechanism in gene mutations

# Small world Phenomena

- So far we focused on obtaining graphs with power-law distributions on the degrees. What about other properties?
  - **Clustering coefficient**: real-life networks tend to have high clustering coefficient
    - This property can appear if **edges that close triangles** have higher probability
  - **Short paths**: real-life networks are “**small worlds**”
    - This property can appear by adding **random edges**.
  - Can we combine these two properties?

# Clustering Coefficient

- How can you create a graph with high clustering coefficient?




- High clustering coefficient but long paths

# Small-world Graphs

- According to Watts [W99]
  - Large networks ( $n \gg 1$ )
  - Sparse connectivity (avg degree  $z \ll n$ )
  - No central node ( $k_{\max} \ll n$ )
  - Large clustering coefficient (larger than in random graphs of same size)
  - Short average paths ( $\sim \log n$ , close to those of random graphs of the same size)

# The Caveman Model [W99]

- The random graph
  - edges are generated completely at random
  - low avg. path length  $L \leq \log n / \log z$
  - low clustering coefficient  $C \sim z/n$
- The Caveman model
  - edges follow a structure
  - high avg. path length  $L \sim n/z$
  - high clustering coefficient  $C \sim 1 - O(1/z)$
- Can we interpolate between the two?





# Mixing order with randomness

- Inspired by the work of Solmonoff and Rapoport
  - nodes that share neighbors should have higher probability to be connected
- Generate an edge between  $i$  and  $j$  with probability **proportional** to  $R_{ij}$

$$R_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m_{ij} \geq z \\ \left(\frac{m_{ij}}{z}\right)^\alpha (1-p) + p & \text{if } 0 < m_{ij} < z \\ p & \text{if } m_{ij} = 0 \end{cases}$$


$m_{ij}$  = number of **common neighbors** of  $i$  and  $j$   
 $z$  = average degree (high)  
 $p$  = very small value

- When  $\alpha = 0$ , edges are placed only between nodes with common neighbors (caveman model)
- When  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , edges are essentially independent of the common neighbors (except for rare cases)
- For intermediate values we obtain a combination of order and randomness

# Algorithm

- Start with a ring
- For  $i = 1 \dots n$ 
  - Select a vertex  $j$  with probability proportional to  $R_{ij}$  and generate an edge  $(i,j)$
- Repeat until  $z$  edges are added to each vertex


# Clustering coefficient – Avg path length



small world graphs


# Watts and Strogatz model [WS98]

- Start with a ring, where every node is connected to the next  $z$  nodes
- With probability  $p$ , **rewire** every edge (or, **add a shortcut**) to a uniformly chosen destination.
  - Granovetter, “The strength of weak ties”




order

$p = 0$




$0 < p < 1$



randomness

$p = 1$

# Clustering Coefficient – Characteristic Path Length



When  $p = 0$ ,  $C = 3(k-2)/4(k-1) \sim 3/4$   
 $L = n/k$

For small  $p$ ,  $C \sim 3/4$   
 $L \sim \log n$

# Graph Theory Results

- Graph theorist failed to be impressed. Adding random edges is known to decrease the diameter of a graph.

# Network models and temporal evolution



- For most of the existing models it is assumed that
  - number of edges grows linearly with the number of nodes
  - the diameter grows at rate  $\log n$ , or  $\log \log n$
- What about real graphs?
  - Leskovec, Kleinberg, Faloutsos 2005

# Densification laws

- In real-life networks the average degree increases! – networks become **denser**!



$$E(t) \propto N(t)^{\alpha}$$

$\alpha$  = densification exponent






# More examples







- The densification exponent  $1 \leq \alpha \leq 2$ 
  - $\alpha = 1$ : linear growth – constant out degree
  - $\alpha = 2$ : quadratic growth - clique

# What about diameter?

- **Effective diameter**: the interpolated value where 90% of node pairs are reachable



# Diameter shrinks




# Modeling Densification

- Existing graph generation models do not capture the **Densification Power Law** and **Shrinking diameters**
- Can we find a simple model of **local** behavior, which naturally leads to observed phenomena?
- Two proposed models
  - **Community Guided Attachment** – obeys Densification
  - **Forest Fire model** – obeys Densification, Shrinking diameter (and Power Law degree distribution)

# Community structure

- Let's assume the **community structure**
- One expects many within-group friendships and fewer cross-group ones
- How hard is it to **cross communities?**



Self-similar university  
community structure

# Fundamental Assumption

- The cross-community linking probability of nodes at tree-distance  $h$  (the height of the least common ancestor) is **scale-free**
- We propose cross-community linking probability:

$$f(h) = c^{-h}$$


where:  $c \geq 1$  ... the **Difficulty constant**

$h$  ... tree-distance


# Densification Power Law

- Theorem: The **Community Guided Attachment** leads to **Densification Power Law** with exponent

$$a = 2 - \log_b(c)$$



- **$\alpha$**  ... densification exponent  $E(t) \propto N(t)^a$
- **$b$**  ... community structure branching factor
- **$c$**  ... difficulty constant



# Difficulty Constant

- Theorem:

$$a = 2 - \log_b(c)$$

- Gives any non-integer Densification exponent
- If  $c = 1$ : easy to cross communities
  - Then:  $\alpha = 2$ , quadratic growth of edges – near clique
- If  $c = b$ : hard to cross communities
  - Then:  $\alpha = 1$ , linear growth of edges – constant out-degree



# Room for Improvement

- Community Guided Attachment explains **Densification Power Law**
- Issues:
  - Requires explicit **Community structure**
  - Does not obey **Shrinking Diameters**
- The "Forrest Fire" model

# “Forest Fire” model – Wish List

- We want:
  - no explicit Community structure
  - Shrinking diameters
  - and:
    - “Rich get richer” attachment process, to get heavy-tailed in-degrees
    - “Copying” model, to lead to communities
    - Community Guided Attachment, to produce  
Densification Power Law

# “Forest Fire” model – Intuition


- How do authors identify references?
  1. Find first paper and cite it
  2. Follow a few citations, make citations
  3. Continue recursively
  4. From time to time use bibliographic tools (e.g. Google Scholar) and chase back-links

# “Forest Fire” model – Intuition

- How do people make friends in a new environment?
  1. Find first a person and make friends
  2. From time to time get introduced to their friends
  3. Continue recursively
- Forest Fire model imitates exactly this process



# “Forest Fire” – the Model

- A node arrives
- Randomly chooses an “ambassador”
- Starts burning nodes (with probability  $p$ ) and adds links to burned nodes
- “Fire” spreads recursively





# Forest Fire in Action (1)

- Forest Fire generates graphs that **Densify** and have **Shrinking Diameter**



# Forest Fire in Action (2)

- Forest Fire also generates graphs with **heavy-tailed degree distribution**



# Forest Fire model – Justification

- **Densification Power Law:**
  - Similar to Community Guided Attachment
  - The probability of linking decays exponentially with the distance – Densification Power Law
- **Power law out-degrees:**
  - From time to time we get large fires
- **Power law in-degrees:**
  - The fire is more likely to reach hubs



# Forest Fire model – Justification


- Communities:
  - Newcomer copies neighbors' links
- Shrinking diameter

# Kronecker graphs

- **Kronecker graphs** are a model for generating graphs using the **Kronecker product** matrix operation
  - Leskovec, Chakrabarti, Kleinberg, Faloutsos, PKDD 2005
- Kronecker graphs have **rich properties**:
  - Static Patterns
    - Power Law Degree Distribution
    - Small Diameter
    - Power Law Eigenvalue and Eigenvector Distribution
  - Temporal Patterns
    - Densification Power Law
    - Shrinking/Constant Diameter
- Kronecker graphs are **analytically tractable**




# Idea: Recursive graph generation

- Intuition: self-similarity leads to **power-laws**
- Try to mimic **recursive** graph / community growth
- There are many obvious (but wrong) ways:



- **Kronecker Product** is a way of generating self-similar matrices

# Kronecker product: Graph



Intermediate stage

1	1	0
1	1	1
0	1	1

(3x3)

$G_1$

Adjacency matrix

$G_1$	$G_1$	0
$G_1$	$G_1$	$G_1$
0	$G_1$	$G_1$

(9x9)

$G_2 = G_1 \otimes G_1$

Adjacency matrix

# Kronecker product: Definition

- The Kronecker product of matrices  $A$  and  $B$  is given by

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B} \doteq \begin{pmatrix} a_{1,1}\mathbf{B} & a_{1,2}\mathbf{B} & \dots & a_{1,m}\mathbf{B} \\ a_{2,1}\mathbf{B} & a_{2,2}\mathbf{B} & \dots & a_{2,m}\mathbf{B} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n,1}\mathbf{B} & a_{n,2}\mathbf{B} & \dots & a_{n,m}\mathbf{B} \end{pmatrix}$$

$N * K \times M * L$

- We define a Kronecker product of two graphs as a Kronecker product of their adjacency matrices

# Kronecker graphs

- We create the self-similar graphs **recursively**
  - Start with an **initiator** graph  $G_1$  on  $N_1$  nodes and  $E_1$  edges
  - The recursion will then produce larger graphs  $G_2, G_3, \dots, G_k$  on  $N_1^k$  nodes
- We obtain a growing sequence of graphs by iterating the **Kronecker product**


$$G_k = \underbrace{G_1 \otimes G_1 \otimes \dots \otimes G_1}_{k \text{ times}}$$

# Kronecker product: Graph

- Continuing multiplying with  $G_1$  we obtain  $G_2$  and so on ...

1	1	0
1	1	1
0	1	1

$G_1$




1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1

$G_2$  adjacency matrix

# Kronecker product: Graph


- Continuing multiplying with  $G_1$  we obtain  $G_2$  and so on ...




Each cell in  $G_2$  is the product by two cells in  $G_1$   
 Each cell in  $G_3$  is the product of three cells in  $G_1$   
 and so on



# Example




(a)  $K_3$  adjacency matrix ( $27 \times 27$ )





(b)  $K_4$  adjacency matrix ( $81 \times 81$ )


# Examples



1	1	1	1
1	1	0	0
1	0	1	0
1	0	0	1



1	1	1	1
1	1	0	0
1	0	1	1
1	0	1	1






Initiator  $K_1$

$K_1$  adjacency matrix

$K_3$  adjacency matrix


# Kronecker graphs: Intuition

- **Recursive growth of graph communities**
  - Nodes get expanded to micro communities
  - Nodes in sub-community link among themselves and to nodes from different communities as determined by the original graph  $G_1$




# Kronecker graphs


- Kronecker graphs have nice properties but they are deterministic and the distributions we obtain are not smooth:



(a) Kronecker initiator  $K_1$



(b) Degree distribution of  $K_6$  ( $6^{th}$  Kronecker power of  $K_1$ )




(c) Network value of  $K_6$  ( $6^{th}$  Kronecker power of  $K_1$ )

Figure 5: The “staircase” effect. Kronecker initiator and the degree distribution and network value plot for the  $6^{th}$  Kronecker power of the initiator. Notice the non-smoothness of the curves.

# Stochastic Kronecker graphs

- Create  $N_1 \times N_1$  **probability matrix**  $\Theta_1$
- Compute the  $k^{\text{th}}$  Kronecker power  $\Theta_k$
- For each entry  $p_{uv}$  of  $\Theta_k$  include an edge  $(u, v)$  with probability  $p_{uv}$



# Stochastic Kronecker graphs: Intuition

- **Node attribute representation**

- Nodes are described by  $k$  features

- [in loannina, student, computer science]

- $u=[1,1,0]$ ,  $v=[1, 1,1]$

- Parameter matrix gives the linking probability

- $p(u,v) = 0.5 * 0.5 * 0.1 = 0.025$

Both in loannina

Both students

One CS one not

		<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>
$\Theta_1$	<i>1</i>	0.5	0.1
	<i>0</i>	0.1	0.3

We could have different probabilities for different attributes

# Kronecker graph construction

- We can construct the graph by flipping a coin for **each** of the possible edges.
  - But this is expensive, **quadratic number** of coins to flip.
- We can exploit the **recursive/hierarchical** nature of Kronecker graphs

	$u_1$	$u_2$
$u_1$	a	b
$u_2$	c	d

(a)  $2 \times 2$  Stochastic Kronecker initiator  $\mathcal{P}_1$

	$v_1$	$v_2$	$v_3$	$v_4$
$v_1$	a·a	a·b	b·a	b·b
$v_2$	a·c	a·d	b·c	b·d
$v_3$	c·a	c·b	d·a	d·b
$v_4$	c·c	c·d	d·c	d·d

(b) Probability matrix  $\mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_1 \otimes \mathcal{P}_1$

	$v_1$	$v_2$	$v_3$	$v_4$
$v_1$	a	b	a	b
$v_2$	<b>a</b>	d	<b>c</b>	d
$v_3$	a	b	a	b
$v_4$	<b>c</b>	d	<b>d</b>	d

(c) Alternative view of  $\mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_1 \otimes \mathcal{P}_1$

# Kronecker graph construction

- If for  $P_1$  we have that  $E_1 = \sum_{ij} \theta_{ij}$  then the number of edges is normally distributed with expectation  $E_1^k$
- Process:
  - Sample the **number of edges** from the normal distribution
  - For each edge to be added, **descend** to the position of the edge:
    - Pick a top-level cell with probability  $\theta_{ij}/E_1$
    - Within the top-level cell repeat recursively
    - Until you have gone down  $k$  levels



# Example

	$u_1$	$u_2$
$u_1$	a	b
$u_2$	c	d

(a)  $2 \times 2$  Stochastic Kronecker initiator  $\mathcal{P}_1$

	$v_1$	$v_2$	$v_3$	$v_4$
$v_1$	a·a	a·b	b·a	b·b
$v_2$	a·c	a·d	b·c	b·d
$v_3$	c·a	c·b	d·a	d·b
$v_4$	c·c	c·d	d·c	d·d

(b) Probability matrix  
 $\mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_1 \otimes \mathcal{P}_1$

	$v_1$	$v_2$	$v_3$	$v_4$
$v_1$	a	b	a	b
$v_2$	<b>a</b>	d	<b>c</b>	d
$v_3$	a	b	a	b
$v_4$	<b>c</b>	d	<b>d</b>	d

(c) Alternative view  
of  $\mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_1 \otimes \mathcal{P}_1$


- To generate the edge  $(v_2, v_3)$  first we pick the top quadrant
- Then within that we pick the exact cell of the matrix.

# Properties of Kronecker graphs

- We **prove** that Kronecker multiplication generates graphs that obey [PKDD'05]
  - Properties of static networks
    - ✓ Power Law Degree Distribution
    - ✓ Power Law eigenvalue and eigenvector distribution
    - ✓ Small Diameter
  - Properties of dynamic networks
    - ✓ Densification Power Law
    - ✓ Shrinking/Stabilizing Diameter
- Good news: Kronecker graphs have the necessary **expressive power**

# Experiments

- Use a 4-star as the graph  $G_1$



1	1	1	1
1	1	0	0
1	0	1	0
1	0	0	1

$\alpha$	$\alpha$	$\alpha$	$\alpha$
$\alpha$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\beta$
$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$
$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\alpha$

- Make the matrix **stochastic** by having probability  $\alpha$  for all edges and  $\beta$  for all non-edges in the matrix




Figure 7: *Citation network (CIT-HEP-TH)*: Patterns from the real graph (top row), the deterministic Kronecker graph with  $K_1$  being a star graph on 4 nodes (center + 3 satellites) (middle row), and the Stochastic Kronecker graph ( $\alpha = 0.41$ ,  $\beta = 0.11$  – bottom row). *Static* patterns: (a) is the PDF of degrees in the graph (log-log scale), and (b) the distribution of eigenvalues (log-log scale). *Temporal* patterns: (c) gives the effective diameter over time (linear-linear scale), and (d) is the number of edges versus number of nodes over time (log-log scale). Notice that the Stochastic Kronecker graphs qualitatively matches all the patterns very well.







Figure 8: *Autonomous systems (AS-ROUTEVIEWS)*: Real (top) versus Kronecker (bottom). Columns (a) and (b) show the degree distribution and the scree plot, as before. Columns (c) and (d) show two more static patterns (see text). Notice that, again, the Stochastic Kronecker graph matches well the properties of the real graph.



(a) Increasing diameter  
 $\alpha = 0.38, \beta = 0$



(b) Constant diameter  
 $\alpha = 0.43, \beta = 0$



(c) Decreasing diameter  
 $\alpha = 0.54, \beta = 0$

Figure 9: Effective diameter over time for a 4-node chain initiator graph. After each consecutive Kronecker power we measure the effective diameter. We use different settings of  $\alpha$  parameter.  $\alpha = 0.38, 0.43, 0.54$  and  $\beta = 0$ , respectively.

# Threshold phenomena




Figure 10: Fraction of nodes in the largest weakly connected component ( $N_c/N$ ) and the effective diameter for 4-star initiator graph. (a) We fix  $\beta = 0.15$  and vary  $\alpha$ . (b) We vary both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . (c) Effective diameter of the network, if network is disconnected or very dense path lengths are short, the diameter is large when the network is barely connected.

# Model estimation: approach

- How do we choose the parameters to match the properties of a real network?
- **Maximum likelihood estimation**


- Given real graph  $G$

- Estimate Kronecker initiator graph  $\Theta$  (e.g., 

1	1	0
1	1	1
0	1	1

) which

$$\arg \max_{\Theta} P(G | \Theta)$$



- We need to (efficiently) calculate


$$P(G | \Theta)$$

- And maximize over  $\Theta$  (e.g., using gradient descent)








# Fitting Kronecker graphs

- Given a graph  $G$  and Kronecker matrix  $\Theta$  we calculate probability that  $\Theta$  generated  $G$   $P(G/\Theta)$



$$P(G | \Theta) = \prod_{(u,v) \in G} \Theta_k[u, v] \prod_{(u,v) \notin G} (1 - \Theta_k[u, v])$$

# Challenge 1: Node correspondence



$$P(G'|\Theta) = P(G''|\Theta)$$

- Nodes are **unlabeled**
- Graphs  $G'$  and  $G''$  should have the same probability

$$P(G'|\Theta) = P(G''|\Theta)$$

- One needs to consider all node correspondences  $\sigma$

$$P(G|\Theta) = \sum_{\sigma} P(G|\Theta, \sigma)P(\sigma)$$



- All correspondences are a priori equally likely
- **There are  $O(N!)$  correspondences**
- Solution: Sample from the possible distributions

## Challenge 2: Calculating $P(G/\Theta, \sigma)$

- Calculating naively  $P(G/\Theta, \sigma)$  takes  $O(N^2)$
- Idea:
  - First calculate likelihood of **empty graph**, a graph with 0 edges
  - Correct the likelihood for edges that we observe in the graph
- By exploiting the structure of Kronecker product we obtain **closed form** for likelihood of an empty graph

# Challenge 2: Calculating $P(G/\Theta, \sigma)$

- We approximate the likelihood:



$$l(\Theta) \approx \underbrace{l_e(\Theta)}_{\text{Empty graph}} + \sum_{(u,v) \in G} \underbrace{-\log(1 - \Theta_k[\sigma_u, \sigma_v])}_{\text{No-edge likelihood}} + \underbrace{\log(\Theta_k[\sigma_u, \sigma_v])}_{\text{Edge likelihood}}$$

- The sum goes only over the edges
- Evaluating  $P(G/\Theta, \sigma)$  takes  $O(E)$  time
- Real graphs are **sparse**,  $E \ll N^2$

# Experiments: real networks

- Experimental setup:
  - Given real graph
  - Stochastic gradient descent from random initial point
  - Obtain estimated parameters
  - Generate synthetic graphs
  - Compare properties of both graphs
- We do not fit the properties themselves
- We fit the likelihood and then compare the graph properties



# AS graph (N=6500, E=26500)

- Autonomous systems (internet)
- We search the space of  $\sim 10^{50,000}$  permutations
- Fitting takes 20 minutes
- AS graph is undirected and estimated parameter matrix is symmetric:

0.98	0.58
0.58	0.06



# AS: comparing graph properties

- Generate synthetic graph using estimated parameters
- Compare the properties of two graphs



# AS: comparing graph properties

- Spectral properties of graph adjacency matrices







# Epinions graph (N=76k, E=510k)


- We search the space of  $\sim 10^{1,000,000}$  permutations
- Fitting takes 2 hours
- The structure of the estimated parameter gives insight into the structure of the graph

0.99	0.54
0.49	0.13




# Epinions graph (N=76k, E=510k)

Scree plot




Network value



# Scalability

- Fitting scales **linearly** with the number of edges



# Conclusion

- Kronecker Graph model has
  - **provable** properties
  - small number of parameters
- We developed **scalable** algorithms for fitting Kronecker Graphs
- We can **efficiently search** large space ( $\sim 10^{1,000,000}$ ) of permutations
- Kronecker graphs fit well real networks using **few parameters**
- We match graph properties without a priori deciding on which ones to fit

# References

- *Graphs over Time: Densification Laws, Shrinking Diameters and Possible Explanations*, by Jure Leskovec, Jon Kleinberg, Christos Faloutsos, ACM KDD 2005
- *Graph Evolution: Densification and Shrinking Diameters*, by Jure Leskovec, Jon Kleinberg and Christos Faloutsos, ACM TKDD 2007
- *Realistic, Mathematically Tractable Graph Generation and Evolution, Using Kronecker Multiplication*, by Jure Leskovec, Deepay Chakrabarti, Jon Kleinberg and Christos Faloutsos, PKDD 2005
- *Scalable Modeling of Real Graphs using Kronecker Multiplication*, by Jure Leskovec and Christos Faloutsos, ICML 2007

Acknowledgements: Christos Faloutsos, Jon Kleinberg, Zoubin Ghahramani, Pall Melsted, Alan Frieze, Larry Wasserman, Carlos Guestrin, Deepay Chakrabarti

# Acknowledgements

- Many thanks to Jure Leskovec for his slides from the KDD 2005 paper and his slides on Kronecker graphs

# References

- M. E. J. Newman, [The structure and function of complex networks](#), SIAM Reviews, 45(2): 167-256, 2003
- R. Albert and L.A. Barabasi, [Statistical Mechanics of Complex Networks](#), Rev. Mod. Phys. 74, 47-97 (2002).
- B. Bollobas, [Mathematical Results in Scale-Free random Graphs](#)
- D.J. Watts. Networks, [Dynamics and Small-World Phenomenon](#), American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 105, Number 2, 493-527, 1999
- Watts, D. J. and S. H. Strogatz. [Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks](#). Nature 393:440-42, 1998
- Michael T. Gastner and M. E. J. Newman, [Optimal design of spatial distribution networks](#), *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 016117 (2006).J.
- Leskovec, J. Kleinberg, C. Faloutsos. [Graphs over Time: Densification Laws, Shrinking Diameters and Possible Explanations](#). Proc. 11th ACM SIGKDD Intl. Conf. on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 2005.
- Jure Leskovec, Deepayan Chakrabarti, Jon M. Kleinberg, Christos Faloutsos, Zoubin Ghahramani, [Kronecker Graphs: An Approach to Modeling Networks](#). Journal of Machine Learning Research 11: 985-1042 (2010)