

International Journal of Modern Physics B
 © World Scientific Publishing Company

OPTIMIZATION OF SCALE-FREE NETWORK FOR RANDOM FAILURES

JIAN-GUO LIU[†], ZHONG-TUO WANG and YAN-ZHONG DANG

*Institute of System Engineering, Dalian University of Technology, 2 Ling Gong Rd.,
 Dalian 116024, P R China*

[†] *liujg004@tom.com*

Received (8 February 2005)

Revised (31 Aug 2005)

It has been found that the networks with scale-free distribution are very resilient to random failures. The purpose of this work is to determine the network design guideline which maximize the network robustness to random failures with the average number of links per node of the network is constant. The optimal value of the distribution exponent and the minimum connectivity to different network size are given in this paper. Finally, the optimization strategy how to improve the evolving network robustness is given.

Keywords: Scale-free network; optimal programme; power-law degree distribution; random failures.

1. Introduction

Recently, much attention has been focused on the topic of scale-free networks which characterize many social, information, technological and biological systems.^{1,2,3,4} The qualitative properties of many interesting real-world examples, such as the internet network, the power grid network and the protein interaction network, are as following:

- (1) the degree distribution has power-law tail;
- (2) local clustering of edges: graph is not locally tree-like;
- (3) small average distance.

The networks can be visualized by nodes representing individuals, organizations, computers and by links between them representing their interactions. For the purpose of analyzing topology, we ignore the variation in the type of links. Robustness of the network topology comes from the presence of alternate paths, which ensures the communication remains possible in spite of the damages to the network.

Designers of the networks must assume that networks have random failures or might be attacked, and some of these attacks can result in damage. The robust networks will continue functioning in spite of such damages. Although many litera-

tures have discussed what the optimal network topology would be, many real-world networks present the power-law degree distribution.

When the scale-free networks are subjected to random breakdowns, with a fraction p of the nodes and their connections are removed randomly, the network's integrity might be compromised: when the exponent of the power-law degree distribution $\gamma > 3$, there exists a critical threshold p_c , such that for $p > p_c$, the network would break into smaller and disconnected parts, but the networks with $\gamma < 3$ are more resilient to random breakdowns. Cohen *et. al*⁵ presented a criterion to calculate the percolation critical threshold to random failures to scale-free networks. If we attack the scale-free networks intentionally: the removal of sites is not random, but rather sites with the highest connectivity are targeted first. The numerical simulations suggest that scale-free networks are highly sensitive to this kind of attack.⁶ Cohen *et. al*⁷ studied the exact value of the critical fraction needed for disruption. Thus scale-free networks are highly robust against random failures of nodes and hypersensitive to intentional attacks against the system's largest nodes. So a randomly chosen node has low degree with high probability, but removal of a highly connected node might produce large effect to the network. This situation is often compared to that of the classical random graph presented by Erdős and Rényi.^{8,9} Such graphs have a Poisson degree distribution. This makes the random graphs less robust to random failures than comparable networks with power-law degree distribution, but much more robust against attacks on hubs.

In this paper, we specifically focus on the robustness of the network topology to random failures. We use the percolation theory and the optimization method to investigate the guideline which can maximize the robustness of the scale-free networks to random failures of nodes with the constrained condition that the average connectivity of per node in the network is constant. The percolation theory provides the measures of distribution which are possible ways for measuring robustness. We examine the relationship between the average connectivity per node and the network robustness to random failures. Then, we investigate the trend of the network robustness to random failures with the network size N . The work may provide the theoretical evidence that if the minimal connectivity and the exponent of the power-law degree distribution take in more optimal way, the robustness of the scale-free networks can be optimized.

If we construct and maintain a network with a given number of nodes as being proportional to the average number of links $\langle k \rangle$ per node in the network, our goal then becomes how to maximize the robustness of a network with N nodes to random failures with the constraint that the number of links remains constant but the nodes are connected in a different and more optimal way.

2. Optimal Strategy for Random Failures

Our goal is to maximize the threshold for random removal with the condition that the average degree $\langle k \rangle$ per node is constant. We construct the following model.

$$\begin{cases} \max p_c^{\text{rand}}, \\ \text{s.t. } \langle k \rangle = \text{constant}. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

For any degree distribution $P(k)$, the threshold for random removal of nodes is⁹

$$p_c^{\text{rand}} = 1 - \frac{1}{\kappa_0 - 1}, \quad (2)$$

where $\kappa_0 \equiv \frac{\langle k^2 \rangle}{\langle k \rangle}$ is calculated from the original connectivity distribution. A wide range of networks have the power-law degree distribution:

$$P(k) = ck^{-\alpha}, \quad k = m, m+1, \dots, K, \quad (3)$$

where $k = m$ is the minimal connectivity and $k = K$ is an effective connectivity cutoff presented in finite networks. To the power-law degree distribution, the average $\langle k \rangle$ can be given with the usual continuous approximation, this yields

$$\langle k \rangle = \int_m^K k \cdot ck^{-\alpha} dk = c \frac{[K^{(2-\alpha)} - m^{(2-\alpha)}]}{2-\alpha}. \quad (4)$$

From (3), κ_0 can be calculated as

$$\kappa_0 = \langle k^2 \rangle / \langle k \rangle = \frac{2-\alpha}{3-\alpha} \frac{[K^{(2-\alpha)} - m^{(2-\alpha)}]}{[K^{(3-\alpha)} - m^{(3-\alpha)}]}. \quad (5)$$

In a finite network, the largest connectivity K can be estimated from⁵

$$\int_K^\infty P(k) dk = \frac{1}{N},$$

where N is the number of the network nodes. Then we have that

$$\left(\frac{K}{m}\right)^{\alpha-1} = N. \quad (6)$$

To the power-law degree distribution $P(k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \int_m^K ck^{-\alpha} dk \\ &= c[K^{(1-\alpha)} - m^{(1-\alpha)}] / (1-\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

this yields

$$c = \frac{\alpha-1}{m^{(1-\alpha)} - K^{(1-\alpha)}} = \frac{m^\alpha(\alpha-1)}{m[1 - (\frac{K}{m})^{(1-\alpha)}]}.$$

In the real world, there always exists the relation $K \gg m$, so we have

$$c \approx \frac{m^\alpha(\alpha-1)}{m}. \quad (7)$$

4 *Jian-Guo Liu, et. al*

Table 1. When $N = 10^6$, the relationship between m and p_c^{rand} .

$\langle k \rangle$	$a(m=1)$	$a(m=2)$	$a(m=3)$	$a(m=4)$	$a(m=5)$	$a(m=6)$
3	2.492	4.000	–	–	–	–
4	2.318	2.998	5.000	–	–	–
5	2.225	2.662	3.498	6.000	–	–
6	2.172	2.491	2.998	4.000	7.00	–
7	2.126	2.388	2.747	3.333	4.50	8.00

Combining (5) and (7), we have that

$$\langle k \rangle \approx \frac{(\alpha - 1)}{(2 - \alpha)} m \left[\left(\frac{K}{m} \right)^{(2-\alpha)} - 1 \right]. \quad (8)$$

From (8), we have the following numerical results.

It can be seen from table 1 that the distribution exponent α increases when the minimal connectivity m increases.

Combining (6) and (8), we have that

$$\langle k \rangle = \frac{(\alpha - 1)}{(\alpha - 2)} m \frac{1 - N^{-\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha-1}}}{1 - N^{-1}}. \quad (9)$$

From table 1, we can get the following relationship:

- (1) When the average connectivity $\langle k \rangle$ per node is constant, the exponent α increases when the minimum connectivity m increases;
- (2) To the minimum connectivity $m = 1$, the exponent α decreases when the average connectivity $\langle k \rangle$ of the network increases.

Using the results obtained above we construct the following model.

$$\begin{cases} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{\kappa_0 - 1} \right\} \\ \text{s.t. } \frac{(\alpha - 1)}{(\alpha - 2)} m \left[1 - N^{-\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha-1}} \right] = \langle k \rangle \\ m \in Z^+, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $\kappa_0 = \frac{2-\alpha}{3-\alpha} \frac{[K^{(2-\alpha)} - m^{(2-\alpha)}]}{[K^{(3-\alpha)} - m^{(3-\alpha)}]}$. The numerical results suggest that whether the network size N is very large or not, p_c reaches its maximum value when $m = 1$. The numerical results are presented in table 2.

From table 2, we can get the following three conclusions:

- (1) If the average connectivity $\langle k \rangle$ per node and the exponent α of the power-law degree distribution is constant, the robustness of the scale-free networks will decrease when the network size becomes larger.
- (2) If the network size N is constant, the robustness of the scale-free networks increase when the average connectivity $\langle k \rangle$ becomes larger.
- (3) To the random failures, we have to take several times cost to increase the robustness of the scale-free networks about 1%.




Fig. 1. The critical percolation thresholds for random failures to different $\langle k \rangle$.

Table 2. When $N = 10^6$, the relationship between m and p_c^{rand} .

	$\langle k \rangle=3$	$\langle k \rangle=4$	$\langle k \rangle=5$	$\langle k \rangle=6$	$\langle k \rangle=7$
$N = 10^3$	0.9766	0.9872	0.9906	0.9917	0.9922
$N = 10^4$	0.9715	0.9847	0.9888	0.9906	0.9916
$N = 10^6$	0.9683	0.9824	0.9869	0.9889	0.9903

3. Discussion and Summary

It is well known that the networks with power-law degree distribution are resilient to random failures. But this conclusion don't answer the following three questions: (i) To a constant average connectivity $\langle k \rangle$, how to determine the distribution exponent of the scale-free networks so that the networks are more robust to the random failures. (ii) To different network size, how many edges we need to add to the network to satisfy the robustness level to random failures. (iii) To an exist network with power-law degree distribution, what we need to do to improve the network robustness. In this paper, we use the percolation theory and the mathematic programme method to optimize the robustness of the scale-free networks for random failures and give the numerical results. Finally, we give the relationship between the threshold p_c and the network size, the degree distribution exponent α and the average connectivity $\langle k \rangle$ per node.

6 *Jian-Guo Liu, et. al*

From Fig. 1, we can get the conclusion that if the scale-free networks size become large, the network robustness to random failures would become weak. To the internet and other growing scale-free networks the designers must add more links to the network to improve the average connectivity per node to random failures.

Subjects for further study include (i) an analysis of the robustness of the scale-free networks to the intentional attack to the highest connectivity nodes. (ii) the optimization of complex network under both random failures and intentional attack. (iii) the topology structure to improving the robustness of existing scale-free networks.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Dr. Qiang Guo for her valuable comments and suggestions, which have led to a better presentation of this paper. This research was supported by Chinese Natural Science Foundation Grant Nos. 70431001 and 70271046.

References

1. R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 47 (2002).
2. M. E. J. Newmann, *SIAM Rev.* **45**, 167 (2003).
3. J. F. F. Mendes, S. N. Dorogovtsev and A. F. Ioffe, *Evolution of Networks: From Biological Nets to the Internet and the WWW* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003).
4. R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, *Evolution and Structure of the Internet: A Statistical Physics Approach* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
5. R. Cohen, K. Erez, D. ben-Avraham, S. Havlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 4626 (2000).
6. G. Paul, T. Tanizawa, S. Havlin and H. E. Stanley, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **38**, 187 (2004).
7. R. Cohen, K. Erez, D. ben-Avraham, S. Havlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3682 (2001).
8. P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *Publicationes Mathematicae* **6**, 290 (1959).
9. P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *Publicationes Mathematicae Inst. of the Hungarian Acad. of Sciences* **5**, 17 (1960).
10. D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, *Nature* **393**, 440 (1998).
11. B. Bollobas, *Random Graphs* (Academic, London, 1985).
12. R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A. L. Barabási, *Nature*, **406**, 6794 (2000).