

Sensitivity of complex networks measurements

P. R. Villas Boas, F. A. Rodrigues, G. Travieso, and L. da F. Costa
*Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo,
PO Box 369, 13560-970, São Carlos, SP, Brazil*

Complex networks obtained from the real-world networks are often characterized by incompleteness and noise, consequences of limited sampling as well as artifacts in the acquisition process. Because the characterization, analysis and modeling of complex systems underlain by complex networks are critically affected by the quality of the respective initial structures, it becomes imperative to devise methodologies for identifying and quantifying the effect of such sampling problems on the characterization of complex networks. Given that several measurements need to be applied in order to achieve a comprehensive characterization of complex networks, it is important to investigate the effect of incompleteness and noise on such quantifications. In this article we report such a study, involving 8 different measurements applied on 6 different complex networks models. We evaluate the sensitiveness of the measurements to perturbations in the topology of the network considering the relative entropy. Three particularly important types of progressive perturbations to the network are considered: edge suppression, addition and rewiring. The conclusions have important practical consequences including the fact that scale-free structures are more robust to perturbations. The measurements allowing the best balance of stability (smaller sensitivity to perturbations) and discriminability (separation between different network topologies) were also identified.

I. INTRODUCTION

Complex networks theory has been largely applied to model real-world systems, such as the Internet, the World Wide Web, protein interactions, airlines, roads, food webs and society [1, 2, 3]. The success of this area is to a great extent the consequence of two recent developments: increase of computational power and availability of several databases. In the former case, computers allowed processing of networks with thousand or even million of vertices. In the latter, many maps of interactions, ranging from biology to social science, have become available since the 90's. However, most of these maps are not complete and methods should be developed to characterize these networks [4].

Sampling is a fundamental problem in complex networks because the connectivity of many studied real-world networks may differ substantially from the original complex systems from which they were derived. This effect results in biased models, inaccurate characterization, or incorrect classification and modeling of complex systems. In addition, many dynamical processes such as resilience to random and target attacks [5], spreading process [6], synchronization [1], random walk [7] and flow [8] are closely related to the completeness of networks.

A variety of sampling methods can be considered to map a complex system into a network. The sampling issue has been recently considered in the analysis of different cross-section approaches to construct biological, information, technological and social networks. For instance, the available protein-protein interactions cover only a fraction of the complete interactome map. As a matter of fact, the high-throughput “yeast two-hybrid” assay tends to provide a high number of false positives, i.e. interactions identified in the experiment but that never take place in the cell [9, 10]. Sprinzak et al. [11]

suggested that the reliability of the high-throughput Y2H is about 50%. Generally, it is assumed that the incomplete maps can be extrapolated to the complete interactome, so that limited sampling would not affect the topological structure of the network [12]. This assumption is based on the scale-free structure of protein interaction networks. However, the subnetworks obtained by sampling of scale-free networks are not guaranteed to be scale-free [4]. In addition, limited sampling can result in scale-free structures irrespective of the original network topology [13, 14]. In order to overcome these limitations, efforts have been developed to obtain more accurate databases of protein interactions [15].

In the case of the World Wide Web, the network structure depend strongly on the web crawler applied for sampling each chosen domain [16]. Different sampling strategies can induce bias, affecting in many ways the resulting recovered structure [17]. Indeed, some crawlers tend to overestimate the average number of connections of pages. A possible solution for such limitations is to start from as large a set of pages as possible [17].

Accurate topologies of the Internet are fundamental for routing strategies and to forecast its growth. Internet sampling is generally based on *tracerouters* — packets are sent through the network in order to obtain the IP address of the routers in the path. However, it is often assumed that these packets follow the shortest paths in the network [18], implying a large set of connections to be missed because of the possible presence of redundant links among routers. Moreover, in the traceroute strategy edges close to the root are more visible, i.e. the probability to obtain a edge far from the root decreases with the distance from the root [19]. It has also been observed that the traceroute sampling of random networks leads to networks with power-law degree distribution [19].

Social networks are also incomplete. Generally, these networks are restricted to a special class of human activ-

ity (e.g. music, sports, casting and collaborations in science) or are constructed by considering human relations (e.g. friendship and relationship). The way in which these networks are obtained can often result in biased data, such as the boundary specification problem, inaccuracy in questionnaire application and inaccessibility of subjects [20]. Moreover, depending of the considered type of personal relationship, it becomes particularly hard to define the links. It is a difficult difficult to estimate the effects of missing data in social networks.

In the light of the above discussion, it becomes clear that sampling bias might induce properties not representative of the actual complex networks, leading to incorrect characterization and modeling. The sampling problem can be tackled by considering the following three possible approaches:

1. Improvement of sampling methodologies,
2. Development of methods to predict missing [21] and wrong links,
3. Determination of the most suitable measurements to characterize incomplete networks.

The first strategy depends on the type of the network that one wants to sample. The second involves assumptions about rules and constraints for each network structure, such as hierarchical organization [21]. The third has the intrinsic advantages of being applicable to all already existing networks as well as providing the only alternative in cases where the sampling problems cannot be completely avoided. Some strategies have also been developed to minimize the incomplete sampling problem by applying remedial techniques [16]. The work reported in the current article relates to the third of the strategies above, by quantifying the influence of several types of perturbations on complex networks measurements. The perturbation of the degree distribution has been investigated before [13, 22]. Nevertheless, it is now realized that a single type of measurement (i.e. degree) is not enough to characterize the structure of networks [23]. In addition, Alderson *et al.* [24] have showed that networks with the same degree distribution can present distinct topologies. Therefore, a comprehensive set of measurement must be taken into account in order to obtain an accurate network characterization [23], implying the effect of structural perturbations on several complex networks measurements to become a particularly important issue.

Measurements that are too sensitive to perturbations in the network may not be adequate to characterize incomplete or noisy networks. Moreover, measurements that do not reflect differences between distinct network structures are of reduced value because of the implied lack of discriminability [23]. In this paper, we analyze the most traditional measurements used for networks characterization by considering three important classes of perturbations: (i) edge removal, (ii) edge inclusion, and (iii)

edge rewiring. Since these perturbations can be understood as noise added to networks, we considered information processing theory [25] in order to quantify the sensitivity of network measurements. More specifically, we analyzed the distribution of measurements in terms of relative entropies (Kullback-Leibler distance). This measurement allows to determine the “distance” in bits between two probability mass function. In this way, we obtained the distribution of a given measurement p and the distribution of the same measurement after the network perturbation, q . The entropy calculated taking into account these two distributions quantify how much they are different (the relative entropy is always larger than zero). Thus, by inspecting the behavior of the measurements under these perturbations, we were able to identify the candidate measurements most suitable for analysis and characterization of networks constructed with incomplete data or in the presence of noise. We analyzed 8 different measurements on 6 different complex networks models.

II. BASIC CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGY

An undirected complex network (or graph) G is defined as $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of N nodes and E is the set of M undirected edges of the type $\{i, j\}$, indicating that the nodes i and j are connected. An undirected complex network without multiple edges can be represented in terms of its adjacency matrix A , whose elements a_{ij} and a_{ji} are equal to one whenever there is a connection between the vertices i and j ; and equal to 0 otherwise. Since most real-world networks are composed by thousand or even million of vertices, the analysis of their structure cannot be performed by visual inspection. In this way, a set of measurements are considered in order to describe and discriminate network topologies. These measurements can reflect different features on the network, such as connectivity, assortativity, centrality and hierarchies. In this work, we considered the distribution of the following representative set of measurements in order to characterize the network structures [23]. The chosen measurements include more traditional and simpler measurements such as node degree and clustering coefficient as well as more recent and sophisticate features such as betweenness centrality and hierarchical measurements.

- *Degree*: the degree of a node i , k_i , is given by its number of connections.
- *Average degree of nearest neighbors*: The average neighbor connectivity, k_{nn} , measures the average degree of the neighbors of the vertices in the network.
- *Clustering coefficient*: The clustering coefficient of a node i , C_i , is defined as the number of links between the vertices within its neighborhood, l_i , divided by the number of edges that could possibly exist between them $(k_i(k_i - 1)/2)$.

- *Hierarchical measurements*: Hierarchical measurements are defined by considering the successive neighborhoods around each node [23, 26]. Such measurements are particularly interesting because they reflect several topological scales around each reference node, from purely local (first neighborhood) to completely global (the most distance neighbors). The ring of vertices $R_d(i)$ (or hierarchical/concentric level) is formed by those vertices distant d edges from the reference vertex i .
 - *Hierarchical degree* at level d , $hk_d(i)$, is defined as the number of edges connecting the rings $R_d(i)$ and $R_{d+1}(i)$.
 - *Hierarchical clustering coefficient*, hC_d , is given by the number of edges among nodes in the respective d -ring ($m_d(i)$), divided by the total number of possible edges between the vertices in that ring.
 - *Divergence ratio*, hdr_d , corresponds to the ratio between the number of vertices in the ring at level $d+1$ and the hierarchical node degree at level d .
- *Shortest path length*: The shortest path length between two vertices i and j , l_{ij} , is given by the shortest distance between that pair of vertices.
- *Betweenness centrality*: The betweenness centrality of a vertex i , B_i , quantifies the fraction of shortest paths between each pair of nodes in the network that pass through this vertex.

A. Perturbation methods

In this work, the noise and incompleteness frequently found in complex networks derived from real-world data are modeled in terms of three basic types of structural perturbations, namely:

- *Edge removal*: Edges are selected at random and removed from the network.
- *Edge addition*: Two not connected vertices are selected at random, and a connections is established between them.
- *Edge rewiring*: Two pairs of connected vertices are chosen and their connections are interchanged.

In our analysis, we also considered a random combination of all these types of perturbations.

The intensity of the perturbations ranged from 0 to 10% of the total number of edges in the network. In the case of the rewiring perturbation, the number of steps necessary to reach 10% of edges was half of that required for the other two because each step corresponded to a change of two edges. Perturbations involving vertices

could also be considered. However, the addition of vertices should depend on the type of network in question. In order to make our analysis simpler and more robust, we focused edge perturbations. The behavior of the measurements was therefore studied with respect to several types of edge perturbations.

B. Relative entropy

In statistical mechanics, the entropy is a measure of uncertainty or disorganization in a physical system [27]. In principle, the entropy is given by the logarithm of the number of ways in which a system can be configured. The concept of entropy has many application to different research areas. For instance, while in quantum mechanics, the entropy is related to the von Neumann entropy [28]; in complexity theory, to the Kolmogorov entropy [29]. Here, we consider the concept of entropy in the sense of information theory, where entropy is used to quantify the minimum descriptive complexity of a random variable [25]. In this case, the entropy of a discrete random distribution $p(x)$ is given as

$$H(p) = - \sum_x p(x) \log p(x), \quad (1)$$

where the logarithm is taken on the base 2. In case of complex networks, many of their properties result from heterogeneity of their connections. Jun *et al.* [30] suggested the consideration of the normalized entropy of rank distribution in order to analyze scale-free networks.

The *relative entropy*, or Kullback-Leibler distance, measures the “distance” in bits between two probability mass function $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ and is defined as

$$D(p, q) = \sum_x p(x) \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}. \quad (2)$$

Such value is always nonnegative and is zero if and only if $p = q$. Typically $0 \log \frac{0}{0} = 0$, $0 \log \frac{0}{q} = 0$ and $p \log \frac{p}{0} = \infty$. Therefore, if p is the distribution of a given network measurement and q is the distribution of the same measurement obtained from the respective network under presence of noise, the relative entropy provides a sound means to quantify the intensity of changes implied by the noise on the distribution p . In this work we considered the relative entropy to determine the sensitivity of different network measurements.

C. Analyzed Networks

In order to study the effects of perturbations on networks, we considered structures generated by six different network models, including traditional structures such as random, scale-free and geographical models as well as

more recent models such as limited and non-linear preferential attachment. The consideration of several models is fundamental for investigating the effect of perturbations in networks because the implied changes are strongly dependent on specific network connectivity. Also, because of the distinct properties of these models and that we can generate ensembles of networks, it becomes immediately possible to quantify the discrimination of the measurements with respect to such different types of structures.

1. Theoretical models

Since the perturbation dynamics can depend on the network structure, we considered the following network models [1].

- *Erdős-Rényi random graph (ER)*: This model generates networks with random distribution of connections. The network is constructed connecting each pair of vertices in the network with a fixed probability p [31]. This model generates a Poisson like degree distribution [32].
- *Small-world model of Watts and Strogatz (WS)*: To construct this type of small-world network, one starts with a regular ring lattice of N vertices in which each vertex is connected to κ nearest neighbors in each direction. Each edge is then randomly rewired with probability q [33].
- *Barabási-Albert scale-free model (BA)*: This model generates networks with power law degree distribution. The network is generated by starting with a set of m_0 vertices and, at each time step, the network grows with the addition of a new vertex with m links. The vertices which receive the new edges are chosen following a linear preferential attachment rule, i.e. the probability of the new vertex i to connect with an existing vertex j is proportional to the degree of j , $\mathcal{P}(i \rightarrow j) = k_j / \sum_u k_u$ [34].
- *Waxman geographical model (WG)*: Geographical networks can be constructed by distributing N vertices at random in a 2D space and connecting them according to the distance [35]. This model is created by randomly distributing N vertices in a square of length $L = \sqrt{N}$ and connecting them with probability $p = e^{-\lambda d}$, where d is their geographic distance, and λ is a constant adjusted to achieve the desirable average degree.
- *Limited scale-free model (LSF)*: The network is generated as in the BA model but the maximum degree is limited to a maximum k_{max} value [36].
- *Nonlinear preferential attachment network model (NLBA)*: The network is constructed as in the BA model, but instead of a linear preferential attachment rule, the vertices are connected

following a nonlinear preferential attachment rule, i.e., $P_{i \rightarrow j} = k_j^\alpha / \sum_u k_u^\alpha$. In this case, while for $\alpha < 1$, the network has a stretched exponential degree distribution, for $\alpha > 1$ a single site connects to nearly all other sites [37].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Our simulations considered the following parameters: $N = 1,000$ vertices; average degree 6; in case of WS model, the probability q of reconnection was 0.3; λ was 1.0 for WG model; $\alpha = 0.5$ for the NLBA network model; and the maximum degree was $k_{max} = 50$ for the LSF network mode.

The perturbations were performed from 0.5% up to 10% of the total number of edges of each network in steps of 0.5%. Also, for each network model, 20 networks were generated at each step. For each network, we obtained the normalized distribution of measurements considering 50 boxes. The histograms for every network were obtained by taking into account the same maximum and minimum values for each measurement. In order to quantify the variation on the distribution, we calculated the relative entropies by considering the equation II B.

Figure 1 present the results with respect to each of the 6 network models, and Table I shows the average of the relative entropy for all network models considering 10% of edge perturbations. The main results observed are discussed as follows:

- Random edge removal causes smaller variations in the measurements than the other three types of perturbations (including the random combination of all perturbations). From this result, we can conclude that it is better not to include edges about which we are uncertain, as the inclusion of an unexistent edge implies larger deviations of the measurements than the removal of an existing one.
- Comparing the results for all networks, according to each perturbation, the measurements can be ordered as following according to the values of the maximum entropy:
 - Edge addition:
 $B, C, k, hdr_2, hC_2, k_{nn}, hk_2, \ell$.
 - Edge rewiring:
 $k, k_{nn}, C, hC_2, B, hdr_2, hk_2, \ell$.
 - Edge removing:
 $hC_2, B, C, hdr_2, k, \ell, k_{nn}, hk_2$.
 - All three perturbation together:
 $k, hC_2, k_{nn}, C, hdr_2, B, hk_2, \ell$.

Depending on the perturbation, the measurements can be more or less sensitive. Therefore, it is important to select the appropriated set of measurements

TABLE I: Average variation of entropy for each plot in Figure 1 considering the maximum perturbation with respect to edges addition, edges rewiring, edge removing and all these perturbations applied together.

Meas.	Addition	Rewiring	Removing	Altogether
k	0.0269	0.0000	0.0418	0.0006
k_{nn}	0.1207	0.0003	0.0514	0.0010
hk_2	0.3216	0.0605	0.2060	0.0412
C	0.0127	0.0197	0.0050	0.0122
hC_2	0.0354	0.0245	0.0003	0.0008
hdr_2	0.0333	0.0310	0.0353	0.0188
ℓ	0.8218	0.4992	0.0510	0.4771
B	0.0031	0.0268	0.0031	0.0215
Average	0.1719	0.0828	0.0493	0.0717
St. deviation	0.2828	0.1693	0.0669	0.1644

according to the type of perturbation, since particularly sensitive measurements can lead to wrong network characterization.

- The shortest path length is the most sensitive network measurement, specially for the geographical WS and WG models. This result was expected because just a few rewiring in a regular network can lead to a small-world network [33]. In other words, adding or rewiring edges can connect vertices which are far away, reducing the average shortest path length. Therefore, this measurement is not particularly suitable for networks exhibiting geographical organization.
- Among the network models, the scale-free structures resulted as those presenting the less sensitive structures, being the LSF and NLBA the most robust. Indeed, these network models generate topologies which are more close to real world networks than the BA model. For instance, the BA model tend to generate networks whose average clustering coefficient is smaller than that observed in real world networks. On the other hand, the LSF and NLBA can overcome this limitation by considering appropriated parameters. The fact that scale-free networks are less sensitive to perturbation dynamics is a fundamental finding because most real-world networks are scale-free. Indeed, scale-free network have been previously observed to be highly resilience against random failures [5], although just the average shortest paths length was investigated in that work. On the other hand, WG and WS models present the structures most sensitive to the considered perturbations.

In order to quantify the discriminability of each measurement, we resourced again to the mutual information in order to obtain the “distance” between pairs of different types of models in the absence of perturbations. So, high values of relative entropy suggest good separability between models. Tables II to IX present the pairwise comparison for the six models for each of the eight mea-

TABLE II: Relative entropy of degree distribution, where ER is the Erdős and Rényi random model, WS is the Watts and Strogatz small-world model, BA is the Barabási and Albert scale-free model, WG is the Waxman geographic model, NLBA is the non-linear preferential attachment model, and LSF is the limited scale-free model.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	0.502	0.424	0.005	0.306	0.504
WS	0.468	0.000	0.957	0.527	1.125	1.366
BA	0.377	1.767	0.000	0.325	0.037	0.001
WG	0.005	0.548	0.396	0.000	0.270	0.467
NLBA	0.527	1.708	0.047	0.544	0.000	0.040
LSF	0.704	2.056	0.022	0.719	0.082	0.000

surements. For instance, in the case of the degree distribution (see table II), the relative entropy between the BA and LSF network models is the smallest one, followed by the relative entropy between the ER and WG models. The betweenness centrality is the measurement that provided the poorest separation between models. This is mainly due to the lack of community structure of the considered network models.

Analyzing the average values on the tables II to IX, the measurements that provide highest discrimination (highest values of entropy) are in order presented in Table X. Interesting to note that the degree distribution, which is largely considered to characterize complex network models, does not performed particularly well in our analysis. For instance, while the relative entropy between the ER and BA degree distributions is 0.424, for the hierarchical clustering coefficient of level 2 it is 5.581. Indeed, the hierarchical measurements accounted for the best overall characterization of network structures with respect to discriminability. This property is possibly related to fact that the hierarchical measurements take into account a larger portion of the original network, therefore providing a more comprehensive quantification of the local topology.

The main motivation of our studying of perturbations in networks was to find measurements allowing an acceptable compromise between stability and discriminability. In this way, a proper measurement to characterize sampled networks should be that which provide good characterization of network structure and small sensitivity to perturbations. Figure 2 shows scatterplots defined by the sensitivity with respect to edge addition (Fig. 2a), rewiring ((Fig. 2b), removal (Fig. 2c) and joint perturbations (Fig. 2d) versus the discriminability considering the average relative entropy in each respective case. The best measurements are those resulting at the lower right-hand portions of these scatterplots. Therefore, the measurements allowing the overall best combinations of sensitivity and discriminability include the hC_2 , hk_2 , C and hdr_2 . Interestingly, the node degree, betweenness and shortest path – which have frequent and intensively used for networks characterization – are either too sensitive or not discriminative.

TABLE III: Relative entropy of average degree of nearest neighbors distribution.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	1.454	1.688	0.102	0.711	1.563
WS	0.816	0.000	2.197	1.021	1.760	2.659
BA	1.854	0.814	0.000	1.786	1.011	0.162
WG	0.137	1.780	1.592	0.000	0.549	1.373
NLBA	1.312	1.677	0.627	1.372	0.000	0.387
LSF	1.907	0.375	0.121	2.291	0.638	0.000

TABLE IV: Relative entropy of hierarchical degree of level 2 distribution.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	2.621	2.272	2.386	0.562	1.597
WS	1.949	0.000	6.353	0.276	3.158	5.447
BA	1.353	0.374	0.000	1.271	0.741	0.088
WG	1.655	0.428	6.319	0.000	3.212	5.406
NLBA	0.739	1.763	0.786	2.064	0.000	0.393
LSF	1.115	1.034	0.091	1.933	0.360	0.000

TABLE V: Relative entropy of clustering coefficient distribution.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	3.226	0.113	1.748	0.017	0.074
WS	3.776	0.000	3.659	0.393	5.361	3.979
BA	0.256	2.614	0.000	1.297	0.085	0.009
WG	3.009	0.399	1.954	0.000	3.095	2.328
NLBA	0.029	3.052	0.056	1.616	0.000	0.028
LSF	0.147	2.738	0.008	1.385	0.037	0.000

TABLE VI: Relative entropy of hierarchical clustering coefficient of level 2 distribution.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	5.581	2.149	5.311	0.872	1.976
WS	5.741	0.000	1.955	1.674	2.630	1.879
BA	2.054	2.143	0.000	4.148	0.185	0.050
WG	7.366	1.642	4.859	0.000	6.107	5.262
NLBA	1.196	2.738	0.249	4.446	0.000	0.227
LSF	2.371	1.794	0.052	3.991	0.200	0.000

TABLE VII: Relative entropy of hierarchical divergence ratio of level 2 distribution.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	2.701	0.363	2.922	0.118	0.280
WS	4.849	0.000	1.948	0.588	2.197	1.785
BA	0.484	1.564	0.000	2.514	0.130	0.027
WG	2.880	0.766	3.269	0.000	3.110	2.602
NLBA	0.248	2.350	0.137	2.324	0.000	0.071
LSF	0.509	2.137	0.032	2.227	0.065	0.000

TABLE VIII: Relative entropy of shortest path length distribution.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	0.377	0.620	1.743	0.092	0.397
WS	0.503	0.000	2.811	1.339	1.254	2.269
BA	0.403	1.258	0.000	2.288	0.167	0.021
WG	4.647	1.863	1.093	0.000	2.797	0.841
NLBA	0.068	0.683	0.214	1.952	0.000	0.096
LSF	0.266	1.064	0.022	2.184	0.079	0.000

TABLE IX: Relative entropy of vertex betweenness centrality distribution.

	ER	WS	BA	WG	NLBA	LSF
ER	0.000	0.138	0.076	0.250	0.317	0.556
WS	0.111	0.000	0.114	0.366	0.697	1.054
BA	0.039	0.067	0.000	0.215	0.018	0.004
WG	0.390	0.398	0.329	0.000	0.244	0.433
NLBA	0.286	0.656	0.025	0.204	0.000	0.046
LSF	0.435	0.892	0.010	0.342	0.053	0.000

TABLE X: Average and standard deviation among the values present in Tables II to IX.

Measurement	Av. and std
hC_2	2.69 (2.08)
hk_2	1.92 (1.81)
C	1.55 (1.57)
hdr_2	1.51 (1.31)
k_{nn}	1.19 (0.71)
ℓ	1.11 (1.10)
k	0.56 (0.55)
B	0.29 (0.27)

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Much of the success of complex network research has relied on the accurate modeling of complex phenomena. To reach this goal, efforts should be concentrated in developing methods able to obtain databases and measurements that can characterize networks structures with accuracy. Thus, the development of improved sampling techniques and analysis of the behavior of measurements with respect to incomplete networks or networks with biased connections are fundamental for complex networks research. In this paper, we reported an analysis of network measurements with respect to progressively perturbed networks. The perturbations were performed at the edge level, considering random removal, addition and rewiring. We applied the relative entropy in order to quantify the robustness of the network measurements considering six representative network models. The four measurements most suitable to analyze perturbed network were identified as: the hierarchical clustering coefficient (hC_2), hierarchical degree (hk_2), clustering coefficient (C) and divergence ratio (hdr_2). It is interesting to note that the node degree did not result as the best network measurement, being associated with poor discrimination between networks with distinct structures. For instance, while the relative entropy between the ER and WG model is just 0.005 when the degree distribution is considered, it increases to 5.741 when the hierarchical clustering coefficient is used instead. Among the network models, structures with scale-free organization presented the highest robustness when submitted to perturbations. We suggest as future works the consideration of other complex network measurements as well as other types of perturbations, such as node removal or perturbation with preferential rules. The consideration of multivariate

statistical methods (e.g. MANOVA [38]) and data mining techniques can also help complementing the perturbation and discrimination analysis.

cisco A. Rodrigues acknowledges FAPESP sponsorship (07/50633-9), Paulino R. Villas Boas acknowledges CNPq sponsorship (141390/2004-2).

Acknowledgments

Luciano da F. Costa is grateful to FAPESP (05/00587-5), CNPq (301303/06-1) for financial support. Fran-

-
- [1] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chaves, and D.-U. Hwang. Complex networks: structure and dynamics. *Physics Reports*, 424:175–308, 2006.
- [2] L. da F. Costa, O.N. Oliveira Jr, G. Travieso, F.A. Rodrigues, P.R. Villas Boas, L. Antigueira, M.P. Viana, and L.E.C. da Rocha. Analyzing and Modeling Real-World Phenomena with Complex Networks: A Survey of Applications. *eprint arXiv: 0711.3199*, 2007.
- [3] L. da F. Costa, O. N. Oliveira Jr., G. Travieso, F. A. Rodrigues, P. R. Villas Boas, L. Antigueira, M. P. Viana, and L. E. C. da Rocha. Analyzing and modeling real-world phenomena with complex networks: A survey of applications. *arXiv:0711.3199v1*, 2008.
- [4] M.P.H. Stumpf, C. Wiuf, and R.M. May. Subnets of scale-free networks are not scale-free: Sampling properties of networks. *PNAS*, 102(12):4221–4224, 2005.
- [5] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A.-L. Barabási. Error and attack tolerance of complex networks. *Nature*, 406:378–382, 2000.
- [6] M. Boguñá, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani. Absence of epidemic threshold in scale-free networks with degree correlations. *Physical Review Letters*, 90(2):028701–028703, 2003.
- [7] L. da F. Costa and G. Travieso. Exploring complex networks through random walks. *Physical Review E*, 75(1):16102, 2007.
- [8] B. Tadić, G. J. Rodgers, and S. Thurner. Transport on complex networks: Flow, jamming and optimization. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 17(7):2363–2385, 2007.
- [9] R. Mrowka, A. Patzak, and H. Herzel. Is there a bias in proteome research? *Genome Research*, 11:1971–1973, 2001.
- [10] R. Saito, H. Suzuki, Y. Hayashizaki, and O. Journals. Interaction generality, a measurement to assess the reliability of a protein–protein interaction. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 30(5):1163–1168, 2002.
- [11] E. Sprinzak, S. Sattath, and H. Margalit. How reliable are experimental protein–protein interaction data. *J Mol Biol*, 327(5):919–23, 2003.
- [12] H. Jeong, S. P. Mason, A.-L. Barabási, and Z. N. Oltvai. Lethality and centrality in protein networks. *Nature*, 411(6833):41–42, 2001.
- [13] J. D. Han, D. Dupuy, N. Bertin, M. E. Cusick, and M. Vidal. Effect of sampling on topology predictions of protein-protein interaction networks. *Nature Biotechnology*, 23(7):839–844, 2005.
- [14] R. Khanin and E. Wit. How scale-free are biological networks. *J. Comput. Biol*, 13:810–818, 2006.
- [15] N. J. Krogan, G. Cagney, H. Yu, G. Zhong, X. Guo, A. Ignatchenko, J. Li, S. Pu, N. Datta, A. P. Tikuisis, et al. Global landscape of protein complexes in the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Nature*, 440:637–643, 2006.
- [16] M.Á. Serrano, A. Maguitman, M. Boguñá, and A. Vespignani. Decoding the structure of the WWW: A comparative analysis of Web crawls. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 1(2), 2007.
- [17] L. Becchetti, C. Castillo, D. Donato, and A. Fazzone. A comparison of sampling techniques for web graph characterization. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Link Analysis (LinkKDD06)*, Philadelphia, PA, 2006.
- [18] J. Leguay, M. Latapy, T. Friedman, and K. Salamatian. Describing and simulating Internet routes. *Computer Networks*, 51(8):2067–2085, 2007.
- [19] A. Lakhina, J. W. Byers, M. Crovella, and P. Xie. Sampling biases in IP topology measurements. In *INFOCOM 2003*, volume 1. IEEE, 2003. Twenty-Second Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies.
- [20] G. Kossinets. Effects of missing data in social networks. *Social Networks*, 28(3):247–268, 2006.
- [21] A. Clauset, C. Moore, and M. E. J. Newman. Hierarchical structure and the prediction of missing links in networks. *Nature*, 453(7191):98–101, 2008.
- [22] T. Petermann and P. D. Los Rios. Exploration of scale-free networks. *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter*, 38(2):201–204, 2004.
- [23] L. da F. Costa, F. A. Rodrigues, G. Travieso, and P. R. Villas Boas. Characterization of complex networks: A survey of measurements. *Advances in Physics*, 56(1):167 – 242, 2007.
- [24] D. Alderson, J. C. Doyle, L. Li, and W. Willinger. Towards a theory of scale-free graphs: Definition, properties, and implications. *Internet Mathematics*, 2(4):431–523, 2005.
- [25] T.M. Cover and J.A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. Wiley New York, 1991.
- [26] L. da F. Costa and F. N. Silva. Hierarchical characterization of complex networks. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 125(4):841–872, 2006.
- [27] L. E. Reichl. *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics*. University of Texas Press, 1980.
- [28] J. von Neumann. *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik (Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics)*. Springer, Berlin, 1955.
- [29] M. Li and P. Vitányi. *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications*. Springer, 1997.
- [30] W. Jun, T. Yue-Jin, D. Hong-Zhong, and Z. Da-Zhi. Normalized entropy of rank distribution: a novel measure of heterogeneity of complex networks. *Chinese Physics*,

- 16:1576–1580, 2007.
- [31] P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On the evolution of random graphs. *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute*, 38(4):343–347, 1960.
- [32] B. Bollobás. *Modern Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [33] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of small-world networks. *Nature*, 393(6684):440–442, 1998.
- [34] A.L. Barabási and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286:509, 1999.
- [35] B. M. Waxman. Routing of multipoint connections. *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on*, 6(9):1617–1622, 1988.
- [36] L. A. N. Amaral, A. Scala, M. Barthelemy, and H. E. Stanley. Classes of Small-World Networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 97(21):11149–11152, 2000.
- [37] PL Krapivsky and S. Redner. Organization of growing random networks. *Physical Review E*, 63(6):66123, 2001.
- [38] R. O. Duda, P. E. Hart, and D. G. Stork. *Pattern Classification*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2001.




FIG. 1: Measurement entropies for the considered network models: \diamond – Erdős and Rényi's random graph, \triangle – Watts and Strogatz's small-world model, \circ – Barabási and Albert scale-free model, \square – Waxman's geographic model, ∇ – Krapivsky's non-linear preferential attachment model, and \triangleright – Amaral et al.'s limited scale-free model




FIG. 2: Discrimination versus sensitivity of network measurements considering different types of perturbations, considering the values of the Tables II to IX and Table I.

