

# Asymptotic analysis of random walk first passage time in complex network

Hon Wai LAU\* and K. Y. SZETO†

*Department of Physics, The Hong Kong University  
of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, China*

## Abstract

We investigate the random walk first passage time (FPT) and mean first passage time (MFPT) in complex network with size  $N$ . By using an asymptotic analysis, we introduce a method to compute the decay rate of the FPT exponential tail. For networks with short relaxation time  $\tau \ll N$ , we show that the decay rate is proportional to the degree of destination node, and is upper bounded by this value. For Erdős-Rényi and Barabási-Albert network, the MFPT is shown to be inversely proportional to the destination degree and we have derived the exact expression. The method is then applied to real world networks and results suggest that MFPT is bounded by our predicted lower bound.

---

\*Electronic address: lau65536@gmail.com

†Electronic address: phszeto@ust.hk

## I. INTRODUCTION

First passage process study the first encounter events with a given target. It is critical to many real problems because the consequence occurs after the first encounter between the walker and the target. Examples include epidemic spreading in social network [1], computer virus propagating in Internet [2], stochastic resonance in potential wells [3, 4], diffusion controlled reaction [5, 6], neuron firing dynamics [7], traffic problem toward the destination [8], various target search process [9, 10] and many process related to trapped random walk [11]. All phenomenon requires the walker reaching the destination to trigger the event. First passage process can be well described by first passage time (FPT) distribution, which is the probability that a walker encounter with the destination for the first time. Moreover, the mean first passage time (MFPT) can represent the average time of walker reaching the destination [5, 12].

The random walk problem is well studied in different lattice dimension, topology and boundary condition [5]. Recent results include the analysis of FPT distribution in 2D and 3D structure [13, 14] and the random walk in small world network [15]. On the other hand, random walk in fractal topology and network is still an active area of research. Recently, some attempts [16] have been tried to generalize random walk to a type of network with fractal scaling [17, 18]. Another notable development is the relationship established between fractal dimension, walker dimension, spectral dimension and resistivity exponent for fractal network [19].

While there is no theory to describe random walk in a general network, in this paper, we analyze a particular type of network with short relaxation time. In contrast to the distance commonly studied in fractal network [13, 14], we focus on the degree of destination in complex network. A different analytical approach from fractal network is used to analyze this problem. Our result applies specifically to those networks with short relaxation time and the actual MFPT is lower bounded by the value we computed.

We begin in Sec. II with an introduction of random walk problem. We then give the formulation of first passage time by adding a sink in the network. In Sec. III, we perform asymptotic analysis on the FPT distribution and obtain a method to compute the decay rate of the tail of FPT distribution. By using short relaxation time, we can find an upper bound of the decay rate. In Sec. IV, we argue that the MFPT is the inverse of decay rate

and compute an approximate lower bound of MFPT, which is inversely proportional to the destination node degree. We then argue that the lower bound is likely to be satisfied by real world network with high mean degree and it is then verified by simulation in Sec V.

## II. RANDOM WALK IN NETWORK

We consider a finite undirected network  $G = (V, E)$  which consists of a set of node  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$  and a set of edge  $E \subseteq V \times V$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}(v, t)$  be the probability of random walker located at node  $v$  at time step  $t$ . Let  $\text{Nei}(v_i) = \{u | (u, v_i) \in E\}$  be the set of neighbors of node  $v_i$ . At time  $t = 0$ , a random walker starts at a source node  $v_s$ , given by the initial condition  $\mathcal{P}(v, t) = \delta_{vv_s} \delta_{t0}$ . At each time step, the walker can move from the current node  $v_i$  to one of its nearest neighbor node  $v_j \in \text{Nei}(v_i)$ , with equal probability  $\frac{1}{k_i}$ . Hence, the master equation of random walk is

$$\mathcal{P}(v_i, t + 1) = \sum_{v_j \in \text{Nei}(v_i)} \frac{\mathcal{P}(v_j, t)}{k_j} \quad (1)$$

For random walk problem in a finite domain, there is a characteristic relaxation time  $\tau$  [20] in which equilibrium state is essentially reached when  $t \gg \tau$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(v)$  be the equilibrium probability distribution when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . By the principle of detailed balance, the net flow of walker probability  $\frac{1}{k_i} \mathcal{P}^\infty(v_i) - \frac{1}{k_j} \mathcal{P}^\infty(v_j)$  is zero along each edge at equilibrium state. Hence, the equilibrium probability is proportional to the node degree  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(v) \propto k_v$ . The proportionality constant can be found by the normalization condition of unity walker probability in the whole network. The result is

$$\mathcal{P}^\infty(v) = \frac{k_v}{\sum_l k_l} = \frac{k_v}{N \langle k \rangle} \quad (2)$$

where  $\langle k \rangle$  and  $N \langle k \rangle$  are mean degree and total degree of the network respectively. At equilibrium, there is same amount of walker probability  $\frac{1}{N \langle k \rangle}$  moving in both directions along each edge, in contrast, high degree nodes have higher chance to be occupied. From Eq. (2), we see that occupation number is proportional to the node degree and the role of nodes is a reservoir of the random walker.

Let  $\mathcal{F}(v_d, t | v_s)$  be the first passage time (FPT) distribution from a source node  $v_s$  to a destination node  $v_d$  that takes time  $t$ . FPT distribution can be found by introducing a sink at destination node  $v_d$ . In this case, the walker is removed when it reaches the destination

$v_d$ . The decrease in walker probability is exactly equal to the FPT distribution. For this network, let  $\mathcal{W}(v, t)$  be the walker probability located at node  $v$ , at time  $t$ . Note that  $\mathcal{W}(v, t)$  is similar to  $\mathcal{P}(v, t)$  and the only different is that  $\mathcal{P}(v, t)$  has no sink in network. The FPT distribution can be computed by equations:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{W}(v, 0) = \delta_{vv_s} \\ \mathcal{W}(v_d, t) = 0 & \forall t > 0 \\ \mathcal{W}(v, t) = \sum_{u \in \text{Nei}(v)} \frac{\mathcal{W}(u, t-1)}{k_u} & \forall v \in V - \{v_d\} \\ \mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) = \sum_{u \in \text{Nei}(v_d)} \frac{\mathcal{W}(u, t-1)}{k_u} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The first equation is the initial condition. The second equation is the absorbing boundary condition. The third equation is the random walk transition probability corresponding to Eq. (1). These three equations define the random walk problem with a sink located at  $v_d$ . The last equation introduces the method to find the FPT distribution, which is given by the incoming probability flux flowing towards the destination  $v_d$ . Moreover, removal of the random walker in the sink decreases the total walker probability  $\mathcal{W}_{total}(t)$ , defined by  $\mathcal{W}_{total}(t) = \sum_{v \in V} \mathcal{W}(v, t)$ . The  $\mathcal{W}_{total}(t)$  is also known as the survival probability of random walker. Hence, FPT distribution and total walker probability are related by

$$\mathcal{W}_{total}(t) = 1 - \int_0^t \mathcal{F}(v_d, t'|v_s) dt' \quad (4)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{W}_{total}(t)$  is a monotonically decreasing function because walker probability is continuously removed from the network. The differential form of the above relation is

$$\mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) = -\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{W}_{total}(t) \quad (5)$$

The whole formulation of random walk FPT distribution is described by Eq. (3). Simulation can be carried out directly from these equations. Moreover, by replacing the initial condition to be  $\mathcal{W}(v, 0) = \frac{1}{N}$  in this formulation, we can get the ensemble average over all initial source nodes.

### III. ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS OF FPT DISTRIBUTION

Here, we perform an asymptotic analysis of the FPT distribution. When  $t \gg \tau$ , the initial information of the source node is washed away, so the probability decreases uniformly

for each node in the network. In this case,  $\mathcal{W}(v, t)$  can be separated into two parts:

$$\mathcal{W}(v, t) \sim \mathcal{W}(v)\mathcal{W}_{total}(t), \quad t \gg \tau \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{W}(v)$  is a time independent probability distribution that depends only on the topology of the network and the location of destination. By substituting Eq. (6) back into the last equation of (3), the asymptotic FPT distribution is

$$\mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) \sim \beta_d \mathcal{W}_{total}(t - 1), \quad t \gg \tau \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta_d$  depends on the destination node  $v_d$  defined by

$$\beta_d = \sum_{u \in \text{Nei}(v_d)} \frac{\mathcal{W}(u)}{k_u} \quad (8)$$

If  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  of all neighbors of node  $v_d$  is known, then  $\beta_d$  can be computed from this equation. To obtain the explicit asymptotic solution of FPT distribution, we can substitute Eq. (7) back to Eq. (5) and get the differential equation  $\partial_t \mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) = -\beta_d \mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s)$ . Therefore, the FPT distribution decays with exponential tail:

$$\mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) \sim A \exp[-\beta_d t], \quad t \gg \tau \quad (9)$$

where  $A$  is an arbitrary constant. From this relation,  $\beta_d$  can be interpreted as the tail decay rate of the FPT distribution. In addition, we now know a method to compute  $\beta_d$  analytically which is Eq. (8).

### A. Short relaxation time

We specifically focus on finding the decay rate  $\beta_d$  for the network with short relaxation time  $\tau$ . The time scale  $\tau$  represents the time to reach equilibrium of random walk in network without sink and  $1/\beta_d$  is an approximate time scale for the decrease in total walker probability of the network. In the derivation of  $\beta_d$ , short relaxation time means  $\tau \ll 1/\beta_d$ . The analogue of diffusion in one dimensional ring with a sink suggests that, for nodes far from the sink, the local variation in probability is small and the probability is roughly proportional to the uniform equilibrium distribution without sink. Nevertheless, the equilibrium probability of random walk in network is proportional to the degree of nodes. Thus, for nodes far from the sink, the probability distribution  $\mathcal{W}(u, t)$  is roughly




Figure 1:  $\mathcal{W}(u)/\mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  vs different distance from the destination node  $v_d$ . BA model,  $N = 10000$ ,  $\langle k \rangle = 10$

proportional to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  within the time scale  $\tau \ll t \ll 1/\beta_d$ . It is because the equilibrium is reached for  $t \gg \tau$  and the total probability is one for  $t \ll 1/\beta_d$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{W}(u, t) \approx \mathcal{P}^\infty(u)\mathcal{W}_{total}(t)$  for the long time scale when  $t \gg 1/\beta_d$ .

For Erdős-Rényi (ER) random network and Barabási-Albert (BA) scale free network, the relaxation time is short with only few time steps [20] even for a network with size  $N = 10000$ . To see how good the approximation is to the actual random walk, we find the walker probability  $\mathcal{W}(u, t)$  numerically after a long time. Fig. (1) shows the comparison between simulated  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  and analytical  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  of BA model. The result suggests that  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  is almost the same as  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(u) \propto k_u$  for nodes far from the destination. This is also correct for  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  close to destination, but with a larger deviation. Note that  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  can be obtained by

$$\mathcal{W}(u) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{W}(u, t)}{\mathcal{W}_{total}(t)} \quad (10)$$

In the simplest case, it is reasonable to assume that the probability distribution  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  is equal to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  of the network without sink:

$$\mathcal{W}(u) = \mathcal{P}^\infty(u) = \frac{k_u}{N \langle k \rangle}, \quad d(u, v_d) \geq 1 \quad (11)$$

where  $d(u, v_d)$  measures the shortest distance between nodes  $u$  and  $v_d$ . When this assumption is substituted back to Eq. (8), the decay rate is

$$\beta_d = \frac{k_d}{N \langle k \rangle} \quad (12)$$

Here, decay rate of destination  $v_d$  scales inversely with the size of the network while high degree destination has high decay rate. Note that this result is consistent with the condition that  $\tau \ll 1/\beta_d$  if  $\tau \ll N$ . Thus, we can define the short relaxation time to be  $\tau \ll N$  and this definition is used in the later part of this paper.

## B. Upper bound of decay rate

For a nearest neighbor  $u$  of the destination  $v_d$ ,  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  must takes a smaller value than  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  to compensate the flow of walker toward the sink. Rather than assuming  $\mathcal{W}(u) = \mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  for non-destination nodes, a refined assuming is

$$\mathcal{W}(u, t) = \mathcal{P}^\infty(u)\mathcal{W}_{total}(t), \quad d(u, v_d) \geq 2 \quad (13)$$

Here, nodes outside the set of nearest neighbors take the same value as equilibrium of the network without sink. With this assumption,  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  for the nearest neighbors of  $v_d$  have to be found before computing the decay rate  $\beta_d$ .

Note that nodes with distance two from the destination are treated as the reservoir of walker probability. Hence each edge of node  $v$ , with  $d(v, v_d) \geq 2$ , has probability  $\frac{1}{N\langle k \rangle}$  moving out at each time step. Focusing on a nearest neighbor node  $u$ , since the edge from the sink has no probability flow toward  $u$ , so only  $k_u - 1$  neighbors of  $u$  have probability moving into  $u$ . If there is no edges connecting nodes within  $\text{Nei}(v_d)$ , or zero clustering coefficient of  $v_d$ , then all  $k_u - 1$  nearest neighbors of  $u$  are second neighbors of  $v_d$  in which each node contributes  $\frac{1}{N\langle k \rangle}$  to the walker probability of  $u$ . In this case, the result is  $\mathcal{W}(u) = \frac{1}{N\langle k \rangle} (k_u - 1)$ .

If there is some edges connecting nodes within  $\text{Nei}(v_d)$ , or the clustering coefficient of  $v_d$  is not zero, then some neighbors of  $u$  are also neighbors of  $v_d$ . Since node  $w$  in  $\text{Nei}(v_d)$  has value less than  $\mathcal{P}(w)$ , so probability from nodes in  $\text{Nei}(v_d)$  to  $u$  is less than  $\frac{1}{N\langle k \rangle}$ . The exact value can be found by solving  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  for all  $u \in \text{Nei}(v_d)$  simultaneously and it is upper bounded by

$$\mathcal{W}(u) \leq \left( \frac{k_u - 1}{k_u} \right) \mathcal{P}^\infty(u), \quad d(u, v_d) = 1 \quad (14)$$

In Fig. 2,  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  of the set of nearest neighbors are plotted. It shows that the equality sign of Eq. (14) is a good fit with the numerical data. Similar results are tested for BA and ER model with other variable and it suggests that the equality sign is hold by BA and ER network.




Figure 2:  $\mathcal{W}(u)/\mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  vs degree of all nearest neighbors  $u \in \text{Nei}(v_d)$ . The set of points correspond to the distance=1 in Fig. 1.

Substituting this equation back to the Eq. (8), we get

$$\beta_d \leq \frac{k_d}{N \langle k \rangle} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{k_d} \sum_{u \in \text{Nei}(v_d)} \frac{1}{k_u} \right) \quad (15)$$

where the last term is the mean of inverse degree of neighbor that can be approximated by mean field. Reminded that the probability of selecting one of nearest neighbors with degree  $k$  is equal to  $P(k)k / \langle k \rangle$  [21], where  $P(k)$  is the degree distribution of the network such that  $\int_0^\infty P(k)dk = 1$ . Similar to the study of mean degree of neighbor [22], the mean of inverse degree of neighbor is:

$$\frac{1}{k_d} \sum_{u \in \text{Nei}(v_d)} \frac{1}{k_u} \approx \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{P(k)k}{\langle k \rangle} \right) \frac{1}{k} dk = \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle}$$

which gives a good result for high degree node because the averaging of many nodes result in less fluctuation. With this mean field approximation, the decay rate  $\beta_d$  is

$$\beta_d \leq \frac{k_d}{N \langle k \rangle} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \right) \quad (16)$$

which suggests decay rate obtained in simulation should be slower than this value.

#### IV. MEAN FIRST PASSAGE TIME

Since the walker will eventually reach the destination for finite connected network, so FPT distribution is normalized  $\int_0^\infty \mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s)dt = 1$ . This integral can be split as the sum



of short time scale and long time scale, written asymptotically

$$\int_0^{t_c} \mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) dt + \int_{t_c}^{\infty} A e^{-\beta_d t} dt \sim 1, \quad t_c \gg \tau \quad (17)$$

If we know the FPT distribution for the short time scale, then  $A$  can be found by asymptotic matching. Nevertheless, the short time is usually difficult to compute. A typical FPT distribution in finite lattice [5] raises from 0 when  $t = 0$  and then decreases with exponential tail when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , an intermediate power law tail exists if the distance between source and destination are short. Using this analogue, a network with short relaxation time and destination node far from the source node, the first term can be dropped while comparing with the second term. For the second term, the lower index can be set to 0 because  $\int_0^{t_c} A e^{-\beta_d t} dt \sim 0$  is insignificant for  $\tau \ll t_c \ll 1/\beta_d$ . By computing eq  $\int_0^{t_c} A e^{-\beta_d t} dt \approx 1$ , we get  $A \approx \beta_d$ .

The mean first passage time (MFPT) represents the average time the random walker needed to reach the destination, defined by:

$$\langle T \rangle = \int_0^{\infty} t \mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) dt \quad (18)$$

Using the exponential tail of FPT distribution, it can be written as

$$\langle T \rangle \sim \int_0^{t_c} t \mathcal{F}(v_d, t|v_s) dt + \int_{t_c}^{\infty} t A e^{-\beta_d t} dt, \quad t_c \gg \tau \quad (19)$$

Using the same condition discussed in the normalization of FPT distribution, it can be observed that the relative contribution from the first term is even small. Dropping the first term and setting the lower index of the second term to be 0. The MFPT can be approximated by  $\langle T \rangle \approx A/\beta_d^2 \approx 1/\beta_d$ . Using the decay rate derived in Eq. (16), the MFPT is

$$\langle T(v_d) \rangle \geq \frac{N \langle k \rangle}{k_d} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \langle k \rangle^{-1}} \right) \quad (20)$$

From this equation, it can be observed that MFPT has a lower bounded for different destination nodes. Moreover, the lower bound is inversely proportional to the degree of destination. This is compatible with the result  $\langle T(k_d) \rangle \propto \frac{1}{k_d}$  suggesting previously [23], in which the unimportant short time scale of FPT distribution is assumed in the derivation of the MFPT of ER model. Here, we have additionally computed the proportionality constant and claim that this is the lower bound of MFPT of any network with short relaxation time.

The result in Eq. (20) is computed for a destination node far from a source node. However, most nodes in a ER and BA network have separation distance of order  $\mathcal{O}(\ln N)$ ,

which suggest that MFPT is dominated by nodes with separation  $\mathcal{O}(\ln N)$ . Hence, by taking average over all nodes with same destination, the MFPT  $\langle T(k_d) \rangle$  effectively eliminate the requirement of long distance between destination and source.

As we discuss before, the relaxation time of BA and ER network is short. The result is shown in Fig. 3, the match between the analytic and numerical is very good for both ER and BA network. It can be observed that the curve is not exactly overlap with, but a slightly lower than, the simulation result. This is exactly matched with our prediction of the lower bound of MFPT, especially for  $\langle k \rangle = 4$  with small mean degree.

The mean degree has effect on the relaxation time. Note that short relaxation time is usually correlated with short distance between pair of nodes and so does mean degree of network. For ER network with very high mean degree  $\langle k \rangle \approx N - 1$  close to a complete network, nodes are neighbors to all other nodes and the equilibrium is almost reached instantaneously. In comparison, network with low mean degree, say  $\langle k \rangle \approx 2$ , is similar to a tree structure. In this case, separation between nodes is large, so the relaxation time is long. This suggested that the ER and BA network with high mean degree have MFPT close to the lower bound computed in Eq. (20).

The equality sign in Eqs. (16) and (20) holds for most parameters of ER and BA model, except those with low mean degree. Note that for ER model with high clustering coefficient, the mean degree is also high. In this case, the neighbors of destination have high degree and they act as a big reservoir of random walk, so the deviation between  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  and  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(u)$  is still small.

## V. REAL WORLD NETWORKS

We have considered so far about artificial network with short relaxation time. Our results have applied very well on the ER and BA network. However, these artificial networks do not include network inhomogeneity of real world network. Now, we test the applicability of our theory to some real world networks. The networks we examined are Political blogosphere [24], Coauthorship network (astro-ph, cond-mat, hep-th) [25, 26], C. Elegans neural network [27], Adjective and noun network [28], World Wide Web [29], Movie and actor network [30], Dolphins social network [31], E. Coli. Metabolic network [32], Network scientists coauthorship network [28], Karate club [33], Internet at autonomous level [34], WordNet [35], Yeast




Figure 3: MFPT vs destination node degree  $k_d$  for (a) ER and (b) BA model, with network size  $N = 10000$ . The curves from theory match very good for the simulation result with high mean degree and it is the lower bound for network with small mean degree.

protein interaction [36] and United States Power Grid [37]. In the simulation, only the largest connected component of each undirected network is considered.

The results are shown in Fig. 4 for networks with high mean degree. It can be observed that the networks with high mean degree are better fitted with the theoretical lower bound, which is inversely proportional to the destination degree in Eq. (20). The reason is similar to ER and BA model, network with high mean degree usually implies a short relaxation time since the distance between node pairs are short. This result is expected because it can be treated as a small perturbation from our theory.

On the other hand, the MFPT of networks with low mean degree are shown in Fig. 5. It can be observed that the MFPT for low mean degree network is not close to the theoretical curve. Networks with low mean degree usually need longer time to reach equilibrium so that our theory fails to predict the MFPT in this regime. These networks with low mean degree means that the MFPT are better described by the distance rather the destination degree. However, the simulation result still shows that the MFPT is still roughly bounded below by our theoretical lower bound. For these networks, the time to reach the destination is large because the distance between the source and target are large.




Figure 4: MFPT vs  $k_d$  of real world network with high mean degree. Dots represent simulation result and curves represent computed MFPT

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have introduced the formulation (3) of FPT distribution by adding a sink at the destination. By performing asymptotic analysis, we know FPT distribution tail is exponential decay. Within the analysis, we also explicitly obtain a method to compute the decay rate. For network with short random walk relaxation time  $\tau \ll N$ , we can assume that walker probability  $\mathcal{W}(u)$  for network with sink taking similar value to  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(u) = k_u/N \langle k \rangle$  for network without sink. The computed decay rate is  $\beta_d \leq \frac{k_d}{N \langle k \rangle} (1 - \langle k \rangle^{-1})$ , in which the inequality is satisfied if nearest neighbors of destination have low degree and strong clustering.

Furthermore, for network with short relaxation time, we argue that MFPT is the inverse of decay rate. With the short relaxation time of ER and BA model, our results provide a very good description of the simulation result. We further show that for real world network with high mean degree, the MFPT is close to the predicted lower bound. The numerical result also shows that the network with low mean degree satisfied this lower bound.

We stress that the analysis of random walk in complex network is different from the analysis of fractal network [19]. Because we do not specify any particular network in our derivation, our results are applicable to networks with short relaxation time or with high mean degree. In our analysis, we provide a complementary view of the random walk in complex network to the lattice. While the FPT tail is important for the random walk in




Figure 5: MFPT vs  $k_d$  of real world network with low mean degree. Dots represent simulation result and curves represent computed MFPT

network, the FPT tail contributes very little to the MFPT for lattice random walk because the relaxation time is very long. Moreover, short relaxation time of complex network such as ER and BA network means that the analysis of these network is similar to the analysis of equilibrium state.

- 
- [1] M. Frasca, A. Buscarino, A. Rizzo, L. Fortuna, and S. Boccaletti, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 036110 (2006).
  - [2] A. L. Lloyd and R. M. May, Science **292**, 1316 (2001).
  - [3] A. R. Bulsara, S. B. Lowen, and C. D. Rees, Phys. Rev. E **49**, 4989 (1994).
  - [4] D. S. Leonard, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 6742 (1992).
  - [5] S. Redner, *A guide to first-passage processes* (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
  - [6] H. H. Schmidt-Martens, D. Froemberg, I. M. Sokolov, and F. Sagués, Phys. Rev. E **79**, 041135 (2009).

- [7] H. Tuckwell, *Introduction to theoretical neurobiology* (Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- [8] G. M. Buendía, G. M. Viswanathan, and V. M. Kenkre, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 056110 (2008).
- [9] D. Volchenkov and P. Blanchard, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 026104 (2007).
- [10] D. O. Cajueiro, *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 046103 (2009).
- [11] J. W. Evans and R. S. Nord, *Phys. Rev. A* **32**, 2926 (1985).
- [12] B. Hughes, *Random walks and random environments: Volume 1: Random Walks* (Oxford University Press, USA, 1995).
- [13] S. Condamin, O. Bénichou, and M. Moreau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 260601 (2005).
- [14] S. Condamin, O. Bénichou, and M. Moreau, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 021111 (2007).
- [15] E. Almaas, R. V. Kulkarni, and D. Stroud, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 056105 (2003).
- [16] S. Condamin, O. Benichou, V. Tejedor, R. Voituriez, and J. Klafter, *Nature* **450**, 77 (2007).
- [17] C. Song, S. Havlin, and H. A. Makse, *Nature* **433**, 392 (2005).
- [18] C. Song, S. Havlin, and H. A. Makse, *Nat Phys* **2**, 275 (2006).
- [19] C. P. Haynes and A. P. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 020601 (2009).
- [20] J. D. Noh and H. Rieger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 118701 (2004).
- [21] M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 026118 (2001).
- [22] C. W. Ma and K. Y. Szeto, *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 047101 (2006).
- [23] A. Baronchelli and V. Loreto, *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 026103 (2006).
- [24] L. A. Adamic and N. Glance, *Proceedings of the WWW-2005 Workshop on the Weblogging Ecosystem* pp. 36–43 (2005).
- [25] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 016131 (2001).
- [26] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 016132 (2001).
- [27] J. G. White, E. Southgate, J. N. Thomson, and S. Brenner, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* **314**, 1 (1986).
- [28] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 036104 (2006).
- [29] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A.-L. Barabasi, *Nature* **401**, 130 (1999).
- [30] R. Albert-László Barabási, Albert, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999).
- [31] D. Lusseau, K. Schneider, O. Boisseau, P. Haase, E. Sloaten, and S. Dawson, *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **54**, 396 (2003).
- [32] H. Jeong, B. Tombor, R. Albert, Z. N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabasi, *Nature* **407**, 651 (2000).
- [33] W. Zachary, *Journal of Anthropological Research* **33**, 452 (1977).

- [34] Newman Database, <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/netdata/>.
- [35] WordNet, <http://wordnet.princeton.edu/>.
- [36] H. Jeong, S. P. Mason, A.-L. Barabasi, and Z. N. Oltvai, *Nature* **411**, 41 (2001).
- [37] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, *Nature* **393**, 440 (1998).