

Exploring maps with greedy navigators

Sang Hoon Lee^{1,*} and Petter Holme^{1,2,3}

¹*IceLab, Department of Physics, Umeå University, 901 87 Umeå, Sweden*

²*Department of Energy Science, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea*

³*Department of Sociology, Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*

During the last decade of network researches focusing on structural and dynamical properties of networks, the role of network users has been more or less underestimated from the bird's eye view of global perspective. In this era of GPS-equipped smartphones, however, user's ability to access local geometric information and find efficient pathways on networks plays a crucial role, rather than the globally optimal pathways. We present a simple greedy spatial navigation strategy as a probe to explore spatial networks. These greedy navigators use directional information in every move they take, without being trapped in a dead end based on their memory about previous routes. We suggest that the centralities measures have to be modified to incorporate the navigators' behavior, and present the intriguing effect of navigators' greediness where removing some edges may actually enhance the routing efficiency, which is reminiscent of Braess's paradox caused by the chasm between user and global optimum. In addition, using samples of road structures in large cities around the world, it is shown that the navigability measure we define reflects unique structural properties, which are not easy to predict from other topological characteristics. In this respect, we believe that our routing scheme significantly moves the routing problem on networks one step closer to reality, incorporating the inevitable incompleteness of navigators' information.

PACS numbers: 89.40.-a, 89.75.Fb, 89.75.-k

A sociopsychological problem that has turned out to be especially suited to methods of physics is human mobility—how can we characterize, measure and explain the movement of people in their daily lives [1]? One piece of the human mobility puzzle is how to measure the navigability of cities and buildings. Whenever we move around, away from the places we are most familiar with, we challenge our senses and memory to navigate between two points. How successful we are at finding our way is a function both of our cognitive ability, how much relevant information we have, and also the spatial organization of our surrounding. Most of the methods characterizing the spatial organization of cities and buildings assumes either that agents have complete information of the environment of their journey or that they essentially do random walks without any information. In the former category, there are measures like betweenness centrality [2, 3]; in the other category, random walk centrality [4] or first-passage time [5]. The reality, of course, is somewhere in between—we always navigate with incomplete information. This information could be better (if we have GPS devices or maps) or worse (going back to the cafeteria the second day at work in a big office building); but to understand the large-scale patterns of human movements and how it is influenced by the spatial organization, we need models and measures that incorporate navigation with incomplete information. In this paper, we propose framework for exploring spatial organization that is intended to be as simple as possible and at the same time consistent with some documented properties of human navigation.

We call the key component of our approach *greedy navigators*. These are agents in a spatial network [6], that are traveling between a start s and target point t . The agents

have a sense of direction and a memory of where they have been. Briefly speaking, agents move in a direction as close as possible to the direction of the target. If they reach a *cul-de-sac*, they backtrack to the previous point where they have an untested choice of route. In this paper, we use a spatial network formalism (where the agents move along links between a finite set points in a two-dimensional space), but it should be rather straightforward to extend the concepts to a continuous space. Our main idea is to use the spatial navigators to define a distance metric that captures the common deviations from the shortest route that people to in their everyday navigation. It is important to stress that we do not try to model people exactly, but that the greedy navigators capture the relative magnitude of deviation from an optimal navigation caused by the underlying spatial structure. In other words, we surmise the greedy navigators fare worse in cities or buildings where humans would easily get lost or make unnecessary detours, than in those where it is easy to get around. We will use the greedy navigators to analyze various real-world road structures such as partial maps of Boston and New York, along with samples of large cities all over the world, to investigate how the structural properties of roads are elucidated in terms of the greedy navigators' performance.

In a review of the cognitive processes of human navigation, Wolbers and Hegarty [7] list three main categories of cognitive processes: the use of spatial cues, computational mechanisms, and spatial representations. The first category contains the recognition of landmarks and other environmental cues to establish a direction toward a target. The second is, simply speaking, about how we reason about how to reach the target most efficiently. The third concerns the use of maps, real or mental, or other representations of the spatial surrounding. All these aspect would be interesting to integrate into metrics of city navigability issues. There are articles discussing models to mimic the human formation of mental

*Electronic address: sanghoon.lee@physics.umu.se




FIG. 1: (Color online) Illustration of three different routing schemes to probe navigability-related structures of cities and buildings. (a) shows the shortest path from s to t ; (b) shows the route of a greedy navigator (the angles are those used in the algorithm); (c) illustrates a possible route of a random navigator, where the backtracking steps occur at ‘9’ and ‘6.’

TABLE I: Properties of four empirical datasets. Performance of routing strategies for road and railway networks. For each network, the number of vertices N , the number of edges M , the average path length for GSN strategy d_g , real shortest path d , random DFS d_r , and navigability $\nu = d/d_g$ are shown in each column. Null models for Boston and New York roads are connected Erdős-Rényi random graphs [15] with the same N and M , where the geographic layout to guide the GSN navigator is given by Kamada-Kawai algorithm [16], and the results averaged over 10^3 samples are shown.

network	N	M	d_g	d	d_r	ν
Boston	88	155	6.82	5.72	30.75	84%
null model			8.606(9)	23.20(1)	3.6758(1)	37%
New York	125	217	8.27	6.79	44.39	82%
null model			11.72(2)	33.51(2)	4.0300(1)	34%
Switzerland	1613	1680	145.14	46.56	769.68	32%
Europe	4853	5765	143.69	50.87	2011.93	35%

maps [8] as well, but they are however by necessity quite convoluted. In our model, we assume the agents have a good, large-scale sense of the navigation, but no reliable real or cognitive map. Translated to a spatial network language—where the network is represented as a graph of N vertices at coordinates $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N = (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_N, y_N)$ that are connected by M edges—the greedy navigators act as follows. Assume an agent stands at a vertex i and wants to travel to t . Let $\mathbf{v}_{i,j} = \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i$ be the vector between vertices i and j and θ_j be the angle between $\mathbf{v}_{i,t}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{i,j}$. The greedy navigator moves to the neighbor j of i that has not been visited before and has the smallest θ_j . If all the neighbors of i has been visited the navigator goes back to the vertex from which the navigator arrived to i , which is in contrast to the simple greedy navigation based on the geometric proximity that sometimes fails to reach the target due to the lack of such a backtracking process [9, 10]. This procedure is repeated until t is reached (which will happen eventually if G is connected, or, more generally, if i and j are in the same components). We contrast the greedy navigators with *random navigators* that move between the source and target in the same way as the greedy ones except that they go to a random neighbor when the greedy ones chose the neighbor with smallest θ_j , which is essentially the random depth-first search (DFS) [11]. See Fig. 1 for an illustration of greedy and random navigators.

How can we use greedy navigators to quantify the naviga-




FIG. 2: (Color online) An example of the GSN pathway from the entrance ϵ in the left to the central target τ for the Leeds Castle Maze structure (184 vertices and 194 edges) is shown, where the red arrows indicate the pathway with the backtracking processes represented as blue dotted arrows and the real shortest path is shown in filled circles. The distances for this specific pair of the source and target with different routing strategies (GSN, random DFS, real shortest path, respectively) are $d_g(\epsilon \rightarrow \tau) = 87$, compared to $d_r(\epsilon \rightarrow \tau) = 134.13$ (averaged over 10^3 trials with the standard error 1.067), and $d(\epsilon \rightarrow \tau) = 52$.

bility of a map? Let d_g be the average distance in the eyes of the greedy navigators. More precisely, we average, over all pairs of distinct vertices, the number of edges in the greedy navigators’ paths. d is the average distance as usual (the average number of edges in shortest paths). d is the lower bound of d_g , which makes $\nu = d/d_g$ a natural measure of navigability of the underlying spatial network. ν takes values in the interval $(0, 1]$ where fewer detours means a higher value. As an option to the graph distance one can use the real road distance (or the sum of Euclidean distance of the edges). The advantage of using the graph distance is that ν can be interpreted, roughly, as the fraction of correct choices of which road to take at an intersection [12]. We first measure the navigability of four empirical datasets. Two of these maps are excerpts of the road networks of the Boston and New York City [13]. The roads of the excerpt are chosen to represent the major thoroughfares of the downtown areas. The other networks are railway networks from Europe [14]—a dataset covering most of Western continental Europe and the Swiss subnetwork of the former. The results for the navigability and some other statistics is shown in Table I. As an illustrative example of GSN, we present the performance of GSN in case of an intentionally delusive structure to navigators, namely, a maze. Figure 2 shows a GSN pathway on the graph representation of Leeds Castle Maze [17] in England, where the GSN performance for all the pairs of vertices is $\nu = 0.329$ compared to $d/d_r = 0.239$, where d_r is the average path length for the random DFS strategy.

In spite of the essential role of geometric information, studies on the network centralities related to transport on networks have mostly focused either on the shortest path [2, 3] or the random walk [4] without explicit consideration of geometry. We define centralities based on our GSN and compare those with conventional ones in various cases. First, the centrality considering the “betweenness” in the pathway,




FIG. 3: (Color online) Characteristics of vertices and edges of two empirical road maps from Boston (a)–(e) and New York (f)–(j). We show scatter plots with color-coded density resolving the spatial structure with respect to vertices [(b) and (g)] and edges [(c), (d), (h) and (i)]. We show the relation between betweenness b and navigator centrality n [(b), (c), (g) and (h)] and the relation between navigator essentiality e and betweenness b [(d) and (i)]. The maps [(a) and (f)] show the natural logarithm of the navigator centrality for the vertices (red) and edges (blue). [(e) and (j)] chart the natural logarithm of the absolute values of navigator essentiality (blue for are normal edges and red for Braess ones). In (e) and (j) we also highlight some of the representative e -values from panels (d) and (i) respectively.

called navigator centrality n for vertex or edge x is defined as $n(x) = \sum_{i \neq j} \sigma_{ixj} / N(N-1)$, where $\sigma_{ixj} = 1$ if the GSN path from the source vertex i and the target vertex j goes through the vertex or edge x in the middle and $\sigma_{ixj} = 0$ otherwise.

We present the Boston and New York roads where the n values are color-coded, in Figs. 3(a) and (f). In all the networks including railway networks (not shown), we have found that the correlation between n and conventional betweenness centrality b [2, 3] (using the shortest path only considering the hopping distance for topological connections) are larger for vertices than edges, as shown in Figs. 3(b), (c), (g), and (h). In other words, while the relative b of vertices is more or less similar whether it is defined from the topologically shortest pathways or from the GSN pathways, b for the edges is significantly different for those two cases. To further investigate the properties of edges in terms of GSN, we introduce another centrality addressing the essentiality of edges. First, we define average GSN path length (aGPL) as the average number of steps of GSN for all the source-target pairs of vertices in graph G . Then, the edge essentiality e for edge l is defined as $e(l) = \text{aGPL}(G \setminus \{l\}) - \text{aGPL}(G)$, which quantifies the average number of *additional* steps necessary as the effect from the absence of the edge l , naturally implying the edge’s importance for GSN. Note that $e(l)$ can be negative somewhat counterintuitively, which implies that the removal of the edge l *enhances* the navigability in terms of GSN. The case $e(l) < 0$ is clearly reminiscent of the Braess’s paradox [13]. Here we denote the edges with $e > 0$ as “normal” edges and the edges with $e < 0$ as “Braess” edges. Figures 3(e) and (j) show Boston and New York roads where e values are color-coded. Again, as in case of n , there is significant difference between e and b . Therefore, we conclude that the spatial structure of edges indeed acts as a crucial substrate for greedy navigators.

In our example road structures, we observe that the detailed structure of networks really matters. Figures 3(d) and

TABLE II: Coefficients for the multiple linear regression $e = m_1 b + m_2(\text{length}) + m_3 c + m_4(k_i k_j)$ for road networks, with some measures defined on edges: b , the edge length, the distance c from the midpoint of edges to the centroid of vertices, and the product $k_i k_j$ of degrees of vertices attached to edges. The statistical significance codes are *: < 0.05 , **: < 0.01 , and ***: < 0.001 .

road	Boston	New York
m_1	6.902***	9.389***
m_2	$-4.687 \times 10^{-5*}$	$-6.141 \times 10^{-5**}$
m_3	-1.504×10^{-6}	$2.142 \times 10^{-5*}$
m_4	$-8.817 \times 10^{-3**}$	$-5.653 \times 10^{-3*}$
multiple R^2	0.2508	0.1917
p -value	7.784×10^{-9}	3.395×10^{-9}

(i) clearly demonstrate the diversity of road structures, by indicating four representative roads for each city. The examples clarify that relatively low correlations for e and b stem from those roads whose importance is quite different for GSN and shortest path routing. Roads in the periphery naturally show low e values, but some important ones in terms of GSN, e.g., the road ‘1’ in Fig. 3(e) is clearly indicated by large e values. In case of the Braess road ‘2’ in Boston [Fig. 3(e)], we observe that removal of it helps the large volume of traffic from the upper left part to avoid entering the central part to reach the lower right part, and induce to take more efficient “outsirt” roads. The multiple linear regression results shown in Table II clearly demonstrate that predicting e values is not plausible from the linear combination of those network and geometric measures, with mediocre multiple R^2 values. From the same regression analysis on much larger Switzerland and European railways, we observe even smaller R^2 values estimated by the 10^4 sampled source-target pairs for each removal of edge. Therefore, e or the Braessness is a uniquely measured only by considering




FIG. 4: (Color online) Scatter plots for the GSN navigability $\nu = d/d_g$ (a) and the random navigability d/d_r (b) vs the number of vertices N , for the 100 large cities in the world.

this greedy behavior of navigators.

Finally, we investigate whether there is any correlation between the GSN navigability and various socio-economic indices. For systematic verification, we have selected 20 largest cities in the United States (US), Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa, respectively (100 cities in total), and used Merkaartor program [18] to extract a representative sample of each city (a square of 2km sides) provided by OpenStreetMap project [19]. First, we compared the GSN navigability ν and random navigability d/d_r to the numbers of vertices N , as shown in Fig. 4. There is a striking difference between those two cases, where the clear scaling relationship between d/d_r and N [Fig. 4(b)] is shown, meaning that the random navigability is completely governed by the system sizes. In contrast, the widely scattered points in Fig. 4(a) strongly suggest that the numbers of vertices cannot predict the GSN navigability at all, in addition to the fact that purely topological measures cannot predict e in Table II. In this respect, the GSN navigability obviously reflects unique properties of different cities with vastly different developmental histories. We have tried a number of socio-economic indices such as population density, median resident income, unemployment rate, fraction of public transit commuters, etc for the US cities. However, we could not find a single or linear combinations of such mea-

asures showing statistically significant correlations with the navigability, which again leads to the conclusion that different cities have unique properties of navigability independent of other socio-economic factors. One example is the correlation between the navigability and the population change ratio of the 20 cities in the US defined as the ratio of the population change between 1960 and 2010 to the population in 1960 [20]. A very weak negative correlation between ν and the ratio is observed with $R^2 = 0.09(3)$, but it is too weak to reach any meaningful conclusion.

In summary, we have introduced a new routing strategy incorporating greedy movement and memory of network users. This strategy, we believe, is a minimal model considering the basic concept of human psychology for navigation, namely, incomplete navigational information and the memory not to be lost. From the results from real-world road and railway structures, we demonstrate the important difference in terms of centralities for navigation and the fact that there exist celebrated Braess's paradox caused by the network users' behavior just equipped with this simple strategy. From the observation of correlation profiles for centralities in road structures, we have shown that the importance of each element heavily depends on detailed layout of structures. This type of tool—linking spatial cognition, the environment and emergent navigational properties—can be helpful for urban planners and architects [21].

Acknowledgments

This research is supported by the Swedish Research Foundation and the WCU program through NRF Korea funded by MEST R31-2008-10029 (PH). The authors thank Vincent Blondel, Daniel Equercia, Veronica Ramenzoni and Bo Söderberg for comments and Hyejin Youn for help with data acquisition.

-
- [1] C. Song, Z. Qu, N. Blumm, and A.-L. Barabási, *Science* **327**, 1018 (2010).
 - [2] S. Wasserman and K. Faust, *Social Network Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, 1994).
 - [3] K.-I. Goh, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 278701 (2001).
 - [4] J. D. Noh and H. Rieger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 118701 (2004).
 - [5] S. Redner, *A Guide to First-Passage Processes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, 2001).
 - [6] M. Barthelemy, *Phys. Rep.* **499**, 1 (2011).
 - [7] T. Wolbers and M. Hegarty, *Trends in Cognitive Science* **14**, 138 (2010).
 - [8] R. Thomas and S. Donikian, *Spatial Cognition V, LNAI 4387*, pp. 421-438 (2007).
 - [9] J. M. Kleinberg, *Nature* **406**, 845 (2000).
 - [10] M. Boguñá, D. Krioukov, and K. C. Claffy, *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 74 (2008); M. Boguñá and D. Krioukov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 058701 (2009).
 - [11] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein, *Introduction to Algorithms* (The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001).
 - [12] Note that at a step the agent can either get one step closer or further from the target or remain at the same distance. Assuming that the steps increasing the distance are rare in real networks the interpretation of ν as a correct-step rate is correct.
 - [13] H. Youn, M. T. Gastner, and H. Jeong, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 128701 (2008).
 - [14] M. Kurant and P. Thiran, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 138701 (2006); *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 036114 (2006).
 - [15] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *Publ. Math.* **6**, 290 (1959).
 - [16] S. H. Lee and P. Holme, *Physica A* **390**, 3996 (2011).
 - [17] The graph representation is manually processed, based on the image available online at <http://bit.ly/uYGLXz>.
 - [18] <http://merkaartor.be/>.
 - [19] <http://www.openstreetmap.org/>.
 - [20] <http://1.usa.gov/7TyXkW>.
 - [21] B. Hillier and J. Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, 1984); L. A. Carlson, C. Hölscher, T. F. Shipley, and R. C. Dalton, *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* **19**, 284 (2010).