

Characteristic times of biased random walks on complex networks

Moreno Bonaventura,^{1,2} Vincenzo Nicosia,¹ and Vito Latora^{1,3}

¹*School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, E1 4NS, London (UK)*

²*School of Business and Management, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, E1 4NS, London (UK)*

³*Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia, Università di Catania and INFN, 95123 Catania, Italy*

We consider degree-biased random walkers whose probability to move from a node to one of its neighbours of degree k is proportional to k^α , where α is a tuning parameter. We study both numerically and analytically three types of characteristic times, namely: *i*) the time the walker needs to come back to the starting node, *ii*) the time it takes to pass from a given node, and *iii*) the time it takes to visit all the nodes of the network. We consider a large database of real-world networks and we show that the value of α which minimizes the three characteristic times is different from the value $\alpha_{\min} = -1$ analytically found for uncorrelated networks in the mean-field approximation. In addition to this, assortative networks have preferentially a value of α_{\min} in the range $[-1, -0.5]$, while disassortative networks have α_{\min} in the range $[-0.5, 0]$. When only local information is available, degree-biased random walks can guarantee smaller characteristic times by means of an appropriate tuning of the motion bias.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 05.40.Fb, 89.75.Kd

In the last decade or so the quantitative analysis of networks having different origin and function, including social networks, the human brain, the Internet, the World Wide Web, has revealed that all these systems exhibit comparable structural properties at different scales, and are more similar to each other than expected [1, 2]. It has been found that the structural complexity of networks from the real world usually has a significant impact on the dynamical processes occurring over them, including opinion dynamics [3], epidemics [4] and synchronization [5].

Random walks are the simplest way to explore a network, and are one of the most widely studied class of processes on complex networks [6, 7]. Different kinds of random walks have been used to implement efficient local search strategies [9, 10], and also to reveal the presence of hierarchies and network communities [11, 12]. Particular attention has been devoted to the study of the *characteristic times* associated to random walks, such as the *mean return times*, or the *mean first passage times*, respectively the average time the walker takes to come back to the starting node or to hit a given node [13]. Such characteristic times can be determined analytically for random walks on regular lattices [14], but their calculation for graphs with heterogeneous structures is still the object of active research. Recent results include the derivation of analytic expressions for the characteristic times of unbiased random walks on Erdős–Rényi random graphs [15], on fractal networks [16–19] and on particular classes of scale-free graphs [20]. To date, only approximate solutions are available for random walks on real networks [21–24].

A class of random walks which is particularly interesting to consider on heterogeneous networks is that of *degree-biased random walks*. In a degree-biased random walk, the probability to move from a given node to one of its neighbours, of degree k , is proportional to k^α , where α is a tuning parameter. According to the sign of the

bias parameter α , the walkers preferentially move either towards hubs or towards poorly connected nodes [25]. Biased random walks have been recently employed for community detection [26] and to define new centrality measures [27, 28]. Furthermore, analytical results on the characteristic times of degree-biased random walks have been obtained for specific classes of random graphs in the mean-field approximation [29]. However, the structure of real networks is far from being random, and several empirical evidences suggest that the presence of degree-degree correlations can affect the dynamics of the walk. For instance, the authors of Ref. [25] have shown that the value of entropy rate of biased random walks on real correlated networks substantially deviates from the prediction for the corresponding randomized graphs. Similarly, more recent works show that degree-biased random walks can approximate maximally entropic walks, but the quality of such approximation depends again on degree-degree correlations [30, 31].

In this Article we study, both numerically and analytically, three types of characteristic times for biased random walks, namely mean return times (MRT), mean first passage times (MFPT), and mean coverage times (MCT). We consider different synthetic graphs and a large data set of social, biological and technological complex networks from the real world, and we study how the characteristic times depend on the bias parameter α of the walker, with special attention to the values α_{\min} that minimize the characteristic times. Our main result is that the characteristic times of biased random walks on real-world networks sensibly deviate from those observed in uncorrelated random graphs. In particular, we prove analytically that the minimum MRT in Erdős–Rényi and scale-free random graphs is always obtained for $\alpha_{\min} = -1$, while we show through numerical simulations that the minimum MRT in real-world networks is obtained for values of α that significantly deviate from -1 . We find that the value α_{\min} is correlated with the

assortativity coefficient of the network, and in particular that for assortative networks $-1 < \alpha_{\min} < -0.5$, while for disassortative networks $-0.5 < \alpha_{\min} < 0$. We also compute the MRT for nodes with a given degree k , and we derive a closed form to calculate the value of the bias $\alpha_{\min}(k)$ which minimizes the MRT for each degree class in uncorrelated scale-free graphs. Similar results are also found and presented for the analysis of optimal values of the bias parameter α for MFPT and MCT.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section I we introduce random walks whose motion is biased on the degree of the nodes, and we give the definition of return, first passage and coverage times. In Section II we study how the MRT depends on the value of the bias parameter α , and we compare the analytical predictions of characteristic times in the case of uncorrelated graphs with the numerical results obtained on a large data set of real-world networks, showing the existence of a strong correlation between the sign of the degree-degree correlations and the dynamics of biased random walks. We also investigate the dependence of MRT on the degree of the starting node. In Section III and Section IV we discuss the results obtained on real-world networks for MFPT and MCT, respectively, and we show that the relation between the sign of degree-degree correlations in a graph and the dynamics of the walkers on the graph are indeed similar to those found for MRT. Finally, in Section V we discuss the results of the paper and we outline possible future directions for the investigation of characteristic times of random walks on real-world networks.

I. DEGREE-BIASED RANDOM WALKS

Let us consider an undirected and unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$ with $N = |V|$ nodes and $K = |E|$ edges. Denote as A the adjacency matrix of graph G , i.e. the symmetric $N \times N$ matrix whose entry a_{ij} is equal to 1 if an edge exists between node i and j , and is 0 otherwise. We consider the following dynamical process occurring on the graph: a walker that at each time step moves from a node to one of its neighbours with a probability proportional to the α -power of the degree of the target node. The process corresponds to a discrete-time Markov chain [8] on the state space V defined by the transition matrix Π , whose each entry π_{ji} is equal to the probability for a walker on node i to jump to one of its neighbours j , and reads:

$$\pi_{ji} = \frac{a_{ij}k_j^\alpha}{\sum_l a_{il}k_l^\alpha} \quad (1)$$

The exponent α is the control parameter that allows to tune the dependence of the process on the node degree. When $\alpha > 0$ the random motion is biased towards high-degree nodes, while when $\alpha < 0$ the walkers move with higher probability to neighbors with low degree. When $\alpha = 0$ the common (unbiased) random walk is recovered. The fundamental quantity to describe the

random walk is the occupation probability distribution $p_i(t)$. Being $p_i(t)$ the probability that a walker is at node i at time t , then the probability $p_j(t+1)$ of being at node j at time $t+1$ is given by:

$$p_j(t+1) = \sum_i \pi_{ji} p_i(t) \quad (2)$$

or in vector notation: $\mathbf{p}(t+1) = \Pi \mathbf{p}(t)$. A fixed point solution \mathbf{p}^* of the latter equation, such that $\mathbf{p}^* = \Pi \mathbf{p}^*$, is called the *stationary distribution*. If the transition matrix Π is primitive, i.e. if the graph is connected and contains at least an odd cycle, the Perron-Frobenius theorem assures that \mathbf{p}^* always exists, is unique, and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi^t \mathbf{p}(0) = \mathbf{p}^* \quad \forall \mathbf{p}(0)$$

i.e. all initial occupation probability distributions $\mathbf{p}(0)$ converge to the stationary distribution \mathbf{p}^* [35]. In particular, the stationary distribution associated to the transition matrix (1) of a degree-biased random walk is [25]:

$$p_i^* = \frac{c_i k_i^\alpha}{\sum_\ell c_\ell k_\ell^\alpha}, \quad c_i = \sum_j a_{ij} k_j^\alpha \quad (3)$$

When $\alpha = 0$, Eq. (3) reduces to:

$$p_i^* = \frac{k_i}{2K} \quad (4)$$

which states that for unbiased random walks the number of walkers at a node i is proportional to the degree k_i , so that the dynamic process is completely characterized by the degree sequence of the graph. Conversely, when $\alpha \neq 0$, the stationary distribution p_i^* does not depend only on the degree k_i but also on the degrees of the first neighbors of node i , through the coefficient c_i . The stationary probability distribution \mathbf{p}^* is therefore sensitive to the degree sequence and also to the presence of degree-degree correlations in the network. It is interesting to notice that the majority of real-world networks exhibit degree-degree correlations, meaning that their nodes are found to be preferentially connected with other nodes having either similar or dissimilar degree [32–34]. Consequently, in these networks the stationary probability distribution \mathbf{p}^* can sensibly deviate from that observed on a random graph having the same degree distribution and no degree-degree correlations. Degree-degree correlations are fully described by the joint probability $P(k, k')$, that represents the likelihood that nodes with degree k and k' are connected through an edge. The type of correlations is usually characterized by the average degree $k_{nn}(k)$ of the nearest neighbors of nodes with degree k . This can be written in terms of the joint probability $P(k, k')$ as [32]:

$$k_{nn}(k) = \sum_{k'} k' P(k, k')$$

Networks are called assortative when k_{nn} is an increasing function of k and disassortative when k_{nn} is a decreasing

function of k [32]. Moreover, for many real-world networks the nearest neighbors average degree is a power-law function of k , $k_{nn}(k) \sim k^\nu$, so that the exponent ν can be used to quantitatively characterize degree correlations. A positive exponent $\nu > 0$ indicates assortative correlation while a negative value $\nu < 0$ indicates disassortative ones.

In this paper we are interested in the typical times of degree-biased random walkers. In particular, assuming that a walker is at node i at time $t = 0$ and moves according to Eq. 1, we consider the expected time that the random walker needs to:

- come back to node i for the first time, referred to as Mean Return Time (MRT) and denoted as r_i ,
- reach a node j ($j \neq i$) for the first time, referred to as Mean First Passage Time (MFPT) and denoted as t_{ij} ,
- visit all nodes in the network at least once, referred to as Mean Coverage Time (MCT) and denoted as c_i .

In the following sections we explore how the three characteristic times defined above are affected by the bias in the random walk. In particular we will focus on the value of the bias parameter α which respectively minimizes MRT, MFPT and MCT. We use a data set consisting of many assortative and disassortative medium-to-large sized real-world networks, and we will show how degree biased random walks can highlight assortativity or disassortativity from a dynamical point of view.

II. MEAN RETURN TIME

The mean return time (MRT) r_i is defined as the expected time needed for a random walker starting at node i to come back for the first time to node i . The MRT can be calculated from the inverse of the stationary distribution [36]:

$$r_i = 1/p_i^* \quad (5)$$

In order to summarize in a single value the typical return time for the entire network, we define the *graph mean return time* R as the average of r_i over all nodes:

$$R = \langle r_i \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i \quad (6)$$

In the case of a degree-biased random walk, R depends on α because the stationary distribution depends on α as in Eq. (3). In Fig. (1) we show the graph mean return time R as a function of α for three networks, namely a scale-free network with $N = 10^4$ nodes, degree exponent $\gamma = 2.5$ and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 46$, constructed by the




Figure 1. (color online) The average mean return time R of a graph re-scaled by the number of nodes N in the graph as a function of α for InternetAS (red dashes), SCN (green dots) and an uncorrelated scale-free network (solid blue line). Due to the presence of correlations, R/N is a much narrower function of α in real-world networks than in synthetic networks, suggesting that mean-field approximations can adequately describe the dynamics of biased random walks only for uncorrelated graphs.

configuration model [48], the scientific collaboration network of scientists in condensed matter (SCN) [49], having $N = 12,722$ nodes and $K = 39,967$ edges, and a sample of the Internet at the Autonomous System level (InternetAS) [32], having $N = 11,174$ and $K = 23,409$ edges. The values of R are re-scaled by the network size N . The networks reported in figure are representative of the general behavior observed in the entire data set. In fact, for all the considered networks R is always a convex function of α , with a single minimum, denoted by R_{\min} , observed at a value of α denoted as α_{\min}^R . For the uncorrelated scale-free network we find $\alpha_{\min}^R = -1$ and $R_{\min} \sim N$. The same result has been found for Erdős-Rényi random graphs and for other uncorrelated scale-free networks constructed through linear preferential attachment [37]. As shown in Table I, as the average degree $\langle k \rangle$ of a synthetic network increases, the corresponding value of α_{\min}^R approaches -1 . Also the minimum return time becomes progressively more similar to the size of the network: $R_{\min} \sim N$. These results are in agreement with what has been found in Ref. [29]. We will give an analytical explanation of the fact that $\alpha_{\min}^R = -1$ for uncorrelated networks at the end of this Section.

From Fig. 1 it is clear that the dynamical behaviour of biased random walks on real-world networks considerably deviates from that observed in uncorrelated synthetic networks. In fact, if a network has degree-degree correlations then the minimum of R always occurs for values of α larger than -1 . In particular, for SCN we have $\alpha_{\min}^R \simeq -0.65$ while for InternetAS we have $\alpha_{\min}^R \simeq -0.15$ (refer to Table I for the values of α_{\min}^R in each of the real-world networks considered in this study). As we see in




Figure 2. (color online) The minimum value of the normalized graph mean return time R_{\min}/N and the corresponding α_{\min}^R for all networks in the considered data set. Assortative networks (green labels) have $-1 < \alpha_{\min}^R < -0.5$ and $R_{\min}/N \in [1.0, 1.5]$, while for disassortative networks (red labels) $-0.5 < \alpha_{\min}^R < 0$ and $R_{\min}/N > 1.5$. The networks for which the function $k_{nn}(k)$ is not a power-law of k are indicated by black labels.

the Figure, the value of R is also highly sensitive to the value of α , and R_{\min} can be considerably lower than the unbiased case $\alpha = 0$. For instance, in SCN the value of R_{\min} is about half the value of R for the unbiased random walk. This result indicates that a careful choice of the bias parameter can significantly reduce the characteristic times of degree-biased random walkers.

In Fig. 2 we report the values of R_{\min} and α_{\min}^R for each network in the data set. For those networks with $\alpha_{\min}^R < -0.5$ the minimum value R_{\min} is only slightly greater than the size of the network N , while the differences are more pronounced in the region $\alpha > -0.5$. Notice that all the networks with clear assortative degree-degree correlations (reported in green) have a value of $\alpha_{\min}^R < -0.5$, while disassortative networks (reported in red) have $\alpha_{\min}^R > -0.5$. This result indicates that the presence of degree-degree correlations has a significant impact in the values of α_{\min}^R , and consequently on the performance of a biased random walk on a graph in terms of exploration speed. The relation between the degree-correlation exponent ν and the value of α_{\min}^R is shown in Fig. 3. The values corresponding to real-world networks lie almost exclusively in the top-left and in the bottom-right quadrants, respectively corresponding to ($\alpha_{\min}^R < -0.5, \nu > 0$) and ($\alpha_{\min}^R > -0.5, \nu < 0$). Fig. 3 shows very clearly that the value of α_{\min}^R is always smaller than -0.5 for assortative networks and larger -0.5 for disassortative ones. To further investigate the special role played by the bias parameter $\alpha = -0.5$ we have considered a large set of synthetic networks with degree-

degree correlations generated through the edge-swapping procedure described in Ref. [38]. This procedure, reported in details in Appendix, starts from an uncorrelated network and artificially introduces a prescribed amount of either assortative or disassortative degree-degree correlations by rewiring the edges of the graph without modifying the degree sequence. As a result, this algorithm allows to investigate the relation between the value of ν and α_{\min}^R of a network by varying continuously the correlation exponent ν while preserving the degree sequence.

The black curve in Fig. 3 has been obtained by starting with a configuration model scale-free network with $N = 10^4$ nodes, $k_{max} = 300$ and $\gamma = 3$, which has no degree-degree correlations, and by running the swapping procedure to introduce assortative or disassortative correlations. We notice that by performing assortative swaps the value of ν increases considerably, while α_{\min}^R remains asymptotically confined below -0.5 . Conversely, few disassortative swaps are enough to determine a fast change on α_{\min}^R , which enters the region $\alpha > -0.5$ where the majority of real-world disassortative networks lie. In Fig. 4 we report as a solid line the values of R_{\min}




Figure 3. (color online) The degree-correlation exponent ν and the value α_{\min}^R that minimizes the graph mean return time in real-world networks (black square) and in synthetic networks with a tunable value of ν (black line). Notice that assortative networks are confined in $-1 < \alpha_{\min}^R < -0.5$ while almost all of the disassortative real-world networks lie in the region $-0.5 < \alpha_{\min}^R < 0$. For comparison we also report an Erdős-Rényi random graph with $N = 10^4$ and $\langle k \rangle = 40$.

as a function of the degree-correlation exponent ν for the same set of synthetic networks considered in Fig. 3. Filled squares represent the values obtained on real-world networks. We observe that R_{\min}/N is considerably larger than 1 for disassortative networks, while it is closer to 1 for assortative networks. Moreover, all the real-world networks considered in the study (with the only exception of the C.Elegans neural network, indicated as “cen” in the Figure) lie on the right of the curve corresponding to synthetic correlated networks.

The numerical analysis of the mean return time indicates that, for uncorrelated networks, $\alpha_{\min} = -1$, so that the deviations from this value observed in real-world networks are due to the presence of degree-degree correlations. Here, we provide an analytical proof of the fact that $\alpha_{\min} = -1$ in the mean-field approximation, and we compare the analytical predictions with numerical results on real-world networks. In the mean-field approximation a graph is described by the annealed adjacency matrix:

$$\langle a \rangle_{ij} = \frac{k_i k_j}{2K} \quad (7)$$

The value $\langle a \rangle_{ij}$ can be interpreted as the probability that an edge exists between any two nodes i and j with degrees k_i and k_j if the nodes are connected at random. In fact, let us imagine a network where each node i has k_i stubs to be paired with some of the stubs of other nodes. If K is the total number of links there are $2K$ of such free stubs. Among these $2K$ stubs, only k_j are incident in node j . Therefore, there are k_j ways a stub of node i can be connected with a node j over a total of $2K$ possible pairings with other nodes. One obtains the expression for $\langle a \rangle_{ij}$ in Eq. (7) by observing that node i has k_i different stubs to connect with one of the stubs of j , where the product $k_i k_j / 2K$ represents the probability that nodes i and j are connected by the stubs at random. If we plug Eq. (7) into Eq. (3) we obtain:

$$p_i^* = \frac{k_i^{\alpha+1}}{N \langle k^{\alpha+1} \rangle} \quad (8)$$

which gives

$$r_i(k_i) = N \langle k^{\alpha+1} \rangle k_i^{-\alpha-1} \quad (9)$$

and

$$R = N \langle k^{\alpha+1} \rangle \langle k^{-\alpha-1} \rangle \quad (10)$$

in agreement with the result found in Ref. [29]. It is straightforward to verify that $R = N$ when $\alpha = -1$. Moreover, one can easily verify that for Erdős–Rényi graphs $\alpha_{\min} = -1$ gives the minimum value of R . In order to see this, we can replace the average over nodes $\langle \dots \rangle$ in Eq. (10) with an integral over degree classes $\int_1^\infty \dots P(k) dk$. We denote with $P_{ER}(k)$ the degree distribution of Erdős–Rényi graphs (this distribution is binomial, and can be approximated by a Poissonian distribution for large N). Differentiating with respect to α to find the minimum value of R we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{dR}{d\alpha} = \\ &= N \frac{d}{d\alpha} \left[\int_1^\infty P_{ER}(k) k^{\alpha+1} dk \int_1^\infty P_{ER}(z) z^{-\alpha-1} dz \right] = \\ &= N \int_1^\infty P_{ER}(k) \log(k) k^{\alpha+1} dk \int_1^\infty P_{ER}(z) z^{-\alpha-1} dz + \\ &- N \int_1^\infty P_{ER}(k) k^{\alpha+1} dk \int_1^\infty P_{ER}(z) \log(z) z^{-\alpha-1} dz. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 4. (color online) The degree-correlation exponent ν and the normalized graph mean return time R_{\min}/N for the same set of synthetic networks in Fig.3 (black line) and real-world networks. Notice that in the $\nu - R_{\min}/N$ plane all real-world networks lie on the right of the black curve corresponding to synthetic correlated networks.

The latter expression is equal to 0 for $\alpha = -1$, since we have $k^{\alpha+1} = 1 = z^{-\alpha-1}$ and the last two terms are equal and opposite in sign. Analogously we can derive the minimum value of R also for uncorrelated networks with power-law degree distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$:

$$\begin{aligned} R &\sim N \int_1^\infty k^{-\gamma} k^{\alpha+1} dk \int_1^\infty k^{-\gamma} k^{-\alpha-1} dk = \\ &= N \left[\frac{1}{\gamma - \alpha - 2} \right] \left[\frac{1}{\gamma + \alpha} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the integrability conditions are satisfied if α is in the range $[-2, 0]$, and $2 < \gamma < 4$ which is compatible with the values of γ observed in real-world networks. Differentiating Eq. (11) with respect to α we get again the value $\alpha_{\min}^R = -1$, while the second derivative is always positive, as expected. It is worth noting that the result $\alpha_{\min}^R = -1$ does not depend on the value of the scaling exponent γ of the degree distribution and on the maximum degree in the network, k_{max} . The quantity R is an average over all graph nodes. However, Eq. (9) allows also to compute the value $\alpha_{\min}^r(k)$ that minimizes the return time $r(k)$ of nodes having a certain degree k . In the case of Erdős–Rényi graphs a large number of nodes have the same degree because the degree distribution is picked around $\langle k \rangle$ and, as a result, the values of return times are very similar for most of the nodes. For real networks instead the degree distribution is often heterogeneous and the return time sensibly depends on the degree of the starting node. Differentiating Eq. (9) with respect to α we get:

$$0 = \frac{d}{d\alpha} r(k) = C'_\alpha k^{-\alpha-1} - C_\alpha k^{-\alpha-1} \log(k) \quad (12)$$

being $C_\alpha = N \langle k^{\alpha+1} \rangle$. Replacing the average over nodes

(...) with the integral over degree classes, and considering networks with power-law degree distributions $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ and with minimum and maximum degree k_m and k_M we get

$$C_\alpha \sim N \int_{k_m}^{k_M} k^{-\gamma} k^{\alpha+1} dk \quad (13)$$

Integrating Eq. (13) and plugging in Eq. (12) we obtain:

$$\left[\left(k_M^\beta \ln k_M - k_m^\beta \ln k_m - (k_M^\beta - k_m^\beta) \ln k \right) \beta + k_M^\beta + k_m^\beta \right] k^{-\alpha-1} = 0 \quad (14)$$

where $\beta = -\gamma + \alpha + 2$. The return time $r(k)$ for nodes of a given degree class k takes its minimum at the value of α which satisfies the previous equation. Excluding the indeterminate case $\beta = 0$, Eq. (14) has only one solution for each value of k .

In the three top panels of Fig. 5 we report the return time $r(k)$ as a function of α for different degree classes (solid curves), compared with the average return time R of the same graph (black dotted curve). The three panels correspond, respectively, to a configuration model scale-free graph with $\gamma = 3$ (a), InternetAS (b) and SCN (c). These plots show that a wrong choice of the biased parameter can result in a large increase of the return time. For instance in Fig. 5 (c) the minimum return time $r_{min}(17)$ for the degree class $k = 17$ occurs for $\alpha = 0.5$ and is about four times smaller than the return time $r(17)$ obtained at $\alpha = -1$ (refer to the vertical dashed lines for guidance). In the three bottom panels of Fig. 5 we report $\alpha_{min}^r(k)$, the minimum value of the bias parameter α , as a function of the degree k . The black crosses are the numerical results, while the solid blue line is the prediction in mean-field obtained from the zeros of Eq. (14). We notice a good agreement of the numerical results and the mean-field solution in the case of the uncorrelated scale-free graph, while the results obtained on real-world networks display considerable deviations from the analytical prediction, evidently due to the presence of degree-degree correlations. From the point of view of network exploration, Eq. (14) turns out to be useful when an agent is sent through the network in order to collect information and then come back to his starting point [39]. In fact, this equation gives insight about how to fine-tune the bias parameter in order to increase or decrease the time required (on average) by the agents to come back to the starting nodes with collected information. It is worth noting that small changes in α can produce large variations in the return times, thus highlighting the importance of a proper tuning.

III. MEAN FIRST PASSAGE TIME

In this Section we focus on the mean first passage time (MFPT), showing that the interplay between degree cor-

relations and the dynamics of biased random walks produces qualitatively similar results to those found for the mean return time.

We denote as t_{ij} the expected time needed for a random walker to reach node j for the first time when starting from node i . If the transition matrix Π of the walker is primitive, it is possible to determine t_{ij} by using the fundamental matrix of the Markov Chain associated to the random walk [36]. The fundamental matrix Z is defined as:

$$Z = (I - \Pi^\top + W)^{-1} \quad (15)$$

where each row of W is equal to the stationary probability distribution \mathbf{p}^* and I is the identity matrix. The mean first passage time t_{ij} is then equal to:

$$t_{ij} = \frac{z_{jj} - z_{ij}}{p_j^*} \quad (16)$$

where z_{jj} and z_{ij} are the entries of the fundamental matrix Z . Notice that in general $t_{ij} \neq t_{ji}$. We define the *graph mean first passage time* T as the average of the first passage time over all possible node pairs:

$$T = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i,j} t_{ij} \quad (17)$$

The inversion of the matrix in Eq. (15) for large network is computational intensive. For these reason we used the fundamental matrix Z only to compute the mean first passage time for relatively small networks ($N \lesssim 10^4$), while for larger networks we computed t_{ij} using an agent-based simulation, described in the Appendix. As found for the global mean return time, also T is a convex function of the bias parameter α with a single minimum at α_{min}^T . This is illustrated in Fig. 6(a). Again, the position of the minimum is at -1 only for uncorrelated networks (see Table I). We also notice that for disassortative real-world networks $-0.5 < \alpha_{min}^T < 0$ as already found in the case of the mean return time. Conversely, some assortative networks can have a value α_{min}^T which is not in the range $[-1, -0.5]$. It is worth noting that the minimum value T_{min} in real-world networks is significantly smaller than the MFPT for unbiased ($\alpha = 0$) random walks, or for the case of uncorrelated networks ($\alpha = -1$). In Fig. 6(b) we plot the minimum value of graph first passage time T_{min} re-scaled by the number of nodes N for all the networks in the data set. Despite there is no clear separation at $\alpha = -0.5$ between assortative and disassortative networks, as observed for the MRT, the behaviour is similar to that of Fig. 2: the farther α_{min}^T is from -1 , the more T_{min}/N deviates from 1.

A comparison between the α_{min} values for MFPT and MRT is reported in Fig. 6(c). Excluding the network of the US power-grid (indicated in the figure as USPower), the value of the Pearson's linear correlation coefficient between α_{min}^R and α_{min}^T is $r = 0.87$. Despite the two values of α_{min} are not equal for all networks, the correlation we find is still remarkable. We notice that the US




Figure 5. (color online) Top panels: return time $r(k)$ for nodes of degree class k as a function of α (solid lines, each curve correspond to a value of k) respectively for (a) a configuration model scale-free graph with $\gamma = 3$ (black), (b) InternetAS (red) and (c) SCN (green). The dotted line in each panel is the average of $r(k)$ over all degree classes. Bottom panels: the value $\alpha_{\min}^r(k)$ which minimizes $r(k)$ as a function of k (dots) for the three networks considered in the top panels. The solid blue line is the mean field prediction of Eq. (14) where γ is chosen equal to the exponent of the degree distribution of the corresponding real network.




Figure 6. (color online) (a) The *graph mean first passage time* T , re-scaled by the number of nodes N , is plotted as a function of α for SCN (dashed green line), InternetAS (dotted red line) and an uncorrelated scale-free graph with $N = 10^4$ and $\gamma = 2.5$ (solid blue line). (b) The value α_{\min}^T and the corresponding minimum value of global mean first passage time T_{\min}/N for all networks in the data set. (c) There is a positive correlation between the two values of the bias α which minimize respectively MRT and MFPT. The solid line corresponds to $\alpha_{\min}^R = \alpha_{\min}^T$. The value of the Pearson's linear correlation coefficient is $r = 0.87$ (the US power-grid network is excluded).

power grid is the only spatially embedded network in the data set and its exceptional values of α_{\min} can be due to spatial constraints absent in the other networks studied. The existence of a relatively strong positive correlation between α_{\min}^R and α_{\min}^T could have interesting practical applications. In fact, in order to obtain a walk having a small graph MFPT, it is possible to use α_{\min}^R as an approximation of α_{\min}^T . Thus, by setting $\alpha = \alpha_{\min}^R$ one can obtain a quasi-optimal biased random walks, with respect

to MFPT, without the need to invert the fundamental matrix of the graph, which is practically impossible for large networks.

IV. MEAN COVERAGE TIME

The last characteristic time under investigation is the mean coverage time (MCT) c_i , defined as the expected




Figure 7. (color online) (a) The *graph mean coverage time* C , re-scaled by the lower bound $N \ln(N)$, is plotted as a function of α for the same networks as in Fig. 6(a). (b) The minimum value α_{\min}^C and the corresponding coverage time C_{\min} for all networks in the data set. (c) There is a positive correlation between the two values of the bias α which minimize respectively MRT and MCT. The solid line corresponds to $\alpha_{\min}^R = \alpha_{\min}^C$. The value of the Pearson's linear correlation coefficient is $r = 0.77$ (the US power-grid network is excluded).

number of time steps required for the walker to visit all the nodes of the graph at least once when starting from node i . We also study the *graph mean coverage time* C , defined as an average of c_i over all the graph nodes:

$$C = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i^N c_i \quad (18)$$

We have computed the graph mean coverage time C for all but two networks in the data set by means of an agent-based simulation and by averaging over many realizations of the walk as described in the appendix. The asymptotic lower bound on the coverage time for the unbiased ($\alpha = 0$) random walk on a generic graph is given by [40]:

$$c_i \geq (1 + O(1)) N \ln(N) \quad (\alpha = 0) \quad (19)$$

where the equality is satisfied for the complete graph of N nodes, i.e. the graph in which there is a link between every pair of nodes. The inequality (19) implies the following lower bound for the global mean coverage time:

$$C \geq (1 + o(1)) N \ln(N) \quad (\alpha = 0) \quad (20)$$

We therefore normalize the obtained values of C by the quantity $N \ln(N)$. In Fig. 7(a) we report such normalized quantity as a function of the bias parameter for the configuration model, SCN and Internet AS. The mean coverage time is a convex function of α with a single minimum at α_{\min}^C . As for MRT and MFPT we notice that the minimum of the global mean coverage time for the uncorrelated scale-free graph occurs at $\alpha_{\min}^C = -1$, and that the minimum value C_{\min} is very close to the lower bound given by Eq. (20). Real-world networks have instead values of C_{\min} significantly higher than the lower bound. Moreover, the graph mean coverage time is more sensitive to α than the previous metrics (the concavities of MCT in Fig. 7(a) are narrower than the concavities in Fig. 6(a) and in Fig. 1). For instance, in the SCN network the minimum mean coverage time, $C_{\min} = 90,330$,

is about 1.7 times smaller than the mean coverage time for unbiased random walkers, $C_{(\alpha=0)} = 142,490$, or for the $\alpha = -1$ case, $C_{(\alpha=-1)} = 159,020$. Disassortative networks, like InternetAS, have instead a minimum value of the coverage time that is similar to that for the unbiased case, while extremely different from the value at $\alpha = -1$. In Fig. 7(b) we report the values of α_{\min}^C and the corresponding C_{\min} for all the networks in the considered data set. This Figure is qualitatively similar to Fig. 6(b) and Fig. 2. Minima of C occur at $\alpha_{\min}^C \neq \alpha_{\min}^R$, nevertheless Fig. 7(c) shows that the two values are correlated. The Pearson's linear correlation coefficient between the two quantities is $r = 0.77$.

V. CONCLUSION

Random walks are the simplest way to visit a network, and degree-biased random walkers, which make use of information about node degree, are particularly suited to highlight the presence of degree-degree correlations. In this paper we have focused on the typical times of biased-random walks, namely on the expected time that a walker needs to come back to its starting node (MRT), to hit a given node (MFPT), or to visit all the nodes of the network (MCT). We have studied how such characteristic times depend on the value of the motion bias α . We have found that, in the mean-field approximation, the value α_{\min} that minimizes the characteristic times in uncorrelated networks is equal to -1 . This corresponds to a walk in which the probability to move to a node is inversely proportional to its degree. This mean-field approximation works pretty well in uncorrelated networks. However, real-world networks have degree-degree correlations and, as a result, the characteristic times of degree-biased random walks on real-world networks deviate from those obtained by using the mean field approach, as we have shown in the paper by studying a large data set of real-world networks. In particular, the value of α_{\min}

sensibly differs from -1 , in a way that depends on the sign of degree-degree correlations.

The minimization of characteristic times may be useful in the context of network exploration. When only local information is available, degree-biased random walks can achieve better exploration performance than unbiased random walks by appropriately tuning the bias parameter α according to the global structural properties of the graph at hand. Although we have not found an analytical relation between α_{\min} and the exponent of the degree-correlations ν , we have been able to provide guidelines to inform the choice of the optimal bias depending on the network topology. Despite the large variety of topologies considered we have shown that optimal values of the bias parameter α lie between -1 and 0 for a large number of real-world networks. In addition to this, we have shown that the minimum characteristic times occur preferentially in the range $[-1, -0.5]$ for assortative network, and in the range $[-0.5, 0]$ for disassortative ones. We hope that our results can trigger other studies on the properties of biased random walks, and can have practical applications in network searching.

APPENDIX

We describe here the algorithm we have used to generate graphs with tunable degree-degree correlations, and the agent-based approach used to estimate the mean coverage time and the mean first passage time in large graphs.

Swapping algorithm. In Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 we have reported the values of the degree-correlations exponent ν and the motion bias which minimizes the return time α_{\min}^R for a set of graphs with the same degree sequence of a chosen starting graph and tunable degree-degree correlations. An increasing amount of assortative or disassortative correlations is introduced by repeatedly applying the edge swapping procedure described in Ref.[38] to an initially uncorrelated graph. Each swap is performed as follows. Two edges connecting four different nodes are randomly selected and the nodes at the ends are ordered according to their degree $k_1 \leq k_2 \leq k_3 \leq k_4$. The two edges are then removed. Positive assortative correlations are introduced by connecting the two nodes with the smaller degrees and the two nodes with the larger degrees. Instead, disassortative correlations are introduced by connecting the node with the smallest degree with the node with the largest degree and the two remaining nodes with intermediate degrees. In order to preserve the degree sequence, all swaps that produce parallel edges are not allowed. Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 illustrate the two types of swaps.

Agent-based simulation for MFPT and MCT.

The MFPT and MCT are estimated by means of an agent based simulation. In both cases we simulated a walker




Figure 8. Assortative Swap




Figure 9. Disassortative Swap

which moves across the nodes of the network according to the transition probability given in Eq. (1). The simplest way to compute the characteristic times is to wait until the walker, started at a randomly selected node, explores all the nodes at least once. At that point the value of c_i is given by the total number of time steps spent by the walker to visit all the nodes, while t_{ij} can be obtained by storing in memory the first passage times to all other nodes during the simulation. However, despite this procedure is pretty simple to implement, it is not suitable to obtain robust results in a reasonable amount of time. In fact, in order to have an estimate of c_i and t_i , we need to average over a sufficiently large number of walks starting at node i , and the same procedure should be repeated for all the starting nodes. However, the heterogeneity of the degree distribution of real-world networks induces heterogeneity in the number of visits on nodes with different degree. Just to make an example, in the unbiased case ($\alpha = 0$) the walker visits a node with degree 1 only once every k_{max} visits on the node with the maximum degree. As a result, most of the computation time is wasted by repeated visits to highly connected nodes. A value of $\alpha \neq 0$ can either accentuate or mitigate the disproportion in the number of visits. To overcome this problems, we implemented a smarter strategy. The key-point of our method is to consider each hop as the starting point of a new walk and to store the entire sequence of node labels in an array we call *Tape*. As soon as all nodes have been visited at least once, both t_{ij} and c_i can be calculated (here i is the node label at the beginning of *Tape*). Then the first entry of *Tape* is removed, and the computation of the mean first passage and coverage time is performed for the new node which now occupies the first entry of *Tape*. If, after a removal of the first entry, a node label is no longer contained in *Tape* new walker hops are simulated until all missing nodes are visited.

Here we describe separately the two algorithms for MCT and MFPT despite the simulation could in principle be performed simultaneously.

Algorithm for the Mean Coverage Time.

We randomly select a starting node and we simulate the

walk according to the transition probability of Eq. (1) for a given value of α . We dynamically add the labels of the nodes visited at the end of an array referred to as *Tape*. An array $number-of-visits[i]$ of length N keeps track of the number of visits on each node i . A *counter* stores the number of unique nodes visited: when all nodes have been visited at least once the *counter* is equal to N . Finally a variable L stores the number of hops between the node at the first entry of *Tape* and the node at the end, i.e. the length of *Tape* minus 1. The steps of the algorithm are reported in the following:

- 0) Initialize all variables to zero and choose a node i at random. Set $number-of-visits[i]$ and *counter* equal to 1.
- 1) Jump to a successive node, say node j , and add the node label j as new element at the end of *Tape* (push-back operation). Increase L and $number-of-visits[j]$ by 1. If the new value of $number-of-visits[j]$ is equal to 1 increase also *counter* by 1.
- 2) If *counter* is equal to N proceed to step 3) otherwise go to step 1).
- 3) The current value of L is the estimate of the coverage time c_i relative to the node in the first entry of *Tape* (let's say i). Store the value c_i and the corresponding node label i .
- 4) Consider again the first entry i of *Tape* and decrease L and $number-of-visits[i]$ by 1. If the new value of $number-of-visits[i]$ is equal to zero decrease also *counter* by 1.
- 5) Remove the first entry i of *Tape* and free the memory (pop-front operation). Then go to step 2).

The simulation ends when the estimated values of c_i are averaged over at least 1000 realisations for each node i . Consequently in the unbiased case the value c_j for a node j with degree k_j will be averaged over $1000 \cdot k_j / k_{min}$ realisations. In Fig. 10 we illustrate the basic principle of the algorithm. The loop 1 – 2 performs the walker motion and adds the node labels in *Tape*. When all nodes have been visited at least once the algorithm enters in the 3 – 5 loop where the estimates of the coverage time are calculated and stored. If the $number-of-visits[i]$ for a certain node i is equal to zero then this node i is no longer contained in *Tape* and the algorithm goes back to the 1 – 2 loop.

Algorithm for the Mean First Passage Time.

We notice that the estimation of the mean first passage time does not require the computation of each entry of the matrix Z but just the average of its rows:

$$t_i = \frac{1}{(N-1)} \sum_{j \neq i} t_{ij} \quad (21)$$




Figure 10. The flowchart illustrates the core principle of the algorithm for the estimation of the mean coverage time. *Tape* is an array whose length changes dynamically. In steps 1 – 2 new node labels are written at the end of *Tape*, while in steps 3-5 nodes are removed from the beginning of *Tape*.

that is the average MFPT from node i to all the other nodes. We randomly select the starting node and we simulate the walk according to the transition probability of Eq. (1) for a given value of α . As before we add the labels of visited nodes at the end of *Tape*. An array of dimension N keeps track of the $number-of-visits[i]$ on each node i , and a *counter* stores the number of unique nodes visited. We use the variable L to keep track of the total number of hops during the entire walk and in this case this value will not be reduced when we pull off nodes from the beginning of *Tape*. Indeed we use a second variable L^{old} to store the number of nodes pulled off from *Tape*. Moreover for each node i we initialize an array $not-first-passage[i]$ that store the times, i.e. the values of L , at which the walker visits a node already previously visited. At later stages of the algorithm these values will be used to rapidly compute the first passage time for a given walker path. Finally, a variable FPT temporarily accumulates the sum of the values of the first passages times t_{ij} in order to calculate t_i in Eq. 21. Its role will be clear later. The algorithm consists of the following steps:

- 0) Initialize all variables to zero and choose a node i at random. Set $number-of-visits[i]$ and *counter* equal to 1.
- 1) Jump to a successive node (let's say j), add the node label j as new element at the end of *Tape* (push-back operation), and increase L by 1.
- 2) If $number-of-visits[j]$ is equal to zero go to step 3) otherwise go to step 4).
- 3) Add the value $(L - L^{old})$ to the variable FPT s. Increase the *counter* and $number-of-visits[j]$ by 1.

Network	Nodes	Edges	$\langle k \rangle$	ν	α_{min}^R	α_{min}^T	α_{min}^C
Synthetic Model:							
ER	10^4	$2 \cdot 10^4$	4	–	–0.78	-0.46 ± 0.01	–0.90
ER	10^4	$5 \cdot 10^4$	10	–	–0.89	-0.78 ± 0.01	–1.00
ER	10^4	$2 \cdot 10^5$	40	–	–0.97	-0.96 ± 0.01	–1.00
Conf. Model ($\gamma = 3$)	10^3	4037	8	–	–0.87	–0.65	-0.65 ± 0.05
Conf. Model ($\gamma = 3$)	$5 \cdot 10^4$	21458	8	–	–0.86	–	–
Conf. Model ($\gamma = 3$)	10^3	8764	17.5	–	–0.94	–0.87	-0.95 ± 0.03
Conf. Model ($\gamma = 3$)	10^3	28522	57	–	–0.99	–0.98	-0.98 ± 0.02
Conf. Model ($\gamma = 2.5$)	10^4	232722	46.5	–	–0.98	–0.98	–0.98
BA(m=3)	10^3	$3 \cdot 10^3$	5.9	–	–0.78	-0.36 ± 0.02	–0.30
BA(m=5)	10^3	$5 \cdot 10^3$	9.9	–	–0.98	–0.67	-0.50 ± 0.05
BA(m=20)	10^3	$2 \cdot 10^4$	40	–	–1.02	–0.99	-1.05 ± 0.05
BA(m=3)	10^5	$3 \cdot 10^5$	6	–	–0.76	–	–
BA(m=5)	10^5	$5 \cdot 10^5$	10	–	–0.99	–	–
BA(m=20)	10^5	$2 \cdot 10^6$	39.9	–	–1.02	–	–
BA(m=20)	$4 \cdot 10^4$	$8 \cdot 10^5$	39.9	–	–1.02	–	–
Real-world networks:							
Gnutella(P2P) [41]	62561	147877	4.72	–	–0.91	-0.55 ± 0.02	-0.5 ± 0.05
PairsFSG [42]	10618	63787	12.01	–	–0.89	-0.68 ± 0.01	-0.60 ± 0.05
Email URV [43]	1133	5451	9.62	0.05	–0.76	–0.62	–0.70
Jazz [44]	198	2742	29.01	0.11	–0.70	–0.70	–0.90
amazon [45]	410236	2439437	11.89	–	–0.68	–	–
USPower [46]	4941	6593	2.66	–0.02	–0.66	0.17	-0.12 ± 0.05
SCN [49]	12722	39967	6.28	0.18	–0.64	–0.32	-0.5 ± 0.1
ca-CondMath [49]	21363	91286	8.54	0.16	–0.63	-0.43 ± 0.01	-0.47 ± 0.05
ca-HepTh [49]	8638	24806	5.76	0.19	–0.63	-0.37 ± 0.01	-0.47 ± 0.05
ca-AstroPh [49]	17903	196972	22.00	0.22	–0.62	-0.58 ± 0.01	-0.52 ± 0.05
ca-ASTRO [49]	13259	123838	18.68	0.34	–0.59	-0.54 ± 0.01	-0.60 ± 0.05
ca-HepPh [54]	11204	117619	20.99	0.54	–0.57	-0.51 ± 0.01	-0.43 ± 0.05
pgp [50]	10680	24316	4.55	–	–0.48	-0.20 ± 0.02	-0.25 ± 0.05
C.elegans (cen) [46]	279	2287	16.39	–0.15	–0.79	–0.68	-0.7 ± 0.1
bio-Yeast [53]	2312	7165	6.20	–0.42	–0.44	-0.32 ± 0.01	-0.20 ± 0.02
www-Google [56]	855802	4291352	10.03	–0.42	–0.43	-0.33 ± 0.02	-0.25 ± 0.1
soc-Slashdot [56]	82168	582290	14.17	–0.78	–0.43	-0.38 ± 0.02	-0.16 ± 0.06
soc-Epinions [52]	75877	405739	10.69	–	–0.39	-0.34 ± 0.02	-0.24 ± 0.01
Actors [46]	374511	1222908	6.53	–0.23	–0.37	-0.35 ± 0.02	-0.28 ± 0.06
wordnet [47]	75609	120473	3.18	–0.41	–0.30	-0.11 ± 0.02	-0.20 ± 0.05
www-NotreDame [55]	325729	1090108	6.69	–0.84	–0.29	-0.1 ± 0.05	–
www-Stanford [56]	255265	1941926	15.21	–0.72	–0.23	-0.23 ± 0.07	-0.25 ± 0.08
www-BerkStan [56]	654782	6581870	20.10	–0.84	–0.25	-0.29 ± 0.05	–
caida [54]	26475	53381	4.03	–0.50	–0.15	-0.12 ± 0.01	-0.15 ± 0.05
InternetAS [32]	11174	23409	4.19	–0.52	–0.14	-0.12 ± 0.01	-0.11 ± 0.01
USairport [57]	1572	17214	21.90	–	–0.58	-0.55 ± 0.01	-0.6 ± 0.01
USairports500 [51]	500	2980	11.92	–	–0.50	–0.42	–0.40
netscience.net [58]	379	914	4.82	–	–0.67	–0.58	–0.20

Table I. Values of ν and of the various α_{min} for synthetic and real-world complex networks. Mean field approximation gives correct results for synthetic networks (i.e., Erdős–Rényi, configuration model and Barabási-Albert networks) with sufficiently large values of $\langle k \rangle$ and N . The values of ν are missing for real networks for which the average degree $k_{nn}(k)$ of the first neighbours of a node with degree k is not a power-law.

-
- [1] M. E. J. Newman, *SIAM Review* **45**,, 167-256 (2003).
- [2] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez and D.-U. Hwang, *Phys. Rep.* **424**, 175 (2006).
- [3] C. Castellano, S. Fortunato and V. Loreto *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 591 (2009).
- [4] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3200 (2001).
- [5] A. Arenas, A. Diaz-Guilera, J. Kurths, Y. Moreno and C. Zhou, *Phys. Rep.* **469**, 93 (2008).
- [6] J. D. Noh and H. Rieger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 118701 (2004).
- [7] S.-J. Yang, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 016107 (2005).
- [8] Norris, James R. *Markov chains*. Cambridge University Press. (1998)
- [9] M. Rosvall, P. Minnhagen and K. Sneppen, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 066111 (2005).
- [10] G. Ghoshal and M.E.J. Newman, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **58**, 175 (2007)
- [11] H. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 041908 (2003).
- [12] M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 1118-1123 (2008).
- [13] S. Redner, *A Guide to First-Passage Processes*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2001).
- [14] B.D. Hughes, *Random Walks and Random Environments: Random Walks, Volume 1*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 1995).
- [15] V. Sood, S. Redner and D. ben Avraham, *J. Phys. A-Math. Gen.* **38**, 109 (2005).
- [16] S. Condamin, O. Benichou, V. Tejedor, R. Voituriez and J. Klafter, *Nature* **450**, 77-80 (2007).
- [17] E. Agliari, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 011128 (2008).
- [18] Y. Lin, B. Wu and Z. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 031140 (2010).
- [19] B. Meyer, E. Agliari, O. Bénichou and R. Voituriez, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 026113 (2012).
- [20] E. Agliari and R. Burioni, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 031125 (2009).
- [21] V. Tejedor, O. Bénichou and R. Voituriez, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 065104 (2009).
- [22] H. W. Lau and K. Y. Szeto, *Europhys. Lett.*) **90**, 40005 (2010).
- [23] S. Hwang, D.-S. Lee and B. Kahng, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 088701 (2012).
- [24] A. Baronchelli, V. Loreto, *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 026103 (2006).
- [25] J. Gomez-Gardenes and V. Latora, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 065102(R) (2008).
- [26] V. Zlatić, A. Gabrielli and G. Caldarelli, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 066109 (2010).
- [27] S. Lee, S. H. Yook and Y. Kim, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **68**, 277-281 (2009).
- [28] J.-C. Delvenne and A.-S. Libert, *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 046117 (2011).
- [29] A. Fronczak and P. Fronczak, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 016107 (2009).
- [30] Z. Burda, J. Duda, J. M. Luck, and B. Waclaw, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 160602 (2009).
- [31] R. Sinatra, J. Gómez-Gardenes, R. Lambiotte, V. Nicosia and V. Latora, *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 030103 (2011).
- [32] R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Vazquez and A. Vespignani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 258701 (2001).
- [33] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**,, 208701 (2002).
- [34] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**,, 026126 (2003).
- [35] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, (Wiley, 1991).
- [36] C.M. Grinstead and J.L. Snell *Introduction to Probability* (American Mathematical Society, 1997).
- [37] R. Albert, H. Jeong and A.-L. Barabasi, *Nature* **401**, 130-131 (1999).
- [38] R. Xulvi-Brunet and I. M. Sokolov, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **36**, 1431 (2005).
- [39] L. Prignano, Y. Moreno and A. Diaz-Guilera, *Phys. Rev. E* **86**, 066116 (2012).
- [40] U. Feige, *Random Struct. Algor.* **6**, 433 (1995).
- [41] M. Ripeanu, I. Foster, A. Iamnitchi, *Mapping the Gnutella Network: Properties of Large-Scale Peer-to-Peer Systems and Implications for System Design*. IEEE Internet Computing Journal, 6(1), 50-57 (2002).
- [42] Nelson, D. L., McEvoy, C. L., Schreiber, T. A. (1998). The University of South Florida word association, rhyme, and word fragment norms
- [43] R. Guimera, L. Danon, A. Diaz-Guilera, F. Giralt and A. Arenas, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 065103(R), (2003).
- [44] P.Gleiser and L. Danon , *Adv. Complex Syst.*6, 565 (2003).
- [45] J. Leskovec, L. Adamic and B. Adamic. The Dynamics of Viral Marketing. ACM Transactions on the Web (ACM TWEB), 1(1), 2007.
- [46] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, *Nature* **393**, 440-442 (1998).
- [47] Christiane Fellbaum, editor. WordNet: an Electronic Lexical Database. MIT Press, 1998
- [48] E.A. Bender and E.R. Canfield, *J. Combin. Theory A* 24 (1978) 296.
- [49] M. E. J. Newman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **98**, 404-409 (2001).
- [50] M. Boguña, R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Díaz-Guilera, A. Arenas, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 056122 (2004)
- [51] V. Colizza, R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Vespignani, *Nat. Phys.* **3**, 276 (2007).
- [52] M. Richardson, R. Agrawal, P. Domingos, *Trust Management for the Semantic Web*, In Proceedings of The Semantic Web - ISWC2003, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2870, 351-368 (2003).
- [53] S. Sun, L. Ling, N. Zhang, G. Li, R. Chen, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **31** (9), 2443 (2003).
- [54] J. Leskovec, J. Kleinberg and C. Faloutsos. "Graph Evolution: Densification and Shrinking Diameters". ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (ACM TKDD), 1(1), (2007)
- [55] R. Albert, H. Jeong, A.-L. Barabasi. Diameter of the World-Wide Web. *Nature*, 1999
- [56] J. Leskovec, K. Lang, A. Dasgupta, M. Mahoney, *Internet Math.* **6**(1), 29 (2009).
- [57] Opsahl, T., 2011. Why Anchorage is not (that) important: Binary ties and Sample selection.
- [58] M. E. J. Newman, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 036104 (2006).