

# Efficient algorithm to compute mutually connected components in interconnected networks

S. Hwang,<sup>1,2</sup> S. Choi,<sup>2</sup> Deokjae Lee,<sup>2</sup> and B. Kahng<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, 50937 Köln, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-747, Korea*

(Received June 15, 2022)

Mutually connected components (MCCs) play an important role as a measure of resilience in the study of interconnected networks. Despite their importance, an efficient algorithm to obtain physical properties of all MCCs during the removals of links is not available. Here, using a well-known fully-dynamic graph algorithm, we propose an efficient algorithm to accomplish this. We show that the time complexity of this algorithm is approximately  $\mathcal{O}(N^{1.2})$ , which is more efficient than the brute-force algorithm with complexity  $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ . We anticipate this algorithm to allow simulations with complex dynamic rules to research a size regime that was not permitted before.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 64.60.ah, 05.10.-a

*Introduction.*— Networks are ubiquitous in our world, and many of these interact with one another [1–4]. An instance of a strong inter-network correlation is the power outage in 2003 in Italy [5], where the power grid network and the computer network closely interacted with each other. A failure in the former caused that in the latter, which in turn led to a further failure in the former, and so on. Such a process halts only when there is no additional node that can fail. This avalanche of failures and its devastating consequences triggered efforts to assess the resilience of interconnected network structures against external forces [5–11].

As a natural measure of resilience of such interconnected networks, the size of a mutually connected component (MCC) per system size has been studied as an order parameter of the percolation transition [5, 12–15]. Here the MCC means that a node belonging to an MCC is connected to other nodes in the same MCC both in the two different networks, called A-layer network and B-layer network, respectively. Note that the nodes in A-layer network are in a one-to-one correspondance with the nodes in B-layer network. However, each one-layer network has its own set of links that are connected to the nodes in the same layer and the configuration is independent of the that of the other layer network. Although MCC has been proven to be an excellent measure of network resilience, it has been computationally difficult to obtain for large-sized systems because of the absence of an efficient algorithm. This problem was partially solved by proposing a data structure that keeps track of a giant MCC during the removal of nodes [16]. However, one still has to resort to the brute-force algorithm if other physical quantities, such as the size distribution of the MCCs, are requested.

In this paper, we introduce an efficient algorithm which keeps track of not only the giant MCC but also all other MCCs, and thus the size distribution of MCCs can be calculated. Moreover, our algorithm proceeds as links are deleted. Thus, the percolation transition of the MCC can be traced in terms of the actual number of links removed.

We utilize the fully dynamic graph algorithm (called the HLT algorithm hereafter) introduced by Holm, de Lichtenberg and Thorup [17], which has been efficiently used in computer science community to obtain structural properties of a graph as it dynamically changes.

The HLT algorithm uses a dynamic data structure in form of a forest composed of trees. Once a cluster consisting of multiple paths of links is mapped to a special representation of spanning tree called the Euler tour tree, it can then be easily updated as links are deleted and clusters are divided. Because the forest representation is well designed, structural features of a given mono-layer network such as number of clusters and their sizes can be calculated within a short computing time  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  for most cases, where  $N$  is the system size. However, to keep the forest effective for further calculation upon link deletion, one needs computing time  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 N)$ .

*Algorithm.*— Our algorithm starts by identifying MCCs of a given multiplex network, which is the first part of the algorithm. After this, links are removed one by one and those MCCs are updated accordingly, which is the second part. Each update utilizes the previous information of the details of MCCs. Throughout these processes, we can obtain the evolution of MCCs as a function of the number of links deleted.

To be specific, each link is categorized as either active or inactive. Here, an active link is one that belongs to an MCC. Ones that do not belong to an MCC are inactive. For example, solid lines in Fig. 1 represent active links, while dashed and dotted lines represent inactive ones. It is noteworthy that even if two nodes ( $v, w$ ) are connected by a link  $e$  in one layer A and they are connected in the other layer B, the link  $e$  can be inactive when the path in B contains one or more inactive links. However, once deemed inactive, a link  $e$  will be inactive permanently as long as links are not added to the network; i.e., link deletion does not affect the status of inactive links. To use this simple property, we investigate the percolation transition of the MCCs from a multiplex network with a macroscopic-scale giant MCC.




FIG. 1. (a) We suppose that there exist three MCCs, distinguished by grayscale, in a system at a certain time. Inactive links (dashed lines) exist between different MCCs in (a). When a link (indicated by curly arrow) in layer B is removed at the next step, the largest MCC is divided into three pieces in (b), distinguished by symbol. Then, three active links (thick solid line) in (a) become inactive (dotted lines) in (b). These new inactive links connect different MCCs.

We introduce the algorithm in detail below. The network we consider is a double-layer multiplex network, in which  $N$  number of nodes exist for each layer. Let  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  denote the sets of links present on layer A and B, respectively. Let us begin by introducing the first part of the algorithm.

- i) We choose a node  $v$ , which is supposed to be connected to  $k_{v,A}$  and  $k_{v,B}$  nodes on the layer A and B, respectively. Then, we add  $N - k_{v,A}$  and  $N - k_{v,B}$  *ad hoc* links to unconnected nodes to  $v$  on each layer. This process leads to all nodes in the system belonging to one MCC. Let  $\mathcal{D}_X$  denote a set of all such *ad hoc* links on layer  $X$  for each  $X \in \{A, B\}$ . Then, the set of active links can be denoted as  $\mathcal{A}_X = \mathcal{L}_X \cup \mathcal{D}_X$ , and the set of inactive links becomes  $\mathcal{I}_X = \emptyset$ .
- ii) For each layer  $X$ , we apply the HLT algorithm to the set  $\mathcal{A}_X$ , not to  $\mathcal{L}_X$ , which creates a giant spanning tree denoted as  $\mathcal{S}_X$ .
- iii) Remove a link  $e$  from the set of *ad hoc* links  $\mathcal{D}_A$ . If  $e \in \mathcal{I}_A$ , then  $e$  is removed from  $\mathcal{I}_A$ . This case

does not happen at the beginning, but can happen during the iterative process. Otherwise, execute the operation “Delete( $e$ )”. If  $e$  is a part of  $\mathcal{S}_A$ , it tries to find another link that can replace  $e$ . The tree that contains  $e$  is divided into two if no such link is found.

- iv) As one can see from Fig. 1, the above division process may make some links in  $\mathcal{A}_B$  inactive. When such case happens, the operation, “Delete( $e$ )” is executed to each such inactive links in the HLT forest of B, and throws them into  $\mathcal{I}_B$ . Of course, this in turn can trigger some other links in  $\mathcal{A}_A$  to be inactive, and then we again repeat the above process. The details can be found in Appendix.
- v) Repeat the steps iii) and iv) until  $\mathcal{D}_A = \emptyset$ .

After the above first steps are completed, all MCCs for a given multiplex network are identified and their structural information such as the sizes of each MCC can be obtained. Next, we take the following step to see the evolution of the MCCs as links are removed further. This second part of the algorithm can be accomplished by taking similar steps to iii)-iv).

- vi) Repeat the steps iii)-iv) on  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  instead of  $\mathcal{D}_A$  and  $\mathcal{D}_B$ . This process is repeated until the number of removed links reaches the value one wants.

Step vi) contains the process of removing links that belong to the original network. Thus, the behavior of the order parameter of the percolation transition for the MCC can be obtained. Each updating of the second part does not repeat the first part of the algorithm; instead, it builds on the structure obtained in the previous iteration, because the remaining network in the previous iteration is in form of spanning forest. Therefore by performing step vi), we can effortlessly garner the MCCs as a function of the number of remaining links.

*Assessment.*— We carried out numerical simulations to measure the performance of our algorithm. All results shown below are obtained from an interdependent multiplex network composed of two random graphes of the same size proposed by Erdős and Rényi (ER).

We first examine the size (denoted as  $m$ ) of a giant MCC divided by the system size  $N = 10^6$  as a function of the mean degree in Fig. 2. The mean degree is obtained as  $k = 2L/N$ , where  $L$  is the number of links remaining in either  $\mathcal{L}_A$  or  $\mathcal{L}_B$  at each iteration step. Actually, the numbers of links in  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  are the same. The data are obtained from the initial configuration of the network with  $k = 3$ . The obtained result shows a jump of  $m_c = 0.511699 \dots$  at  $k_c = 2.455407 \dots$  as predicted in the previous studies [12]. We also examine the sizes of clusters near the percolation threshold. In a system of size  $N = 6.4 \times 10^6$ , at  $k^+$ , i.e. immediately before a big drop, the number of clusters of size one is 284,684, while a giant cluster of size 355,316 is present. Whereas at  $k^-$ , i.e. immediately after a big drop, the numbers




FIG. 2. (Color Online) Plot of the order parameter  $m$ , the size of a giant MCC divided by the system size  $N$ , vs. mean degree  $k = 2L/N$ , where  $L$  is the number of links in the system.  $N = 10^6$  is chosen and  $k$  at initial is taken as 3.0. By successive removal of links randomly from each layer, the order parameter  $m$  exhibits a discontinuous transition. Numerical value of the point (the circle) obtained by simulation is consistent with the value predicted by the analytic formula derived in [12].

of clusters of size one and of size two are 639,990 and 5, respectively.

Now we consider the time complexity of the algorithm. Step v) forces iii) and iv) to be repeated  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  times, and for each iii) and iv), the Delete operation has to be executed at least once. These steps request the computing time  $\mathcal{O}(N \log^2 N)$ . However, when one link is deleted, inactivation of multiple number of links can follow, which may lead to cascading of deletions back and forth between the two layers. Of course, it is also possible that the deleted link may not induce further inactivation process. Such complicated processes hamper concrete estimation of time complexity, and thus we resort to numerical methods to provide an approximate complexity.

We measured the total computing time  $T$  to keep track of the MCCs until  $k = 0$  from three different initial values  $k = 3, 4$ , and 5. In Fig. 3, we plot  $T$  versus system sizes  $N$ . Each data point, obtained by taking average over 10 different samples, is well-collapsed into a point, which implies that the fluctuations in  $T$  is negligible. One may also deduce that the initial difference of  $k$  does not affect time complexity, but rather acts as some constant factor. We find in Fig.3 that the time complexity depends on the system size as  $\mathcal{O}(N^{1.2})$ . This numerical result suggests that the contribution of the avalanche is estimated as  $\mathcal{O}(N^{0.2})$ . Moreover, the logarithmic correction  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 N)$  due to the “Delete” operation was expected, but this is not conspicuous in Fig. 3.

*Summary.*— We have proposed an efficient algorithm that keeps track of the MCCs in an interdependent multiplex network. Our algorithm maintains the full structural information of MCCs during deletions of links, and thus




FIG. 3. (Color Online) Plot of total computing time  $T$  vs. system size  $N$  for different initial mean degree  $k = 3(\circ)$ ,  $4(\times)$  and  $5(\square)$ . Each point is obtained by taking average over 10 samples. Dashed line is a guideline for eye with slope 1.2.

enables one to extract various interesting physical quantities such as the sizes of a giant MCC as well as other MCCs. The algorithm in [16] is rather simpler, because as each node is deleted, multiple pathways can be simultaneously deleted. Accordingly, the computing time is reduced as  $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ . On the other hand, our algorithm provides other useful information on structural features of the MCCs. Therefore, we believe that our algorithm can facilitate further studies in various directions.

Finally, we remark that the HLT algorithm utilized here when *links* are removed can be applied to other problems such as temporal network models [18], where links can be added or deleted.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research has been supported by the NRF grant No. 2010-0015066, the SNU research grant (BK) and by the DFG within SFB 680 (SH).

## APPENDIX

### A. Details of the HLT algorithm

*Euler tree.*— For each connected component of size  $n$ , an Euler tour cycle of length  $2n - 2$  is drawn, starting from and ending at an arbitrary node. This cycle can be represented as a sequence of  $2n - 1$  node indices. Each sequence is then stored in a self-adjusting tree (e.g. splay tree) consisting of  $2n - 1$  nodes, its ordering preserving that of the corresponding sequence. Each node of the tree carries the index of the node it represents; thus the leftmost and rightmost nodes of each tree carry the same index. We refer to trees built this way as Euler trees. It is

noteworthy that a node having degree  $k$  in the spanning tree appears  $k$  times in the Euler tree, with one exception being the starting node, which appears  $k + 1$  time.

Note that the trees are self-adjusting; this means finding the root of one that a given node belongs to takes  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  steps on average. That, therefore, is the complexity of determining whether two given nodes are connected.

One useful information would be the size of the connected component a given node belongs to. For this we augment each node of the tree to keep track of the number of its descendants. Whenever a node is given, the corresponding root and hence the size of the component can be obtained in  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  steps.

Keeping these in mind, we are now ready to introduce the four principal operations of the data structure. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  denote a set of links in the network and  $\mathcal{S}$  the set of links that constitute the forest. Usually,  $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of all links in the network, but in our algorithm it is the set of all *active* links.

1.  $\text{Connected}(v, w)$  : Determines whether  $v$  and  $w$  are in the same component.
  - (a) Let  $r_v$  and  $r_w$  be the roots of the Euler trees containing  $v$  and  $w$ , respectively.
  - (b) Return true if  $r_v = r_w$ , false otherwise.
2.  $\text{Size}(v)$  : Returns the size  $n$  of the component that contains  $v$ .
  - (a) Find the root of the Euler tree containing  $v$ .
  - (b) The root will contain the number  $s$  of its descendants, which would be  $s = 2n - 2$ . Thus return  $n = s/2 + 1$ .
3.  $\text{Insert}(e = (v, w))$  : Adds a link  $e$  to the network.
  - (a) Add  $e$  to  $\mathcal{E}$ .
  - (b) If  $\text{Connected}(v, w)$ , do nothing. Otherwise, connect the two Euler trees adjacent to  $e$ .
4.  $\text{Delete}(e = (v, w))$  : Removes a link  $e$  from the network.
  - (a) Remove  $e$  from  $\mathcal{E}$ .
  - (b) If  $e \notin \mathcal{S}$ , do nothing. If  $e \in \mathcal{S}$ , remove  $e$  from  $\mathcal{S}$ . This will split a tree into two pieces. See if there exists a link  $e' \in \mathcal{E}$  that can replace  $e$ , i.e., connect the two again. If so, add  $e'$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ .

It is clear that Connected, Size, and Insert each require  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  steps. In contrast, in Delete it is nontrivial to find  $e'$  efficiently. To achieve this, HLT algorithm introduces layers of spanning forest, which sets the amortized costs of Insert and Delete to  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 N)$ . For details we refer the reader to [17].

### B. Successive removal of link $e$ from $\mathcal{D}_A$

1. If  $e \in \mathcal{I}_A$ , remove  $e$  from  $\mathcal{I}_A$  too.
2. Otherwise, perform  $\text{Delete}(e)$  on the HLT forest of  $A$ . This will split some connected component into two only if  $e \in \mathcal{S}_A$  and no other links in  $\mathcal{A}_A$  can connect them once  $e$  is removed.
  - (a) If Delete does not split any connected component, nothing more needs to be done.
  - (b) If it does, some links in  $\mathcal{A}_B$  can become inactive, as one can see from Fig. 1.
    - i. All links in  $\mathcal{A}_B$  that connect the two split components will become inactive. To find them, one can scan each node in the smaller component exhaustively and see if any of its outgoing links connect it to a node belonging to the larger component.
    - ii. For each of these links, perform Delete on the HLT forest of  $B$  and add it to  $\mathcal{I}_B$ .
    - iii. Of course, this in turn can trigger some of  $\mathcal{A}_A$  to become inactive, and again we perform Delete for each.
    - iv. This recursive process should be carried out until no more inactive links are generated.

Of course, this in turn can trigger some of  $\mathcal{A}_A$  to become inactive, and again we perform Delete for each. This recursive process should be carried out until no more inactive links are generated.

---

[1] A.-L. Barabasi and R. Albert, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999)  
 [2] A. Barrat, M. Barthelemy, and A. Vespignani, *Dynamical processes on complex networks*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 2008)  
 [3] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, *Evolution and structure of the Internet: A statistical physics approach*

(Cambridge University Press, 2007)  
 [4] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. Mendes, *Evolution of networks: From biological nets to the Internet and WWW* (Oxford University Press, 2013)  
 [5] S. V. Buldyrev, R. Parshani, G. Paul, H. E. Stanley, and S. Havlin, *Nature* **464**, 1025 (Apr. 2010), ISSN 0028-0836

- [6] R. Parshani, S. V. Buldyrev, and S. Havlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 048701 (Jul. 2010)
- [7] R. Parshani, S. V. Buldyrev, and S. Havlin, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**, 1007 (2011)
- [8] J. Gao, S. V. Buldyrev, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 195701 (2011)
- [9] Y. Hu, B. Ksherim, R. Cohen, and S. Havlin, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 066116 (2011)
- [10] X. Huang, J. Gao, S. V. Buldyrev, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 065101 (2011)
- [11] M. Dickison, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 066109 (2012)
- [12] S.-W. Son, G. Bizhani, C. Christensen, P. Grassberger, and M. Paczuski, *EPL* **97**, 16006 (2012)
- [13] G. Bianconi, S. N. Dorogovtsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, *ArXiv e-prints*(Feb. 2014), arXiv:1402.0215 [physics.soc-ph]
- [14] B. Min, S. D. Yi, K.-M. Lee, and K.-I. Goh, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 042811 (Apr. 2014)
- [15] S. Watanabe and Y. Kabashima, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 012808 (Jan. 2014)
- [16] C. M. Schneider, N. A. Araújo, and H. J. Herrmann, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 043302 (2013)
- [17] J. Holm, K. de Lichtenberg, and M. Thorup, *J. ACM* **48**, 723 (Jul. 2001), ISSN 0004-5411
- [18] P. Holme and J. Saramäki, *Phys. Rep.* **519**, 97 (2012), ISSN 0370-1573, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0370157312000841>