

Scale-invariant geometric random graphs

Zheng Xie¹ and Tim Rogers²

¹College of Science, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, 410073, China

²Centre for Networks and Collective Behaviour, Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, Bath, BA27AY, UK.

We introduce and analyze a class of growing geometric random graphs that are invariant under rescaling of space and time. Directed connections between nodes are drawn according to an influence zone that depends on node position in space and time, capturing the heterogeneity and increased specialization found in growing networks. Through calculations and numerical simulations we explore the consequences of scale-invariance for geometric graphs generated this way. Our analysis reveals a dichotomy between scale-free and Poisson distributions of in- and out-degree, the existence of a random number of hub nodes, high clustering, and unusual percolation behaviour. Moreover, we show how these properties provide a good fit to those of empirically observed web graphs.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 89.75.-k, 64.60.ah

The theory of random geometric graphs (RGG) enables research of complex networks via geometry[1]. For many applications it is particularly attractive to imagine the nodes of a network embedded in space, as this can provide useful intuition about an otherwise complicated and abstract discrete structure. In the standard RGG model [2, 3], one places N nodes uniformly at random in the unit square, and connects any pair within distance d of each other. Augmenting space with a time axis (*i.e.* Minkowski space), it becomes possible to discuss dynamical random geometric graphs. The simplest dynamical RGG assigns to nodes a random location and ‘birth time’ according to a unit intensity Poisson process. The resulting model is a growing graph, in which a new node appears on average once per unit time, forming connections to other nodes within a given radius. Certain specific networked systems are very well-described by models of this type (*e.g.* relations between mobile telephone users and cell sites [4–6]), and the propensity of new nodes to attach only to those that are ‘similar’ (in the sense of spatial location) mirrors the homophily frequently observed in social systems [7]. However, these model networks exhibit a both a fixed natural scale (see left panels of Fig. 1) and a level of homogeneity that is highly quite atypical of many real world networks [8].

A geometric expression of network inhomogeneity is possible by modifying the attachment rule to take account of node ‘visibility’ according to the light cone structure of some Pseudo Riemannian manifold (*e.g.*, de Sitter space, the standard cosmological model [9–11]), resulting in scale-free networks [12]. This approach is meaningful in the case of systems with an underlying causal structure, such as citation networks [13]. A more common explanation for node inhomogeneity in real networks is as a result of growth via a mechanism of preferential attachment [14]. In fact, exactly the same effect also arises as a consequence of increasing specialization, where older nodes gain more edges because they are likely to have a wider scope than newer ones. Examples of this phenomenon include the progression of scientific research, the replacement of generalist species by specialists in




FIG. 1: First two: an RGG in the domain $[0, 1]^2$, with $N = 1500$ nodes and fixed connection distance radius $d = 0.05$, shown in full (left) and in close-up (right). Last two: a scale-invariant RGG in the same domain, with $N = 10000$ nodes and influence zone areas $a_i = t_i^{-1}/2$, shown in full (left) and in close-up (right). This choice of network ensemble is a special case of the general form given in Eq. (4).

ecology, and the evolution of the world-wide-web.

Here, we describe a new geometric model of growing directed networks in Minkowski space, describing the asymmetrical and inhomogeneous relationships emergent from the growing specialization of nodes. As usual, nodes are created by a unit intensity Poisson process in 2+1 dimensions and connected according to proximity. The novel aspect we introduce is to demand that both the connection mechanism and the resulting graph ensemble is invariant under rescaling of time and space. As we show, this simple constraint induces a range of emergent properties in the generated networks: a dichotomy between scale-free and Poisson distribution of in- and out-degree, the existence of a random number of hub nodes, high clustering, and unusual percolation behaviour. Finally we show that, as well as being of purely intellectual interest, this model provides a good fit to network data from the world-wide-web, hinting at the potential for a new geometric understanding of real-world networks.

The attachment rule for our class of spatiotemporal scale-invariant geometric networks is constructed as follows. Node i is identified by its location in space $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and time $t_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Each node is assigned a spatial zone of influence (or simply ‘zone’ hereafter) defined as the circular region with center \mathbf{x}_i and area $a_i = f(\mathbf{x}_i, t_i)$, where f is a positive and piecewise-continuous function

to be determined. For each ordered pair of nodes i and j , a directed edge is drawn $i \rightarrow j$ if \mathbf{x}_i lies within the zone of j . Finite networks are sampled by restricting the model to a cylindrical region Ω with radius R around the origin in space and duration T in time. Scale-invariance is enforced by demanding that the statistical law of any such sampled network must depend only on the expected number of nodes $N \propto \pi R^2 T$. This demand ensures that f must take a particular functional form. Considering the law of a single node, where we have the requirement that for arbitrary scale factors $\lambda, \mu > 0$

$$f(\lambda \mathbf{x}, \mu t) = g(\lambda) h(\mu) f(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (1)$$

for some pair of functions g and h . Using polar spatial coordinates $\mathbf{x} = (r, \theta)$, it is straightforward to check that the only positive continuous solutions to (1) have the form $f(\mathbf{x}, t) = \alpha(\theta) t^{-\beta} r^{-\gamma}$, where α is a bounded function and β, γ are constants.

Consideration of the network as a whole provides a joint scaling relation that the exponents β and γ must satisfy. For a fixed expected number of nodes N , we require that the expected number of edges M does not depend on the spatiotemporal scale. Now $M = N \langle k^- \rangle / 2$, where $\langle k^- \rangle$ is the mean node in-degree. Since nodes fall as an unit rate Poisson process, the mean degree of node i is simply $a_i T$. Ignoring boundary effects, we can thus compute

$$M \approx \frac{NT}{2\text{vol}(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} f(\mathbf{x}, t) d\mathbf{x} dt \propto NT^{1-\beta} R^{-\gamma}. \quad (2)$$

Fixing N as a constant sets $R \propto T^{-1/2}$, and then M is independent of scale if and only if

$$\gamma = 2(\beta - 1). \quad (3)$$

We thus arrive at the general functional form for determining the zonal area of a given node:

$$f(\mathbf{x}, t) = \alpha(\theta) t^{-\beta} r^{2-2\beta}. \quad (4)$$

Notice that the spatial scaling here means that zonal area expands with distance from the origin if $\beta < 1$, is fixed when $\beta = 1$, and contracts when $\beta > 1$. Fig. 1 contrasts a classic RGG with an example of a spatiotemporal scale-invariant geometric networks with $\beta = 1, \alpha(\theta) \equiv \alpha$. This is an important special case as it gives rise to spatially homogeneous networks.

Let us fix a node i with co-ordinates (\mathbf{x}_i, t_i) , and examine the distribution of in-degree and out-degree. This node is the target of an inbound edge from every other node inside the cylindrical region Ω_i^- of points whose spatial coordinates lie inside the zone of i . Conversely, node i has a directed edge leading from it to every node j for which $\mathbf{x}_i \in \Omega_j^-$ (see Fig. 2 for an illustration). Writing Ω_i^+ for the region of possible locations of such nodes,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_i^- &= \{(\mathbf{x}, t) : \pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i|^2 \leq f(\mathbf{x}_i, t_i)\}, \\ \Omega_i^+ &= \{(\mathbf{x}, t) : \pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i|^2 \leq f(\mathbf{x}, t)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$




FIG. 2: Illustration of the regions Ω_i^- (blue) and Ω_i^+ (green), with $\beta = 0.5, \mathbf{x}_i = (1.5, 0)$ on the left and $\beta = 1.5, \mathbf{x}_i = (1, 0)$ on the right.

The number of nodes that fall within either of these regions is a Poisson random variable with mean equal to the region volume. Therefore the probability that a node with known coordinates (\mathbf{x}_i, t_i) has a given in- or out-degree is simply

$$\mathbb{P}(k_i^\pm = k) = \frac{\text{vol}(\Omega_i^\pm)^k \exp\{-\text{vol}(\Omega_i^\pm)\}}{k!}. \quad (6)$$

The spatial nature of the connection mechanism we employ induces correlations between nodes, for the simple reason that if $i \rightarrow j$ and $j \rightarrow l$ it is more likely that i and l are spatially proximate, and hence $i \rightarrow l$. However, one might hope to obtain a reasonable approximation to the degree distribution of a realized network by simply integrating Eq. 6 over the uniform distribution of node location. For the in-degree p_k^- , this procedure works well. We compute

$$p_k^- = \frac{1}{\pi^2 R^2 T k!} \int_{\Omega} e^{L_k(\mathbf{x}, t)} d\mathbf{x} dt, \quad (7)$$

where $L_k(\mathbf{x}, t) = k \log(Tf(\mathbf{x}, t)) - Tf(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Laplace's method offers a considerable simplification: expanding L_k around its maximum $t_*(\mathbf{x}) = (\alpha(\theta)r^{2-2\beta}T/k)^{1/\beta}$ we find

$$L_k(\mathbf{x}, t) \approx k \log(k) - k - \frac{k\beta^2}{2} (t/t_*(\mathbf{x}) - 1)^2. \quad (8)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} p_k^- &\approx \frac{k^k e^{-k}}{\pi^2 R^2 T k!} \int_{\Omega} e^{-\frac{k\beta^2}{2} (t/t_*(\mathbf{x}) - 1)^2} d\mathbf{x} dt \\ &\approx \left(\frac{1}{k^{1+1/\beta}} \right) \frac{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_0^R \alpha(\theta)^{1/\beta} r^{2/\beta-1} dr d\theta}{\beta \pi^2 R^2 T^{1-1/\beta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the second line follows from Gaussian integration on a time axis extended to $\pm\infty$ and using Stirling's approximation for the factorial. This calculation becomes exact in the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$, meaning that the tail of the in-degree distribution has a power-law with exponent $-(1 + 1/\beta)$. One important caveat to note is that formally the integrals as they written in (9) do not converge, due to singularities at the origin in time ($\beta \leq 1$) or space




FIG. 3: Out degree distribution for the scale invariant geometric random graph with $\beta = 1$, $\alpha(\theta) \equiv 1$ and $\pi R^2 T = 10^3$. The red circles show the out degree distribution averaged over 100 realizations, while the black curve shows the result of equation (12). Blue and green triangles are the empirical degree distributions from two of the 100 graphs sampled — their horizontal shift results from the random number of hubs.

($\beta > 1$). Mathematically, this is simply an artifact of us not taking care with zone that may overlap the boundary of the sampling region Ω , however, this observation is part of a wider phenomenon with major consequences for the distribution of out-degrees.

Examining (4), it is clear to see that nodes arriving very early in the process ($t \ll 1$) enjoy a considerable advantage over more typical nodes, having extremely large zonal areas. When $\beta > 1$, the same is true of nodes close to the center of the domain. In fact, any node i in the region

$$\Gamma = \left\{ (r, \theta, t) : \alpha(\theta)t^{-\beta}r^{2(1-\beta)} \geq \pi R^2 \right\} \quad (10)$$

has a zone the same size as Ω . In a particular network realization, the possible presence of such a ‘hub’ node would have the effect of increasing the degree of almost every other node by one, essentially shifting the entire out-degree distribution one place to the right. The number of such hubs is itself a Poisson random variable, with mean $\text{vol}(\Gamma)$.

For nodes outside of the hub region in large networks ($T \gg 1$) we can expect that the volume of Ω_i^+ is dominated by the large T tail, in which we can approximate the area segment $\pi|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i|^2 = f(\mathbf{x}, t)$ by the circle $\pi|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i|^2 = f(\mathbf{x}_i, t)$. The result is

$$\text{vol}(\Omega_i^+ \setminus \Gamma) \approx \alpha(\theta_i)r_i^{2-2\beta} \int_{T_0(r_i, \theta_i)}^T t^{-\beta} dt, \quad (11)$$

where $T_0(r, \theta)$ is the time boundary of the hub region Γ along the line with fixed r and θ . The out-degree distribution of node i is then given by a Poisson with mean $\text{vol}(\Omega_i^+ \setminus \Gamma)$, right-shifted by the number of hubs.

We illustrate the above calculation for the spatially homogeneous case $\beta = 1$ and $\alpha(\theta) \equiv \alpha$. The hub region for this model is the cylinder $\Gamma = \{(r, \theta, t) : t \leq \alpha/\pi R^2\}$, with volume α . Equation (11) becomes $\text{vol}(\Omega_i^+ \setminus \Gamma) \approx \alpha \log(N/\alpha)$. Averaging over the number of hubs h , we obtain the expected out degree distribution

$$\mathbb{E}p_k^+ = \frac{1}{k!} (\alpha(1 + \log(N/\alpha)))^k e^{-\alpha(1 + \log(N/\alpha))}. \quad (12)$$




FIG. 4: In- and out-degree distributions of a scale-invariant geometric random graph (blue circles) and the Stanford web-graph (orange squares), compared with analytical predictions of Eq. (9) and Eq. (12) (black lines).

Fig. 3 compares this prediction to numerical results. For radially inhomogeneous networks the expected out-degree distribution is obtained by replacing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha(\theta)$ in (12) and integrating over θ , in particular, if $\alpha(\theta)$ is piecewise constant taking values $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_L\}$ on domains of size $\{2\pi w_1, \dots, 2\pi w_L\}$ then the result is a mixture Poisson $\mathbb{E}p_k^+ = \sum_l w_l e^{-c_l} c_l^k / k!$, where $c_l = \alpha_l(1 + \log(N/\alpha_l))$.

Experimentally we observe that the generated networks are typically highly clustered, which can be seen as a consequence of the scale free distribution of in-degree. Nodes with small in-degree typically have small zonal areas and thus nodes connecting to them are likely to be spatially close and hence connected to each other. The scale-free degree distribution of in-degree implies that there are very many more nodes of small in-degree than large, so they dominate the mean clustering coefficient. For the spatially homogeneous case $\beta = 1, \alpha(\theta) \equiv \alpha$ we can go further than this heuristic argument, deriving a scaling relation between node degree and clustering. Suppose node i has time-coordinate t and node j links to i . If j has time-coordinate s and we make the assumption that the overlap of the zones of i and j is approximately $\min\{\alpha/s, \alpha/t\}$ (this is justified if either of s or t is large, which is common in networks with $T \gg 1$), then the probability that another node ℓ in the influence zone of i is also in the influence zone of j is $\min\{1, t/s\}$. Integrating over possible values of s , we find $C(t) \approx t(1 + \log(T/t))/T$. For the case $\beta = 1, \alpha(\theta) \equiv \alpha$ the mean degree of nodes with time-coordinate t is simply $Tf(x, t) = \alpha T/t$, so together we find

$$C(k) \approx \alpha(1 + \log(k/\alpha))/k. \quad (13)$$

The clustering and degree distributions of scale invariant geometric random graphs derived above are not of purely intellectual interest, but in fact show a striking similarity to a particular class of real networks: web graphs. These are directed networks whose nodes correspond to web pages, and a directed link connects page i to page j if there exists a hyperlink on page i referring to page j . Previous authors have proposed causal mechanisms relating to the ‘popularity’ and ‘similarity’ of pages [18, 19] to explain the local connectivity properties of web graphs. Here, we show that essentially the




FIG. 5: Local clustering coefficient as a function of node degree in the scale-invariant geometric random graph (blue circles) and the Stanford webgraph (orange squares), compared with the theoretical prediction of Eq. (13). Note that the data has been binned on the k -axis to improve visibility (shown is the average of $C(k)$ for nodes with degree $\approx k$).

same behaviour emerges as a consequence of the single simple property of scale invariance. We compare the web graph *Web-Stanford* [20] to our scale invariant model with $\beta = 1$ and $\alpha(\theta)$ taken to be piecewise constant with values $\{1.4, 0.55, 0.17\}$ and weights $\{0.17, 0.36, 0.47\}$. As shown above, choosing piecewise constant $\alpha(\theta)$ allows us to fit the out-degree distribution to a given mixture Poisson; in principle we could choose a more complex form in order to achieve a closer fit, but we find three-component mixture to be sufficient for illustration purposes. From a modelling point of view the interpretation is that pages in the webgraph can be loosely grouped into three ‘types’ that have different typical zones of influence. In Fig. 4 the in- and out-degree distributions of the Stanford webgraph is compared with that of a single randomly generated scale-invariant network, as well as our predictions for the ensemble average. Fig. 5 presents the same comparison for the relationship between node degree and clustering in both graphs; although the fit is not as clean as for the degree distribution, we do observe in both graphs a negative correlation of approximately the same magnitude.

We end by discussing percolation — a question of central importance to the study of random networks, which has been thoroughly explored in the standard RGG models [3, 16, 17]. The possible existence of infinite connected clusters is by definition a property of the system in the thermodynamic limit of large numbers of nodes. We have numerically investigated the percolation transition in the scale invariant ensemble, for simplicity considering only the rotationally invariant case $\alpha(\theta) = \alpha N^{1-\beta}$. The additional scaling with N here is required to keep the mean degree fixed as N grows and hence obtain a meaningful thermodynamic limit. Writing ρ_i for the fractional size of the strongly connected component containing node i , we compute the size of the largest component $\rho = \max_i \rho_i / N$, which increases from N^{-1} to 1 as α varies in $[0, \infty)$. The numerical results shown in Fig. 6 present a several puzzles. Noting the logarithmic scale on the vertical axis of the left panel, we can tentatively suggest that for larger β the model appears to percolate for arbi-




FIG. 6: Percolation in the scale invariant RGG. Left: shades show the fractional size of the strongly connected component containing an average node in graphs generated from a fixed collection of $N = 10^4$ uniformly distributed nodes, with various choices of exponent β and connection length scale $\alpha(\theta) \equiv \alpha N^{1-\beta}$. Right: the $\beta = 1$ slice for $N = 10^2, 10^3$, and 10^4 , averaged over $S = 10^3, 10^2$, and 10 samples, respectively.

trarily small α in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. The inflection point of the level lines appears to be close to $(0.7, 4)$, shown as a red dot, suggesting a critical point in this region. The behavior along the slice $\beta = 1$, shown in the right panel, is also unexpected. Our earlier calculation showed that the mean degree is $1 + \log(N)$ in this case, yet it appears that a logarithmic correction to α is not required to achieve data collapse for different N .

The purpose of this article has been to initiate the study of a new class of growing geometric random graphs that are statistically invariant to changes of spatial and temporal scale. We have shown how this simple constraint leads to a graph ensemble that is governed by a single scale parameter β and a function $\alpha(\theta)$ that determines local connectivity and spatial heterogeneity. Simple analytical arguments allow for the prediction of the degree distribution and degree-clustering correlations, which we have shown to provide a surprisingly good fit to those of webgraphs. Several promising directions for future research have been opened. On the analytical front the most important of these is to develop a precise theory percolation in scale-invariant graphs. There is also considerable potential as a tool to understand aspects of real-world networks. In particular we ask whether the fit of webgraphs to the case $\beta = 1$ is in some sense unique, or if each real-world network has a geometrical analogue (with different scaling parameter β), hinting that we may understand the ubiquity of scale-free degree distributions as an epiphenomenon of the more fundamental property of scale-invariance.

TR acknowledges support from the Royal Society. ZX is supported by the National University of Defense Technology project No.201406-01.

-
- [1] M. Barthélemy, Phys. Rep. **499**, 1-101 (2011).
 - [2] J. Dall, and M. Christensen, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 016121 (2002).
 - [3] M. PENROSE, Random geometric graphs (Oxford Studies in Probability, 2003).
 - [4] J. R. Banavar, A. Maritan, and A. Rinaldo, Nature **399**, 130 (1999).
 - [5] M. Haenggi, Stochastic geometry for wireless networks (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
 - [6] S. Mukherjee. Analytical Modeling of Heterogeneous Cellular Networks: Geometry, Coverage, and Capacity (Cambridge University Press, 2014).
 - [7] O. Simsek, D. Jensen, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, **105**, 12758-62 (2008).
 - [8] M. E. J. Newman, Networks: An Introduction (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010).
 - [9] M. Ahmed, and D. Rideout, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 083528 (2010).
 - [10] L. Bombelli, J. Lee, D. Meyer, and R. Sorkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 521-524 (1987).
 - [11] D. Rideout, and R. Sorkin, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 024002 (1999).
 - [12] D. Krioukov, M. Kitsak, R. S. Sinkovits, D. Rideout, D. Meyer, and M. Boguñá, Sci. Rep. **2**, 793 (2012).
 - [13] Z. Xie, Z. Ouyang, P. Zhang, D. Yi, D. Kong, Plos One **10**, e0120687 (2015).
 - [14] A. L. Barabasi, and A. Albert, Science **286**, 509-512 (1999).
 - [15] D. Krioukov, F. Papadopoulos, M. Kitsak, A. Vahdat, and M. Boguñá, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 36106 (2010).
 - [16] U. Alon, I. Balberg, and A. Drory, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2879 (1991).
 - [17] R. M. Ziff, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 051105 (2010).
 - [18] F. Menczer, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **99**, 4014-14019 (2002).
 - [19] F. Papadopoulos, M. Kitsak, M. A. Serrano, M. Boguñá, and D. Krioukov, Nature **489**, 537-540 (2012).
 - [20] J. Leskovec, K. Lang, A. Dasgupta, and M. Mahoney, Inter. Math. **6**, 29-123 (2009).