

# Collective frequency variation in complex networks and Google's PageRank

Per Sebastian Skardal,<sup>1,\*</sup> Dane Taylor,<sup>2</sup> Jie Sun,<sup>3,4</sup> and Alex Arenas<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Trinity College, Hartford, CT 06106, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Carolina Center for Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics,*

*Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Clarkson University, Potsdam, NY 13699, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics, Clarkson University, Potsdam, NY 13699, USA*

<sup>5</sup>*Departament d'Enginyeria Informàtica i Matemàtiques, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, 43007 Tarragona, Spain*

We study the collective frequency of self-organizing oscillators' systems. We show that the collective frequency of a synchronized state for a generic directed network is, in general, not equal to the mean natural frequency of the individual units. The collective frequency equals a weighted average of the natural frequencies, where the weights are given by an out-flow centrality measure that is equivalent to a reverse PageRank centrality. We study the range of collective frequency variation for a variety of networks and illustrate its dependence on the directedness and degree heterogeneity of the network structure.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Xt, 89.75.Hc

The emergence of synchronization in ensembles of dynamical units is a universal phenomenon that is vital to the functionality of many natural and man-made systems [1–3]. In addition to the ability of the individuals that make up such systems to operate in unison, in many instances the particular frequency or velocity with which they evolve is important. For example, the sources and loads that make up power grids must reach consensus to avoid power failures, but reaching a common frequency alone is not enough; the system is most efficient near a certain reference frequency of approximately 50 - 60 Hz [4, 5]. Other examples arise in neuroscience and cardiology, where slower or faster rhythms can have drastic effects on the macroscopic behavior and functionality of the system that may be dangerous or problematic [6, 7].

In the majority of works studying the dynamics of synchronization, it is assumed that the collective frequency of the synchronized state oscillates precisely at the mean natural frequency of the individual units [2, 3, 8]. In other words, the synchronized state reaches an oscillation rate that is equal to the unweighted average of the oscillation rates of the individual elements when acting in isolation. In this Letter, we study the collective frequency of self-organizing systems of oscillators and show that it is *not* in general equal to the mean of the individuals' natural frequencies. We find that it is true for all-to-all coupled and other undirected networks [9, 10]; however, not for general directed networks [11, 12].

To investigate this phenomenon, we consider the general linearized dynamics of  $N$  coupled units,  $x_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , given by

$$\dot{x}_i = \omega_i - K \sum_{j=1}^N L_{ij} x_j, \quad (1)$$

where  $\omega_i$  is the natural frequency of oscillator  $i$ ,  $K$  is the global coupling strength, and  $L$  is the network Laplacian matrix. The entries of  $L$  are defined  $L_{ij} = \delta_{ij} k_i^{\text{in}} - A_{ij}$ , where  $A_{ij}$  is the network adjacency matrix and  $k_i^{\text{in}} = \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij}$  is the in-degree of node  $i$ . We also define the out-degree of

node  $i$ ,  $k_i^{\text{out}} = \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ji}$ . We assume the network encoded by  $A$  to be strongly-connected. In principle, our analysis allows the network to be directed and weighted, although we will focus on the case of unweighted edges:  $A_{ij} = 1$  if a directed link  $j \rightarrow i$  exists, and otherwise  $A_{ij} = 0$ . We note that there are several ways to define a Laplacian matrix for directed networks [13]; we study a version that is appropriate for the dynamics of interest. For example, Eq. (1) can be obtained from linearizing a variety of systems around the synchronized state, for instance the Kuramoto model which serves as a model for a wide range of synchronization phenomena including power grid dynamics [14, 15], as well as other systems with more general coupling which are utilized in modeling excitable- and reaction-diffusion-type systems [16–18].

In this Letter, we quantify the collective frequency variation by examining  $\Omega - \bar{\omega}$ , where  $\Omega$  denotes the collective frequency of the synchronized population and  $\bar{\omega} = N^{-1} \sum_i \omega_i$  is the mean natural frequency. We show that under typical conditions, when the frequencies  $\omega_i$  are non-identical and the in- and out-degrees  $k_i^{\text{in}}$  and  $k_i^{\text{out}}$  are not all the same, then  $\Omega - \bar{\omega} \neq 0$ . However, when the in- and out-degrees match for each node in the network, then the collective frequency variation vanishes, i.e.,  $\Omega = \bar{\omega}$ , for any choice of frequencies. We calculate the collective frequency variation directly from Eq. (1) and show that  $\Omega - \bar{\omega}$  is given by a weighted average of the natural frequency vector, where the weights correspond to entries of the first left singular vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$  of  $L$  that is associated with the trivial singular value  $\sigma_1 = 0$ . We find that  $\mathbf{u}^1$  represents an out-flow centrality measure, and in fact the entries of  $\mathbf{u}^1$  are well-approximated by the out-to-in-degree ratio,  $u_i \propto k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$ . Interestingly, the first-left-singular-vector centrality is a reverse analogue of Google's PageRank centrality [19], which favors nodes with strong in-flow [20]. The collective frequency variation for a given network thus depends not only on the network structure and the natural frequencies, but the arrangement of the natural frequencies on the network and is intimately related with the directedness of the network [21, 22].




FIG. 1. (Color online) *Collective frequency variation.* (a),(b) Two networks of size  $N = 8$  with 16 links. In (b), the in- and out-degrees match at each node,  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}} = 2$ , while in (a) this balance is broken. Each node's area is proportional to the ratio  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$ , which represents a mean field approximation to the first left singular vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$  of  $L$ . (c) The density  $P(\Omega)$  of collective frequencies  $\Omega$  observed in networks (a) and (b) (solid blue and dashed red, respectively) for different permutations of a normally distributed frequency vector  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  with mean  $\bar{\omega} = 0$  and variance  $\sigma^2 = 1$ . We find  $\Omega$  to relate closely to the alignment of  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  with vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$ , which represents an out-flow centrality measure.

We begin our analysis by writing Eq. (1) in vector form,

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \boldsymbol{\omega} - KL\mathbf{x}. \quad (2)$$

Our aim is to calculate the collective frequency of the synchronized population, and therefore we propose the ansatz

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}^* + \Omega\mathbf{1}t, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is a vector encoding initial conditions,  $\mathbf{1} = [1, \dots, 1]^T$ , and  $\Omega$  is the collective frequency. To proceed, we will utilize the pseudoinverse  $L^\dagger$  of the Laplacian matrix, which satisfies  $LL^\dagger L = L$  and  $L^\dagger LL^\dagger = L^\dagger$  [23]. In the undirected case,  $L^\dagger$  can be found using the eigenvalue decomposition of  $L$ , whereas in the more general case of a directed network,  $L^\dagger$  is formulated in terms of the singular value decomposition (SVD) of  $L$ . In particular, if  $L = U\Sigma V^T = \sum_{j=2}^N \sigma_j \mathbf{u}^j \mathbf{v}^{jT}$ , where  $\sigma_j \geq 0$  are the singular values which are ordered  $0 = \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 \leq \dots \leq \sigma_N$  and make up the diagonal entries of  $\Sigma$ , and  $\mathbf{u}^j$  and  $\mathbf{v}^{jT}$  are the corresponding left and right singular vectors that make up the columns of  $U$  and  $V$ , respectively, then the pseudoinverse is given by  $L^\dagger = V\Sigma^\dagger U^T = \sum_{j=2}^N \sigma_j^{-1} \mathbf{v}^j \mathbf{u}^{jT}$ . An important distinction between  $L$  and  $L^\dagger$  is that, while  $L$  maps all constant vectors to zero since its rows sum to zero, this is not generally true of  $L^\dagger$ , whose nullspace is nontrivial. Furthermore, the sets of singular vectors  $\{\mathbf{u}^j\}_{j=1}^N$  and  $\{\mathbf{v}^j\}_{j=1}^N$  (appropriately normalized) each form an orthonormal basis for  $\mathbb{R}^N$ .

Proceeding with the analysis, we insert Eq. (3) into Eq. (2) and rearrange to obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} - \Omega\mathbf{1} = KL\mathbf{x}^*. \quad (4)$$

Left-multiplying by  $LL^\dagger$ , and using that  $LL^\dagger L = L$ , we find

$$LL^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\omega} - \Omega\mathbf{1}) = KL\mathbf{x}^*. \quad (5)$$

Equations (4) and (5) thus imply that

$$(I - LL^\dagger)\boldsymbol{\omega} = \Omega(I - LL^\dagger)\mathbf{1}. \quad (6)$$

Next, since  $\sigma_1 = 0$ , the matrix  $I - LL^\dagger$  can be simplified to  $\mathbf{u}^1 \mathbf{u}^{1T}$ . Finally, we left-multiply Eq. (6) by  $\mathbf{1}$ , rearrange, and subtract  $\bar{\omega}$  from the right- and left-hand sides to obtain

$$\Omega - \bar{\omega} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}^1, \boldsymbol{\omega} - \bar{\omega}\mathbf{1} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}^1, \mathbf{1} \rangle}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{b} = \sum_i a_i b_i$  denotes the inner product.

Equation (7) gives the collective frequency variation  $\Omega - \bar{\omega}$  of a synchronized population as the projection of the natural frequency vector  $\boldsymbol{\omega} - \bar{\omega}\mathbf{1}$  (shifted to have zero mean) onto the first left singular vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$ . The physical interpretation of Eq. (7) is that the collective frequency variation is a weighted average of the natural frequencies, wherein the weights are given by the entries of  $\mathbf{u}^1$ . Thus, nodes with large entries in  $\mathbf{u}^1$  contribute more to the collective frequency variation than those with small entries, allowing for non-zero values of  $\Omega - \bar{\omega}$  provided that the entries of  $\mathbf{u}^1$  are not identical. Furthermore, we can formulate the full range of collective frequencies for a given network as the maximum of  $|\Omega - \bar{\omega}|$  over all choices of  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  with some fixed variance. As we will show below, the first left singular vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$  induces a centrality measure for the network that is related to the out-flow of each node. Interestingly, we will show that this centrality is analogous to a “reverse” PageRank. In fact, it is equivalent to Google's PageRank centrality for the network obtained by reversing the direction of each link in the original network.

We now demonstrate our main result, Eq. (7), with a simple example using two small networks of size  $N = 8$ , which are illustrated in Fig. 1(a) and (b). Both networks contain 16 links, yielding a mean in- and out-degree of  $\langle k \rangle = 2$ ; however, in network (a) the links are made randomly so the in- and out-degrees at each node are not necessarily equal, while network (b) is balanced so that the links are made to satisfy  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}} = 2$  for all  $i$ . For visual distinction, each node's area is proportional to the out-to-in-degree ratio  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$ . Next, we draw a set of normally distributed natural frequencies with mean  $\bar{\omega} = 0$  and variance  $\sigma^2 = 1$  and calculate for each network the collective frequency  $\Omega$  using Eq. (7) for  $10^4$  different permutations of these frequencies.




FIG. 2. (Color online) *Collective frequency variation range*. For (a) ER and (b) SF networks of size  $N = 200$  and various mean degrees, the collective frequency variation range  $\max_{\text{var}(\omega)=\sigma^2} |\Omega - \bar{\omega}|$  for  $\sigma^2 = 1$ .

In Fig. 1(c), we plot the observed density  $P(\Omega)$  for networks (a) and (b) (solid blue and dashed red, respectively). In the generic case, network (a), where in- and out-degrees are not necessarily equal at each node, we observe a wide range of collective frequencies, while for network (b), where the balance  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}}$  is maintained, the collective frequency is zero in each case, resulting in a delta function  $P(\Omega) = \delta(\Omega)$ . This example highlights two important properties. First, the collective frequency variation is intimately linked with the directedness of a network: once the balance  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}}$  is broken, a non-zero value of  $\Omega - \bar{\omega}$  should be expected. Second, the precise value of  $\Omega - \bar{\omega}$  depends not only on the network and set of natural frequencies, but the arrangement of natural frequencies on the network. In other words, for different permutations of the same frequency vector, we obtain different collective frequency variations.

A natural question to ask of a given network is: What is the range of possible collective frequency variations? We formalize this by considering for a given network, the magnitude of the maximum collective frequency variation across all frequency vectors with fixed variance  $\sigma^2$ , i.e.,  $\max_{\text{var}(\omega)=\sigma^2} |\Omega - \bar{\omega}|$ . Inspecting Eq. (7), it is straight-forward to see that the collective frequency variation is in fact maximized when the shifted natural frequency vector  $\omega - \bar{\omega}\mathbf{1}$  is aligned with the first left singular vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$ . Thus, the choices of  $\omega$  that maximize  $|\Omega - \bar{\omega}|$  with mean  $\bar{\omega}$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  are precisely

$$\omega_{\text{max}} = \pm \sqrt{N} \sigma \frac{\mathbf{u}^1 - \bar{u}^1 \mathbf{1}}{\|\mathbf{u}^1 - \bar{u}^1 \mathbf{1}\|} + \bar{\omega} \mathbf{1}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\bar{u}^1 = N^{-1} \sum_i u_i^1$  and the + and - symbols correspond to maximizing and minimizing  $\Omega - \bar{\omega}$ , respectively (that is, assuming  $u_i^1 > 0$  for each  $i$ ). This yields a collective frequency variation range of

$$\max_{\text{var}(\omega)=\sigma^2} |\Omega - \bar{\omega}| = \sigma \sqrt{1 - N(\bar{u}^1)^2} / \sqrt{N(\bar{u}^1)^2}. \quad (9)$$

To investigate how the range of collective frequency variation depends on network structure, we consider a variety of Erdős-Rényi [24] (ER) and scale-free (SF) networks. ER networks are constructed using a link probability  $p$  that describes the

likelihood of any given directed link  $j \rightarrow i$  existing. SF networks are built using the configuration model [25] for target in- and out- degrees drawn from the distribution  $P(k) \propto k^{-\gamma}$  for  $k \geq k_0$ , where  $k_0$  is an enforced minimum degree. The mean degree for ER and SF networks can be tuned according to  $\langle k \rangle = (N-1)p$  and  $\langle k \rangle = (\gamma-1)k_0/(\gamma-2)$ , respectively. In our experiment, we fix  $\gamma = 3$  and construct networks of size  $N = 200$  with various mean degrees and compute the collective frequency range according to Eq. (9) with  $\sigma^2 = 1$ . In Fig. 2(a) and (b), we plot the results for over 1000 ER and SF network realizations, respectively; we denote the mean and standard deviations using the symbols and dashed curves, respectively. For both network families, the collective frequency variation range tends to increase as the networks become more sparse. The central difference we observe is that both the mean collective frequency variation range and its standard deviation tend to be larger for SF networks than for ER networks. This suggests that structural heterogeneity has an amplifying effect on the collective frequency variation range of a network.

A complementary question is then: For which network structures is the collective frequency variation exactly zero? That is, which network structures yield  $\Omega - \bar{\omega} = 0$  regardless of the choice of  $\omega$ ? From Eq. (7), it follows that  $\Omega - \bar{\omega} = 0$  for any  $\omega$  whenever the entries of  $\mathbf{u}^1$  are all identical, i.e.,  $\mathbf{u}^1 \propto \mathbf{1}$ . We note that since  $L = D_{\text{in}} - A$ , where  $D_{\text{in}} = \text{diag}(k_1^{\text{in}}, \dots, k_N^{\text{in}})$ , and  $\sigma_1 = 0$ , then  $\mathbf{u}^1$  must satisfy  $\mathbf{u}^1 = D_{\text{in}}^{-1} A^T \mathbf{u}^1$ , or equivalently  $\mathbf{u}^1$  is the leading right eigenvector of  $D_{\text{in}}^{-1} A^T$ . At each entry, we must have  $u_i = \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ji} u_j / k_i^{\text{in}}$ , and therefore by inserting  $\mathbf{u}^1 = c \mathbf{1}$  (for any  $c \neq 0$ ) it is easy to see then that  $\mathbf{u}^1 \propto \mathbf{1}$  implies  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}}$  for all  $i$ . The converse follows from a simple application of the Perron-Frobenius theorem [26]. Specifically,  $\mathbf{u}^1 \propto \mathbf{1}$  is a solution of the leading right eigenvalue equation for  $D_{\text{in}}^{-1} A^T$ , and the Perron-Frobenius theorem implies that it is in fact the unique solution, provided that the network is strongly connected. Therefore, any given network generically has zero collective frequency variation if and only if  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}}$  for all  $i$ .

We now turn our attention to the properties of the first left singular vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$ , which dictates the contribution of each oscillator to the collective frequency variation. First, we note that the entries  $u_i^1$  can be chosen to be all positive, and thus  $\mathbf{u}^1$  induces a centrality measure for the network. The positiveness of the entries follows from applying the Perron-Frobenius theorem [26] to the irreducible matrix  $D_{\text{in}}^{-1} A^T$  and noting that  $\mathbf{u}^1$  is the leading right eigenvector of the matrix. The role of  $\mathbf{u}^1$  as the leading right eigenvector of  $D_{\text{in}}^{-1} A^T$  also elucidates its structural properties. In particular, Google's PageRank centrality – which tends to favor nodes with strong in-flow – is given by the leading right eigenvector  $\mathbf{v}$  of the matrix  $M = (q/N)\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T + (1-q)D_{\text{out}}^{-1}A$ , where  $D_{\text{out}} = (k_1^{\text{out}}, \dots, k_N^{\text{out}})$  and  $q \in [0, 1)$  is a damping factor [20]. When the damping factor is set to zero and each directed link is reversed, the matrix  $M$  from which PageRank is calculated




FIG. 3. (Color online) *First-left-singular-vector centrality and PageRank*. (a) Entries  $u_i^1$  of the first left singular vector vs the out-to-in-degree ratio  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$  for an ER network of size  $N = 200$  and  $p = 0.1$ . (b) The relationship between PageRank entries  $v_i$  (damped and undamped cases are plotted with red triangles and blue dots, respectively) and first-left-singular-vector entries for the same network. The expected inverse relationship  $u_i^1 v_i \approx \text{const.}$  is plotted as a black curve.

is equal to  $D_{\text{in}}^{-1} A^T$  (for which  $\mathbf{u}^1$  is the leading right eigenvector.)

To provide further insight into the structure of  $\mathbf{u}^1$ , we consider instead  $D_{\text{in}}^{-1} \tilde{A}^T$ , where  $\tilde{A}_{ij} = k_i^{\text{in}} k_j^{\text{out}} / N \langle k \rangle$  is the mean-field counterpart to  $A$ . In particular, the corresponding mean-field approximation of  $\mathbf{u}^1$ , which satisfies  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^1 = D_{\text{in}}^{-1} \tilde{A}^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^1$ , is precisely

$$\tilde{u}_i^1 = c k_i^{\text{out}} / k_i^{\text{in}}, \quad (10)$$

where  $c = [\sum_j (k_j^{\text{out}} / k_j^{\text{in}})^2]^{-1/2}$  is a normalizing factor. Thus, the centrality induced by  $\mathbf{u}^1$  can be approximated by the out-to-in-degree ratio  $k_i^{\text{out}} / k_i^{\text{in}}$  – a local indicator of the out-flow at a given node. In Fig. 3(a), we plot the entries  $u_i^1$  vs  $k_i^{\text{out}} / k_i^{\text{in}}$  for an ER network of size  $N = 200$  with  $p = 0.2$ , and we denote the mean field approximation given by Eq. (10) with a dashed black line. In Fig. 3(b), we compare the centrality induced by  $\mathbf{u}^1$  to PageRank centrality induced by  $\mathbf{v}$ ; we plot the entries  $v_i$  vs  $u_i^1$  for both a damped case ( $q = 0.15$ ) and the undamped case ( $q = 0$ ) in red triangles and blue dots, respectively. The black curve indicates an approximate inverse relationship between the entries of  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^1$ . Specifically, we use an approximation similar to the derivation of  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^1$  to find  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \propto k_i^{\text{in}} / k_i^{\text{out}}$ , which implies that the mean field approximations satisfy

$$\tilde{u}_i^1 \tilde{v}_i = \left( \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N \left( \frac{k_j^{\text{out}}}{k_j^{\text{in}}} \right)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N \left( \frac{k_j^{\text{in}}}{k_j^{\text{out}}} \right)^2} \right)^{-1}, \quad (11)$$

where the right-hand side is a constant. The strong agreement between Eq. (11) and the actual entries of  $\mathbf{u}^1$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  illustrates the strong and opposite relationship between the centrality induced by the first left singular vector  $\mathbf{u}^1$  and PageRank  $\mathbf{v}$ .

In this Letter, we have studied the collective frequency of self-organizing systems in general directed networks. In particular, we have shown that the collective frequency variation from the mean natural frequency is generally nonzero, and

rather is given by a weighted average of the natural frequencies. The weights are associated with the left singular vector of  $L$  corresponding to the singular value  $\sigma^1 = 0$ . This formalism allowed us to define and calculate the full range of collective frequency variations possible for any given network. We have shown that the only networks with generic zero collective frequency variation are balanced networks in which the in- and out-degrees match for every node (i.e.,  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}}$ ).

We have found that the first left singular vector – which dictates the contribution of each oscillator to the collective frequency variation – in fact induces a centrality measure on the network. This centrality is intimately linked with the directedness of the network and measures an effective out-flow at each node. Interestingly, we have found that this centrality is a reverse analogue of PageRank centrality [19]; PageRank is a cornerstone to Google’s ranking of webpages and is well-known to quantify the in-flow at each node [20]. In fact, we have shown that the mean field approximations to the first-left-singular-vector centrality and the PageRank centrality are precisely the inverse of one another.

We believe that these results will have significant impact on network-coupled, self-organizing processes in which it is important that the dynamics not only synchronize, but must also oscillate at a collective frequency near a certain operational frequency. One such example is the power grid – a particularly important complex network of oscillators (i.e., sources and loads) that governs the flow of energy [27]. In particular, power grids must synchronize to avoid power failures, but must also evolve close enough to a reference frequency of approximately 50 - 60 Hz [28]. Another example lies in cardiovascular physiology, where the rate at which cardiac tissue beats has an effect on the restitution properties of the tissue, and in various regimes gives rise to dynamical effects such as cardiac alternans that can precede ventricular fibrillation and sudden cardiac failure [29, 30].

DT acknowledges support from NIH Award Number R01HD075712. JS acknowledges funding from the Simons Foundation Grant No. 318812. AA acknowledges support by the European Commission FET-Proactive project PLEX-MATH (Grant No. 317614) and the Generalitat de Catalunya 2009-SGR-838, the ICREA Academia, the James S. McDonnell Foundation, and by FIS2012-38266.

\* persebastian.skardal@trincoll.edu

- [1] S. H. Strogatz, *Sync: the Emerging Science of Spontaneous Order* (Hyperion, 2003).
- [2] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization: A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Sciences* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- [3] A. Arenas, A. Díaz-Guilera, J. Kurths, Y. Moreno, and C. Zhou, *Phys. Rep.* **469**, 93 (2008).
- [4] M. Rohden, A. Sorge, M. Timme, and D. Witthaut. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 064101 (2012).
- [5] A. E. Motter, S. A. Myers, M. Anghel, and T. Nishikawa, *Nat.*



- Phys. **9**, 191 (2013).
- [6] A. Schnitzler and J. Gross, Nat. Rev. Neurosci. **6**, 285 (2005).
- [7] A. Karma and R. F. Gilmour, Phys. Today **60**, 51 (2007).
- [8] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence* (Springer, New York, 1984).
- [9] E. Ott and T. M. Antonsen, Chaos **18**, 037113 (2008).
- [10] J. G. Restrepo, E. Ott, and B. R. Hunt, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 036151 (2005).
- [11] J. G. Restrepo, E. Ott, and B. R. Hunt, Chaos **16**, 015107 (2005).
- [12] S. Assenza, R. Gutiérrez, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, V. Latora, and S. Boccaletti, Sci. Rep. **1**, 00099 (2011).
- [13] F. Chung, Annals of Combinatorics **9**(1), 1–19 (2005).
- [14] F. Dörfler, M. Chertkov, and F. Bullo, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **110**, 2005 (2013).
- [15] P. S. Skardal and A. Arenas, Sci. Adv. **1**, e1500339 (2015).
- [16] N. Kopell and G. B. Ermentrout, in *Handbook of Dynamical Systems II*, edited by B. Fiedler (Elsevier, New York, 2002), Vol. 2, pp. 3–54.
- [17] P. S. Skardal, D. Taylor, and J. Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 144101 (2014).
- [18] P. S. Skardal, D. Taylor, J. Sun, and A. Arenas, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 010802(R) (2015).
- [19] S. Brin and L. Page, Computer Networks and ISDN Systems **30**, 107–117 (1998).
- [20] D. F. Gleich, SIAM Rev. **57**, 321 (2015).
- [21] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 47 (2002).
- [22] M. E. J. Newman, SIAM Rev. **45**, 167 (2003).
- [23] A. Ben-Israel and T. N. E. Grenville, *Generalized Inverses* (Springer, New York, 1974).
- [24] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, Pub. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci. **5**, 17 (1960).
- [25] M. Molloy and B. Reed, Random Struct. Algor. **6**, 161 (1995).
- [26] C. R. MacCluer, SIAM Rev. **42**, 487 (2000).
- [27] F. Dörfler and F. Bullo, F. SIAM J. Control Optim. **50**, 1616 (2012).
- [28] S. Lozano, L. Buzna, and A. Díaz-Guilera, Euro. Phys. J. B **85**, 231 (2012).
- [29] A. Karma, Annu Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **4**, 313 (2013).
- [30] P. S. Skardal, A. Karma, and J. G. Restrepo, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 052707 (2014).