

The long-term impact of ranking algorithms in growing networks

Shilun Zhang^a, Matúš Medo^{a,b,c}, Linyuan Lü^{a,d}, Manuel Sebastian Mariani^{a,e}

^a*Institute of Fundamental and Frontier Sciences, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, 610051 Chengdu, PR China*

^b*Department of Radiation Oncology, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital and University of Bern, 3010 Bern, Switzerland*

^c*Department of Physics, University of Fribourg, 1700 Fribourg, Switzerland*

^d*Alibaba Research Center for Complexity Sciences, Hangzhou Normal University, 311121 Hangzhou, PR China*

^e*URPP Social Networks, Universität Zürich, 8050 Zürich, Switzerland*

Abstract

When we search online for content, we are constantly exposed to rankings. For example, web search results are presented as a ranking, and online bookstores often show us lists of best-selling books. While popularity- and network-based ranking metrics such as degree and Google's PageRank have been extensively studied in previous literature, we still lack a clear understanding of the potential systemic consequences of the adoption of different ranking algorithms. In this work, we fill this gap by introducing a model of network growth where the probability that a node acquires a new connection depends on both its current ranking position and its inherent quality. The model allows us to quantify the ability of a ranking algorithm to detect and promote high-quality content, as well as the heterogeneity of the resulting content popularity distribution. We show that by correcting for the omnipresent age bias of ranking metrics, the resulting networks exhibit a significantly larger agreement between the nodes' quality and their long-term popularity, and larger popularity diversity. Our findings move the first steps toward a model-based understanding of the long-term impact of popularity metrics, and could be used as an informative tool for the design of improved information filtering tools.

Keywords: Complex networks, Ranking, Popularity and quality, Popularity inequality, Algorithmic bias

Email addresses: linyuan.lv@uestc.edu.cn (Linyuan Lü),
manuel.mariani@business.uzh.ch (Manuel Sebastian Mariani)

1. Introduction

Ranking algorithms allow us to efficiently sort the massive amount of online information, aiming to quickly provide us with the relevant items that fit our needs. Due to the ubiquity of ranking, the implications of ranking-based information filtering tools such as search engines [2] and recommendation systems [15] for our society are widely debated [1, 4, 5, 10]. Even when free from apparent manipulation, the rankings that we are exposed to in online platforms and information repositories are influenced by social processes and, at the same time, influence social processes themselves [30]. To provide a few examples, rankings can heavily impact on the eventual popularity of movies and songs in cultural markets [29], affect the attention received by products in online e-commerce platforms [11, 31, 36], increase the sales of top-ranked dishes in restaurants [3], and even influence the choices of undecided electors and, as a result, the outcome of political elections [6]. Understanding the potential systemic impact of ranking algorithms and correcting their potential flaws becomes therefore a critical issue in diverse contexts.

A robust finding in previous experiments of diverse nature [3, 4, 8, 13, 28, 29] is that the current ranking position of an item (or, generally, its current popularity) heavily influences its eventual popularity or success. As a consequence, one of the key challenges is to assess whether, in a given system, the final popularity of an item is a reliable proxy for its “quality” or “fitness”, where quality is interpreted as the success the item would have in absence of social influence mechanisms [29]. In other words, it becomes critical to determine whether the adoption of a given ranking algorithm by a given system allows high-quality nodes to experience larger success than low-quality nodes. If this is not the case, we may conclude that the adopted ranking algorithm has a negative impact on the system, as it may prevent high-quality nodes from becoming popular and allow low-quality nodes to stand out.

Previous research [4] has pointed out that ranking algorithms and search engines that favor already popular items create a strong “popularity bias” [8] – also dubbed as “search-engine bias” [4], and “googlearchy” [10] – such that only the already popular nodes can receive substantial attention in the next future, whereas recent high-quality nodes go essentially unnoticed [4]. This bias can amplify initial differences between the items’ popularity, leading some items to a disproportionately high popularity regardless of their quality. Salganik et al. [28, 29] found that in artificial cultural markets, showing the item popularity ranking to consumers significantly impacts on the items’ final popularity. Other studies [26, 35] emphasize the individuals’ limited attention as a determinant for the viral popularity of low-quality items. Besides, both model-based [12, 22] and experimental results [29] indicate that in presence of social influence, the relation between popularity and quality is highly non-linear, meaning that a small variation of quality leads to large variations in popularity.

While both the relation between popularity and quality and the search-engine bias in the Web have attracted considerable attention from previous research, the abilities of different ranking algorithms to promote quality in a given system are typically not compared with each other. The main reason is that the intrinsic node quality is typically inaccessible in the real world, and we lack a clear understanding of how the interplay between ranking and quality shapes the growth of a given system. As a result, we still lack a general framework to assess the long-term impact of different ranking algorithms.

The main goal of this paper is to move the first steps toward filling this gap. To this end, building on existing models of network growth [7] and popularity dynamics [23], we introduce a growing directed-network model where each node, when choosing the nodes to point to, is driven either by the results of a given adopted ranking algorithm or by quality. The nodes’ sensitivity to quality is a homogeneous parameter of the model [23]. Crucially, different adopted ranking algorithms lead to different properties of the final network. We use the model to address the following questions: Will a given algorithm facilitate or impede the success of high-quality nodes in the system? Is a given algorithm useful in discovering high-quality nodes? We postulate that a good ranking algorithm should lead to a network where: (1) node long-term popularity strongly correlates with their quality (*quality promotion*); (2) nodes’ score strongly correlates with their quality (*quality detection*); (3) the node popularity distribution is relatively diverse (*diversity promotion*). The quality promotion and detection properties favor the algorithms that help the system to improve the popularity-quality correlation (quality promotion) [23] and help the nodes to find high-quality nodes (quality detection) [18]. The diversity promotion favors the algorithms that distribute popularity more evenly across the nodes, making it easier for the nodes to find quality nodes that are not among the most popular ones [38].

We find that in networks that adopted cumulative popularity (as measured by the number of incoming links – node indegree [24]) as the ranking algorithm, the correlation between node popularity and quality strongly depends not only on the nodes’ sensitivity to quality, but also on their willingness to select low-ranked nodes (“exploration cost” in [23]). A popularity metric that is not biased by node age [19, 25] (called rescaled indegree in [19]) leads to networks where both the final nodes’ popularity and the node score are significantly better correlated with node quality, and the final popularity distribution is significantly more diverse. Interestingly, when the exploration cost is large, networks that adopted a random ranking of the nodes exhibit even higher indegree-quality correlation than networks that adopted a popularity-based ranking: while popularity-based ranking algorithms are always useful for the nodes to discover high-quality content, they may accelerate the dissemination of low-quality content when individuals rely too heavily on them.

This work provides the first systematic comparison of network-based ranking metrics with respect to their long-term systemic effects. It complements the question of whether a given ranking metric is able to detect important nodes [14, 16] with the question of whether high-quality nodes will stand out in a system that adopted that given metric. It reveals that suppressing the bias by node age of popularity-based metrics is beneficial to quality promotion, detection and popularity diversity.

2. Model and metrics

In this Section, we introduce the model of network growth (Section 2.1), and the metrics used to evaluate the long-term impact of ranking algorithms (Section 2.2).

2.1. The model of network growth

We focus here on monopartite directed networks. Our model is meant to represent a social or information network where the number of nodes grows with time. In the model, each node i is endowed with a quality parameter q_i which quantifies its attractiveness to new incoming connections in absence of ranking influence. Before generating each network, we choose the ranking algorithm \mathcal{A} that influences the growth – equivalently, as the nodes choose their links¹ based on the node ranking by \mathcal{A} , we say that the system "has adopted" algorithm \mathcal{A} . We introduce a model which features three essential elements:

1. *Growth.* At each time step, one new node enters the system. Nodes can thus be labeled directly by the time step in which they appeared. Each new node creates m directed links to m different preexisting nodes².
2. *Ranking-driven attachment.* With probability β , node t chooses its target according to the probability

$$P^{(\mathcal{A})}(j, t) = \frac{R_j(t)^{-\alpha}}{\sum_{l=1}^{t-1} R_l(t)^{-\alpha}}, \quad (1)$$

where $R_j(t)$ is the ranking position of node j at time t according to \mathcal{A} ; α is a tunable model parameter referred to as *exploration cost* by Nematzadeh et al.[23]: Large values of α imply that the nodes are only willing to connect to the top-nodes by the adopted ranking algorithm, whereas low values of α allow the nodes to also connect to low-ranked nodes.

¹The network's directed links might be interpreted as friendship or follower relationships in online social networks, or as citations between documents in information networks.

²Self-loops and multiple links are prohibited.

3. *Quality-driven attachment.* With probability $1 - \beta$, node t chooses its target according to the probability

$$P^{(q)}(j, t) = \frac{q_j}{\sum_{l=1}^{t-1} q_l}. \quad (2)$$

Our model reduces to the model by Fortunato et al. [7] in the special case $\beta = 1$; node quality and quality-driven attachment are novel elements with respect to Fortunato et al.’s model [7]. Differently from the recent popularity dynamics model by Nematzadeh et al. [23] which considers a cultural market composed of a fixed number N of items, our model represents a network that grows with time. Differently from previous works [8, 22, 23], we aim to use our growing network model to compare the long-term properties of the networks generated based on different ranking metrics.

As our main goal is to uncover the long-term implications of the temporal bias of static centrality metrics, and the benefits from suppressing such bias, we focus here on three ranking metrics:

1. *Indegree k .* The indegree³ of a node is defined as the number of incoming connections received by that node [24]. We simply rank the nodes in order of decreasing indegree k , which is arguably the simplest way to rank the nodes in a directed network [24]. In growing networks, node indegree is strongly biased by node age [14, 19, 25], as confirmed by numerical simulations and analytic computations with our model (see [Appendix B](#)).
2. *Age-rescaled indegree $R(k)$.* We rank the nodes in order of decreasing age-rescaled indegree [19] $R(k)$. The rescaled indegree is built on indegree by requiring that node score is not biased by node age. More specifically, for each node i , we consider a reference set $[i - \Delta/2, i + \Delta/2]$ of Δ nodes of similar age as node i . We compute the mean $\mu_i(k)$ and the standard deviation $\sigma_i(k)$ of node score within this reference set. The rescaled indegree score $R_i(k)$ of node i is given by the z -score [19]

$$R_i(k) = \frac{s_i - \mu_i(k)}{\sigma_i(k)}. \quad (3)$$

The rescaled indegree of a given node thus quantifies how larger the node’s indegree is with respect to nodes of similar age, in units of standard deviations.

³In the following, we will use interchangeably “indegree”, “popularity”, and “cumulative popularity”. This is because in our simple setting, the incoming links received by a node are the only available information on its “popularity”. The situation might be different in a real online system where, for example, the popularity of a video can be quantified by the number of downloads, by the number of views, by the number of shares, etc.

Using the z -score to normalize static metrics of node importance is customary in scientometrics [17, 33, 37] where scholars aim to gauge the impact of a given scientific paper independently of its field and publication date [34]. Besides, in citation networks, the rescaled indegree allows us to identify significantly earlier important papers [19, 25], movies [27] and patents [20] with respect to citation count.

3. *Random ranking.* The nodes are ranked at random. The resulting ranking is used as a baseline to understand for which parameter values the final indegree-quality correlation benefits from the rankings by indegree and rescaled indegree.

The choice of the quality distribution deserves some attention. A simple mean-field approximation shows that for $\beta = 0$, the final popularity of the nodes k is expected to be proportional to node quality; simulation results show that for $\beta > 0$, node final popularity is a power-law function of node quality (see Appendix B for details). Motivated by this property, to mimic the broad popularity distributions typically observed in real data [24], we choose a Pareto distribution of the quality values q (see Appendix A for details). This choice leads indeed to broad indegree distributions as shown in Fig. S1. We refer to the Appendix A section for all the simulation details.

2.2. Evaluating the algorithms' long-term impact

To assess the long-term impact of different algorithms, we grow random networks based on the model described above for each ranking algorithm \mathcal{A} . The algorithm determines, at any time, the ranking of the nodes that, in turn, determines the probability that a node receives a new connection, according to Eq. (1). We refer to the networks generated with the algorithm \mathcal{A} as to the \mathcal{A} -generated networks. Ideally, we would expect a good ranking algorithm \mathcal{A} to exhibit the three main properties introduced above: (i) *Quality promotion*: The algorithm generates networks where the final popularity of the nodes strongly correlates with their quality; (ii) *Quality detection*: The algorithm is effective in identifying high-quality nodes; (iii) *Popularity diversity*: The algorithm generates networks where the popularity is not strongly concentrated among few nodes. In the following, we introduce three classes of observables to quantify these three properties.

Quality promotion. For a given ranking algorithm \mathcal{A} , we evaluate how well the final popularity k of the nodes reproduces the inherent quality values q for \mathcal{A} -generated networks. We calculate the Pearson's linear correlation $r^{\mathcal{A}}(k, q)$ between node popularity k and node quality q . While this metric takes all the nodes into account, we are also interested in the algorithm's ability to promote the top-quality nodes. To this end, we measure the precision $P_{100}^{\mathcal{A}}(k, q)$ defined as the fraction of nodes that are placed in the top-100 of both the ranking by k and the ranking by q .

q . Nevertheless, quality promotion is not sufficient alone to evaluate the metrics because by construction, the nodes have a non-zero probability to choose their targets based on quality. As a consequence, even the random ranking of the nodes produces networks with non-zero indegree-quality correlation. Such correlation increases as the nodes’ sensitivity to quality increases (i.e., as β decreases) – see Fig. 2 and the related discussion below. However, the random ranking is useless to find valuable nodes in the system. For this reason, we study not only quality promotion, but also quality detection.

Quality detection. For a given ranking algorithm \mathcal{A} , we evaluate how well the scores by \mathcal{A} reproduce the inherent quality values q for \mathcal{A} -generated networks. To this end, we measure the Pearson’s linear correlation $r^{\mathcal{A}}(s, q)$ between the node-level scores s produced by the algorithm \mathcal{A} (measured at the end of the network growth) and node quality q for \mathcal{A} -generated networks. In parallel, we also measure the precision [15] $P_{100}^{\mathcal{A}}(s, q)$ of the algorithm, defined as the fraction of nodes that are placed in the top-100 of both the ranking by s and the ranking by q .

Diversity. To quantify the ability of the algorithms to evenly spread popularity across the network’s nodes, we measure the indegree’s Herfindahl index [9] $H(\mathbf{k})$.

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{k_i}{L} \right)^2. \quad (4)$$

The index is proportional to the variance of the network’s indegree distribution: the smaller $H(\mathbf{k})$, the less concentrated indegree is within a restricted group of nodes. More specifically, the index ranges between $H_{min} = 1/N$ (egalitarian network where all the nodes have indegree equal to L/N) and $H_{max} = 1$ (network where one node has indegree L , and all the other nodes have indegree equal to zero). We define $N_{eff}(\mathbf{k}) = 1/H(\mathbf{k})$ as the “effective number of nodes” that received incoming links. Such number N_{eff} is equal to 1 if one single node received all the incoming links, and it is equal to N if all the nodes received the same amount of links. We posit that a good ranking algorithms should not produce too concentrated networks, and its generated networks should therefore exhibit relatively large values of N_{eff} .

3. Results

We grow networks of $N = 10,000$ nodes according to the model described above; we refer to Appendix A for all the simulation details. Here, we show the results for node outdegree $m = 6$; the results for $m = 3$ are in qualitative agreement and they are shown in the SM (Figs. S2–S10). Our goal is to compare the properties of networks generated by the two different metrics and by the random algorithm, according to the observables described above.




Figure 1: Quality promotion as measured by $r(k, q)$ (the Pearson’s linear correlation between node indegree k and node quality q – top panels), and $P_{100}(k, q)$ (the precision of node indegree k in identifying the top-100 nodes by quality q – bottom panels): comparison between indegree-generated and $R(k)$ -generated networks. (A-B): $r(k, q)$ for indegree-generated ($r^k(k, q)$, panel A) and $R(k)$ -generated ($r^R(k, q)$, panel B) networks, as a function of the model parameters α (exploration cost) and β (reliance on ranking). (C): Ratio $r^R(k, q)/r^k(k, q)$ as a function of the model parameters. (D-E): $P_{100}(k, q)$ for indegree-generated ($P_{100}^k(k, q)$, panel D) and $R(k)$ -generated ($P_{100}^R(k, q)$, panel E) networks, as a function of the model parameters. (F): Ratio $P_{100}^R(k, q)/P_{100}^k(k, q)$ as a function of the model parameters. Results are averaged over 500 realizations.

3.1. Quality promotion: the (α, β) parameter space

Fig. 1A shows the indegree-quality Pearson’s linear correlation $r(k, q)$ in indegree-generated networks. The correlation between final popularity and quality is sensitive to both α and β . As α grows, it becomes harder for low-ranked high-quality nodes to acquire new incoming connections, which results in a lower indegree-quality correlation. The (approximately) monotonous dependence of $r^k(k, q)$ on α was not found for the model of a static market⁴ by Nematzadeh et al. [23], which indicates that it is a consequence of the network’s growth. As β grows, the nodes

⁴By static market, we mean a collection of a fixed number of items. This is different from our growing network model where, at each time step, a new node enters the system and connects to the preexisting nodes.




Figure 2: Quality promotion as measured by $r(k, q)$ (the Pearson’s linear correlation between node indegree k and node quality q – *top* panels), and $P_{100}(k, q)$ (the precision of node indegree k in identifying the top-100 nodes by quality q – *bottom* panels): comparison between indegree-generated (circles), $R(k)$ -generated (squares), and random-generated networks (triangles). The three columns correspond, from left to right, to $\beta = 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$, respectively. Results are averaged over 500 realizations; the error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

become less sensitive to quality and, as a direct consequence, the indegree-quality correlations deteriorates.

Fig. 1B shows the correlation $r^R(k, q)$ between node indegree k and node quality in $R(k)$ -generated networks. The figure shows that by adopting the age-rescaled metric $R(k)$, the indegree-quality correlation stays large for a broader parameter region. For example, we observe values of $r^R(k, q)$ as high⁵ as 0.35 when $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0.7)$, which corresponds to a scenario where the nodes are driven by quality only three times out of ten.

To visually appreciate the parameter regions where the indegree-quality correlations significantly differ among the two classes of networks, we represent the heatmap of the ratio $r^R(k, q)/r^k(k, q)$ (Fig. 1C). When $\beta = 0$, all the nodes are only sensitive to quality, and the plotted ratio is thus one by definition (on average) because node ranking has no influence. As soon as $\beta > 0$, the nodes become driven both by quality and by ranking, which makes it possible to reveal the differences between the networks grown with different algorithms. We find that rescaled indegree produces networks with higher indegree-quality correlation for all the pa-

⁵As opposed to $r^k(k, q) = 0.12$ observed for indegree-generated networks for the same pair of (α, β) values.

parameter space; we observe the largest advantage of the rescaled indegree in terms of quality promotion for the region where both α and β are relatively large – i.e., in the region where the nodes are unwilling to choose low-ranked nodes and, at the same time, are highly sensitive to ranking. Analogous heatmaps for the precision metrics (Figs. 1D–F) show that the indegree’s precision in $R(k)$ -generated networks is systematically larger than that in indegree-generated networks. Differently from Fig. 1C, Fig. 1F shows that the largest gaps between the precision in $R(k)$ - and indegree-generated networks occur in the small α , large β region. We discuss the reasons behind the different trend for correlation and precision in next paragraph.

3.2. Quality promotion: comparing with the random ranking

Fig. 1 indicates that adopting the rescaled indegree allows us to better promote node quality for a broad range of model parameters. At the same time, it is important to compare our results with those for networks generated with the random ranking. As pointed out above, for $\beta < 1$, the nodes have a non-zero probability to choose their targets based on quality, which results in a non-zero indegree-quality even for networks generated with a random ranking. We focus on three values of β ($\beta = 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$) which correspond to population of nodes who are mostly driven by ranking when selecting their targets; analogous results for smaller values of β are shown in Supplementary Figs. S13–S15 for $m = 6$ and S8–S10 for $m = 3$.

We find (Fig. 2, top panels) that the indegree-quality correlation observed in $R(k)$ -generated networks is not always larger than the indegree-quality correlation observed in random-generated networks: as the exploration cost α grows, the indegree-quality correlation in $R(k)$ -generated networks dwindles; when α is larger than one, $R(k)$ -generated networks exhibit a smaller indegree-quality correlation than random-generated networks. While a large exploration cost is harmful for the overall indegree-quality correlation in both indegree-generated and $R(k)$ -generated networks, for $\alpha \geq 1$, indegree’s precision in promoting the top-quality nodes (Fig. 2, bottom panels) tends to grow with the exploration cost. Remarkably, $R(k)$ -generated networks exhibit the largest precision values for all the values of α .

The qualitative difference between the top and the bottom panels of Fig. 2 is explained by the different indegree distributions of the networks generated with different values of α . When α is large, the incoming links are concentrated on few top items (as the effective number of nodes shows, see Fig. 4 below and the related discussion) and, at the same time, the low-quality items remain unnoticed. The small number of incoming links received by low-quality items do not allow the metrics to discriminate their quality, which results in small indegree-quality correlation values. By contrast, high-quality nodes receive a large number of incoming links, and it is possible for the metrics to rank them at the top, which results in relatively large precision values.




Figure 3: Quality detection as measured by $r(s, q)$ (the Pearson’s linear correlation between node score s and node quality q – *top* panels), and $P_{100}(s, q)$ (the precision of node score s in identifying the top-100 nodes by quality q – *bottom* panels): comparison between indegree-generated ($s = k$, circles), $R(k)$ -generated ($s = R(k)$, squares), and random-generated networks ($s = \rho$, triangles). The three columns correspond, from left to right, to $\beta = 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$, respectively. The dots represent averages over 500 realizations; the error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

3.3. Quality detection

In indegree-generated and $R(k)$ -generated networks, nodes’ indegree and age-rescaled indegree, respectively, are the scores that are used for the nodes’ ranking. Our ability to detect quality in such networks is determined by the strength of the relation between node score s and q (as measured by both the Pearson’s linear correlation $r^s(s, q)$ and the precision $P_{100}^s(s, q)$). Remarkably, the correlation $r^R(R(k), q)$ is larger than the correlation $r^k(k, q)$ for all the parameter values (Fig. 3, top panels, and Fig. S11). The precision of age-rescaled indegree in identifying the top-quality nodes is also larger than indegree’s precision for all the parameter values (Fig. 3, bottom panels). By being completely insensitive to node popularity, the random score always achieves zero precision, on average, in identifying the top-quality nodes. As expected, while the random score can still generate networks with non-zero indegree-quality correlation (Fig. 2), the rankings it produces have no practical utility.

3.4. Diversity

For both indegree- and $R(k)$ -generated networks, the effective number of nodes N_{eff} depends on both α and β (Figs. 4). Unsurprisingly, the random score produces the most egalitarian networks (Fig. 4), with N_{eff} values above $3000 = 0.3 N$.




Figure 4: Diversity as measured by the effective number of nodes N_{eff} (the smaller, the more egalitarian the indegree distribution): comparison between indegree-generated (circles), $R(k)$ -generated (squares), and random-generated (triangles) networks. The three columns correspond, from left to right, to $\beta = 0.7, 0.8, 0.9$, respectively. The dots represent averages over 500 realizations; the error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

In qualitative agreement with previous findings[29], the net effect of a larger sensitivity to ranking position is, for all the studied metrics, a more unequal popularity distribution, which manifests itself in the decrease of N_{eff} as α increases. Importantly, the popularity distribution is more even for $R(k)$ -generated networks than for indegree-generated networks (Figs. 4 and S12). In summary, the age normalization procedure not only improves the indegree-quality and the score-quality correlation, but it also decreases the popularity inequality in the system. At the same time, both the $R(k)$ -generated and the indegree-generated networks exhibit N_{eff} values significantly smaller than the N_{eff} achieved by the random ranking. It remains open to design ranking algorithms that lead to more egalitarian networks than rescaled indegree, yet maintaining a similar level of quality promotion and quality detection.

4. Discussion

To summarize, we find that age-rescaled indegree allow us not only to fairly compare old and recent nodes [19, 25], but also to produce networks where the nodes' final popularity is better correlated with their quality than for the networks that adopted indegree, and the popularity distribution is more even. Examples of widely-used cumulative popularity metrics include the number of views or downloads for online content, the number of received citations for scientific papers, among others. Our results indicate that despite the widespread use of cumulative popularity metrics, age-rescaled metrics may better help both users to find high-quality content, and high-quality content to experience larger success than

low-quality content.

The main message of our work is that network-based growth models can help us not only to understand the impact of network growth mechanisms on the rankings by a given algorithm [14, 18, 21], but also to estimate the impact of the adoption of different ranking algorithms by a given system. In other words, we can investigate not only how the past evolution of the system influenced the current rankings, but also how the adopted rankings may influence the future evolution of the system.

Our work sheds light on the long-studied relation between quality and success: Do the high-quality nodes experience larger success than the low-quality nodes? Why nodes of similar worthiness experience widely different success? In real systems, addressing these questions is challenging as defining “node quality” in an unbiased and objective way is often not possible. Our model-based approach bypasses this obstacle by defining node quality as an intrinsic node property, and by building multiple independent realizations of an artificial system where the nodes choose their connections based on both the other nodes’ ranking and their quality. At the same time, while the model studied here is arguably one of the simplest model which features all the elements of interest in our analysis (network growth, and the joint influence of ranking and quality on network growth), it can only provide a stylized description of the growth of real networks. We envision that more sophisticated models together with suitable field experiments will improve our reliability in predicting the effects of ranking algorithms, providing us with a robust basis for more informed choices of ranking metrics for real-world applications. To draw a parallel, in a similar way as high-resolution models of epidemic spreading have led to accurate predictions of the properties of disease outbreaks [32], detailed models of network evolution may lead to the accurate quantification of the consequences of the adoption of a given metric in a given system.

Acknowledgments

We thank Yi-Cheng Zhang for many enlightening discussions on the topic. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants nos. 61673150, 11622538) and the Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant no. LR16A050001). LL acknowledges the Science Enhancement Programme of the UESTC for support. MSM acknowledges the University of Zürich for support through the URPP Social Networks.

Author contributions statement

M.S.M. and M.M. conceived the idea, M.S.M. and L.L. designed research, S.Z. performed the numerical simulations, S.Z. and M.S.M. performed the analytic computations, all authors analyzed and discussed the results. S.Z. and M.S.M. wrote the manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

References

- [1] Engin Bozdag. Bias in algorithmic filtering and personalization. *Ethics and information technology*, 15(3):209–227, 2013.
- [2] Sergey Brin and Lawrence Page. The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine. *Computer Networks and ISDN Systems*, 30(1):107–117, 1998.
- [3] Hongbin Cai, Yuyu Chen, and Hanming Fang. Observational learning: Evidence from a randomized natural field experiment. *The American Economic Review*, 99(3):864–882, 2009.
- [4] Junghoo Cho and Sourashis Roy. Impact of search engines on page popularity. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 20–29. ACM, 2004.
- [5] Alejandro Diaz. Through the google goggles: Sociopolitical bias in search engine design. *Web search*, pages 11–34, 2008.
- [6] Robert Epstein and Ronald E Robertson. The search engine manipulation effect (seme) and its possible impact on the outcomes of elections. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(33):E4512–E4521, 2015.
- [7] Santo Fortunato, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Scale-free network growth by ranking. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(21):218701, 2006.
- [8] Santo Fortunato, Alessandro Flammini, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Vespignani. Topical interests and the mitigation of search engine bias. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(34):12684–12689, 2006.
- [9] Orris Clemens Herfindahl. *Copper costs and prices: 1870-1957*. Baltimore, Published, P, 1959. Published for Resources for the Future by Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.
- [10] Matthew Hindman, Kostas Tsioutsoulis, and Judy A Johnson. Googlearchy: How a few heavily-linked sites dominate politics on the web. In *In Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association*, 2003.
- [11] Dietmar Jannach and Kolja Hegelich. A case study on the effectiveness of recommendations in the mobile internet. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 205–208. ACM, 2009.
- [12] Joseph S Kong, Nima Sarshar, and Vwani P Roychowdhury. Experience versus talent shapes the structure of the web. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(37):13724–13729, 2008.

- [13] Steve Lawrence and C Lee Giles. Accessibility of information on the web. *Nature*, 400(6740):107–107, 1999.
- [14] Hao Liao, Manuel Sebastian Mariani, Matus Medo, Yi-Cheng Zhang, and Ming-Yang Zhou. Ranking in evolving complex networks. *Physics Reports*, 689:1–54, 2017.
- [15] Linyuan Lü, Matúš Medo, Chi Ho Yeung, Yi-Cheng Zhang, Zi-Ke Zhang, and Tao Zhou. Recommender systems. *Physics Reports*, 519(1):1–49, 2012.
- [16] Linyuan Lü, Duanbing Chen, Xiao-Long Ren, Qian-Ming Zhang, Yi-Cheng Zhang, and Tao Zhou. Vital nodes identification in complex networks. *Physics Reports*, 650:1–63, 2016.
- [17] Jonas Lundberg. Lifting the crown-citation z -score. *Journal of Informetrics*, 1(2):145–154, 2007.
- [18] Manuel Sebastian Mariani, Matúš Medo, and Yi-Cheng Zhang. Ranking nodes in growing networks: When pagerank fails. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 2015.
- [19] Manuel Sebastian Mariani, Matúš Medo, and Yi-Cheng Zhang. Identification of milestone papers through time-balanced network centrality. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(4):1207–1223, 2016.
- [20] Manuel Sebastian Mariani, Matus Medo, and François Lafond. Early identification of important patents: Design and validation of citation network metrics. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.01.036>, 2018.
- [21] Matúš Medo and Giulio Cimini. Model-based evaluation of scientific impact indicators. *Physical Review E*, 94(3):032312, 2016.
- [22] Matúš Medo, Giulio Cimini, and Stanislao Gualdi. Temporal effects in the growth of networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 107(23):238701, 2011.
- [23] Azadeh Nematzadeh, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. How algorithmic popularity bias hinders or promotes quality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.00574*, 2017.
- [24] Mark Newman. *Networks: An introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [25] MEJ Newman. The first-mover advantage in scientific publication. *Europhys. Lett.*, 86(6):68001, 2009.

- [26] Xiaoyan Qiu, Diego FM Oliveira, Alireza Sahami Shirazi, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Limited individual attention and online virality of low-quality information. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(7):0132, 2017.
- [27] Zhuo-Ming Ren, Manuel Sebastian Mariani, Yi-Cheng Zhang, and Matus Medo. A time-respecting null model to explore the structure of growing networks. *Physical Review E*, 97(3):052311, 2018.
- [28] Matthew J Salganik and Duncan J Watts. Web-based experiments for the study of collective social dynamics in cultural markets. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 1(3):439–468, 2009.
- [29] Matthew J Salganik, Peter Sheridan Dodds, and Duncan J Watts. Experimental study of inequality and unpredictability in an artificial cultural market. *Science*, 311(5762):854–856, 2006.
- [30] Ingo Scholtes, René Pfitzner, and Frank Schweitzer. The social dimension of information ranking: A discussion of research challenges and approaches. In *Socioinformatics-The Social Impact of Interactions between Humans and IT*, pages 45–61. Springer, 2014.
- [31] Amit Sharma, Jake M Hofman, and Duncan J Watts. Estimating the causal impact of recommendation systems from observational data. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 453–470. ACM, 2015.
- [32] Michele Tizzoni, Paolo Bajardi, Chiara Poletto, José J Ramasco, Duygu Balcan, Bruno Gonçalves, Nicola Perra, Vittoria Colizza, and Alessandro Vespignani. Real-time numerical forecast of global epidemic spreading: case study of 2009 a/h1n1pdm. *BMC medicine*, 10(1):165, 2012.
- [33] Giacomo Vaccario, Matúš Medo, Nicolas Wider, and Manuel Sebastian Mariani. Quantifying and suppressing ranking bias in a large citation network. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(3):766–782, 2017.
- [34] Ludo Waltman. A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. *Journal of Informetrics*, 10(2):365–391, 2016.
- [35] Lillian Weng, Alessandro Flammini, Alessandro Vespignani, and Filippo Menczer. Competition among memes in a world with limited attention. *Scientific Reports*, 2:335, 2012.
- [36] An Zeng, Chi Ho Yeung, Matúš Medo, and Yi-Cheng Zhang. Modeling mutual feedback between users and recommender systems. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2015(7):P07020, 2015.

- [37] Zhihui Zhang, Ying Cheng, and Nian Cai Liu. Comparison of the effect of mean-based method and z-score for field normalization of citations at the level of web of science subject categories. *Scientometrics*, 101(3):1679–1693, 2014.
- [38] Tao Zhou, Zoltán Kuscsik, Jian-Guo Liu, Matúš Medo, Joseph Rushton Wakeling, and Yi-Cheng Zhang. Solving the apparent diversity-accuracy dilemma of recommender systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(10):4511–4515, 2010.

Appendix A. Details on the numerical simulations

We focus on networks composed of 10^4 nodes, and study the following model parameters: α from 0.25 to 2.0 with step 0.25 and β from 0 to 1 with step 0.1. Node quality values are drawn from the Pareto distribution $P(q) \sim q^{-3}$ where $q \in [1, \infty)$. The network is initialized with a network of m nodes, each of them with one outgoing and incoming link. At each time step $t > m + 1$, a new node t is added to the system and m nodes (only results for $m = 6$ are shown in main text, whereas results for both $m = 3$ and $m = 6$ are shown in the Supplementary Material) are chosen as targets to establish m new links. With probability β , the probability that a given node is chosen is given by Eq. (1), with probability $1 - \beta$, it is given by Eq. (2). To save computational time, for times $t \leq 10^2$, we re-compute and update the rankings at each time step, whereas for times $t \geq 10^2$, the newly introduced nodes are placed at the bottom of the node ranking, and we re-compute and update the rankings every 10 time steps. To make our results insensitive to random fluctuations, for each parameter pair (α, β) , all the results shown here represent averages over 500 realizations of the network growth process.

Appendix B. The relation between popularity and quality in indegree-generated networks

We start by considering networks where the nodes cannot perceive the other nodes ranking, and are completely driven by quality ($\beta = 1$). In this scenario, the average indegree of node i at time N is given by

$$\bar{k}_i(N) = \sum_{t=i+1}^N m \frac{q_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} q_j}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In the thermodynamic limit $N \gg i$, by using a similar mean-field approximation as in [7], we obtain

$$\bar{k}_i(N) \simeq m \frac{q_i}{\bar{q}} \log \left(\frac{N-1}{i-1} \right). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

There is a good agreement between Eq. (B.2) and the results of numerical simulations (see Supplementary Fig. S16). Such linear relation between indegree and quality does not hold for $\beta > 0$, where the analytic calculation is made difficult by the fact that the ranking position of a given node at a given time is influenced by both its quality and the previous dynamics of the system. Nevertheless, we find that the relation $\overline{k}_i(N) = C q_i^\delta$ fits reasonably well the simulation results, and the dependence of the fitted exponent δ on node age is relatively weak (see Fig. S17 and Table S1 for details).