

Preferential Attachment in Systems and Networks of Constant Size

Cornelia Metzиг¹, Caroline Colijn²

¹Queen Mary University London, UK, ²Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada
c.metzig@qmul.ac.uk, ccolijn@sfu.ca

We propose a preferential-attachment-type model for a system of constant size which applies to urn/ball systems and to networks. It yields a power law for the size (or degree) distribution with exponential cutoff depending on parameters. This distribution can be explained by maximization of the Gibbs-Shannon entropy, using as constraint information on the growth of individual urns, or alternatively calculating the exact probabilities. Another distribution that often occurs together with power laws, a ‘tent-shaped’ growth rate distribution, comes out naturally from this model. We confirm our theoretical results with numerical simulations and by another method using recursively calculated exact probabilities.

PACS numbers: 02.50.Fz, 05.10.Gg, 05.40.-a, 05.65.+b

INTRODUCTION

Complex systems self-organize and form scalefree distributions, from word frequency in language [17] and web databases [5], city and company sizes [4, 18] to high-energy physics [8]. Oftentimes, scalefree distributions appear in degrees in a network, e.g. in protein interaction networks [1], brain functional networks [13], email networks [12], road networks [16], and various social networks [7], e.g. respiratory contact networks [14].

Many of these systems have been described by preferential attachment-type models, where the probability of a ball to join an urn (or a link to join a node) is proportional to the urn’s size (node’s degree): either the Yule-model [29] for urn/ball-type problems (like originally biological genera and species [33]) or, for networks, the Barabasi-Albert model [6]. Both models yield a scalefree distribution $p(n) \propto n^{-\alpha}$ above some n' . They can furthermore explain another scaling phenomenon, a ‘tent-shaped’ probability density for the growth rate g_t which often occurs in combination with a scalefree distribution [2, 3, 9, 10, 26, 28, 30, 32]. However, preferential attachment as explanation for scaling relies on the system to be constantly growing, which is often not the case, especially for social systems because people also exit the system. An ansatz for systems of constant size is to use a multiplicative noise term γ in the linear Langevin equation $n_{t+1} = \gamma n_t + \delta$ [8, 31] (where δ is additive noise). This yields a scalefree distribution for n above some value n' , but since γ can be any i.i.d. random variables, it does not additionally explain scaling in the growth rate γ .

[11, 24, 27]

Here, we introduce a micro-founded model for a scalefree distribution and growth rate scaling, which preserves a stationary size in urns and balls by ‘preferential’ deletion of balls, and/or by deletion of urns. Like the Yule process, this algorithm can be extended to networks,

where links and nodes are entering and exiting the network. The stationary size distribution of urns (degree distribution of nodes) is a power law (with/without exponential cutoff), which we derived in two ways, via maximization of the Gibbs-Shannon entropy, and by computing the exact probabilities of evolution.

THE PROCESS

We consider a system of M urns and N balls. Each urn is filled with n_i balls, and their sizes satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^M n_i = N$. The dynamics are framed in terms of urns receiving and losing balls, in discrete timesteps k . The two key features are that averages of N and M are conserved over time, and that every ball has the same chance of attracting another ball or vanishing, which implies ‘preferential’ growth [6, 29]. We give now the succession of events in one iteration τ .

1. Growth of urns: every ball has probability q of attracting another ball from a reservoir. Let X_i be the number of new balls in urn i ; X_i is binomial with mean $n_i q$, such that the urn grows on average to $n_i(1+q)$.
2. Shrinking of urns: every ball has probability of disappearing $\delta_{shrink,t} = \sum_i X_i / (N + \sum_i X_i)$, which is adjusted as a result of the growth step such that N will be conserved. Let Y_i be the number of disappearances of urn i ; Y_i is a random variable with a binomial distribution with mean $\langle Y_i \rangle = \delta_{shrink}(n_i + X_i)$. The system shrinks in number of balls, but since some urns might be left with 0 balls, possibly also in number of urns.
3. Exit of urns (and balls): every urn has probability δ_{exit} of exiting, i.e. being set to size 0, so the system loses balls.

4. Entry of urns (and balls): Urns that have lost all their balls due to steps (2) or (3) are replaced by urns that contain 1 ball.

A varying number of balls exits at each iteration, depending on the exact number and sizes of the exiting urns. Even in the case where step (3) is omitted, some urns will exit, as urns can vanish by losing all their balls. Steps 3 and 4 conserve the number of urns M but may still leave the system with a net loss of balls. To conserve the average number of balls after growth, $\langle N + \sum_i X_i \rangle$, the probability q to attract a new ball from the reservoir is adjusted for the next iteration.

Possible cases

This general process can be reduced to two limiting scenarios with the same growth but different shrinking mechanisms. These are: (I) No deletion of urns of size > 0 . The system stays at a constant size (in terms of number of balls N) because the overall shrinking of urns equals the overall growth of urns. (II) Urns can only grow and do not shrink, but exit (with their balls) at rate δ_{exit} and get replaced by urns of size 1, allowing the system to stay at constant size. (III) A combination of both.

- (I) Urns do not exit (step 3 is omitted), i.e. $\delta_{exit} = 0$. For an urn i of size n_i , the probability distribution of the size after a growth-and-shrink cycle, $p(n_{i,after}|n_i)$ can be written as a discrete Gaussian centered around n_i and with standard deviation

$$\sigma(n_i) = \left(\frac{q}{(1+q)^2} 2n_i \right)^\omega \equiv (\hat{q} 2n_i)^\omega \quad (1)$$

with standard deviation scaling exponent $\omega = 0.5$ (see equations (9) - (10) supplementary information). The number of urns that have attained size 0 and need to be refilled in step (4) is very low, since the probability to reach size 0 decreases with urn size n like $p(0|n_i) = \hat{q}^{n_i}$, so that in practice average urn size is conserved, $\langle n_{i,t+1} \rangle = n_{i,t}$.

- (II) Urns do not shrink (step 2 is omitted). The system size in terms of number of balls, N has then very high fluctuations, as each time a fraction δ_{exit} of urns is deleted (and replaced by urns of size 1), which means that the number of exiting balls varies strongly. The expectation after growth, deletion and replacement of urns is $\langle n_{i,t+1} \rangle = \delta_{exit} \cdot 1 + (1 - \delta_{exit})(n_i + \sum_{X_i=0}^{n_i} X_i p(X_i)) = (1 - \delta_{exit})n_i(1 + q)$ which is different to $n_{i,t}$, i.e. the average urn size is not conserved. With probability $1 - \delta_{exit}$, the urn grows by X_i , and the binomial distribution of X_i has standard deviation

$$\sigma(n_i) = (q(1-q)n_i)^\omega \quad (2)$$

with again scaling exponent $\omega = 0.5$.

- (III) Mixed case. Steps 2 and 3 can be combined such that some balls (a fraction δ_{shrink}) will disappear from the system due to shrinking of urns, and some because urns exit with probability δ_{exit} with their balls. Since the exiting urns have the same mean size as all urns in the system, on average a fraction δ_{exit} of balls exits with them. The turnover rate can then be defined as the fraction of balls that gets removed through exit of urns, normalized by the total number of balls that get removed in one timestep, $\mu = \frac{\delta_{exit}}{\delta_{exit} + \delta_{shrink}}$.

RESULTS

The size distribution of urns converges to one that maximizes Gibbs-Shannon entropy in one timestep. Which urn size distribution $P(n)$ has highest entropy, given that every urn i has a probability to change size which can be approximated by a Gaussian with $\sigma(n_i) \propto \sqrt{n_i}$? If there was a distribution $P(n)$ that allows for higher multiplicity of outcomes of all individual $p(n_{i,t+1}|n_{i,t})$, it would be preferred. We use the fact that for urns that do not exit, the probability $p(n_{i,t+1}|n_{i,t})$ is either Gaussian or binomially distributed and their associated entropies of $s = \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi\sigma^2)$. This term becomes $s_i = \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi 2\hat{q}n_i)$ for the first case using (1), or $s_i = \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi 2q(1-q)n_i)$ for the second case using (2). At stationary state, $\sum_{i=1}^M s_i$ is also stationary. Formulated differently, the size distribution $P(n)$ maximizes entropy under the constraint $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M s_i = C^*$ (or subtracting the constant $\frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi 2q)$), C can be written as

$$C = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \ln(n_i). \quad (3)$$

For case (I) where urns shrink, another constraint is the conservation of individual average urn size $\langle n_{i,t+1} \rangle = \sum_{n_{i,t+1}} n_{i,t+1} p(n_{i,t+1}|n_{i,t}) = n_{i,t}$, or summed over all urns i , $\sum_i \sum_{n_{i,t+1}} n_{i,t+1} p(n_{i,t+1}|n_{i,t}) = \sum_i n_{i,t}$ which can be written as $\sum_n P_n n = E$.

For case (II) where urns exit, this constraint does not hold since for most urns $\langle n_{i,t+1} \rangle > n_{i,t}$ (except for the fraction that exits, which are replaced by urns of size 1). The mean number of balls $\langle n \rangle$ per urn is only conserved for the system as a whole because of reintroduction of urns, but not for individual urns. The entropy functional of the urn size distribution is

$$S(P) = \sum_n P_n \ln P_n + \lambda \left(\sum_n P_n \ln(n) - C \right) + \beta \left(\sum_n P_n n - E \right) \quad (4)$$

with the second constraint only for case (I). To determine the distribution that maximizes S , we calculate $\frac{\partial S}{\partial P_n}$ and set to 0, leading to

$$P_n = Kn^{-(\alpha+1)}e^{-\beta n}. \quad (5)$$

with $\alpha + 1 = \lambda/2$. This equation can be solved using $\sum_n P_n = 1$, $\sum_n P_n \ln n = C$ and $\sum_n P_n n = E$, which gives $C = \frac{K}{\beta^{2-\alpha}} \int_{a_0}^{\infty} dn \frac{\Gamma(2-\alpha, \beta n)}{n}$ and $E = \beta^{2-\alpha} \frac{\Gamma(2-\alpha, \beta)}{\Gamma(2-\alpha, \beta)}$ (with Γ the upper incomplete Gamma function). For $\beta = 0$ the constant in equation (5) becomes $K = (\lambda - 1)a_0^{\lambda-1}$, if urn sizes n can take values in $[a_0, \infty)$. Knowing K , the exponent λ can be determined from the condition $\sum_n P_n \ln n = C$. In continuous approximation $\int_{a_0}^{\infty} dn P_n \ln n = C$ this yields $\alpha + 1 = 1 + \frac{1}{C - \ln a_0}$. This result is independent of q and for $a_0 = 1$ simplifies to

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{C}. \quad (6)$$

For $\beta = 0$, α depends only on C , which is the logarithm of the geometric mean of urn sizes. Exponential decay β is only present if in addition $\langle n_i \rangle$ is conserved.

Numerical size distribution

Numerically the system converges to a power law distribution for urn sizes, in agreement with (5) derived with our entropy argument. However, this comparison requires an adjustment to how (3) is calculated. Approximating the entropy of a binomial $s(n) = \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi q(1-q)n) + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$ holds for large n , but yields $s_{n=1} = 0$. Urns of size 1 make up a large fraction of urns, and since they can grow, we need to account for their contribution to the total entropy. We calculated the exact entropies $s_{e,n=1}$ and $s_{e,n=2}$ from the definition $s_e = \sum_i p_i \ln p_i$, and then multiply their fraction by $s_{n=2}$ from the large- n -approximation: $s_{n=1} = \frac{s_{e,n=1}}{s_{e,n=2}} s_{n=2}$ with $\frac{s_{e,n=1}}{s_{e,n=2}} = \frac{q \ln q + (1-q) \ln(1-q)}{q^2 \ln q^2 + 2q(1-q) \ln[2q(1-q)] + (1-q)^2 \ln(1-q^2)} \approx 0.6$ for a wide range of q . We use an adjusted C

$$C_{corr} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \ln n + \sum_{i, n_i=1} \frac{s_{e,n=1}}{s_{e,n=2}} s_{n=2} \quad (7)$$

The correction is significant for high turnover rates where a large fraction of urns has size 1. The theoretical α is confirmed by the numerical one (see figures 1 a) and 3), so our entropy argument can be used to describe the size distribution. Simulations of the different cases show further that

- (I) The power law distribution has an exponential cutoff β , in agreement with (5). Although (6) holds only for $\beta = 0$, it only slightly overestimates α for $\beta > 0$, since the exponential cutoff affects only a small fraction of urns. In the presence of $\beta > 0$ C can be greater than 1, resulting in $\alpha < 1$, which would diverge without exponential cutoff.

- (II) and case (III) Individual $\langle n_i \rangle$ is not conserved, and already for low turnover rates $\mu > 0$ the cutoff β diminishes rapidly (see figure 1). The larger μ and the mean urn size E , the larger the fluctuations in number of removed balls in step 3, and the more the urn size distribution fluctuates. At each time-point, (7) and (6) give the correct exponent α , if the distribution follows a power law starting at size 1, even if this exponent fluctuates over time. For low μ , a range between power law and exponential decay can form: in that case also two separate power laws could be fitted. In that case the probability that $\frac{n_{i,t}}{n_{i,t-1}} \ll 1$ becomes very low for large urns, so that the large urns do not interact strongly with the smaller urns, and another power law forms from the large urns. It can again be described by a system maximizing entropy. Such distributions have been empirically observed [17].

Both α and β are independent of system size except if the system size is too low for convergence, in which case β increases (see figure 1 c). Simulation results are independent of the urn growth rate in one timestep, q , in agreement with our theoretical result in (6).

Growth rate probability density

It follows from the binomially (or normally) distributed $p(n_{i,t}|n_{i,t-1})$ (where $\sigma(n) \propto n^{0.5}$) that an urn's growth rate, defined as $g_{i,t} = \frac{n_{i,t}}{n_{i,t-1}}$, is also normally distributed

$$\mathcal{G}(g_{i,t}|n_{i,t-1}) = \sqrt{\frac{n_{i,t-1}}{2\pi c}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{n_i}{c} (g_{i,t-1})^2}, \quad (8)$$

with scaling $\sigma_g(n) \propto n^{-0.5}$. Dropping the index t , the aggregate growth rate distribution is $\mathcal{G}(g) = \sum_{i=1}^N p(n_i) \mathcal{G}(g_i|n_i)$, or in the continuous limit $\mathcal{G}(g) = \int_{n_0}^{\infty} dn \mathcal{G}(g|n) \rho(n)$. This can be evaluated using (8) and for $\rho(n)$ the expression (5). For $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\beta = 0$, yields a upper incomplete Gamma function shown in figure 2 and [19, 20]: $\mathcal{G}(g) \propto \Gamma(0, \frac{1}{2} n_0 (g-1)^2)$. Such 'tent-shaped' growth rate distributions are often observed for quantities that themselves follow a power-law [2, 10, 15, 23, 26, 28, 30]. This result adds credibility to our model, in particular since a tent-shaped growth rate distribution does not result from simpler multiplicative noise Langevin models for power law formation.

Extension to Networks

The algorithm can be adapted to derive the degree distribution for networks, where M nodes are connected with N undirected and unweighted links. The substeps become: (1. and 2.) A random link is broken, and one of its neighbors i is chosen to receive an additional link (i.e.

every node is picked with probability proportional to its degree n_i). Its new neighbor j is also picked with probability $\propto n_j$. (3.) Nodes are removed at random at rate δ_{exit} ; their links are broken. (4.) Nodes are re-introduced and linked to an existing node; the probability of selecting a node i as neighbor is $\propto n_i$. New links are added to keep N constant; each node has a probability of receiving a link $\propto n_i$. Compared to an urn/ball system, the exponential cutoff is increased for the following reasons: (i) the number of available neighbours, exclusion of multiple links between the same nodes, exclusion of self-links, (ii) additional features that can make the model more plausible e.g. for epidemiology, clustering [21, 22] or different exit rules, e.g. removal of a node after a given timespan instead of exit by rate δ_{exit} . These features cannot be written as simple constraint in the entropy functional (4), but it is possible to infer α and β in (5) numerically from E , μ and additional features (see figure 4).

DISCUSSION

We introduced a micro-founded growth process for systems and networks of constant size, whose stationary size distribution follows a power law with or without an exponential cutoff, depending on the mechanism that keeps system size constant. It can be deletion of balls (links), and deletion of urns (nodes). The stationary size distribution has been derived by maximizing the Gibbs-Shannon entropy under two constraints. The theoretical and numerical exponent α agree. Furthermore, if the average size E and turnover rate μ are known, the power law exponent α (via the constant C) and the exponential decay β can be inferred numerically (see figure 1). The method of using the entropies of probabilities of individual urns as constraint on entropy to derive urn size distribution can also reproduce established results: trivially for Brownian motion (where the standard deviation scaling exponent $\omega = 0$ and therefore $\alpha - 1 = 0$), and for the Yule process (or Barabasi-Albert for networks) where $\omega = 0.5$ but since urns neither shrink nor exit, C takes larger values. Our method also holds for multiplicative noise Langevin systems [8, 31] $n_{t+1} = \gamma n_t + \delta$. They can be written like $n_{t+1} = n_t + h(n, t)$ where the noise term appears now as an additive term. This (e.g. Gaussian) noise term $h(n, t)$ has then $\sigma_h(n) \propto n$, i.e. $\omega = 1$. In this case, a much larger number of urns will shrink to zero, since $p(0|n) = p_0 = const$ does not decrease for larger urns. Conservation of individual mean sizes $\langle n_i \rangle$ does not hold, so there is no constraint that accounts for exponential decay, which is also not present in numerical results. We derived the same size distributions for cases (I) and (II) numerically with another method using the exact probabilities for every individual urn, which we calculated with a recursion equation (see and figure and 5). Also this method can reproduce Zipf's law for

multiplicative noise Langevin systems.

Newman [25] derive the same equation (6) as a means to determine the exponent of power-law distributed data x . α is the exponent that maximizes the log-likelihood $P(\alpha|x)$, assuming $P(\alpha|x) \approx P(x|\alpha)$.

-
- [1] Reka Albert. Scale-free networks in cell biology. *Journal of cell science*, 118(21):4947–4957, 2005.
 - [2] Simone Alfarano, Mishael Milaković, Albrecht Irle, and Jonas Kauschke. A statistical equilibrium model of competitive firms. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 36(1):136–149, 2012.
 - [3] Luiz GA Alves, Haroldo V Ribeiro, and Renio S Mendes. Scaling laws in the dynamics of crime growth rate. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 392(11):2672–2679, 2013.
 - [4] Robert L Axtell. Zipf distribution of us firm sizes. *science*, 293(5536):1818–1820, 2001.
 - [5] Rohit Babbar, Cornelia Metzger, Ioannis Partalas, Eric Gaussier, and Massih-Reza Amini. On power law distributions in large-scale taxonomies. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 16(1):47–56, 2014.
 - [6] Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
 - [7] Albert-László Barabási, Réka Albert, and Hawoong Jeong. Scale-free characteristics of random networks: the topology of the world-wide web. *Physica A: statistical mechanics and its applications*, 281(1-4):69–77, 2000.
 - [8] Tamás S Biró and Antal Jakovác. Power-law tails from multiplicative noise. *Physical review letters*, 94(13):132302, 2005.
 - [9] Giulio Bottazzi, Elena Cefis, and Giovanni Dosi. Corporate growth and industrial structures: some evidence from the italian manufacturing industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(4):705–723, 2002.
 - [10] Giulio Bottazzi and Angelo Secchi. Explaining the distribution of firm growth rates. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 37(2):235–256, 2006.
 - [11] Sergey N Dorogovtsev and José Fernando F Mendes. Scaling behaviour of developing and decaying networks. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 52(1):33, 2000.
 - [12] Holger Ebel, Lutz-Ingo Mielsch, and Stefan Bornholdt. Scale-free topology of e-mail networks. *Physical review E*, 66(3):035103, 2002.
 - [13] Victor M Eguiluz, Dante R Chialvo, Guillermo A Cecchi, Marwan Baliki, and A Vania Apkarian. Scale-free brain functional networks. *Physical review letters*, 94(1):018102, 2005.
 - [14] Stephen Eubank, Hasan Guclu, VS Anil Kumar, Madhav V Marathe, Aravind Srinivasan, Zoltan Toroczkai, and Nan Wang. Modelling disease outbreaks in realistic urban social networks. *Nature*, 429(6988):180, 2004.
 - [15] Dongfeng Fu, Fabio Pammolli, Sergey V Buldyrev, Massimo Riccaboni, Kaushik Matia, Kazuko Yamasaki, and H Eugene Stanley. The growth of business firms: Theoretical framework and empirical evidence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(52):18801–18806, 2005.
 - [16] Stefan Lämmer, Björn Gehlsen, and Dirk Helbing. Scal-

ing laws in the spatial structure of urban road networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 363(1):89–95, 2006.

- [17] Benoit Mandelbrot. An informational theory of the statistical structure of language. *Communication theory*, 84:486–502, 1953.
- [18] Matteo Marsili and Yi-Cheng Zhang. Interacting individuals leading to zipf’s law. *Physical Review Letters*, 80(12):2741, 1998.
- [19] Cornelia Metzigg and Mirta Gordon. Heterogeneous enterprises in a macroeconomic agent-based model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.5575*, 2012.
- [20] Cornelia Metzigg and Mirta B Gordon. A model for scaling in firms size and growth rate distribution. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 398:264–279, 2014.
- [21] Cornelia Metzigg, Oliver Ratmann, Daniela Bezemer, and Caroline Colijn. Phylogenies from dynamic networks. *PLoS computational biology*, 15(2):e1006761, 2019.
- [22] Cornelia Metzigg, Julian Surey, Marie Francis, Jim Conneely, Ibrahim Abubakar, and Peter J White. Impact of hepatitis c treatment as prevention for people who inject drugs is sensitive to contact network structure. *Scientific reports*, 7(1):1833, 2017.
- [23] Hernan Mondani, Petter Holme, and Fredrik Liljeros. Fat-tailed fluctuations in the size of organizations: the role of social influence. *PLoS one*, 9(7):e100527, 2014.
- [24] Cristopher Moore, Gourab Ghoshal, and Mark EJ Newman. Exact solutions for models of evolving networks with addition and deletion of nodes. *Physical Review E*, 74(3):036121, 2006.
- [25] Mark EJ Newman. Power laws, pareto distributions and zipf’s law. *Contemporary physics*, 46(5):323–351, 2005.
- [26] S Picoli Jr, RS Mendes, LC Malacarne, and EK Lenzi. Scaling behavior in the dynamics of citations to scientific journals. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 75(4):673, 2006.
- [27] Nima Sarshar and Vwani Roychowdhury. Scale-free and stable structures in complex ad hoc networks. *Physical Review E*, 69(2):026101, 2004.
- [28] Yonathan Schwarzkopf, Robert Axtell, and J Doyne Farmer. An explanation of universality in growth fluctuations (*April 28, 2010*), 2010.
- [29] Herbert A Simon. On a class of skew distribution functions. *Biometrika*, 42(3/4):425–440, 1955.
- [30] Michael HR Stanley, Luis AN Amaral, Sergey V Buldyrev, Shlomo Havlin, Heiko Leschhorn, Philipp Maass, Michael A Salinger, and H Eugene Stanley. Scaling behaviour in the growth of companies. *Nature*, 379(6568):804, 1996.
- [31] Hideki Takayasu, Aki-Hiro Sato, and Misako Takayasu. Stable infinite variance fluctuations in randomly amplified langevin systems. *Physical Review Letters*, 79(6):966, 1997.
- [32] Misako Takayasu, Hayafumi Watanabe, and Hideki Takayasu. Generalised central limit theorems for growth rate distribution of complex systems. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 155(1):47–71, 2014.
- [33] Udny G. Yule. A mathematical theory of evolution, based on the conclusions of dr. jc willis, frs.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

In one growth and shrink cycle, an urn of size 1 can reach 3 possible states, 0, 1 and 2. Their probabilities can be calculated by the probability $p_g = q$ to grow by one in the growth step, and $p_s = \frac{1}{1+q}$ the probability to shrink by one. From this follows that

$$p(2|1) = p_g(2|1)p_s(2|2) = \frac{q}{(1+q)^2} \equiv \mathbf{v}$$

$$p(1|1) = p_g(1|1)p_s(1|1) + p_g(2|1)p_s(1|2) = \frac{1-q^2}{1+q} + \frac{2q}{(1+q)^2} = \frac{1+q^2}{(1+q)^2} \equiv \mathbf{w}$$

$$p(0|1) = p_g(1|1)p_s(0|1) + p_g(2|1)p_s(0|2) = \frac{(1-q)q}{1+q} + \frac{q^3}{(1+q)^2} = \frac{q}{(1+q)^2} \equiv \mathbf{v}$$

This probability mass function has mean $m = 1$ and variance $Var(X) = \mathbb{E}[(X-m)^2] = v(-1)^2 + w0^2 + v1^2 = 2v$. For an urn of size n , $\mathbb{E}(X) = \mathbb{E}(X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n) = \mathbb{E}(X_1) + \mathbb{E}(X_2) + \dots + \mathbb{E}(X_n) = n$, and $Var(X) = Var(X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n) = Var(X_1) + Var(X_2) + \dots + Var(X_n) = n2v$ and thus the standard deviation of an urn’s next size $p(n_{t+1}|n_t)$ scales as

$$\sigma(n) \propto n^{0.5} \quad (11)$$

with its size n . This scaling holds whenever growth is the sum of independent growth of balls.

Size distribution with exact probabilities

- (i) From (9)- (10), the probabilities $p(j|k)$, can be calculated, similar to Pascal’s triangle for binomial coefficients. The lowest possible j for an urn of size $n_{t-1} = k$ is always 0 (all balls leave), the largest is always $2k$ (all balls attract another ball). Every probability is itself a sum of terms

$$p(j|k) = \sum_{(x,y)|x+y=k; y_{max}=k-|k-j|} c_{x,y,j,k} \cdot v^x (1-2v)^y \quad (12)$$

We calculated the coefficients $c_{x,y,j,k}$ recursively from coefficients of the corresponding addends in the 3 terms $p(j|k-1)$, $p(j-1|k-1)$ and $p(j-2|k-1)$ with the corresponding powers x and y :


$$c_{x,y,j,k} = \sum_{j'=j-2, j-1, j} c_{x-1,y,j',k-1} + c_{x,y-1,j',k-1} \quad (13)$$

if j' exists, given $j' \in [0, 2(k-1)]$. The $c_{x,y,j,k}$ with $y = y_{max}$ is calculated first and no $c_{x,y,j',k-1}$ can be used in two addends for the same (j, k) . With (13) the coefficients and probabilities have been computed (until $n_{max} = 1000$). Care has been taken at the implementation since (12) and (13) sum over terms of very different orders of magnitude.


- (ii) With the transition probabilities $p(j|k)$ the most probable time evolution of an urn that started at size 1 can be calculated recursively like $p_t(n) = \sum_j p_{t-1}(j)p(n|j)$. $p_t(n=0)$ grows with t and approaches 1, since over time, the probability to have died out is increasing.
- (iii) Assuming that equilibrium has been obtained by continuously replacing urns of size 0 by urns of

size $n=1$, the equilibrium distribution is $P(n) = \frac{1}{t_{max}} \sum_t p_t(n)$. It is shown in figure (5).


The obtained size distribution can again be fitted by a power law with exponential cutoff (see figure 5). The method applies to other processes if $p(j|k)$ can be known. We used it also for multiplicative noise systems where Zipf's law is recovered as result (figure 5a).




(a) example of size distribution, in log-linear and double logarithmic scale. $\langle n \rangle = 20$, $\delta_{N,t} = 0.9$, $N = 10^5$.



(b) Numerical C vs mean E .



(c) Exponential cutoff β fitted to simulations for different system sizes and average urn sizes. For small system sizes, for high μ and E the cutoff eventually is no longer exponential and resembles another power law with higher exponent, which is why for $N = 10^3$ some β are lacking.



(d) β vs C for no turnover rate and different mean degrees in parantheses.

FIG. 1: Simulation results for different turnover rates




FIG. 2: Aggregate growth rate distribution, simulation and fit (for $\beta = 0, \alpha = 0.5$)




FIG. 3: Fitted vs calculated exponent α , for three different ways of accounting of urns of size 1.




FIG. 4: simulated clustered network, and simulation results for different turnover rates, $N = 10^3$




FIG. 5: Size distribution calculated numerically, (a) for the introduced process, (b) for multiplicative noise in the linear Langevin equation, to confirm the established result that the process generates Zipf's law.