Important node identification for complex networks based on improved Electre Multi-Attribute fusion

Qi Cao†, Yurong Song* and Min Li‡

College of Automation and College of Artificial Intelligence
Nanjing University of Posts and Communications
Nanjing 210023, P.R.China
†*1222056224@njupt.edu.cn*
**songyr@njupt.edu.cn*
‡*2022050608@njupt.edu.cn*

Ruqi Li and Hongbo Qu

School of Computer Science
Nanjing University of Posts and Communications
Nanjing 210023, P.R.China

Guo-Ping Jiang and Jingye Xiong

College of Automation and College of Artificial Intelligence
Nanjing University of Posts and Communications
Nanjing 210023, P.R.China

Influence maximization problem involves selecting a subset of seed nodes within a social network to maximize information spread under a given diffusion model, so how to identify the important nodes is the problem to be considered in this paper. Due to the great differences in the reality of the network, a class of multi-attribute decision fusion methods is often used to solve this problem. Electre is mostly used to solve the problems of investment order, benefit, and risk assessment of projects in economics, which supports the decision maker to make choices by comparing the differences between a set of alternatives. In this paper, we propose a multi-attribute decision fusion method named SK-E, which construct local and global metrics for different networks, use the improved Electre to make decision fusion between local and global metrics of nodes, to get the optimal weight between local and global metrics, and then identify the important nodes. The proposed method demonstrates superior accuracy compared to other methods, as evaluated through three experiments: the SIR epidemic model, the independent cascade model, and constraint efficiency. These experiments were conducted across six different real networks selected as the experimental dataset.

Keywords: complex network; importance nodes; multi-attribute decision fusion; influence maximization.

PACS numbers:89.75.Hc, 89.20.Ff

*Corresponding authors.

1. Introduction

All kinds of real networks in real life can be abstracted into complex network models through graph theory,[1–4] such as road traffic networks,[5] virus propagation networks,[6] and rumor information networks.[7] In the road transportation network, the transportation efficiency can be improved by finding the important nodes; in the epidemic virus transmission network, the crowd can be set as the nodes of the network, searching for the super-spreader, so as to curb the large-scale propagation of the virus; in the rumor information network, the spread of rumors can be blocked by searching for the important nodes, as well as controlling the public opinion. The identification of node influence[8–11] is an important issue in current research on complex networks. Currently there are numerous methods to study the identification of influential nodes in complex networks, and most of the real networks are huge and diverse, so it is still a considerable challenge for mining influential nodes in real networks.

Many classical methods have been currently proposed for the identification of important nodes. Freeman[12] proposed the DC (Degree Centrality), which is one of the most classic ones. Although this method is simple to calculate, it only considers the influence between a node and its neighbors, MarkSG[13] pointed out in the weak tie theory that not only neighboring nodes but also nodes that are distant from each other will influence each other in a network. The methods involving targeting the global structure of the network include CC (Closeness Centrality),[14] BC (betweenness centrality),[15] K-Shell,[16] PageRank,[17] CI (Collective Influence),[18]where CC and BC focus on the overall structural properties of the network, but have higher computational complexity. Kitsak[16] proposed the K-Shell method, selecting important nodes by hierarchically partitioning the network. A class of methods that has emerged in recent years primarily focuses on simultaneously considering the local properties of nodes and the overall structural characteristics of networks. Amir[19] proposed the MCDE, which comprehensively considers DC and CC, integrating them to form a new metric. The final outcome exhibits a substantial improvement over DC and CC. Hamad[20] proposed the ECRM , which not only takes into account the degree properties of nodes and the global structural characteristics of networks but also incorporates information entropy. They constructed a multi-attribute ranking method, resulting in a significant improvement compared to previous methods.

In reality, networks exhibit significant diversity, and a single method may not yield ideal results when applied to different networks. Taking into account how to balance the local properties and global structural characteristics of networks, we innovatively proposes the use of an improved Electre[21–23] for decision fusion. Firstly, local metrics and global metrics are established separately for the local properties and global structural characteristics of the network. The optimal weights between the two are obtained through simulation. The Electre is employed to integrate the local metrics and global metrics according to the optimal weights, ulti-

mately obtaining the ranking of node importance. Finally, the effectiveness of the proposed method is validated through three experiments: infectious disease modeling (SIR model),[33–35] information dissemination modeling (independent cascade IC model),[36] and network control (constraint efficiency).[38]

2. Method

Since the structures of different networks are not consistent, methods based on a single attribute may not be applicable to all networks. We developed the SD method, inspired by the degree-based approach, to represent local node attributes. The Ks_Entropy[24] incorporates entropy[25] while considering the global structural characteristics of the network, we utilizes the SD and Ks_Entropy methods to respectively represent the local properties and global structural characteristics of the network. Subsequently, local metrics and global metrics are constructed separately, and Electre is employed for decision fusion. Therefore, we use the acronyms of these three methods and refer to the method as SK-E. The implementation process of this method is as follows.

2.1. *The definition of loacl metrics and global metrics*

Firstly, for an undirected and unweighted network $G = (V, E)$, where V represents the nodes of the network, E represents the edges between nodes, n=$|V|$represents the number of nodes in the network, and m=$|E|$ represents the number of edges in the network. e_{ij} represents the connection relationship between node i and node j. The adjacency matrix of the network is as follows:

$$A = (a_{ij})_{n\times n} = \begin{cases} 1, & e_{ij} \in E \\ 0, & e_{ij} \notin E \end{cases}. \tag{1}$$

2.1.1. *Local metric definition*

The method proposed in this paper requires consideration of the local metric of nodes in the network. we define this metric as:

$$SD(i) = e^{\frac{d_i}{max(d)}}, \tag{2}$$

where i represents a node, d_i represents the degree of node i, $max(d)$ represents the maximum degree in the network.

2.1.2. *Global metric definition*

The method proposed in this paper needs to take into account the global structural characteristics of nodes in the network, as well as the situation of rich club formation caused by traditional K-Shell. Therefore, the Ks_Entropy is used to represent

the global metric. First, calculate the sum of the first-order K-Shell values of all neighbors of every node. The formula is as follows:

$$k_1^i = \sum_{j \in \Gamma_i} k_s(j), \tag{3}$$

where Γ_i represents the set of neighbors of node i, $k_s(j)$ represents the K-Shell value of node j. Therefore, the Ks_Entropy value of node i is as follows:

$$Ks\_Entrophy(i) = -\frac{k_s(i)}{k_1^i} \times \log \frac{k_s(i)}{k_1^i}. \tag{4}$$

2.2. *Utilizing Optimization-based Electre for Fusion*

To obtain the optimal weights between local and global metrics for each network, we introduce different weight variables for local and global metrics. Subsequently, we utilize the Electre to fuse them. The specific process for implementing this method is as follows:

(1) Based on the nodes in the network, the decision matrix X of $n \times 2$ order is obtained by calculating local and global metrics, $\{x_{il} \in X | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, l = 1, 2\}$, The matrix is as follows:

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{n1} & x_{n2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} SD_1 & Ks\_Entropy_1 \\ SD_2 & Ks\_Entropy_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ SD_n & Ks\_Entropy_n \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

where x_{il} represents the l-th index of the i-th node. SD_i represents the local metric of the i-th node. $Ks\_Entropy_i$ represents the global metric of the i-th node.

(2) The decision matrix X is normalized to obtain the normalized matrix of $n \times 2$ order, This is done to convert different metrics into the same scale. The specific formula is as follows:

$$x_{il}^* = \frac{x_{il} - x_{min}}{x_{max} - x_{min}}, \tag{6}$$

where x_{max} represents the maximum value in the l-th column of the matrix, and x_{min} represents the minimum value in the l-th column of the matrix.

(3) The normalized matrix X^* is used to obtain the weighted decision matrix R of $n \times 2$ order, $\{r_{il} \in R | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, l = 1, 2\}$, the local metric and global metric under different weights affect the decision-making effectiveness. We employ a traversal method to find the optimal weight between these two metrics in the network. The calculation formula is as follows:

$$r_{il} = x_{il}^* \times w_l, \tag{7}$$

where r_{il} represents the weighted value of the l-th metric of node i, w_l represents the weight corresponding to the l-th metric.

(4) For the local metric and global metric of each pair of nodes i and j in the network, suppose the set of indicators is $L = \{SD, Ks\_Entropy\}$. By partitioning the set of metrics into two disjoint subsets, the former consisting of metrics in node i with weighted values not less than those in node j, is referred to as the harmonious set H_{ij} of node i with respect to node j. The latter consists of metrics in node i weighted values lower than those in node j, termed as the disharmonious set B_{ij} of node i with respect to node j.

(5) Based on the harmonious set H_{ij}, constructing an $n \times n$ order harmony matrix C to assess the relative superiority of the weight proportion of two metrics between two nodes, $\{c_{ij} \in C | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. The calculation formula is as follows:

$$c_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{l \in H_{ij}} w_l}{\sum_{l \in L} w_l}, \tag{8}$$

where w_l represents the weight of the l-th metric, $L = \{SD, Ks\_Entropy\}$, c_{ij} represents the harmony index between nodes i and j. If c_{ij} is larger, it indicates that the extent to which the methods' weights of node i exceed those of node j is greater.

(6) Based on the disharmonious set B_{ij}, constructing an $n \times n$ order disharmony matrix D to reflect the relative superiority of the scores of two metrics obtained between two nodes, $\{d_{ij} \in D | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. The calculation formula is as follows:

$$d_{ij} = \frac{max_{l \in B_{ij}} |r_{il} - r_{jl}|}{max_{l \in L} |r_{il} - r_{jl}|}, \tag{9}$$

where d_{ij} represents the disharmony index of node i with respect to node j. If d_{ij} is larger, it indicates that the scores of different metrics of node i are more inferior to those of node j.

(7) To reflect the relative superiority of the comprehensive performance of each pair of nodes under the fusion decision of two metrics, using the harmony matrix C and the disharmony matrix D, the comprehensive dominance matrix U of $n \times n$ order is determined. Its calculation formula is as follows:

$$u_{ij} = c_{ij} - d_{ij}, \tag{10}$$

where u_{ij} represents the dominance coefficient of node i over node j. If u_{ij} is larger, it indicates that the dominance of node i over node j is stronger, and node i is superior to node j in the evaluation.

(8) Calculate the net dominance coefficient ζ_i for each node based on the comprehensive dominance matrix U. Its calculation formula as follows:

$$\zeta_i = \sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^{n} (u_{ik} - u_{ki}), i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \tag{11}$$

where ζ_i represents the comprehensive utility of nodes after fusion using the Electre. If ζ_i is larger, it indicates that the utility of the node is better, meaning that the node's influence is greater. Sort the nodes in descending order according to their values of ζ_i, then select the key nodes based on the sorting results.

3. Example

As shown in Fig. 1, this is a complex network structure containing 12 nodes and 16 connected edges. Firstly, the local metric as well as the global metric of each node



Fig. 1: Sample network.

are calculated using SD method and Ks_Entropy method respectively, and these two metrics are constructed into a decision matrix X through Eq. (5). To normalize X^*, we apply Eq. (6). Since this is a sample network, we are not currently seeking the optimal weights for these two metrics. Later on, we will specifically select different weights for each real network's two metrics and experiment to obtain an optimal weight between the two metrics for each network. Furthermore, we define the sum of weights between the two metrics as 1. Therefore, for now, we set the weight of the local metric to 0.7 and the weight of the global metric to 0.3. By using Eq. (7), we compute the weighted decision matrix R. The calculated matrixs for X, X^*, and R are as follows:

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 1.22 & 0.3465 \\ 1.82 & 0.3662 \\ 2.71 & 0.3342 \\ 1.82 & 0.3662 \\ 2.71 & 0.3218 \\ 1.82 & 0.3662 \\ 1.49 & 0.3465 \\ 1.49 & 0.3465 \\ 1.82 & 0.3665 \\ 1.49 & 0.3662 \\ 1.22 & 0 \\ 1.49 & 0.3465 \end{bmatrix}, X^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.9454 \\ 0.4026 & 0.9991 \\ 1 & 0.9118 \\ 0.4026 & 0.9991 \\ 1 & 0.8780 \\ 0.4026 & 0.9991 \\ 0.1812 & 0.9454 \\ 0.1812 & 0.9454 \\ 0.4026 & 1 \\ 0.1812 & 0.9991 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0.1812 & 0.9454 \end{bmatrix}, R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.2836 \\ 0.2818 & 0.2997 \\ 0.7 & 0.2735 \\ 0.2818 & 0.2997 \\ 0.7 & 0.2634 \\ 0.2818 & 0.2997 \\ 0.1268 & 0.2836 \\ 0.1268 & 0.2836 \\ 0.2818 & 0.3 \\ 0.1268 & 0.2836 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0.1268 & 0.2836 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

According on the matrix R, we obtain the harmonious set H and the disharmonious set B between each pair of nodes. For example, when analyzing nodes 1 and 2 in the sample network, the local metric LI and the global metric GI of node 1 are both smaller than those of node 2. Therefore, the harmonious set H between these nodes is empty, and the disharmonious set B consists of $\{SD, Ks\_Entropy\}$. By applying Eq. (8), we calculate c_{12} as 0, similarly, c_{21} as 1.Through this method, we can obtain the harmonic centrality of any two nodes in the entire network.

Consequently, the harmony matrix C is as follows:

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0.3 \\ 1 & 0 & 0.3 & 1 & 0.3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0.7 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0.7 & 0.7 & 0 & 0.7 & 1 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 1 & 0.7 \\ 1 & 1 & 0.3 & 0 & 0.3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0.7 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 0.7 & 1 & 0.7 \\ 1 & 1 & 0.3 & 1 & 0.3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0.7 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0.7 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0.7 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0.3 & 1 & 0.3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0.7 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0.7 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

Similarly, according to Eq. (9), the disharmony matrix D is computed as follows:

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.01 & 0.06 & 0 & 0.06 & 0 & 0.06 & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.06 & 0.04 & 0 & 0.01 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.02 & 0.08 & 1 & 0.08 & 0 & 0.08 & 0.03 & 0.03 & 0.08 & 0.06 & 0 & 0.03 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{14}$$

According to Eq. (10), the comprehensive dominance matrix U is calculated as follows:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & -0.7 & -0.7 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -0.7 \\ 1 & 0 & -0.7 & 1 & -0.7 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -0.3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0.68 & 0.63 & 0 & 0.63 & 1 & 0.63 & 0.68 & 0.68 & 0.63 & 0.65 & 1 & 0.68 \\ 1 & 1 & -0.7 & 0 & -0.7 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -0.3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0.67 & 0.61 & -0.3 & 0.61 & 0 & 0.61 & 0.66 & 0.66 & 0.61 & 0.63 & 1 & 0.66 \\ 1 & 1 & -0.7 & 1 & -0.7 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -0.3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -0.3 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -0.3 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -0.7 & 1 & -0.7 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -0.7 & -0.7 & -0.7 & -0.7 & -0.7 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ -0.3 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & -0.7 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -0.3 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

In the end, we computed the net dominance coefficients of the nodes using Eq. (11), yielding the following results: (−16.55, 7.74, 15.53, 7.74, 13.25, 7.74, −8.34, −8.34, 12.75, −1.89, −21.3, −8.34). After arranging them in descending order, the sequence of nodes is (3, 5, 9, 2, 4, 6, 10, 7, 8, 12, 1, 11). As shown in Tab.1, we present the ranking results of the nodes for eight different methods. The first column in the table represents the node numbers, followed by the rankings of node importance obtained by various methods. According to the data in the table, it can be observed that the results obtained by different methods vary on the same network.

Table 1: Node ranking under different methods.

Node	DC	BC	CC	CI	Ks_Entropy	MCDE	ECRM	SK-E
1	11	11	10	10	10	11	9	10
2	3	9	6	7	6	4	3	4
3	1	3	2	2	2	1	2	1
4	4	2	1	4	3	5	4	5
5	2	5	3	3	4	2	1	2
6	5	8	7	6	9	6	5	6
7	7	10	9	8	7	7	7	8
8	8	7	5	5	8	8	8	9
9	6	1	4	1	1	3	6	3
10	9	4	8	9	5	9	10	7
11	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
12	10	6	11	11	11	10	11	11

4. Expriment

4.1. *Datasets*

To validate the effectiveness of our method, Six real network datasets, denoted as social network,[26] dolphin network,[27] road network,[28] power network,[29] friend network,[30] and Usair network[31] are employed for analysis. The basic topological structures and characteristics of these networks are shown in Tab.2. Where n rep-

Table 2: Network topology and characteristics.

Network	n	m	$\langle k \rangle$	k_{max}	$\langle c \rangle$	$\langle l \rangle$	$\langle k^2 \rangle$
Social	217	1839	16.94	56	0.362	2.39	112.43
Dolphin	291	3182	21.82	99	0.682	-	167.84
Power	685	1967	5.74	14	0.172	12.42	58.6
Friend	1133	5450	9.62	71	0.221	3.61	87.45
Road	1177	1420	2.41	10	0.016	-	10.95
Usair	332	21236	12.81	139	0.625	2.74	183.44

resents the number of nodes in the network, m represents the number of edges in

the network, $\langle k \rangle$ represents the average degree of the network, k_{max} represents the maximum degree in the network, $\langle c \rangle$ represents the average clustering coefficient, $\langle l \rangle$ represents the average path length of the network. As the dolphin network and road network are not connected networks, the average path length does not exist. $\langle k^2 \rangle$ represents the average square degree of the network.

4.2. *Evaluation methods*

The current landscape of evaluating node importance boasts a variety of methods, among which some prominent ones include the Kendall coefficient,[32] viral propagation model,[33–35] independent cascade model,[36] Pearson coefficient,[37] and constraint efficiency.[38] We employs three methods as evaluation metrics, namely the SIR epimedic propagation model, independent cascade model, and constraint efficiency.

4.2.1. *Epidemic propagation model*

The SIR propagation model is widely used in processes such as disease transmission. We adopts this model to assess the influence of selected important nodes. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the SIR model divides all nodes in the network into three states: susceptible (S), infected (I), and recovered (R). In this model, it is assumed that certain initial nodes are infected, while the rest are susceptible. During the propagation process, infected nodes infect susceptible neighbors with an infection rate α. Simultaneously, infected nodes recover at a recovery rate β and become recovered nodes, no longer susceptible to infection. The propagation halts when there are no more infected nodes in the network.



Fig. 2: SIR propagation process.

The influence of nodes is characterized by summing the infected and recovered nodes in the network, denoted as $F(t)$. The representation of $F(t)$ is as follows:

$$F(t) = I(t) + R(t), \tag{16}$$

where t represents the number of days of propagation, $I(t)$ denotes the number of infections on the t-th day, and $R(t)$ denotes the number of recoveries on the t-th day. Before the propagation starts, the identified key nodes are set as infected nodes. After propagation stops, the sum of infected and recovered nodes in the network, denoted as $F(t)$.

4.2.2. *Independent cascade model*

The independent cascade model is a classic information propagation model in dynamic network systems. In this model, for a given network, nodes are categorized into active and inactive states. Suppose at time t, node i is in the active state, and its neighbor j is inactive. Then, node i will attempt to activate node j with a probability $p \in (0, 1)$. If successful, node j becomes active at time $t + 1$. Regardless of success or failure, node i cannot attempt to activate node j again. If node j has multiple neighbors in the active state at time t, the order in which they attempt to activate node j is arbitrary. The system propagates from the initial state until no new nodes can be activated. In this study, important nodes obtained from various methods are set as initial active nodes. Finally, the number of active nodes in the network is counted to represent the influence of the nodes.

4.2.3. *Constraint efficiency*

In real-world networks, which are often vast in scale and structurally complex, achieving complete control over the network typically requires significant costs. In practice, to minimize costs, only a small fraction of nodes in the network are controlled to attain a specific state within a limited time frame. This process is known as constraint control. We introduce a measure of constraint efficiency denoted by P, with the formula as follows:

$$P = \frac{1}{Q_{max}} \sum_{Q=1}^{Q_{max}} \frac{1}{\mu_1(\lambda_{-Q})}, \tag{17}$$

where Q_{max} represents the maximum number of selected key node sets, λ_{-Q} is a principal submatrix obtained by deleting the Q-th row and Q-th column from the original Laplacian matrix, $\mu_1(\lambda_{-Q})$ is the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of λ_{-Q}. The original Laplacian matrix is defined as $\lambda = [\lambda_{ij}]_{n\times n}$. If there is an edge between node i and node j and $i \neq j$, then $\lambda_{ij} = -1$. If there is no edge between nodes i and j, then $\lambda_{ij} = 0$. If $i = j$, then $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ii} = -\sum_{j\neq i} \lambda_{ij}$.The constraint efficiency P being smaller indicates faster decay and hence better performance. In this study, the ranking index set of key nodes obtained through the method will be selected according to the size of Q_{max}, and the top $0.05N$ to $0.1N$ important nodes will be taken to validate the performance.

4.3. *Experimental results and Analysis*

4.3.1. *Search for the optimal weights*

This experiment utilizes the $F(t)$ from SIR as a criterion to search for the weights of two fundamental metrics, on the real network. Because Pastor[39] found in their study on epimedic spread in networks that when the infection rate threshold reaches $\lambda_c \geq \frac{\langle k\rangle}{\langle k^2\rangle}$, the epimedic undergoes explosive propagation. Therefore, in this experiment,

the infection rate of the network is set as follows:

$$\alpha = \frac{\langle k \rangle}{\langle k^2 \rangle}, \tag{18}$$

where $\langle k \rangle$ represents the average degree of the network, $\langle k^2 \rangle$ represents the average square degree of the network, and the recovery rate β is uniformly set to 0.2. In this experiment, the SIR iteration is performed 500 times, and the infection duration is 20 days. Here, the x-axis represents the weight assigned to the global metric obtained through Ks_Entropy, so the weight assigned to the local metric obtained through SD is $1 - x$. The y-axis represents $F(t)$, which is the sum of infected and recovered nodes in the network after 20 days of infection. According to the simulation results in Fig. 3, the optimal weights of local metric and global metric corresponding to the maximum $F(t)$ vary for different networks. It can be observed from the graph that for social and friend networks, the optimal weight for global metric is 0.45, indicating that when the local metric accounts for 0.55, after 20 days of propagation, $F(t)$ reaches its maximum. For the power network, the optimal weight for global metric is 0.55. The optimal weight for global metric in the road network is 0.7. For the dolphin network, the optimal weight for global metric is 0.35. And for the Usair network, the optimal weight for global metric is 0.25.



(a) Road (b) Power (c) Friend

(d) Social (e) Dolphin (f) Usair

Fig. 3: The real network is affected by the weight change of the two metrics.

According on the analysis of the results, it can be inferred that networks with highly connected nodes, such as dolphin, Usair, and social networks, which ex-

hibit scale-free[40] characteristics, have significantly lower optimal weight ratios for global metric compared to other networks. This indirectly suggests that in scale-free networks with a high degree of clustering among central nodes, the attributes between the nodes themselves and their neighbors are more important than the overall structural information of the network. For instance, in the case of dolphin and Usair networks, the average degree is exceptionally high. Through this experiment, it becomes apparent that for such networks, our focus should primarily be on their local attributes. On the other hand, networks like road and power networks, which exhibit relatively lower average degrees, emphasize the importance of the global metric compared to other networks. Therefore, for sparse networks, it is crucial to consider their global structural characteristics.

4.3.2. *SIR comparative experiment*

In this experiment, the initial size of the critical node set in the power network is set to 40, while it is set to 50 for other networks. The infection rate is set to α, and the recovery rate is set to 0.2. The simulation duration is 50 days. As shown in Fig. 4, across the six real datasets of road, power, friend, social, dolphin, and Usair, the SK-E method proposed in this paper consistently outperforms other methods in simulating virus transmission.



(a) Road (b) Power (c) Friend

(d) Social (e) Dolphin (f) Usair

Fig. 4: Comparison experiment results of SIR Model.

4.3.3. *Independent cascade comparative experiment*

As shown in Fig. 5, due to the varying sizes of real networks, different activation probability ranges are selected for each network. For the dolphin network, the activation probability range is set to $[0.02, 0.03]$, with an initial number of activated nodes set to 10. For the friend network, the activation probability range is set to $[0.1, 0.11]$, with an initial number of activated nodes set to 20. For the power network, the activation probability range is set to $[0.1, 0.35]$, with an initial number of activated nodes set to 10. For the road network, the activation probability range is set to $[0.1, 0.35]$, with an initial number of activated nodes set to 10. For the social network, the activation probability range is set to $[0.02, 0.03]$, with an initial number of activated nodes set to 10. For the Usair network, the activation probability range is set to $[0.01, 0.035]$, with an initial number of activated nodes set to 10. From the results, it is evident that in the power and road networks, SK-E significantly outperforms other methods. In the friend, social, and Usair networks, although there are instances where SK-E performs worse than other methods at certain probabilities, overall, SK-E still performs better than other methods.



(a) Road (b) Power (c) Friend

(d) Social (e) Dolphin (f) Usair

Fig. 5: Comparison results of independent cascade experiments.

4.3.4. *Constraint efficiency comparative experiment*

When the constraint efficiency P is smaller, it indicates better performance, while also suggesting greater influence of the selected critical nodes. As shown in Tab.3, taking the critical node set of size $0.05N$ as the experimental set. However, in other networks, the constraint efficiency of the proposed SK-E is lower than other methods. Similarly, in Tab.4, taking the critical node set of size $0.1N$ as the experimental set, although it surpasses BC, ECRM, Ks_Entrophy, and DC in the power network, and its constraint efficiency is only higher than CC in the dolphin network, the overall results analysis indicates that this method is superior overall. Therefore, this experiment also demonstrates that the proposed SK-E can identify more critical nodes effectively.

Table 3: Constraint efficiency of the first 0.05N network nodes.

Network	SK-E	ECRM	MCDE	Ks_Entropy	DC	CC	BC	CI
Social	1.824	2.131	1.929	1.945	1.925	1.939	1.875	1.911
Dolphin	8.422	8.556	8.889	9.051	8.673	9.121	8.431	9.102
Power	1.788	1.791	2.263	1.715	1.791	1.787	1.791	2.264
Friend	4.197	4.481	4.365	5.274	4.382	5.107	5.073	4.361
Road	2.213	2.411	2.412	2.875	2.989	2.477	2.693	2.722
Usair	3.174	3.993	5.242	8.955	5.221	6.659	4.170	5.149

Table 4: Constraint efficiency of the first 0.1N network nodes.

Network	SK-E	ECRM	MCDE	Ks_Entropy	DC	CC	BC	CI
Social	1.153	1.466	1.264	1.265	1.255	1.274	1.222	1.254
Dolphin	4.455	4.642	7.423	5.998	5.816	2.096	5.689	5.547
Power	1.513	1.091	2.123	1.112	1.268	1.535	1.143	1.996
Friend	3.481	3.739	3.682	4.223	3.691	4.049	4.031	3.679
Road	1.911	2.315	2.097	2.442	2.598	2.227	2.374	2.433
Usair	1.496	2.322	3.171	8.955	3.812	3.915	2.973	3.776

5. Conclusion

This paper proposes a multi-attribute fusion method based on Electre decision-making to find the optimal weights between local attributes and global structural characteristics for each network, and then uses fusion to obtain the most important nodes in the network. The proposed method is compared with some popular algorithms for searching important nodes in complex networks. Through comparative experiments conducted in SIR model, independent cascade model, and constraint efficiency, the feasibility of the proposed method is ultimately verified. According

to the experimental results, the proposed SK-E method generally achieves better results compared to other methods when dealing with different types of networks. While the SK-E method resolves the limitation of prior single methods for arbitrary network types, the use of global network information in this study results in slightly increased computational complexity, because the Electre method used in this paper is a type of multi-attribute fusion decision-making method, but the paper only considers two metrics: local and global metrics. Therefore, future research could further enhance the fusion by adding semi-global, semi-local, or machine learning-related methods based on local and global metrics.

Acknowledgments

The research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China(Grant Nos. 62373197), and Jiangsu Province Graduate Research and Practice Innovation Program Project (Grant Nos. KYCX22_1018).

References

1. A. Barabasi and R. Albert, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999).
2. X. F. Wang, X. Li and G. R. chen, *Complex network theory and applications* (Tsinghua University Press, 2006).
3. C. J. Stam and J. C. Reijneveld, *Nonlinear Biomed Phys.* **1**, 3 (2007).
4. A. Lan and O. Jm, *Eur Phys J B* **38**, 147 (2004).
5. Z. Y. Gao, X. M. Zhao, H. J. Huang and B. H. Mao, *J. Transp. Syst. Eng. Inf. Technol.* **6**, 41 (2006).
6. S. Kumar, S. Jar and S. Rar, *Indian J Public Health* **64**, 139 (2020).
7. Y. F. Xing, X. W. Wang, C. C. Qiu, Y. Q. Li and W. He, *Technol. Soc.* **68**, 101902 (2022).
8. L. Y. Lv, D. B. Chen and X. L. Ren, *Phys. Rep.* **650**, 1 (2016).
9. M. L. Li and H. C. Kang, *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **160**, 112136 (2022).
10. X. Xu, C. Zhu, Q. Y. Wang, X. Q. Zhu and Y. Zhou, *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 2691 (2022).
11. L. Y, T. Zhou, Q. M. Zhang and H. E. Stanley, *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 10168 (2016).
12. L. C. Freeman, *Soc Networks* **1**, 215 (1978).
13. M. SG, *Am. J. Sociol.* **78**, 6 (1973).
14. S. G, *Psychometrika* **31**, 581 (1966).
15. L. C. Freeman, *Sociometry* **40**, 35 (1977).
16. M. Kitsak, L. K. Gallos, S. Havlin and F. Liljeros *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 888 (2010).
17. A. N. Langville and C. D. Meyer *Google's PageRank and beyond - the science of search engine rankings* (Princeton University Press, 2011)
18. F. Morone and H. A. Makse, *Nature* **524**, 65 (2015).
19. A. Sheikhahmadi and M. A. Nematbakhsh, *J. Inf. Sci.* **43**, 412 (2017).
20. A. Zareie, A. Sheikhahmadi, M. Jalili and M. S. K. Fasaei, *Knowl Based Syst.* **194**, 105580 (2020).
21. J. R. Figueira, S. Greco, B. Roy and R. Slowinski, *Int. Ser. Oper. Res. Manag. Sci.* **20**, 61 (2016).
22. M. Rogers, M. Bruen and L. Maystre, *Engineering* (Springer, 2000).
23. V. Mousseau and R. Slowinski, *J Glob Optim* **12**, 157 (1998).
24. H. L. Yuan and F. Chong, *Comput. Sci.* **49**, 210800177 (2022).

25. D. Tsai, Y. Lee and E. Matsuyama, *J Digit Imaging* **21**, 338 (2008).
26. J. W. Luo,J. Wu and Y. Z. Wu, *Complexity* **2020**, 3576542 (2020).
27. S. k. Zhang, C. T. Li and S. D. Lin, *Knowl Inf Syst* **62**, 4277 (2020).
28. H. Zhang and Y. A. Yao, *Wirel. Pers. Commun.* **107**, 193 (2019).
29. A. Dwivedi and X. H. Yu *IEEE Trans Industr Inform.* **9**, 81 (2013).
30. X. F. Wang and G. R. Chen *IEEE Circuits Syst. Mag.* **3**, 6 (2003).
31. Z. L. Huang and G. S. Qin *Comput Stat* **38**, 1041 (2023).
32. A. Zeng and W. P. Liu *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 066130 (2023).
33. N. Me *Phys Rev E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys.* **66**, 016128 (2002).
34. I. Cooper, A. Mondal and C. G. Antonopoulos, *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **139**, 110057 (2020).
35. Y. C. Cheng, P. E. Lu and C. S. Chang, *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.* **7**, 3279 (2020).
36. W. Liu, B. Jeon, L. Chen and B. L. Chen *Appl. Intell.* **49**, 912 (2019).
37. W. L. Feng,, Q. Y. Zhu, J. Zhuang and S. M. Yu *Cluster Comput* **22**, 7401 (2019).
38. Y. Yang and J. F. Wang *Journal of Sichuan University (Natural Science Edition)* **3**, 49 (2023).
39. C. Castellano and R. Pastor *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 218701 (2023).
40. A. L. Barabasi, *Science* **325**, 412 (2009).