

# Network Growth Under Opportunistic Attachment

Carolina Mattsson\*

June 18, 2024

## Abstract

Growing network models can potentially be a useful tool in the development of economic theory. This work introduces an “opportunistic attachment” mechanism where incoming nodes, in deciding where to join a network, consider features of the entry points available to them. For example, an entrepreneur looking to start a thriving business might consider the expected revenue of many hypothetical businesses. This mechanism is explored, in isolation, via a minimal model where PageRank serves to score the available opportunities. Despite its simplicity, this model gives rise to rich node dynamics, path-dependence, and an unexpected degenerate structure. We go on to argue that this model might be useful to theoretical development as a maximally stylised model of entrepreneurial growth. Central to the argument is an alternative set of microfoundations introduced in Leontief and Brody 1993 whereby the steady state of a random walk is a notion of economic equilibrium. To the extent this argument holds, our findings suggest that entrepreneurs face a shifting “opportunity space” where the number of potential business opportunities is effectively unbounded. Opportunistic attachment is thus a candidate mechanism for relating the structure of an economic system to its future growth.

Keywords: networks, growth, path dependence, pagerank

JEL Codes: L14, C63, Z13, O10

---

\*CENTAI, Corso Inghilterra 3, 10138, Turin, Italy. mattsson.c@northeastern.edu.

# 1 Introduction

Models of growing networks have proven to be useful in studying social and biological systems, where it is now understood that relatively simple mechanisms can lead to the emergence of complex phenomena. For instance, linear preferential attachment—where incoming nodes are more likely to establish ties to existing nodes with more existing ties—is enough to produce highly non-linear “rich get richer” dynamics (Barabási and Albert 1999; Krapivsky, Redner, and Leyvraz 2000; Barabasi 2016). This has well-studied implications for the resilience, dynamics, and predictability of complex systems (Albert, Jeong, and Barabasi 2000; Pastor-Satorras and Vespignani 2001; Salganik, Dodds, and Watts 2006). There is also substantial evidence of preferential attachment in economic systems (Atalay et al. 2011; Ozaki et al. 2024). Indeed, economic systems can be seen as growing networks in the sense that new businesses (or, any economic entities) establish ties to existing ones as they begin economic activities. However, it is not clear that preferential attachment would be the only mechanism relevant for growing economic systems.

This work introduces “opportunistic attachment” to reflect stylized scenarios where incoming nodes, in deciding where to join the network, consider features of the entry points available to them. As an example, entrepreneurs generally consider the expected revenue of a hypothetical business in deciding whether to start that business (Cassar 2006). The expected revenue depends on both which suppliers are selected and which customers are targeted. The corresponding family of growing network models is one where “opportunity” is operationalized as a metric computed for each entry point that a new node can choose to step into. This is substantially different from the family of growing network models where “preference” is operationalized as a metric computed for the existing nodes to which a new node can choose to connect (Overgoor, Benson, and Ugander 2019; Overgoor, Pakapol Supaniratisai, and Ugander 2020).

We study growing networks under opportunistic attachment where PageRank (Page et al. 1999) is used to quantify opportunity. In the minimal version, incoming nodes place one incoming link and one outgoing link. The projected PageRank is computed for each entry point available to the incoming node. In close analogy to generalized preferential attachment (Krapivsky, Redner, and Leyvraz 2000), incoming nodes select a network position in proportion to this value to a power of  $\gamma$ . Selection is random when  $\gamma = 0$ , and, when  $\gamma$  is high enough, incoming nodes consistently choose optimally with respect to the opportunity score of the available entry points. This paper focuses on the early behavior of this minimal model, where exhaustive search remains computationally feasible. More generally, incoming nodes encounter a rapidly expanding opportunity space in that the number of possible entry points grows combinatorially with the number of existing nodes.

Computational simulation reveals that highly endogenous, path-dependent system dynamics emerge already with the minimal model of network growth under opportunistic attachment. Initial node rank is highly stochastic, but the distribution of opportunity scores encountered by later nodes depends on the intensity of selection by earlier nodes. When the selection of entry point is near-optimal, the stochastic entry of a single node can appreciably shift the opportunity space for subsequent nodes. We see familiar patterns of advantage over time for early nodes at lower selection intensities. However, when choices are sufficiently opportunistic we begin to see a second dynamic whereby new nodes have a chance to take advantage of new opportunities and some are lucky enough to become larger than the old. Finally, when taken to the extreme, these dynamics produce network growth in one principal direction where early nodes end up “left behind”.

It is then argued that this growing network model could be useful as a tool for the development of theory on entrepreneurial growth in economic systems. In support of this argument, we outline a theoretical basis for the main assumptions relating our growing network model to entrepreneurial economies. Central to the

argument is an alternative set of microfoundations introduced in Leontief and Brody 1993 whereby “the flow of money [can be] described as a Markov chain. Its ergodic state is equivalent to the economic equilibrium” (*Theorem 1*, p. 228). This deliberate theoretical grounding makes our growing network model a highly stylized representation of economic systems where “entrepreneurs” seeking out profitable business opportunities is the dominant mechanism of growth.

The contribution of this paper is to suggest that several complex phenomena found in real economic systems might be usefully related via an opportunistic attachment mechanism. In that the aim is to support theoretical development, we deliberately consider a minimally complicated (i.e., maximally stylized) model. Further research is needed to explore the empirical validity of the theoretical assumptions grounding our model. Even so, our findings provide a compelling rationale for the development of specific and explicit theories of evolution within economic systems. Even the most highly stylized of entrepreneurs face a shifting “opportunity space” where the number of potential business opportunities is effectively unbounded. This suggests that discrete choice is inherently limited as a framework for studying entrepreneurial growth. The selection mechanism in more realistic future models ought perhaps to be fundamentally evolutionary in nature.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the growing network model. Section 3 presents our findings on its early behavior. Section 4 details the theoretical argument relating growth under opportunistic attachment to entrepreneurial growth in economic systems. Section 5 discusses the implications of the findings insofar as the proposed economic theory is sound.

## 2 Growing network model

This work uses computational simulation to explore a minimal model of network growth under opportunistic attachment. The initial configuration is, in each instance of the simulation, a simple cycle of three nodes. Incoming nodes then enter the network one by one, each placing a single incoming link and a single outgoing link. The node entering the network at step  $N$  encounters an existing network of  $N - 1$  nodes, where there are  $(N - 1) \cdot (N - 2)$  possible entry points available to select. The entering node considers the  $(N - 1) \cdot (N - 2)$  potential new networks, where it has joined at each of the possible entry points. Our metric for the quality of the “opportunity” available to the incoming node at an entry point is the score given to the incoming node when the PageRank algorithm is run on the potential new network. This score reflects the stationary probability of a random walk at the new node’s position within the potential new network; we include 5% probability of random jumps (Page et al. 1999,  $\alpha = 0.95$ ).

The selection probability assigned to each available entry point derives from the  $(N - 1) \cdot (N - 2)$  projected PageRank scores, scaled by the largest value. This vector of scores is raised to a power of  $\gamma$  before being divided by its sum, in close analogy to generalized models of network growth under preferential attachment (Krapivsky, Redner, and Leyvraz 2000, see below). This probability weighting is used to stochastically select the position at which the incoming node enters the network. When  $\gamma = 0$ , positions are randomly selected. When  $\gamma$  is high enough, entering nodes are consistently choosing optimally with respect to the opportunity score. This “intensity” of the opportunistic attachment mechanism is used in the remainder of this work to explore the effect of the mechanism on system dynamics, node dynamics, and the resulting network structure. Perhaps it should be explicitly stated that once a node has joined the network, it takes no further actions.

## 2.1 Related literature

Growing network models define how incoming nodes join a network to explore the network structure that arises as nodes enter, sequentially. The Barabasi-Albert model is perhaps the most well-known growing network model, where incoming nodes select existing nodes to connect with in proportion to their existing degree (Barabási and Albert 1999). A probability of attachment that is linear with respect to degree gives rise to networks with a power-law degree distribution, as early nodes experience cumulative advantage. Growing network models that include preferential attachment have been developed for use with networks of businesses (Atalay et al. 2011; Ozaki et al. 2024) and extended to incorporate elements such as homophily and triadic closure (Bramoullé et al. 2012). Isolating such mechanisms can be especially insightful in that relatively small differences at the node level can lead to major differences in network structure, over time (Asikainen et al. 2020).

In the generalized version of the Barabasi-Albert model, incoming nodes select existing nodes to connect to in proportion to their degree raised to a power of  $\gamma$  (Krapivsky, Redner, and Leyvraz 2000). When  $\gamma = 0$ , each incoming node is choosing randomly and early nodes experience a steady advantage. When  $\gamma$  is high, entering nodes consistently select the highest-degree nodes and the network structure degenerates to hub-and-spoke. Linear dependence of the probability of attachment on degree ( $\gamma = 1$ ) is special, as this is a reasonable approximation for systems where more links make a node more visible. This has been found to apply on social media, in bibliometrics, in systems driven by referrals, and in systems where incoming nodes copy the connections of existing nodes (Kleinberg et al. 1999; Kumar et al. 2000; Salganik, Dodds, and Watts 2006; Pham, Sheridan, and Shimodaira 2015; Pham, Sheridan, and Shimodaira 2016).

This model can be further generalized into a *family* of growing network models. Within a discrete choice framework, incoming nodes can be modeled to select among the existing nodes based on a preference for *any* features of those nodes (Overgoor, Benson, and Ugander 2019). Degree is just one possible preference metric by which incoming nodes select among existing nodes. In this sense, the Barabasi-Albert model could be considered the minimal model of a network growing under “preferential attachment”.

The model presented in this work would be part of a family of growing network models where incoming nodes select among the network positions available to them, based on features of that *available entry point*. This reflects scenarios where the incoming node is evaluating, not the nodes it would connect to, but, the role it would step into. Let us now envision that there may be scenarios where a single metric, analogous to degree, might be useful in approximating the benefit to an incoming node of entering the network at a particular entry point; we select projected PageRank as the opportunity metric for our minimal model of a network growing under “opportunistic attachment”.

## 3 Results

Network growth under opportunistic attachment gives rise to complex dynamics characterized by an endogenous opportunity space, path-dependence, and turnover in node rank. Figure 1 shows three snapshots of growing networks, at  $N = 50$ , under three different selection intensities. Random selection gives rise to a random network where early nodes see a steady advantage; this is the same network structure as that resulting from a model of network growth under no preferential attachment. Near-optimal selection with respect to the opportunity metric gives rise to networks that grow in a principal direction, occasionally folding back on itself. Opportunistic selection at an intensity between the two extremes produces networks with less predictable, almost organic, patterns of growth.




Figure 1: **Growing networks of 50 nodes.** Visualized structure of growing networks where attachment was random, opportunistic, or near-optimal with respect to projected PageRank ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ,  $\gamma = [0, 4, 8]$ ). Nodes are sized by realized PageRank and colored by entry time; the initial nodes are the lightest.

The remainder of this section describes in greater detail the system dynamics, node dynamics, and network structure that arise from this growing network model. Section 3.1 considers the distribution of opportunity scores available to incoming nodes and an example of how this introduces path-dependence into the system. Section 3.2 outlines the resulting dynamics of node rank. Finally, Section 3.3 describes the degenerate network structure resulting from optimal-choice opportunistic attachment.

### 3.1 Opportunity space

Incoming nodes in our minimal model encounter a precisely defined opportunity space. They can place themselves as “selling to” and “buying from” any pair of existing nodes, and entry points with higher PageRank are considered better opportunities. The growth process itself changes this opportunity space in two ways. First, the incoming node at step  $N$  expands the opportunity space by  $N$  additional possibilities. Second, the entry point selected by the incoming node changes the projected PageRank of the existing  $(N - 1) \cdot (N - 2)$  possibilities. In this specific sense, the opportunity space is endogenous.

As a result, the nodes entering this stylized system under models with different intensities of opportunistic attachment encounter systematically different opportunity spaces. Figure 2 (left) shows the distribution of the opportunity metric as encountered by node 100, for different values of the intensity  $\gamma$ . At lower intensities there are relatively many network positions available, at this point in the growth process, with a score substantially higher than most. Especially good opportunities become more scarce with even mildly opportunistic attachment. Higher intensities compress the range of opportunities further.

Near-optimal opportunistic attachment on this minimal model gives us particular insight into how this happens. Figure 2 (right) shows distributions of the opportunity metric for a specific realization of the growing network model, with  $\gamma = 8$ . In this realization, node 48 selects a network position that appreciably shifts the network structure and thus also the opportunity space. Nodes entering before node 48 see wider distributions of the expected revenue metric (in blue) and select highly opportune network positions with a score near the tail. These nodes are colored blue in the network visualization; note that they grew the network along its principal direction. Node 48 selects a relatively poor opportunity, by chance, and enters at a position that loops the network almost all the way back on itself. This shift in the network structure shifted




Figure 2: **Distributions of the opportunity metric.** Left: Distribution of scaled projected PageRank values for the 9702 network positions available to incoming node 100, within opportunistic attachment models at different intensities. The labeled distributions combine 50 independent realizations, which are also shown separately as fine lines in the same colors. Right: Distributions of the opportunity metric for incoming nodes 44-53 within a specific realization of the growing network model with  $\gamma = 8$ . The selected network positions are noted in a visualization of the growing network upon entry of node 53, as well as the corresponding values of the expected revenue metric. Node 48 looped the network; it and its sampled score are circled in red.

the opportunity space. Subsequent nodes (in purple) encounter distributions of the opportunity metric with a compressed range. This results in the entry of several nodes at network positions far from the most recent nodes. We conclude that stochasticity is of substantial importance in the time-evolution of the opportunity space, and that this time-evolution becomes jagged under highly opportunistic attachment.

### 3.2 Dynamics of node rank

Although incoming nodes are identical, the opportunities available to them are not. Moreover, some nodes are substantially “luckier” in that they happen to choose a more advantageous position given the stochasticity of selection. However, the *expected* PageRank used to construct the opportunity space for an incoming node coincides with the *realized* PageRank only at the step it enters the network. As the network continues to grow, it is the stochastic choices of subsequent nodes that determine the dynamics of node rank over time.

Here we consider the dynamics of node rank with respect to *realized* PageRank. Figure 3 shows the relative rank of every tenth incoming node as networks grow to a size of 100 under three different intensities of the opportunistic attachment mechanism. In a growing network without opportunistic attachment (or, preferential attachment) early nodes are at an advantage and will tend to remain at a higher rank. Random selection thus strongly favors early nodes. The three initial nodes, in particular, will tend to stay above the 80th percentile in rank with respect to realized PageRank. Subsequent nodes will tend to enter at a relatively low rank, while the existing nodes, on average, progressively rise in rank.

As opportunistic attachment increases in intensity, earlier nodes no longer win out as the network continues to grow. Under near-optimal attachment with respect to projected PageRank, later nodes tend to enter at a relatively high rank and newly arrived nodes routinely become the highest-ranked node within a few subsequent steps. However, they are soon overtaken by even newer, highly opportunistic, entrants. Later nodes retain their advantage over those that entered earliest, on average.

The ability to select an opportune network position introduces a potential benefit to arriving later, but



this does not *negate* the benefit of arriving early. Opportunistic attachment at intensities where neither effect dominates, gives rise to, above all, considerable instability in the rank dynamics. The average rank for entrants at a particular  $N$ , across realizations of the model, is noisier and less representative. “Luck” matters most and the modal experience of an incoming node is for their rank to change substantially with the stochastic choices of subsequent incoming nodes.




Figure 3: **Relative rank as networks grow.** Relative rank of nodes within growing networks where attachment was random, opportunistic, or near-optimal with respect to projected PageRank ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ,  $\gamma = [0, 4, 8]$ ). Solid lines track the average rank of every tenth incoming node, plus an initial node, across 50 independent realizations. Fine lines track the relative rank of these same incoming nodes, separately for each realization.

### 3.3 Degenerate case

Stochasticity is needed for growing networks to maintain a rich structure. Under preferential attachment with respect to degree, incoming nodes selecting *optimally* would all connect to the same initial node(s). This degenerate case results deterministically in an extreme hub-and-spoke structure (Barabási and Albert 1999). Under opportunistic attachment with respect to projected PageRank, for this minimal model where each node incoming places one in-link and one out-link, optimal selection results in a ladder network structure where each incoming node connects deterministically to the previous two (Figure 4).

This degenerate case reveals an intriguing additional dynamic. Incoming nodes find the best opportunities around the next-newest nodes. And so, the network will grow inexorably in the principal direction established by the first and only stochastic choice ( $N = 4$ ). Notably, this pattern of growth also results in the deterioration of the opportunities around the older nodes. As the best opportunities get progressively farther away from the oldest nodes, the nearby opportunities also get less and less appealing to incoming nodes; one could say that the oldest nodes are “left behind” as the network grows. Should this phenomenon be general to growth under opportunistic attachment, it would be highly relevant to systems where growth is endogenous and opportunity begets opportunity.

Within our minimal model, ladder motifs appear to be emblematic of opportunistic attachment in the same sense that hubs are emblematic of preferential attachment. Recall from Figure 1 that near-optimal selection results in networks that grow mostly along a principal direction before folding back on themselves. And, the incoming nodes whose selected position folds the network back on itself are those that make an




Figure 4: **Growing network under optimal selection.** Visualized structure of a growing network where attachment was optimal with respect to projected PageRank ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ,  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ ). Existing nodes are colored and selected nodes are circled. Possible entry points are sized by projected PageRank with  $\gamma = 4$ .

especially “unlucky” stochastic choice (Figure 2, right). Shorter ladder motifs appear also in networks growing under less intense opportunistic attachment (Figure 1, middle). This degeneracy persists when incoming nodes are allowed an extra link in either direction or an extra link in each direction; the diameter of the resulting networks increase linearly with the number of nodes (SI Figures 5 & 7). However, imposing additional constraints can prevent the system from producing this degenerate structure under optimal attachment.

This phenomenon also serves to highlight the limitations of this model. Full exploration of the degenerate case is possible only with the development of further models in the opportunistic attachment family, relaxing some constraints and imposing others. For example, directly specifying the ego-network for incoming nodes is a very strong modeling constraint. On the other hand, exhaustive consideration of all possible entry points is a rather generous perspective to take on the acuity of incoming nodes. Moving forward, one might imagine developing models where selection is *evolutionary* instead of *discrete choice*, in that only the “luckiest” nodes survive. For now we conclude only that this unexpected phenomenon—network growth shooting off in one direction—deserves further study in systems where opportunistic attachment may be operating.

## 4 Entrepreneurial economies

Entrepreneurial economies are one domain where opportunistic attachment mechanisms may be operating. To the extent that this is the case, a growing network model fully isolating this mechanism could be a useful tool in the development of relevant theory (Healy 2017). Here we outline a series of dramatic simplifying assumptions that relate the entry of new business in an entrepreneurial economy to our growing network model, providing a theoretical argument for each assumption in turn. First, we represent an economic system as a network of buyer-supplier ties among economic entities (Section 4.1). We then extend a mathematical argument from Leontief and Brody 1993 to consider the stationary density of a walk process on such a network as a notion of economic equilibrium (Section 4.2). In precisely this sense, our growing network model represents a sequence of economic equilibria and our opportunity metric can be interpreted as the expected turnover or revenue of a hypothetical new business.

The result is a *highly stylized* representation of a growing entrepreneurial economy. It is also worth noting that we implicitly employ the Universal Payment System Approximation in representing an entire economic



system as a network in this way (Section 4.3). This helps us articulate some key limitations and points us towards the possibility of exploring these assumptions empirically.

## 4.1 Networks of buyer-supplier ties

Input-output linkages can be considered as a network at many levels of granularity. So-called “production networks” can be constructed for among a handful of sectors, for among dozens of industries and, ultimately, for among millions of individual firms (Carvalho and Tahbaz-Salehi 2019). As findings get translated from one extreme to the other, network analysis of firm-level production networks is becoming recognized as the fully disaggregated version of sector-level input-output analysis (Bacilieri et al. 2023). Most notably: aggregate fluctuations in economic output can arise from the propagation of idiosyncratic productivity shocks over heterogeneous firm-level production networks (Acemoglu et al. 2012; Magerman et al. 2016; Carvalho and Tahbaz-Salehi 2019). Modern simulations of, e.g., supply disruption, are increasingly based on networks constructed from empirical data on buyer-supplier ties (Inoue and Todo 2019; Carvalho et al. 2021).

The links of our network are economic ties from a buyer to a supplier. In the context of our model, we assume that these ties are durable and that payment for the goods and services of this stylized economy would flow primarily over these ties. For this there is some empirical support, plus theoretical rationales offered by a surprisingly diverse set of intellectual traditions. From a survey of 1501 manufacturing firms in Hungary, Slovakia, and Romania, we know that ties accounting for more than 10% of sales usually persist for years and often involve product modification or other investments on the part of the supplier (Bekes, Koren, and Murakozy 2021). Uzzi 1997 combines ethnographic fieldwork with systematic network data to map the garment industry of New York City; while one-off transactions across market relationships are found to be prevalent, a disproportionately large share of business goes to established ties. That an economic system is made up of such ties, to a first approximation, is consistent with network theory of organization (Powell 1989; White 2004), relational contracting (Baker, Gibbons, and Murphy 2002), and diffusion (Perra et al. 2012).

Note that nodes of our network are economic entities, and we avoid making distinctions between households, firms, and other specific categories of entity. This is a deliberate simplification with respect to common practice in agent-based modelling of economic systems (Delli Gatti et al. 2011; Mankiw 2015; Riccetti, Russo, and Gallegati 2015). Distinctions between households, firms, banks, and other categories of economic actors are required to model markets as matching processes, and they are certainly valid within the context of a legal infrastructure that enforces them. However, they may or may not be inherent to specific economic phenomena. Indeed, the literature on networks within development economics often highlights the *lack* of a clear distinction between firms and households in many situations (Fafchamps 1997; Lyon 2000; Jackson, Rodriguez-Barraquer, and Tan 2012).

## 4.2 Economic equilibrium as the stationary density of a walk process

The notion of equilibrium in an economic system is related to the steady-state of a dynamical process. In Leontief and Brody 1993, the authors show that “the flow of money [can be] described as a Markov chain. Its ergodic state is equivalent to the economic equilibrium.” Their Markov chain, which we will call  $T$ , is derived from a 1985 Hungarian input-output table with 5 sectors in the following way: first, entries are normalized to represent the inputs to a sector’s production as a proportion. Then, the transpose of this table is read as a matrix of transition probabilities for money among the sectors. In its simplest form, where unit velocity of money is assumed everywhere, the process described by  $T$  will converge to its steady-state equilibrium so

long as the system allows an equilibrium (*Theorem 1*, p. 228). This result is described as follows:

In economic terms, undisturbed circulation of money may secure equilibrium. NB: no further assumption, besides an abstract numerical possibility of equilibrium, has been used here and this abstract possibility can be expressed by a very simple equation:  $\det(1 - T) = 0$  (Leontief 1941). No terms loaned from labour theory nor any notions of marginalism entered our exposition. Equilibrium prices and proportions, together with their practical attainability, can be based on and demonstrated by simple money-flow considerations. (Leontief and Brody 1993, p. 228)

At higher granularity, this translates to the stationary density of a walk process over a network of buyer-supplier ties among economic entities. Unlike the production functions typical of standard input-output analysis, the mechanics of money at the level of individual entities need not be modeled differently for different sectors. Here, the “Households” and “Governments” sectors of the early input-output table in Leontief and Brody 1993 are treated no differently from the “Extraction”, “Manufacture”, or “Commerce” sectors. Specifically, let  $m_i$  denote the amount of money in the till of sector  $i$ , let  $\mathbf{m}$  denote the vector of these values, and let  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{m} \div \|\mathbf{m}\|$  denote the normalized vector. Equation 1 then reproduces the matrix expression for the steady-state  $\mathbf{p}^*$  of the Markov chain  $T$  in the simplest model where money is assumed to move at unit velocity (*Theorem 1*, p. 228). The very same expression gives the stationary density of a discrete-time random walk over a finite network of  $N$  nodes where  $T$  is the Markov chain representing the transition probabilities among the nodes (Masuda, Porter, and Lambiotte 2017, Eq. 30). Specifically, the transition probability matrix  $T$  is a normalized version of the  $N \times N$  adjacency matrix  $A$  where each entry  $A_{ij}$  is divided by the (possibly weighted) out-degree of node  $i$  (Masuda, Porter, and Lambiotte 2017, Eqs. 24-25).

$$\mathbf{p}^* = \mathbf{p}^* T \tag{1}$$

The stationary density  $\mathbf{p}^*$  is a unique ergodic equilibrium state when the directed network  $A$  is strongly connected (Newman 2010; Masuda, Porter, and Lambiotte 2017). In practice, this condition is often ensured by modifying the transition probability matrix  $T$ . PageRank introduces random jumps into the random walk by combining  $T$  with a preference vector  $u$ . In the standard version of the algorithm,  $T$  is modified such that node  $i$  sees its network transition probabilities  $T_i$  with probability  $\alpha$  and uniform transition probabilities  $u_i = 1/N$  with probability  $(1 - \alpha)$ ; nodes with no out-degree see only  $u_i$  (Masuda, Porter, and Lambiotte 2017, Sec. 5.2.1). In this work we use  $\alpha = 0.95$ , which would correspond to a stylized scenario where 5% of expenditures occur across ties with random entities.

This specific notion of economic equilibrium engages three inter-related simplifications: an unweighted network, Markovian transitions, and discrete time. Networks of buyer-supplier ties are often represented as weighted networks in that total transaction volumes across ties are highly heterogeneous (Mattsson, Criscione, and Takes 2023; Bacilieri et al. 2023). However, total transaction volumes across ties are ultimately an observable *outcome* of the dynamical process. Depending on the model of the process, attaining this outcome may or may not require the input network underlying the circulation of money to be represented as a weighted network. Non-linear money transport models are used to approximate total transaction volumes on unweighted firm-firm networks (Tamura, Takayasu, and Takayasu 2018; Ozaki et al. 2024). Moreover, payments are also weighted and fully granular models of transaction processes would be represented in continuous time (Mattsson and Takes 2021). Equation (1) is not a *realistic* representation of the circulation of money over a network of buyer-supplier ties. A discrete-time random walk is simply the *minimum viable model* for undisturbed circulation of money that would give rise to an economic equilibrium as per Leontief

and Brody 1993.

### 4.3 Universal payment system approximation

Our stylized economic system implicitly operates within a single, universal, payment system. This is a simplification, in that actual monetary infrastructures are complicated systems of systems (James and Weiman 2010; Galbiati and Soramäki 2012; Mbiti and Weil 2015). However, direct violations of the universal payment system approximation—such as the 2023 run on deposits entrusted to Silicon Valley Bank—are as spectacular as they are rare (Cipriani, Eisenbach, and Kovner 2024). Moreover, approximating a “general purpose payment system” is the actual policy objective of regulators in many countries (Summers and Wells 2014). The universal payment system approximation is widely used also in economy-wide agent-based macroeconomic models (e.g., Caiani et al. 2016).

Stating this approximation explicitly lets us articulate what it leaves out. Practically speaking, payment systems can falter during periods of serious disruption (e.g., the events of September 11, 2001, see: Soramäki et al. 2007; Bech and Garratt 2012) or illiquidity (Galbiati and Soramäki 2011). Substantively, improvements to payment system integration can improve economic outcomes by lowering transaction costs (Jack and Suri 2014). However, these factors are deemed to be relatively minor. More consequential is that the universal payment system approximation abstracts away from the actual mechanics of money creation and dissolution, both in theory (Mehrling 1999) and in practice (Werner 2014; McLeay, Radia, and Thomas 2014).

## 5 Discussion

In this paper, we have found that an opportunistic attachment mechanism can produce highly endogenous, path-dependent patterns of network growth. Moreover, we have argued that such growing network models could prove useful as a tool for the development of theory regarding growth in highly entrepreneurial economies. The main result is to suggest that several complex economic phenomena might be usefully related via the concept of a shifting “opportunity space” faced by existing businesses and, especially, by entrepreneurs. In particular, our minimal model can be seen as a proof-of-concept towards more formal models where an economic network and its economic equilibrium meaningfully co-evolve.

Insofar as the proposed economic theory is sound, opportunistic attachment is a relevant mechanism to consider in modelling the creation of new businesses by entrepreneurs keen to start thriving businesses. However, this is *not* to imply that our growing network model is realistic. In fact, new firm entry is necessarily related also to dynamics of innovation (Ghiglino 2012; Carvalho and Voigtländer 2014) and credit provision (Werner 2014; McLeay, Radia, and Thomas 2014). Opportunities for entrepreneurs are limited by many practical constraints not captured as an ego-network (Cassar 2006). Moreover, existing businesses actively search for better suppliers and new customers (Chaney 2014; Carvalho and Voigtländer 2014; Krichene et al. 2019a; Krichene et al. 2019b). While it is possible to develop agent-based models that can serve as calibrated simulations of real systems (Monti et al. 2023), these limitations mean that our model is unlikely to be useful in this regard.

Rather, our aim has been to isolate the opportunistic attachment mechanism via deliberate simplifications and to study its potential implications. Highly stylized models of this sort can be especially insightful in the context of dynamic networks, where relatively small differences in node-level behavior can lead to major changes in network structure; so much so that it has been argued “individual level mechanisms should not be analyzed separately without considering the dynamics of society as a whole” (Asikainen et al. 2020). Strong

path-dependence, for example, is a well-documented feature of real economic systems as a whole (Arthur 2014; Nunn 2007a; Nunn 2007b; Redding, Sturm, and Wolf 2011; Thurner, Klimek, and Hanel 2018). This makes opportunistic attachment an interesting candidate mechanism for relating the network structure of an economic system to the direction of its future growth, alongside other known mechanisms including preferential attachment, technological improvement, and splits/mergers (Atalay et al. 2011; McNerney et al. 2022; Ozaki et al. 2024).

Further research is needed to generalize any specific findings beyond small networks, and as our simplifying assumptions are relaxed. While it is uncommon to formally consider the space of possible entry points for incoming nodes, it is possible to bound the effect of arbitrary node addition on some spectral properties of graphs (Torres 2021). More readily amenable to mathematical formalism may be business *adaptation* rather than business *entry* in highly entrepreneurial economies. Holme and Ghoshal 2006 describe a remarkable model where a fixed population of agents aim to achieve higher closeness centrality while maintaining low degree; this setup includes “the computation of centralities which can be seen as a (fast) dynamical process on the network... similar to other adaptive network models with timescale separation” (Berner et al. 2023, p. 34). It is our fervent hope that the theoretical contribution of this work, relating the stationary density of a random walk on a network of economic entities the economic equilibrium (Section 4.2, Eq. (1)), might motivate the development of adaptive dynamical network models relevant to economic systems.

In the other direction, our results provide a compelling rationale for the development of specific and explicit theories of evolution within economic systems. Our minimal model highlights the extreme limitations of discrete choice as a framework for studying growth in economic systems; actual entrepreneurs face a shifting “opportunity space” where the number of potential business opportunities is effectively unbounded. From an evolutionary perspective, this boundlessness becomes a feature rather than a bug. As in evolutionary models of stylized stock markets (Farmer 2002) or (social) business connections (Holme and Ghoshal 2006), there may be simple heuristic strategies for businesses or entrepreneurs that are especially robust to the strategies of others. The most important *selection* to happen within economic systems may be about survival rather than about utility (Ozaki et al. 2024). Indeed, Minsky’s “survival constraint” has been used to convey the logic that all economic entities must bring in as much as they spend in order to continue participating in an economic system (Mehrling 1999).

## Acknowledgments

Thank you to Brennan Klein for fruitful discussions and to Marco Pangallo for insightful feedback. Thank you to Thomas Mattsson for initial inspiration, to James McNerney for valuable references, to Christoph Riedl for specific comments, and to Frank Takes for his skill in naming things. Thanks also to Francois Lafond for constructive editorial feedback. The author acknowledges support by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship, Grant No. 1451070.

## Software & Data availability

No data is used in this work. Replication code will be made publicly available via GitHub.

## Competing Interests

The author declares no competing interests.

## References

- Acemoglu, Daron, Vasco M. Carvalho, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi (2012). “The Network Origins of Aggregate Fluctuations”. In: *Econometrica* 80.5, pp. 1977–2016. ISSN: 1468-0262. DOI: [10.3982/ECTA9623](https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA9623). URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.3982/ECTA9623> (visited on 06/22/2020) ([Go back](#)).
- Albert, Reka, Hawoong Jeong, and Albert-Laszlo Barabasi (July 2000). “Error and attack tolerance of complex networks”. In: *Nature* 406.6794, pp. 378–382. ISSN: 0028-0836. DOI: [10.1038/35019019](https://doi.org/10.1038/35019019). URL: <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v406/n6794/full/406378a0.html> ([Go back](#)).
- Arthur, W. Brian (Oct. 2014). *Complexity and the Economy*. 1 edition. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN: 978-0-19-933429-2 ([Go back](#)).
- Asikainen, Aili, Gerardo Iñiguez, Javier Ureña-Carrión, Kimmo Kaski, and Mikko Kivelä (May 2020). “Cumulative effects of triadic closure and homophily in social networks”. In: *Science Advances* 6.19, eaax7310. ISSN: 2375-2548. DOI: [10.1126/sciadv.aax7310](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax7310). URL: <https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/6/19/eaax7310> (visited on 02/18/2021) ([Go back](#)).
- Atalay, Enghin, Ali Hortaçsu, James Roberts, and Chad Syverson (Mar. 2011). “Network structure of production”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108.13, pp. 5199–5202. ISSN: 0027-8424, 1091-6490. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1015564108](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1015564108). URL: <http://www.pnas.org/content/108/13/5199> (visited on 10/21/2016) ([Go back](#)).
- Bacilieri, Andrea, Andras Borsos, Pablo Astudillo-Estevez, and Francois Lafond (May 2023). *Firm-level production networks: what do we (really) know?* en. Oxford ([Go back](#)).
- Baker, George, Robert Gibbons, and Kevin J. Murphy (2002). “Relational Contracts and the Theory of the Firm”. In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117.1, pp. 39–84. ISSN: 0033-5533. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2696482> (visited on 04/23/2024) ([Go back](#)).
- Barabasi, Albert-Laszlo (Aug. 2016). *Network Science*. 1st edition. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 978-1-107-07626-6 ([Go back](#)).
- Barabási, Albert-László and Réka Albert (Oct. 1999). “Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks”. In: *Science* 286.5439, pp. 509–512. DOI: [10.1126/science.286.5439.509](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.286.5439.509). URL: <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.286.5439.509> ([Go back](#)).
- Bech, Morten L. and Rodney J. Garratt (Aug. 2012). “Illiquidity in the Interbank Payment System Following Wide-Scale Disruptions”. In: *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 44.5, pp. 903–929. ISSN: 1538-4616. DOI: [10.1111/j.1538-4616.2012.00515.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-4616.2012.00515.x). URL: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1538-4616.2012.00515.x/abstract> ([Go back](#)).
- Bekes, Gabor, Miklos Koren, and Balazs Murakozy (2021). *Supplier-buyer relationships in global value chains*. en. URL: <https://github.com/gbekes/working-papers/blob/main/BKMT-gvc-relationships.pdf> ([Go back](#)).
- Berner, Rico, Thilo Gross, Christian Kuehn, Jürgen Kurths, and Serhiy Yanchuk (Aug. 2023). “Adaptive dynamical networks”. In: *Physics Reports*. Adaptive dynamical networks 1031, pp. 1–59. ISSN: 0370-1573. DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2023.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2023.08.001). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0370157323002685> (visited on 06/10/2024) ([Go back](#)).
- Bramoullé, Yann, Sergio Currarini, Matthew O. Jackson, Paolo Pin, and Brian W. Rogers (Apr. 2012). *Homophily and Long-Run Integration in Social Networks*. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.1201.4564](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1201.4564). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.4564> (visited on 04/16/2024) ([Go back](#)).

- Caiani, Alessandro, Antoine Godin, Eugenio Caverzasi, Mauro Gallegati, Stephen Kinsella, and Joseph E. Stiglitz (Aug. 2016). “Agent based-stock flow consistent macroeconomics: Towards a benchmark model”. In: *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 69, pp. 375–408. ISSN: 0165-1889. DOI: [10.1016/j.jedc.2016.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2016.06.001). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165188915301020> (Go back).
- Carvalho, Vasco M, Makoto Nirei, Yukiko U Saito, and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi (May 2021). “Supply Chain Disruptions: Evidence from the Great East Japan Earthquake\*”. In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 136.2, pp. 1255–1321. ISSN: 0033-5533. DOI: [10.1093/qje/qjaa044](https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa044). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa044> (Go back).
- Carvalho, Vasco M. and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi (2019). “Production Networks: A Primer”. In: *Annual Review of Economics* 11.1, pp. 635–663. DOI: [10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030212](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030212). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080218-030212> (visited on 09/01/2023) (Go back).
- Carvalho, Vasco M. and Nico Voigtländer (Mar. 2014). *Input Diffusion and the Evolution of Production Networks*. Working Paper. DOI: [10.3386/w20025](https://www.nber.org/papers/w20025). URL: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w20025> (visited on 04/16/2024) (Go back).
- Cassar, Gavin (Sept. 2006). “Entrepreneur opportunity costs and intended venture growth”. In: *Journal of Business Venturing* 21.5, pp. 610–632. ISSN: 0883-9026. DOI: [10.1016/j.jbusvent.2005.02.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2005.02.011). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0883902605000510> (Go back).
- Chaney, Thomas (Nov. 2014). “The Network Structure of International Trade”. en. In: *American Economic Review* 104.11, pp. 3600–3634. ISSN: 0002-8282. DOI: [10.1257/aer.104.11.3600](https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.11.3600). URL: <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.104.11.3600> (visited on 04/16/2024) (Go back).
- Cipriani, Marco, Thomas M. Eisenbach, and Anna Kovner (May 2024). *Tracing Bank Runs in Real Time*. en. Staff Reports (Federal Reserve Bank of New York). Federal Reserve Bank of New York. DOI: [10.59576/sr.1104](https://doi.org/10.59576/sr.1104). URL: [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/research/staff\\_reports/sr1104.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/research/staff_reports/sr1104.pdf) (visited on 05/26/2024) (Go back).
- Delli Gatti, Domenico, Saul Desiderio, Edoardo Gaffeo, Pasquale Cirillo, and Mauro Gallegati (2011). *Macroeconomics from the Bottom-up*. New Economic Windows. Springer. ISBN: 978-88-470-1970-6 (Go back).
- Fafchamps, Marcel (May 1997). “Trade credit in Zimbabwean manufacturing”. In: *World Development* 25.5, pp. 795–815. ISSN: 0305-750X. DOI: [10.1016/S0305-750X\(96\)00134-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(96)00134-9). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X96001349> (Go back).
- Farmer, J. Doyne (Nov. 2002). “Market force, ecology and evolution”. In: *Industrial and Corporate Change* 11.5, pp. 895–953. ISSN: 0960-6491. DOI: [10.1093/icc/11.5.895](https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/11.5.895). URL: <https://academic.oup.com/icc/article/11/5/895/774881> (Go back).
- Galbiati, Marco and Kimmo Soramäki (June 2011). “An agent-based model of payment systems”. In: *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 35.6, pp. 859–875. ISSN: 0165-1889. DOI: [10.1016/j.jedc.2010.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2010.11.001). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165188910002472> (Go back).
- (Aug. 2012). “Clearing networks”. In: *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. The Great Recession: motivation for re-thinking paradigms in macroeconomic modeling 83.3, pp. 609–626. ISSN: 0167-2681. DOI: [10.1016/j.jebo.2012.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.05.013). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167268112001229> (Go back).
- Ghiglinò, Christian (Mar. 2012). “Random walk to innovation: Why productivity follows a power law”. In: *Journal of Economic Theory*. Issue in honor of David Cass 147.2, pp. 713–737. ISSN: 0022-0531.



- DOI: [10.1016/j.jet.2011.02.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2011.02.004). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022053111000470> (visited on 04/16/2024) ([Go back](#)).
- Healy, Kieran (June 2017). “Fuck Nuance”. In: *Sociological Theory* 35.2, pp. 118–127. ISSN: 0735-2751. DOI: [10.1177/0735275117709046](https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275117709046). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275117709046> (visited on 04/11/2024) ([Go back](#)).
- Holme, Petter and Gourab Ghoshal (Mar. 2006). “Dynamics of Networking Agents Competing for High Centrality and Low Degree”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 96.9, p. 098701. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.098701](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.098701). URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.098701> (visited on 06/10/2024) ([Go back](#)).
- Inoue, Hiroyasu and Yasuyuki Todo (Sept. 2019). “Firm-level propagation of shocks through supply-chain networks”. In: *Nature Sustainability* 2.9, pp. 841–847. ISSN: 2398-9629. DOI: [10.1038/s41893-019-0351-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0351-x). URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-019-0351-x> ([Go back](#)).
- Jack, William and Tavneet Suri (Jan. 2014). “Risk Sharing and Transactions Costs: Evidence from Kenya’s Mobile Money Revolution”. In: *American Economic Review* 104.1, pp. 183–223. ISSN: 0002-8282. DOI: [10.1257/aer.104.1.183](https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.1.183). URL: <http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/abs/10.1257/aer.104.1.183> ([Go back](#)).
- Jackson, Matthew O., Tomas Rodriguez-Barraquer, and Xu Tan (2012). “Social Capital and Social Quilts: Network Patterns of Favor Exchange”. In: *American Economic Review* 102.5, pp. 1857–97. DOI: [10.1257/aer.102.5.1857](https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.5.1857). URL: <http://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/aer.102.5.1857> ([Go back](#)).
- James, John A. and David F. Weiman (2010). “From Drafts to Checks: The Evolution of Correspondent Banking Networks and the Formation of the Modern U.S. Payments System, 1850–1914”. In: *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 42.2-3, pp. 237–265. ISSN: 1538-4616. DOI: [10.1111/j.1538-4616.2009.00286.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-4616.2009.00286.x). URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1538-4616.2009.00286.x> ([Go back](#)).
- Kleinberg, Jon M., Ravi Kumar, Prabhakar Raghavan, Sridhar Rajagopalan, and Andrew S. Tomkins (1999). “The Web as a Graph: Measurements, Models, and Methods”. In: *Computing and Combinatorics*. Ed. by Takano Asano, Hideki Imai, D. T. Lee, Shin-ichi Nakano, and Takeshi Tokuyama. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 1–17. ISBN: 978-3-540-48686-2. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-48686-0\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48686-0_1) ([Go back](#)).
- Krapivsky, P. L., S. Redner, and F. Leyvraz (Nov. 2000). “Connectivity of Growing Random Networks”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 85.21, pp. 4629–4632. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.4629](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.4629). URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.4629> ([Go back](#)).
- Krichene, Hazem, Abhijit Chakraborty, Yoshi Fujiwara, Hiroyasu Inoue, and Masaaki Terai (Dec. 2019a). “Tie-formation process within the communities of the Japanese production network: application of an exponential random graph model”. In: *Applied Network Science* 4.1, pp. 1–22. ISSN: 2364-8228. DOI: [10.1007/s41109-019-0112-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-019-0112-9). URL: <https://appliednetsci.springeropen.com/articles/10.1007/s41109-019-0112-9> ([Go back](#)).
- Krichene, Hazem, Yoshi Fujiwara, Abhijit Chakraborty, Yoshiyuki Arata, Hiroyasu Inoue, and Masaaki Terai (Oct. 2019b). “The emergence of properties of the Japanese production network: How do listed firms choose their partners?” In: *Social Networks* 59, pp. 1–9. ISSN: 0378-8733. DOI: [10.1016/j.socnet.2019.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2019.05.002). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378873318303009> ([Go back](#)).

- Kumar, R., P. Raghavan, S. Rajagopalan, D. Sivakumar, A. Tomkins, and E. Upfal (Nov. 2000). “Stochastic models for the Web graph”. In: *Proceedings 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 57–65. DOI: [10.1109/SFCS.2000.892065](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.2000.892065) (Go back).
- Leonfief, Wassily (1941). *Structure of the American Economy 1919-1939*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (Go back).
- Leontief, Wassily and András Brody (Jan. 1993). “Money-flow Computations”. In: *Economic Systems Research* 5.3, pp. 225–233. ISSN: 0953-5314, 1469-5758. DOI: [10.1080/09535319300000019](https://doi.org/10.1080/09535319300000019). URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09535319300000019> (Go back).
- Lyon, Fergus (Apr. 2000). “Trust, Networks and Norms: The Creation of Social Capital in Agricultural Economies in Ghana”. In: *World Development* 28.4, pp. 663–681. ISSN: 0305-750X. DOI: [10.1016/S0305-750X\(99\)00146-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(99)00146-1). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X99001461> (Go back).
- Magerman, Glenn, Karolien De Bruyne, Emmanuel Dhyne, and Jan Van Hove (Nov. 2016). *Heterogeneous firms and the micro origins of aggregate fluctuations*. Tech. rep. 312. Brussels: National Bank of Belgium. URL: <http://aei.pitt.edu/97453/1/wp312en.pdf> (Go back).
- Mankiw, N. Gregory (May 2015). *Macroeconomics*. 9 edition. New York: Worth Publishers. ISBN: 978-1-4641-8289-1 (Go back).
- Masuda, Naoki, Mason A. Porter, and Renaud Lambiotte (Nov. 2017). “Random walks and diffusion on networks”. In: *Physics Reports* 716-717, pp. 1–58. ISSN: 03701573. DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2017.07.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2017.07.007). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.03281> (Go back).
- Mattsson, Carolina E. S., Teodoro Criscione, and Frank W. Takes (Apr. 2023). “Circulation of a digital community currency”. In: *Scientific Reports* 13.1, p. 5864. ISSN: 2045-2322. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-023-33184-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-33184-1). URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-023-33184-1> (Go back).
- Mattsson, Carolina E. S. and Frank W. Takes (Dec. 2021). “Trajectories through temporal networks”. In: *Applied Network Science* 6.35, pp. 1–31. ISSN: 2364-8228. DOI: [10.1007/s41109-021-00374-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-021-00374-7). URL: <https://appliednetsci.springeropen.com/articles/10.1007/s41109-021-00374-7> (Go back).
- Mbiti, Isaac and David N. Weil (2015). “Mobile banking: The impact of M-Pesa in Kenya”. In: *African Successes, Volume III: Modernization and Development*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 247–293 (Go back).
- McLeay, Michael, Amar Radia, and Ryland Thomas (2014). *Money creation in the modern economy*. Tech. rep. Bank of England (Go back).
- McNerney, James, Charles Savoie, Francesco Caravelli, Vasco M. Carvalho, and J. Dooyne Farmer (Jan. 2022). “How production networks amplify economic growth”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119.1, e2106031118. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.2106031118](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2106031118). URL: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2106031118> (visited on 04/19/2022) (Go back).
- Mehrling, Perry (1999). “The Vision of Hyman P. Minsky”. In: *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 39.2, pp. 129–158 (Go back).
- Monti, Corrado, Marco Pangallo, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, and Francesco Bonchi (June 2023). “On learning agent-based models from data”. In: *Scientific Reports* 13.1, p. 9268. ISSN: 2045-2322. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-023-35536-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-35536-3). URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-023-35536-3> (visited on 03/08/2024) (Go back).

- Newman, Mark (Mar. 2010). *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press. ISBN: 978-0-19-159417-5. DOI: [10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199206650.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199206650.001.0001). URL: <https://academic.oup.com/book/27303> (visited on 04/23/2024) ([Go back](#)).
- Nunn, Nathan (2007a). “Historical Legacies: A Model Linking Africa’s Past to its Current Underdevelopment”. In: *Journal of Development Economics* 83.1, pp. 157–175 ([Go back](#)).
- (2007b). *The long-term effects of Africa’s slave trades*. Tech. rep. National Bureau of Economic Research. URL: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13367> ([Go back](#)).
- Overgoor, Jan, Austin Benson, and Johan Ugander (May 2019). “Choosing to Grow a Graph: Modeling Network Formation as Discrete Choice”. In: *The World Wide Web Conference*. WWW ’19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 1409–1420. ISBN: 978-1-4503-6674-8. DOI: [10.1145/3308558.3313662](https://doi.org/10.1145/3308558.3313662). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3308558.3313662> ([Go back](#)).
- Overgoor, Jan, George Pakapol Supaniratisai, and Johan Ugander (Aug. 2020). “Scaling Choice Models of Relational Social Data”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. KDD ’20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 1990–1998. ISBN: 978-1-4503-7998-4. DOI: [10.1145/3394486.3403250](https://doi.org/10.1145/3394486.3403250). URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3394486.3403250> ([Go back](#)).
- Ozaki, Jun’ichi, Eduardo Viegas, Hideki Takayasu, and Misako Takayasu (Feb. 2024). “Integration of B-to-B trade network models of structural evolution and monetary flows reproducing all major empirical laws”. In: *Scientific Reports* 14.1, p. 4628. ISSN: 2045-2322. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-024-54719-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-54719-0). URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-54719-0> (visited on 06/09/2024) ([Go back](#)).
- Page, Lawrence, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Terry Winograd (Nov. 1999). *The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web*. Technical Report 1999-66. Stanford InfoLab. URL: <http://ilpubs.stanford.edu:8090/422/> ([Go back](#)).
- Pastor-Satorras, Romualdo and Alessandro Vespignani (Apr. 2001). “Epidemic Spreading in Scale-Free Networks”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 86.14, pp. 3200–3203. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3200](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3200). URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3200> ([Go back](#)).
- Perra, Nicola, Andrea Baronchelli, Delia Mocanu, Bruno Gonçalves, Romualdo Pastor-Satorras, and Alessandro Vespignani (Dec. 2012). “Random Walks and Search in Time-Varying Networks”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 109.23, p. 238701. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.238701](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.238701). URL: <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.238701> ([Go back](#)).
- Pham, Thong, Paul Sheridan, and Hidetoshi Shimodaira (Sept. 2015). “PAFit: A Statistical Method for Measuring Preferential Attachment in Temporal Complex Networks”. In: *PLoS ONE* 10.9, e0137796. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0137796](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137796). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4574777/> ([Go back](#)).
- (Sept. 2016). “Joint estimation of preferential attachment and node fitness in growing complex networks”. In: *Scientific Reports* 6.1, p. 32558. ISSN: 2045-2322. DOI: [10.1038/srep32558](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32558). URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/srep32558> ([Go back](#)).
- Powell, Walter W. (Nov. 1989). “Neither Market nor Hierarchy : Network Forms of Organization”. In: *Research in Organizational Behavior* 12. ISSN: 0191-3085. URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31842399\\_Neither\\_Market\\_nor\\_Hierarchy\\_Network\\_Forms\\_of\\_Organization\\_WW\\_Powell](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31842399_Neither_Market_nor_Hierarchy_Network_Forms_of_Organization_WW_Powell) ([Go back](#)).
- Redding, Stephen J., Daniel M. Sturm, and Nikolaus Wolf (2011). “HISTORY AND INDUSTRY LOCATION: EVIDENCE FROM GERMAN AIRPORTS”. In: *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 93.3, pp. 814–831. ISSN: 0034-6535. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23016079> ([Go back](#)).

- Riccetti, Luca, Alberto Russo, and Mauro Gallegati (Oct. 2015). “An agent based decentralized matching macroeconomic model”. In: *Journal of Economic Interaction and Coordination* 10.2, pp. 305–332. ISSN: 1860-7128. DOI: [10.1007/s11403-014-0130-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11403-014-0130-8). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11403-014-0130-8> (Go back).
- Salganik, M. J., Peter Sheridan Dodds, and Duncan J. Watts (Feb. 2006). “Experimental Study of Inequality and Unpredictability in an Artificial Cultural Market”. In: *Science* 311.5762, pp. 854–856. ISSN: 0036-8075, 1095-9203. DOI: [10.1126/science.1121066](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1121066). URL: <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.1121066> (Go back).
- Soramäki, Kimmo, Morten L. Bech, Jeffrey Arnold, Robert J. Glass, and Walter E. Beyeler (June 2007). “The topology of interbank payment flows”. In: *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 379.1, pp. 317–333. ISSN: 0378-4371. DOI: [10.1016/j.physa.2006.11.093](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2006.11.093). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378437106013124> (Go back).
- Summers, Bruce J. and Kirstin E. Wells (July 2014). *Governance of Payment Systems: A Theoretical Framework and Cross-Country Comparison*. SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 2476552. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. URL: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2476552> (Go back).
- Tamura, Koutarou, Hideki Takayasu, and Misako Takayasu (Apr. 2018). “Diffusion-localization transition caused by nonlinear transport on complex networks”. In: *Scientific Reports* 8.1, pp. 1–7. ISSN: 2045-2322. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-018-23675-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-23675-x). URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-23675-x> (visited on 03/20/2020) (Go back).
- Thurner, Stefan, Peter Klimek, and Rudolf Hanel (Sept. 2018). *Introduction to the Theory of Complex Systems*. Oxford University Press. ISBN: 978-0-19-186106-2. URL: <https://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/oso/9780198821939.001.0001/oso-9780198821939> (Go back).
- Torres, Leo (Nov. 2021). *The Perron non-backtracking eigenvalue after node addition*. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09037> (visited on 06/10/2024) (Go back).
- Uzzi, Brian (1997). “Social Structure and Competition in Interfirm Networks: The Paradox of Embeddedness”. In: *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42.1, pp. 35–67. ISSN: 0001-8392. DOI: [10.2307/2393808](https://doi.org/10.2307/2393808). URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393808> (Go back).
- Werner, Richard A. (Dec. 2014). “Can banks individually create money out of nothing? — The theories and the empirical evidence”. In: *International Review of Financial Analysis* 36, pp. 1–19. ISSN: 1057-5219. DOI: [10.1016/j.irfa.2014.07.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2014.07.015). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1057521914001070> (visited on 04/05/2024) (Go back).
- White, Harrison C. (Oct. 2004). *Markets from Networks*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. ISBN: 978-0-691-12038-6. URL: <https://press.princeton.edu/titles/7207.html> (Go back).

## Supplementary Information




Figure 5: **Network diameter under optimal selection (i-o3)**. Incoming nodes are allowed one in-link, one out-link, and one additional link. The diameter increases linearly, the hallmark of the laddered degenerate network structure, when this link is allowed to be in either direction or constrained to be an extra in-link. In the former case, nodes consistently select an extra in-link. The degenerate structure does not appear when the additional link is constrained to be an extra out-link. Comparison to random selection shown in grey.




Figure 6: **Growing network under optimal selection (i-o3)**. Incoming nodes are allowed one in-link, one out-link, and one additional link in either direction. This results in a laddered degenerate network structure under optimal selection. The numbers on the nodes gives the number of potential entry points considered in the selection of this position; this grows rapidly.




Figure 7: **Network diameter under optimal selection (i2o2)**. Incoming nodes are allowed one in-link, one out-link, and one additional link in each direction. The diameter increases linearly under optimal selection. Comparison to random selection shown in grey.




Figure 8: **Growing network under optimal selection (i2o2)**. Incoming nodes are allowed one in-link, one out-link, and one additional link in each direction. This results in a ladder-like degenerate network structure under optimal selection. The numbers on the nodes gives the number of potential entry points considered in the selection of this position; this grows rapidly.