Multidimensional Territorial Attractiveness: an Application to European Flows

Emanuele Calò^[0009-0007-5545-907X] and Angelo Facchini^[0000-0003-2652-5238]

IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca, Piazza San Francesco 19, 55100 Lucca, Italy

Abstract. In Regional Economics, the attractiveness of regions for capital, migrants, tourists, and other kinds of flows is a relevant topic. Usually, studies in this field have mainly explored single flows, characterizing the dimensions of territorial attractiveness separately, rarely considering the interwoven effect of flows. Here we investigate attractiveness from a multi-dimensional perspective (i.e., dealing with different flows), asking how various types of regional flows collectively shape the attractiveness dynamics of European regions. We analyze eight distinct flow types across NUTS2 regions from 2010 to 2018, employing a multilayer network approach. Notably, the multilayer approach unveils insights that would be missed in single-layer analyses. Community detection reveals complex structures that demonstrate the cohesive power of national borders and the existence of strong cross-border ties in specific regions. Our study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of regional attractiveness, with implications for targeted policy interventions in regional development and European cohesion.

Keywords: Regional Attractiveness · Multilayer Networks.

1 Introduction

Territorial attractiveness is a key component in the economic status of a region. facilitating the integration of regional development strategies with the overarching goal of territorial cohesion. This concept is crucial for formulating policies that enhance the socio-economic prosperity of regions. Authors and government bodies have explored this topic with different methods and focusing on different regions. By example, [23,24] explored the attraction of residents and visitors at the NUTS2 EU regions level, aiming to identify key determinants of regional appeal. Territorial attractiveness is often conceptualized in various ways: it can be seen as perceived, real, or revealed [14]. Perceived attractiveness pertains to how people view and assess a geographical area. Real attractiveness pertains to the factors, such as infrastructure, institutions, services, etc., that enhance a region's appeal. Revealed attractiveness, the subject of this study, concerns inflows into a geographical area, which reveal the inherent attractiveness of a region. Much literature has focused on single flows, such as tourism [6] and migration [27]. However, there is a growing recognition of the importance of adopting a multidimensional approach to understanding territorial attractiveness. For instance,

[15] has significantly contributed to the multidimensional analysis of territorial attractiveness by creating an indicator for Italian regions. Another example is the tool created by the OECD [4] to measure and assess the drivers of regional attractiveness, generating multidimensional profiles to better understand their attractiveness to investors, talent and visitors, and to align their development strategies with evolving global megatrends. Territorial attractiveness can be examined at different spatial scales, ranging from macro-scale (e.g., countries [13]) to micro-geographical (e.g., neighborhoods [17] or cities [21]). Regions, particularly at the NUTS2 scale, provide a good compromise for analysis since they are neither too large to hide local dynamics nor too small to miss broader patterns.

Here we address the following research questions:

- R1 To what extent does a comprehensive analysis of diverse flows reveal patterns of regional attractiveness and importance that differ from those identified through individual flow analyses?
- R2 How do the interconnections and structural patterns formed by multiple types of flows reveal functional relationships and attractiveness dynamics among European regions?

To address these questions, we by employ network science tools [16] to examine origin-destination matrices at the NUTS 2 level that encompass eight flows: tourism, migration, freight transport, foreign direct investment (FDI), Erasmus student exchanges, passenger transport, remittances, and Horizon 2020 collaborations. Network science offers a powerful framework for analyzing complex systems of interconnected entities, making it particularly well-suited for studying the multi-faceted nature of regional attractiveness in Europe. Previous studies have already collected or examined territorial flow data [11,21]. In some cases, network science has also been employed [20].

Our approach, however, brings several novel contributions to the field. Firstly, we integrate multiple types of flows into a comprehensive multilayer network [5], providing a more holistic view of regional interactions than previous single-flow analyses. In our approach, each layer is a weighted directed network representing a different flow type, allowing us to investigate multi-dimensional aspects of regional attractiveness. Multilayer networks, consisting of multiple interrelated networks interacting with each other, can encompass various domains such as social networks, financial markets, and multimodal transportation systems. The multilayer structure significantly influences the dynamics within them, often leading to unexpected behaviors. For example, diffusion on multilayer transportation networks can significantly speed up with respect to diffusion on single layers [9]. Secondly, we apply advanced network science techniques, such as multilayer PageRank centrality [18] and community detection using Infomap [22], to uncover patterns and structures that traditional economic or econometric methods (e.g., gravity models, regression analysis) may overlook. This is particularly innovative in the context of European regional studies, where such data have typically been analyzed using more conventional approaches [3,12]. Our application of Infomap for community detection on multilayer networks represents an advanced technique that, to our knowledge, has not been previously applied to this type of data, potentially revealing new insights into regional clustering across multiple dimensions of attractiveness. As a further element of novelty, we make use of null models for validating results, adding a robust statistical foundation to our findings, and enhancing the reliability and interpretability of the observed network structures. This comprehensive network science approach not only provides new insights into regional attractiveness but also contributes to the broader field of network science by demonstrating its applicability and value in regional studies and policy analysis.

Our study of European regional flow networks reveals several important insights. We observe heavy-tailed distributions across all layers, indicating that a few regions dominate connectivity, a common characteristic in complex networks. The multiplex PageRank analysis reveals substantial changes in regional importance with respect to the single layers, emphasizing the advantages of the multilayer approach. Our analysis enabled us to generate a ranking of European regions according to a centrality measure, both for the single-layer and multilayer cases. Furthermore, rankings are computed over time, thereby revealing the evolution of regional performance over the period 2010-2018. Notably, regions like Bratislava and Leipzig show dramatic increases in ranking that align with their economic growth trajectories. Furthermore, community detection reveals unexpected linkages that transcend traditional national boundaries, suggesting that functional economic ties may not always align with geographic divisions. These findings emphasize the need for a multidimensional perspective in analyzing regional networks, providing valuable insights for policymakers aiming to enhance regional development and cooperation within Europe.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes data and methods, Section 3 presents the results. Finally, we present our conclusions in Section 4.

2 Data and Methods

2.1 Data: ESPON Database

ESPON is an EU-funded program providing territorial analyses, data, and maps. The dataset utilized in this study is derived from the IRiE ESPON project [2] and can be downloaded from the ESPON Database Portal [1]. It specifically includes region-to-region (NUTS 2 level, version of 2016) origin-destination (OD) matrices covering various domains such as People Tourism, People Migration, Freight of Goods by transport mode, Capital Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Knowledge (Erasmus students), People Passengers by transport mode, Capital Remittances, and Knowledge (Horizon 2020). The data encompasses the flows between 297 European regions recorded annually. Different periods are covered for each flow type: i.e., 2010-2014 for Erasmus, 2015-2020 for Horizon 2020, and 2010-2018 for all other categories.

Distinct methodologies were employed by the researchers who collected and processed each type of OD dataset. They gathered and harmonized various data sources at both European and national levels, initially focusing on country-tocountry flows. While most of the data was raw, some flows were estimated using specific techniques (for further technical details, refer to the online documentation). These country-level flows were then decomposed to the regional level for more detailed analysis. In Table 14, we present an overview of the data used in this study. It is important to note that the column **Methodology** describes the procedures employed by the original data collectors, while the column **Our Analysis** outlines the additional steps we performed for our specific analysis.

2.2 Methods: Single-layer Networks

We represent each flow type as a weighted directed network, where nodes correspond to regions, links represent flows between regions within a given year, and link weights denote the magnitude of these flows. Detailed information on the number of nodes, links, and density for each layer and year can be found in the Supplementary Information (subsection 3.1).

Network Properties We analyze first-order properties through node strengths. The out-strength (s_i^{out}) and in-strength (s_i^{in}) of node *i* are defined as:

$$s_i^{out} = \sum_j w_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad s_i^{in} = \sum_j w_{ji} \tag{1}$$

where w_{ij} represents the weight of the directed edge from node *i* to node *j*. We examine the complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF) for in-strength, out-strength, and total strength.

For second-order properties, we focus on the Weighted Average Nearest Neighbors Strength (WANNS), specifically WANNS^{in,out}, defined as:

$$WANNS_i^{in,out} = \frac{\sum_j w_{ij} s_j^{out}}{s_i^{in}}, \quad \forall i,$$
(2)

which calculates the weighted mean of the strengths of a node's neighbors.

Null Models We compare our results with the CReMA null model [19]. This model reconstructs the network topology and assigns weights to established links by maximizing entropy under given constraints. As long as these constraints are met (on average), all possible configurations are equally likely. A specific instance of this model is the Directed Enhanced Configuration Model [25], which constraints the sequences of in-degrees, out-degrees, in-strengths, and out-strengths. We use the NEMtropy package [26] to solve the model, employing the Newton method for both binary and weighted reconstructions and the dcm-exp model for binary reconstruction to generate an ensemble.

2.3 Methods: Multilayer Networks

To analyze the complex interactions between different types of flows, we construct multilayer networks by integrating all flow layers from each given year.



Fig. 1: A multilayer network representation with three layers.

The same nodes are present across all layers with only intra-layer links and no inter-layer links, the resulting structure is thus a multiplex [5]. Fig. 1 provides a pictorial representation of this structure, illustrating the concept with three layers for clarity, although our analysis encompasses all available flow types.

Centrality Measure: PageRank We compute PageRank for the multiplex using the muxViz R package [8].

Community Detection: Infomap For community detection in our multiplex network, we employ the Infomap algorithm, which can detect hierarchical community structures within and across layers. Infomap optimizes a quality function related to the random walker's trajectory, revealing both broad and granular communities. Key parameters include the *two level* setting for nested module detection and the multilayer relaxation rate for inter-layer movements. We conducted a sensitivity analysis on the relaxation rate to understand its impact on community detection. Detailed information on parameter selection and sensitivity analysis results are provided in section 2 and subsection 3.3 of the Supplementary Information.

3 Results

We focus initially on single layers by analyzing first-order properties, such as the strength distribution, which helps us understand the basic structure of the networks by examining how strongly regions are connected. Studying first-order properties is important because it provides fundamental insights into the connectivity and flow patterns within the network. Next, we move on to secondorder properties, such as assortativity, which measures the tendency of nodes to connect to others that are similar or different in some way. By comparing assortativity to a null model, we can discern whether the observed connections are due to underlying structural patterns or are random. This step is essential as it reveals deeper relational dynamics within the networks, better highlighting those topological aspects that are not immediately captured from first-order analysis. Then, we examine the PageRank centrality measure. Centrality measures are vital for identifying the network's most important or influential nodes. They help us understand the roles different regions play in the network, whether key hubs or peripheral nodes.

In a second time, once we have understood the basic one-dimensional features of the flow networks, we study the flows in a multi-dimensional perspective. To this aim, we study the PageRank centrality measure for the entire multilayer network. This comprehensive approach allows us to capture the complex interactions between different types of flows, providing a wide perspective of regional dynamics and their broader implications. Finally, we apply community detection using the Infomap algorithm to the multilayer network, revealing clusters of regions across multiple types of flows. This methodical progression from single-layer to multilayer analysis, and from basic structural properties to complex community structures, allows us to comprehensively map the multifaceted nature of regional attractiveness and interconnectedness in Europe.

3.1 Single-layer Properties

First Order Properties One key feature of real-world networks is the powerlaw (or generally heavy-tailed) degree distribution. This indicates the presence of a few hubs, i.e., nodes that are very (or strongly, in the weighted case) connected and many nodes that are poorly (or weakly) connected. In Fig. 2, we present the networks' complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF) of the strengths for 2010. The heavy-tailed nature is visible, although it cannot be classified as a power-law distribution due to insufficient orders of magnitude of variation. This pattern persists in the 2018 data, as demonstrated in the Supplementary Information, which includes further analyses depicting the relationship between in-strength and out-strength for all flow types in 2010 and 2018.

Second Order Properties Fig. 3 presents the Weighted Average Nearest Neighbor Strength (WANNS) for the empirical networks alongside 50 realizations drawn from the null model ensembles for Migration, Tourism, Erasmus, and Freight. In the Supplementary Information, we present the remaining three layers. The analysis reveals a predominantly assortative trend across all flow types except for Erasmus student mobility. This assortative behavior indicates a positive correlation between node strengths and their neighbors' strengths, suggesting that regions with strong connectivity tend to connect with other strongly



Fig. 2: Complementary cumulative distribution function for the year 2010.

connected regions. This analysis reveals the presence of a core-periphery structure, whereby the core is comprised of regions that demonstrate a high level of interaction and exchange, while the periphery is constituted by regions with limited engagement in these flows. Comparing the empirical results with the null model predictions, we observe that the null model consistently anticipates a stronger correlation between WANNS^{*in,out*} and in-strength. This pattern holds true for all flow types except passenger transport, where both Pearson and Spearman correlations are lower in the null model, deviating from the trend observed in other flow types. Similarly, for FDI, we note that Spearman's correlation coefficient of the null model is smaller than the empirical one.

3.2 Centrality Measure: PageRank

Fig. 4 illustrates the spatial distribution of PageRank centrality values across European regions for Migration, Tourism, FDI, and Remittances in 2010. This visualization provides insights into the relative importance of regions within various flow networks, emphasizing the heterogeneity of regional centrality across different types of flows. In the Supplementary Information, we present the remaining three layers and detailed tables showcasing the top 10 regions ranked by PageRank for all flow types in 2010. Moreover, we include further analyses on the relationship between PageRank and in-strength.

In contrast, Fig. 5 depicts the spatial distribution of multiplex PageRank centrality values for the same year, offering a comprehensive view of regional significance within the interconnected multilayer network structure by integrating information from all flow types.

To capture the temporal evolution of PageRank rankings, Fig. 8 to 10 display a heatmap of these rankings for each layer, with regions ordered according to their average position across all layers and years. The figures present a series of heatmaps organized in columns. Each column represents a specific type of flow, while the vertical axis provides the identifying name of the corresponding region. The width of each column is proportional to the number of temporal observations. The ranking's position is represented by shades of red,



Fig. 3: Empirical vs. ensemble WANNS for Migration, Tourism, Erasmus, and Freight (2010). Subplots show in-strength vs. WANNS^{in,out}. Red: empirical data; blue histogram: ensemble distribution. Pearson's r and Spearman's s correlations provided.

with higher saturation indicating a higher ranking position. This comprehensive visualization reveals a general trend of rank stability, particularly among topranked regions, which tend to maintain their positions across various flow types and years. However, we observe notable exceptions to this pattern, with certain regions demonstrating high centrality only in specific layers. Middle-ranked regions exhibit greater heterogeneity in their rankings across different flow types and years, indicating more dynamic centrality patterns in this tier.

Further analysis of PageRank trends (in the specific instance of the Migration layer) reveals that London maintains a strong upward trajectory in centrality through time, despite a temporary decline in 2016 likely due to the Brexit referen-



Fig. 4: PageRank for Migration, Tourism, FDI, and Remittances in 2010. Colors are displayed on a logarithmic scale, with values normalized such that the region with the highest centrality is set to 1.

dum, highlighting the city's resilience as a key migration hub (see Supplementary Information for details).

To distill key information from these temporal trends, Tables 3 and 4 present a focused analysis of PageRank ranking dynamics. We highlight regions with the highest and lowest average rankings, as well as those experiencing the most significant increases and decreases in ranking positions across layers. This analysis uncovers that certain regions, such as Ile-de-France, consistently maintain high centrality across multiple flow types, demonstrating their multifaceted importance in European networks. Conversely, other regions, like Lazio, exhibit exceptional centrality in specific domains, suggesting specialized roles within particular flow networks.



Fig. 5: PageRank values for the 2010 Multiplex. Colors are displayed on a logarithmic scale, with values normalized such that the region with the highest centrality is set to 1.

Table 1 presents an analysis of the multiplex PageRank ranking across regions. It highlights regions with the highest and lowest average rankings, as well as those experiencing the most substantial positive and negative shifts in their ranking positions. The analysis reveals that Ile-de-France, Comunidad de Madrid, Noord-Holland, Cataluña, and Lombardia consistently maintain the highest average rankings in the multiplex network. This suggests these regions play central roles across multiple types of flows within the European network. Conversely, we observe significant upward mobility in the rankings for regions such as Bratislava and Leipzig. These regions demonstrate the most substantial improvements in their multiplex PageRank positions, indicating an increase in their overall importance within the interconnected flow networks over time.

Single-layer VS Multiplex Fig. 6 illustrates the changes in node ranking when comparing the multilayer PageRank to the average of single-layer PageR-

Table 1: Multiplex rankings (2010-2018): highest and lowest average, largest increases and decreases (excluding autonomous cities, Åland Islands, Atlantic island regions, and French overseas departments).

Category	Region
Highest Average: 1	Ile-de-France (FR)
Highest Average: 2	Comunidad de Madrid (ES)
Highest Average: 3	Noord-Holland (NL)
Highest Average: 4	Cataluña (ES)
Highest Average: 5	Lombardia (IT)
Lowest Average: 1	Liechtenstein (LI)
Lowest Average: 2	Molise (IT)
Lowest Average: 3	La Rioja (ES)
Lowest Average: 4	Flevoland (NL)
Lowest Average: 5	Voreio Aigaio (EL)
Largest Increase: 1	Bratislavský kraj (SK)
Largest Increase: 2	Leipzig (DE)
Largest Increase: 3	Alentejo (PT)
Largest Increase: 4	Kypros (CY)
Largest Increase: 5	Nord-Vest (RO)
Largest Decrease: 1	Dytiki Ellada (EL)
Largest Decrease: 2	Pohjois- ja Itä-Suomi (FI)
Largest Decrease: 3	West Central Scotland (UK)
Largest Decrease: 4	Northern Ireland (UK)
Largest Decrease: 5	Länsi-Suomi (FI)

anks. A comprehensive explanation is provided below. The single-layer PageRank rankings were averaged to obtain a composite ranking, representing each node's average importance across all layers. The positions of nodes in the multilayer PageRank ranking were compared to their positions in the average single-layer PageRank ranking. The difference in ranking positions was calculated for each node. Nodes exhibiting an increase in ranking are indicated by positive values (red). This denotes an increase in the node's ranking in the multilayer PageRank relative to the average single-layer PageRank. That is, the node is more important in the multilayer analysis. Negative values (blue) indicate a reduction in the node's ranking within the multilayer PageRank relative to the average single-layer PageRank. This suggests that the node is of less importance in the multilayer analysis.

This visualization reveals substantial variations, underscoring the importance of considering multiplex centrality measures to obtain comprehensive information not discernible from individual layer analyses and revealing a heterogeneous pattern of ranking shifts. Notably, within individual countries, we observe both positive and negative shifts in regional rankings. The most consistent shift is observed for Malta, with a remarkable change of 91 positions, underscoring the



Fig. 6: Change in Node Ranking: Multilayer vs. Average Single-layer PageRank. Positive values (red) indicate an increase in ranking in the multilayer PageRank compared to the average of single-layer PageRanks, while negative values (blue) indicate a decrease. The intensity of the color represents the number of positions changed, with darker shades indicating larger changes. A logarithmic scale is used to emphasize changes near zero while still representing larger changes.

potential for significant discrepancies between single-layer and multiplex centrality measures.

Analysis of correlations between single-layer and multiplex PageRank values (see Supplementary Information) reveals moderate positive relationships, suggesting that while individual layers contribute to overall centrality, the multiplex approach captures additional structural information not fully represented in any single layer.

3.3 Community Detection: Infomap

The application of the Infomap algorithm to our multiplex network revealed a complex community structure across European regions (Fig. 7). A total of 82 communities were identified, which appears to be a reasonable number given that the total number of regions and countries involved is approximately 300 and 30, respectively. This equates to an average of approximately two and a half



Fig. 7: This map displays the NUTS2 regions of Europe, with the different colors representing the 82 distinct communities detected by the Infomap algorithm applied to the multiplex network for the year 2010.

communities per country. These communities exhibit a mix of national cohesion and cross-border associations. Notable cases that emerged are the following:

- Belgium forms a community with Luxembourg and a neighboring Dutch region, suggesting strong economic and social ties in this cross-border area.
- The Czech Republic and Slovakia form a single community, reflecting their historical and ongoing close relations.
- A community comprises many English regions and Cyprus, indicating strong connections despite geographical distance.
- Several countries form predominantly self-contained communities, including Romania, Austria, Poland, Greece, Portugal, Hungary, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Bulgaria, Finland, Malta, and Iceland. This suggests these nations have stronger internal than external flows across the analyzed dimensions.
- Spain, France, and Italy each display a core community of multiple regions, with additional smaller communities, indicating complex internal structures.
- Cross-border communities are observed between Åland (Finland) and Sweden, and between Liechtenstein and Switzerland, highlighting strong regional ties that transcend national borders.
- The Baltic states (Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia) form a cohesive community, reflecting their geographical proximity and shared historical background.

- Germany and the United Kingdom exhibit highly fragmented community structures, suggesting complex and diverse flow patterns within these countries.
- Slovenia, Croatia, and Malta form an unexpected community, potentially indicating strong economic or social ties among these Mediterranean and Adriatic regions.
- Northern Ireland and Ireland constitute a single community, aligning with their geographical proximity and historical connections.

Having 82 communities poses a set of challenges for their representation on a colored map. For a better and detailed information, we reported in Table (10) of the Supplementary Information the full listing of the communities.

4 Discussion

Our analysis of the European regional flow networks reveals complex patterns of connectivity and centrality across multiple dimensions. The first-order properties, particularly the Complementary Cumulative Distribution Function (CCDF), demonstrate heavy-tailed distributions across all layers, indicative of a network structure where a small number of regions dominate in terms of connectivity while the majority exhibit sparse connections. This pattern, common in realworld networks, underscores the heterogeneous nature of regional interactions within Europe. The Weighted Average Nearest Neighbors Strength (WANNS) analysis provides further insights into the network's structure. The observed tendency for regions with high WANNS^{in,out} to receive flows from regions with high out-strength suggests the presence of a densely interconnected core. However, the lower-than-expected correlation compared to the null model indicates that while a core-periphery structure may exist, it is not as pronounced as one might anticipate. This nuanced finding highlights the complex interplay between regional strengths and their neighbors' characteristics, revealing patterns of connectivity that go beyond simple random interactions.

A key finding of our study is the significant difference between single-layer and multiplex centrality analyses. While single-layer analysis remains crucial for understanding specific types of interactions, the multiplex approach provides a more comprehensive view of regional importance. The single-layer PageRank results demonstrate that some regions maintain consistent centrality across various flow networks, while others display specialized importance within specific domains. For instance, German regions show a particularly strong attractive power in migration flows. The multiplex analysis reveals how regional importance shifts when considering the entire network structure. Interestingly, regions in Eastern Europe demonstrate the largest absolute values in ranking changes. This finding may reflect the economic transformation and integration of Eastern European countries into the EU market. The observed changes in rankings between single-layer and multiplex PageRank underscore the added value of the multiplex centrality measure. These shifts emphasize the necessity of a holistic approach when evaluating regional centrality in multi-dimensional flow systems, as the multiplex perspective uncovers insights that would be overlooked if only examining individual layers.

Notably, Bratislava and Leipzig demonstrate the most significant increases in multiplex ranking from 2010 to 2018. This finding aligns with their documented economic trajectories during this period. Bratislava, despite a relatively stagnant population, experienced remarkable economic growth [10]. Its GDP per capita at purchasing power parity surpassed that of Vienna, placing it among Europe's top 10 leading regions. This economic surge was primarily driven by substantial foreign direct investment, particularly in the automotive sector, leading to full employment in the region. Similarly, Leipzig emerged as Germany's fastest-growing city in the 2010s [7]. Its remarkable growth can be attributed to massive public investments, subsidies, and support programs across various policy fields and sectors. These public initiatives were instrumental in mobilizing significant private capital investments across all urban sectors, fueling the city's rapid development. These case studies of Bratislava and Leipzig illustrate how the multiplex analysis captures complex regional dynamics that might be missed in single-layer examinations. The multiplex approach effectively reflects the multifaceted nature of regional development, encompassing factors such as foreign investment, economic growth, and policy interventions, which collectively influence a region's centrality within the European network of flows.

Our community detection analysis further supports the complexity of interregional connections. The identified community structures often transcend national boundaries, revealing both expected connections based on geographical or historical ties and unexpected linkages. The community structure revealed by the Infomap algorithm presents a mix of expected and unexpected patterns. The formation of communities along national lines for countries like Romania, Austria, Poland, and others is not surprising, as it aligns with the expectation of stronger internal connections within nations. Similarly, the close ties between historically connected regions, such as the Czech Republic and Slovakia, or Ireland and Northern Ireland, are unsurprising. However, several findings are more unexpected. For instance, the community linking English regions with Cyprus is particularly interesting, reflecting strong commercial and financial ties. Another surprising finding is the community comprising Slovenia, Croatia, and Malta is unexpected, as while they share a Mediterranean connection, their economic and social ties are not typically considered strong. This finding underscores the intricate nature of European regional interactions and suggests that traditional geographic or political boundaries may not always align with functional economic and social networks.

In conclusion, our analysis reveals a complex interplay of expected and novel insights into European regional networks. While we observe anticipated patterns such as heavy-tailed distributions and some community formations along national lines, our multiplex approach unveils significant shifts in regional importance that might be overlooked in single-layer examinations. The cases of Bratislava and Leipzig exemplify how multiplex ranking can align with documented economic trajectories, offering a more comprehensive view of regional dynamics. The community detection analysis reveals both expected and unexpected regional connections, highlighting the complexity of European interactions. Our multiplex approach uncovers non-obvious patterns of regional attractiveness and interconnectedness, demonstrating that functional networks often transcend traditional boundaries. This holistic perspective offers valuable insights for policymakers and researchers working on regional development and cooperation in Europe. Future research could further explore the temporal dynamics of these multiplex networks and investigate how external shocks or policy interventions might influence the observed patterns of regional connectivity and centrality.

Acknowledgments. AF is supported by the European Union – Horizon 2020 Program under the scheme "INFRAIA-01-2018-2019 – Integrating Activities for Advanced Communities", Grant Agreement n.871042, "SoBigData++: European Integrated Infrastructure for Social Mining and Big Data Analytics". We thank the IMT Lucca Networks research unit, Leonardo Ialongo, Simone Daniotti, Davide Fiaschi, Angela Parenti, and Cristiano Ricci for providing insightful discussions.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

- 1. Espon database portal. https://database.espon.eu/, accessed: 2024-06-17
- Irie. https://gis-portal.espon.eu/arcgis/apps/sites/#/irie-hub?, accessed: 2024-10-29
- Irie final report. https://gis-portal.espon.eu/arcgis/sharing/rest/content/ items/5d1239c0336041fdb87ef00454f61bb9/data, accessed: 2024-12-05
- Measuring the attractiveness of regions. https://doi.org/10.1787/fbe44086-en, accessed: 2024-12-05
- 5. Bianconi, G.: Multilayer networks: structure and function. Oxford university press (2018)
- Cracolici, M.F., Nijkamp, P.: The attractiveness and competitiveness of tourist destinations: A study of southern italian regions. Tourism management **30**(3), 336–344 (2009)
- Cudny, W., Kunc, J.: Growth and change in post-socialist cities of Central Europe. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group (2022)
- 8. De Domenico, M., Porter, M.A., Arenas, A.: Muxviz: a tool for multilayer analysis and visualization of networks. Journal of Complex Networks **3**(2), 159–176 (2015)
- Gomez, S., Diaz-Guilera, A., Gomez-Gardenes, J., Perez-Vicente, C.J., Moreno, Y., Arenas, A.: Diffusion dynamics on multiplex networks. Physical review letters 110(2), 028701 (2013)
- Hanzl-Weiss, D., Holzner, M., Römisch, R.: Bratislava and vienna: Twin cities with big development potentials (2018), https://api.semanticscholar.org/ CorpusID:169227102
- Kang, Y., Gao, S., Liang, Y., Li, M., Rao, J., Kruse, J.: Multiscale dynamic human mobility flow dataset in the us during the covid-19 epidemic. Scientific data 7(1), 390 (2020)

- Komornicki, T., Rosik, P., Mazur, M.: A multilayer vision of regional integration (2023), https://coilink.org/20.500.12592/m7czwk, retrieved on 09 Dec 2024. COI: 20.500.12592/m7czwk
- Lee, K.H.: The conceptualization of country attractiveness: a review of research. International Review of Administrative Sciences 82(4), 807–826 (2016)
- 14. Musolino, D.: L'attrattività percepita di regioni e province del mezzogiorno per gli investimenti produttivi. Rivista economica del Mezzogiorno **30**(1), 45–70 (2016)
- Musolino, D., Kotosz, B.: A new territorial attractiveness index at the international scale: design, application and patterns in italy. The Annals of Regional Science 72(4), 1159–1187 (2024)
- 16. Newman, M.: Networks. Oxford university press (2018)
- Öner, Ö.: Retail city: the relationship between place attractiveness and accessibility to shops. Spatial Economic Analysis 12(1), 72–91 (2017)
- Page, L., Brin, S., Motwani, R., Winograd, T., et al.: The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web (1999)
- Parisi, F., Squartini, T., Garlaschelli, D.: A faster horse on a safer trail: generalized inference for the efficient reconstruction of weighted networks. New Journal of Physics 22(5), 053053 (2020)
- Provenzano, D., Hawelka, B., Baggio, R.: The mobility network of european tourists: a longitudinal study and a comparison with geo-located twitter data. Tourism Review 73(1), 28–43 (2018)
- Reiner, C., Meyer, S., Sardadvar, S.: Urban attraction policies for international academic talent: Munich and vienna in comparison. Cities 61, 27–35 (2017)
- Rosvall, M., Axelsson, D., Bergstrom, C.T.: The map equation. The European Physical Journal Special Topics 178(1), 13–23 (2009)
- Russo, A., Smith, I., Atkinson, R., Servillo, L., Madsen, B., Van der Borg, J., et al.: Attreg-the attractiveness of european regions and cities for residents and visitors. Applied Research 1(7) (2013)
- Servillo, L., Atkinson, R., Russo, A.P.: Territorial attractiveness in eu urban and spatial policy: A critical review and future research agenda. European urban and regional studies 19(4), 349–365 (2012)
- Squartini, T., Mastrandrea, R., Garlaschelli, D.: Unbiased sampling of network ensembles. New Journal of Physics 17(2), 023052 (2015)
- Vallarano, N., Bruno, M., Marchese, E., Trapani, G., Saracco, F., Cimini, G., Zanon, M., Squartini, T.: Fast and scalable likelihood maximization for exponential random graph models with local constraints. Scientific Reports 11(1), 15227 (2021)
- Waltert, F., Schläpfer, F.: Landscape amenities and local development: A review of migration, regional economic and hedonic pricing studies. Ecological Economics 70(2), 141–152 (2010)

Flow Type	Description	Sources	Methodology	Our Analysis
Migration	Number of peo-	EUROSTAT	Multi-step process: Base Data,	Applied floor
	ple migrating be-	and NSI	Stock Gain estimation, In-Out-	function to
	tween NUTS 2 re-		Cross estimation. Country-to-	ensure whole
	gions		country matrices created, gaps	numbers. Divided
			filled using stock-gain method	by origin region
			and linear models. Region-to-	population (see
			region flows estimated by de-	SI)
			composing country-level data	,
Tourism	Number of	EUROSTAT	Completed gaps in country-	Applied floor
	tourists traveling	and UNWTO	to-country and disaggregated	function. Divided
	between NUTS 2	for country-	country-to-country to region-to-	by origin region
	regions	to-country:	region. Methods include cross-	population
	0	EUROSTAT	referencing UNWTO indexes.	r • r • • • • • • • •
		for regional	interpolation/extrapolation.	
		domestic	and gravity model analysis us-	
		arrivals	ing GDP, arrivals, and distance	
			data	
FDI	Shareholders'	AMADEUS	Aggregated firm-level data. In-	Summed FDI
	funds (thou-	database	cluded intraregional and interre-	across all sectors.
	sand euros) in	(Bureau van	gional intra-national flows	Divided by origin
	foreign-owned	Dijk)		region GDP (see
	companies	5 /		SI)
Remittances	Regionalized bi-	EUROSTAT	Estimated regional-level flows	Divided by origin
	lateral remittance	and World	by regionalizing national-level	region GDP
	estimates (thou-	Bank	data using ratio of regional to	0
	sand euros)		national migration flows	
Freight	Total freight flow	Various, for	Performed consistency and	Divided by total
Transport	between NUTS-2	road, rail,	plausibility checks. Developed	outgoing flows
	regions (thousand	maritime, and	disaggregation procedures	from each region,
	tons)	air transport	where regionalized data un-	multiplied by
		_	available	region's rela-
				tive economic
				importance
Erasmus	Higher education	European	Geocoded individual move-	Divided by origin
Student	student mobility	Commission	ments to NUTS-2 regions	region population
Mobility	between partner	datasets	based on sending and receiving	
	countries		institutions	
Horizon	Number of H2020	CORDIS	Geocoded organizations to	No additional
2020 Part-	partnerships be-	project and	NUTS-2 regions. Counted	processing
nerships	tween NUTS-2	participant	partnerships with coordinating	
	regions	organization	partners as senders and other	
		lists	partners as receivers.	
Passenger	Passenger flows	Various Euro-	Implemented appropriate disag-	Summed air,
Transport	between NUTS-2	stat datasets	gregation procedures where re-	maritime, and
	regions for air,		gionalized data unavailable	rail $(\times 1000)$
	maritime, and			passenger flows.
	rail transport			Divided by origin
				region population

	C O 1	1 /	1 1 1 .	1 1 .
Table 2. Overview	of flow type	data sources	methodologies	and our analysis
$\pm abic 2.0001000$	or now uppe.	, uala sources.	mounouoiogios,	and our analysis.

IUWEDU AVELABE, LEE		A TH SOURCE YEARS ALE UTILIVE		
Category	Erasmus	FDI	Freight	Horizon2020
Highest Average: 1	Comunidad de Madrid (ES)	Noord-Holland (NL)	Lombardia (IT)	Ile-de-France (FR)
Highest Average: 2	Ile-de-France (FR)	Ile-de-France (FR)	Zuid-Holland (NL)	Comunidad de Madrid (ES)
Highest Average: 3	Andalucía (ES)	Luxembourg (LU)	Cataluña (ES)	Oberbayern (DE)
Highest Average: 4	Cataluña (ES)	Eastern and Midland (IE)	Ile-de-France (FR)	Région de Bruxelles (BE)
Highest Average: 5	Berlin (DE)	Comunidad de Madrid (ES)	Nord-Pas de Calais (FR)	Lazio (IT)
Lowest Average: 1	Sterea Ellada (EL)	Hovedstaden (DK)	Liechtenstein (LI)	Liechtenstein (LI)
Lowest Average: 2	Yugoiztochen (BG)	Thessalia (EL)	Ísland (IS)	Valle d'Aosta (IT)
Lowest Average: 3	Dytiki Makedonia (EL)	Espace Mittelland (CH)	Malta (MT)	Warmińsko-mazurskie (PL)
Lowest Average: 4	Valle d'Aosta (IT)	Ticino (CH)	Sostinės regionas (LT)	Cumbria (UK)
Lowest Average: 5	Warmińsko-mazurskie (PL)	Molise (IT)	Highlands and Islands (UK)	Opolskie (PL)
Largest Increase: 1	Kontinentalna Hrvatska (HR)	Bretagne (FR)	Kontinentalna Hrvatska (HR)	Extremadura (ES)
Largest Increase: 2	Jadranska Hrvatska (HR)	East Yorkshire (UK)	Ionia Nisia (EL)	Leipzig (DE)
Largest Increase: 3	Wielkopolskie (PL)	Zachodniopomorskie (PL)	Střední Morava (CZ)	Zentralschweiz (CH)
Largest Increase: 4	Podlaskie (PL)	Midi-Pyrénées (FR)	Jihovýchod (CZ)	Prov. West-Vlaanderen (BE)
Largest Increase: 5	Pomorskie (PL)	Yugoiztochen (BG)	Östra Mellansverige (SE)	Nord-Vest (RO)
Largest Decrease: 1 Largest Decrease: 2 Largest Decrease: 3 Largest Decrease: 4 Largest Decrease: 5 Largest Decrease: 5	Nordjylland (DK) Inner London E (UK) Trentino (IT) Sjælland (DK) Liguria (IT)	Región de Murcia (ES) Sardegna (IT) Dytiki Ellada (EL) Lancashire (UK) Brandenburg (DE)	N Ireland (UK) Nyugat-Dunántúl (HU) Peloponnisos (EL) Dél-Alföld (HU) Etelä-Suomi (FI)	Dél-Alföld (HU) Basilicata (IT) Moravskoslezsko (CZ) Malta (MT) Jihovýchod (CZ)

Inner London - East, and several Greek regions are omitted due to equal last position (zero inflows). Four Norwegian regions (Oslo og Akershus, Nord-Norge, Vestlandet, Trøndelag) are absent from the FDI network. For Erasmus largest increase and Table 3: Single-layer rankings (2010-2018): highest and lowest average, largest increases and decreases for Erasmus, FDI, Freight, and Horizon2020 (excluding Melilla and Ceuta autonomous cities; Açores, Madeira, Åland, Canarias and Baleares island regions, and French overseas departments). E=East, N=North. Note: For FDI lowest average, other Danish regions,

Category	Migration	Passengers	Remittances	Tourism
Highest Average: 1	Oberbayern (DE)	Ile-de-France (FR)	Ile-de-France (FR)	Jadranska Hrvatska (HR)
Highest Average: 2	Stuttgart (DE)	Inner London W (UK)	Cataluña (ES)	Cataluña (ES)
Highest Average: 3	Inner London E (UK)	Comunidad de Madrid (ES)	Luxembourg (LU)	Ile-de-France (FR)
Highest Average: 4	Darmstadt (DE)	Inner London E (UK) C	fomunidad de Madrid (ES)	Andalucía (ES)
Highest Average: 5	Ile-de-France (FR)	Oberbayern (DE)	Rhône-Alpes (FR)	Rhône-Alpes (FR)
Lowest Average: 1	Liechtenstein (LI)	Liechtenstein (LI)	Liechtenstein (LI)	Liechtenstein (LI)
Lowest Average: 2	Valle d'Aosta (IT)	Ipeiros (EL)	Voreio Aigaio (EL)	Prov. Brabant Wallon (BE)
Lowest Average: 3	Molise (IT)	Burgenland (AT)	Ionia Nisia (EL)	Outer London W-NW (UK)
Lowest Average: 4	Malta (MT)	Corse (FR) H	ighlands and Islands (UK)	Molise (IT)
Lowest Average: 5	Basilicata (IT)	Dytiki Makedonia (EL)	NE Scotland (UK)	Outer London E-NE (UK)
Largest Increase: 1 Vidu Largest Increase: 2	urio ir vakarų Lietuvos (LT) Sud-Vest Oltenia (RO) Nord Vest (RO)	Etelä-Suomi (FI) Brandenburg (DE)	Ísland (IS) Nyugat-Dunántúl (HU) Poort (HII)	Alentejo (PT) Zuid-Holland (NL)
Largest Increase: 3	Nord-Vest (RO)	Notio Aigaio (EL)	Pest (HU)	Jihovýchod (CZ)
Largest Increase: 4	Sud-Est (RO)	Leicestershire (UK)	Västsverige (SE)	Overijssel (NL)
Largest Increase: 5	Centru (RO)	Prov. Hainaut (BE)	Östra Mellansverige (SE)	Ísland (IS)
Largest Decrease: 1 Largest Decrease: 2 Largest Decrease: 3	Zentralschweiz (CH) Sicilia (IT) F Campania (IT)	Yugozapaden (BG) Kontinentalna Hrvatska (HR) Vugoiztochen (RC)	Attiki (EL) Kentriki Makedonia (EL) Zuid-Holland (NL)	Sud-Est (RO) Lubuskie (PL)
Largest Decrease: 4	Ostschweiz (CH)	Severoiztochen (BG)	Noord-Holland (NL)	Champagne-Ardenne (FR)
Largest Decrease: 5	Calabria (IT)	Latvija (LV)	Jadranska Hrvatska (HR)	Bourgogne (FR)

Table 4: Single-layer rankings (2010-2018): highest and lowest average, largest increases and decreases for Migration, Passengers, Remittances, and Tourism (excluding Melilla and Ceuta autonomous cities; Açores, Madeira, Åland, Canarias and Baleares island regions, and French overseas departments). E=East, W=West, NW=North West, NE=North East.



Fig. 8: PageRank Heatmap - Top-Ranking regions across layers and years. 21



Fig. 9: PageRank Heatmap - Mid-Ranking regions across layers and years. \$22\$



Fig. 10: PageRank Heatmap - Bottom-Ranking regions across layers and years. \$23\$

Supplementary Information

S1 Data

Detailed information on the data sources and processing methodologies used for harmonization and estimation of missing values can be found in [2].

S1.1 Population

Total population on January 1st, sourced from [1]. Manual additions were made for Mariotte (France) and Ireland for specific years.

We normalize the migration flows by dividing them by the population of the origin region to address a potential bias. According to the gravity model in migration studies, regions with larger populations tend to have higher absolute numbers of incoming and outgoing migrants. By normalizing the flows, we eliminate this population size bias, allowing for a more accurate comparison of regions' relative contributions to migration patterns. This approach is also applied to other types of flows in our study, ensuring consistent analysis across different flow categories.

S1.2 GDP

Gross Domestic Product at current market prices (million euros), sourced from [1]. 2011 values were used for regions lacking 2010 data. Manual additions were made for Iceland and Liechtenstein.

S2 Methods

We configure the Infomap algorithm with the following parameters:

- two_level=False: Clusters the optimal number of nested modules, accommodating both country-level clusters and single-region clusters.
- num_trials=100: Number of outer-most loops to run before selecting the best solution.
- flow_model='rawdir': Determines node visitation rates based on the given direction and weight of edges, without using a PageRank algorithm.
- entropy_corrected=True: Corrects for negative entropy bias in small samples (many modules).
- multilayer_relax_rate=0.15: Probability of relaxing the constraint to move only within the current layer (default value).

We applied the Infomap algorithm to the multiplex network structure to identify communities. In this analysis, it is possible for a region to be assigned to multiple communities across different layers. To resolve such cases and provide a definitive community assignment, we employed a frequency-based approach. Specifically, each region was ultimately assigned to the community in which it appeared most frequently across all layers.

S3 Results

S3.1 Network properties

Table 5 and Table 6 present the network statistics across European NUTS-2 regions from 2010 to 2018. For each flow type, we report the number of nodes, which indicates the participating NUTS-2 regions in the network, as well as the number of edges, representing the connections between these regions where a connection signifies a non-zero flow. Additionally, we calculate the density of each network as the ratio of actual connections to the total possible connections, providing insight into how interconnected the regions are within each flow type.

Fig. 11 and 12 depict the relationship between in-strength and out-strength for all flow types in 2010 and 2018, respectively. These scatter plots reveal notable differences in correlations between various flow types, which remain consistent across both years. For instance, in 2010, the Spearman correlation coefficients range widely from 0.16 to 0.94, indicating diverse patterns of association between inflows and outflows across different domains. This substantial variation in correlations persists in 2018, suggesting that the underlying structures of these regional flow networks maintain their distinct characteristics over time.

Fig. 13 presents the WANNS^{in,out} for the empirical networks alongside 50 realizations drawn from the null model ensembles for FDI, Remittances, and Passengers in 2010.

Fig. 14 focuses specifically on the Migration flow type in 2010, showing the relationship between the WANNS^{in,out} and the in-strength for ensemble copies. This visualization helps to understand the assortativity patterns in the migration network, revealing how regions with higher in-strength tend to receive flows from regions with higher out-strength.

Fig. 15 presents the CCDF for all flow types in 2018. This plot closely resembles the CCDF for 2010 shown in the main paper, indicating a remarkable stability in the strength distributions over time. The consistent tail behavior across both years suggests that the potential heavy-tailed relationships and distribution characteristics for different flow types remain largely unchanged. This similarity underscores the persistent nature of the network structure and flow patterns in the European regional system, with minimal alterations in the relative strengths of connections across various domains between 2010 and 2018.

S3.2 Pagerank

Fig. 16 illustrates the spatial distribution of PageRank centrality values across European regions for Freight, Erasmus, and Passengers in 2010.

Tables 7 through 13 present the top 10 regions ranked by PageRank for various flow types in 2010. For migration flows (Table 7), Oberbayern emerges as the most central region, followed closely by Ile-de-France and Inner London - East. The list is dominated by German regions, highlighting Germany's significance in European migration patterns. Tourism flows (Table 8) show Cataluña as the top-ranked region, with Ile-de-France and Jadranska Hrvatska following closely. This ranking reflects the popularity of Mediterranean coastal regions for tourism. In freight transport (Table 9), Lombardia leads, followed by Zuid-Holland and Emilia-Romagna, underscoring the importance of industrial and port regions in goods movement. For Erasmus student exchanges (Table 10), Ile-de-France ranks first, followed by Comunidad de Madrid and Andalucía, indicating the attractiveness of these regions for international students. In Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flows (Table 11), Noord-Holland tops the list, with Ile-de-France and Comunidad de Madrid following, reflecting the financial importance of these regions. Passenger flows (Table 12) are dominated by Ile-de-France, with a significant lead over Comunidad de Madrid and Inner London - West, highlighting Paris's role as a major transportation hub. Finally, for remittance flows (Table 13), Ile-de-France again leads, followed by Cataluña and Luxembourg, indicating the economic significance of these regions for international money transfers. These rankings collectively demonstrate the varied roles that different regions play in different types of flows, with some regions, particularly Ile-de-France, showing high centrality across multiple networks.

Fig. 17 demonstrates the relationship between PageRank and in-strength across all flow types in 2010. The analysis reveals strong correlations for most flow types, with both Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients exceeding 0.74. This indicates a robust association between a region's centrality and the volume of incoming flows for most networks. However, the Freight network stands out as an exception, exhibiting a notably weaker correlation.

Fig. 18 illustrates the top 8 and bottom 8 slopes of PageRank trends for Migration, highlighting regions with notably increasing or decreasing centrality. Interestingly, London stands out among the top increasing trends, despite experiencing a noticeable dip in 2016, likely attributable to the Brexit referendum. This overall upward trajectory, even in the face of such a significant political event, underscores London's resilience and enduring importance as a migration hub.

Fig. 19 displays the correlations between single-layer PageRank values and the multiplex PageRank for various flow types in 2010. The Spearman correlation coefficients range from 0.54 to 0.73, indicating moderate positive relationships between individual layer centralities and the overall multiplex centrality.

S3.3 Community Detection

Fig. 20 illustrates the relationship between the number of communities and the multilayer relax rate for 2010, showing that the range around the standard value (from 0.1 to 0.2) yields a relatively stable number of communities, varying from 70 to 89. Generally, increasing the relax rate r leads to a higher number of

communities, until it reaches an extremely high value (0.9), at which point the number of communities sharply decreases to around 10.

Table 14 presents the results of the Infomap community detection analysis.

Layer	Year	Nodes	Edges	Density (%)
Migration	2010	297	70797	80.53
Migration	2011	297	71535	81.37
Migration	2012	297	72459	82.42
Migration	2013	297	74502	84.75
Migration	2014	297	75342	85.70
Migration	2015	297	75580	85.97
Migration	2016	297	75955	86.40
Migration	2017	297	76044	86.50
Migration	2018	297	76281	86.77
Tourism	2010	297	87635	99.68
Tourism	2011	297	87649	99.70
Tourism	2012	297	87652	99.70
Tourism	2013	297	87665	99.72
Tourism	2014	297	87662	99.72
Tourism	2015	297	87669	99.72
Tourism	2016	297	87686	99.74
Tourism	2017	297	87682	99.74
Tourism	2018	297	87692	99.75
Freight	2010	297	46695	53.12
Freight	2011	297	47315	53.82
Freight	2012	297	46820	53.26
Freight	2013	297	46663	53.08
Freight	2014	297	46703	53.12
Freight	2015	297	44742	50.89
Freight	2016	297	43628	49.63
Freight	2017	297	43326	49.28
Freight	2018	297	42587	48.44
Erasmus	2010	265	21551	30.80
Erasmus	2011	264	22094	31.82
Erasmus	2012	270	23405	32.22
Erasmus	2013	272	24027	32.60
Erasmus	2014	274	24576	32.85

Table 5: Network statistics for Migration, Tourism, Freight, and Erasmus.

Layer	Year	Nodes	Edges	Density (%)
FDI	2010	292	24872	29.27
FDI	2011	292	25028	29.45
FDI	2012	292	25178	29.63
FDI	2013	292	25309	29.79
FDI	2014	292	25360	29.85
FDI	2015	292	25422	29.92
FDI	2016	292	25483	29.99
FDI	2017	292	25521	30.03
FDI	2018	292	25441	29.94
Passengers	2010	297	12144	13.81
Passengers	2011	297	12486	14.20
Passengers	2012	297	12547	14.27
Passengers	2013	297	12604	14.34
Passengers	2014	297	12649	14.39
Passengers	2015	297	12588	14.32
Passengers	2016	297	12716	14.46
Passengers	2017	297	12849	14.62
Passengers	2018	297	12998	14.79
Remittances	2010	297	81375	92.56
Remittances	2011	297	81355	92.54
Remittances	2012	297	81410	92.60
Remittances	2013	297	81243	92.41
Remittances	2014	297	81172	92.33
Remittances	2015	297	81016	92.16
Remittances	2016	297	81236	92.41
Remittances	2017	297	81250	92.42
Remittances	2018	297	81250	92.42
Horizon2020	2015	287	7482	9.12
Horizon2020	2016	284	7135	8.88
Horizon2020	2017	288	6899	8.35
Horizon2020	2018	279	6475	8.35

Table 6: Network statistics for FDI, Passengers, Remittances, and Horizon2020.



Fig. 11: In-strength VS out-strength for the year 2010.



Fig. 12: In-strength VS out-strength for the year 2018.



Fig. 13: Comparison of empirical and ensemble WANNS for FDI, Remittances and Passengers in 2010. Each subplot shows the relationship between in-strength and WANNS^{*in,out*} values. The red points indicate empirical data, while the blue histogram represents the distribution of ensemble results. Correlation coefficients (Pearson's r and Spearman's s) are displayed for both empirical and ensemble data.



Fig. 14: WANNS in,out VS in-strength for ensemble copies for Migration the year 2010.



Fig. 15: Complementary cumulative distribution function for the year 2018.



Fig. 16: PageRank for Freight, Erasmus, and Passengers in 2010. Colors are displayed on a logarithmic scale, with values normalized such that the region with the highest centrality is set to 1.

Region	PageRank
Oberbayern	1.0000
Ile-de-France	0.8087
Inner London - East	0.6598
Darmstadt	0.6441
Stuttgart	0.6259
Düsseldorf	0.6252
Berlin	0.6167
Köln	0.6105
Attiki	0.6045
Lombardia	0.6024

Table 7: Top 10 regions by PageRank for Migration in 2010.

Region	PageRank
Cataluña	1.0000
Ile-de-France	0.9793
Jadranska Hrvatska	0.9237
Andalucía	0.7983
Rhône-Alpes	0.6389
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	0.6367
Veneto	0.5567
Comunidad Valenciana	0.5176
Lombardia	0.4910
Comunidad de Madrid	0.4865

Table 8: Top 10 regions by PageRank for Tourism in 2010.

Region	PageRank
Lombardia	1.0000
Zuid-Holland	0.7975
Emilia-Romagna	0.6890
Veneto	0.6428
Cataluña	0.6336
Ile-de-France	0.6021
Nord-Pas de Calais	0.5995
Andalucía	0.5737
Weser-Ems	0.5091
Comunidad Valenciana	0.5006

Table 9: Top 10 regions by PageRank for Freight in 2010.

Region	PageRank
Ile-de-France	1.0000
Comunidad de Madrid	0.9202
Andalucía	0.8484
Comunidad Valenciana	0.6656
Cataluña	0.6186
Berlin	0.5657
Lazio	0.5479
Stockholm	0.5269
Rhône-Alpes	0.4794
Hovedstaden	0.4272

Table 10: Top 10 regions by PageRank for Erasmus in 2010.

Region	PageRank
Noord-Holland	1.0000
Ile-de-France	0.6988
Comunidad de Madrid	0.5451
Lombardia	0.4559
București - Ilfov	0.4537
Luxembourg	0.4333
Eastern and Midland	0.4220
Région de Bruxelles-Capitale	0.3791
Zuid-Holland	0.3750
Warszawski stołeczny	0.2924

Table 11: Top 10 regions by PageRank for FDI in 2010.

Region	PageRank
Ile-de-France	1.0000
Comunidad de Madrid	0.3822
Inner London - West	0.3775
Inner London - East	0.3187
Stockholm	0.2466
Oberbayern	0.2449
Cataluña	0.2446
Berlin	0.2232
Noord-Holland	0.2197
Lombardia	0.2186

Table 12: Top 10 regions by PageRank for Passengers in 2010.

Region	PageRank
Ile-de-France	1.0000
Cataluña	0.9165
Luxembourg	0.7257
Comunidad de Madrid	0.7015
Vidurio ir vakarų Lietuvos regionas	0.6988
Prov. Antwerpen	0.5824
Rhône-Alpes	0.5389
Latvija	0.4810
Prov. Oost-Vlaanderen	0.4793
Comunidad Valenciana	0.4563

	0.2000		
Table 13: Top 10 r	egions by PageRank	for Remittances	s in 2010.



Fig. 17: PageRank VS in-strength for the year 2010.



Fig. 18: Top 8 and bottom 8 slopes of PageRank Trends for Migration.



Fig. 19: Correlations among single-layer PageRank and multiplex PageRank for 2010.



Fig. 20: Number of communities VS multilayer relax rate for 2010.

NUTS ID	Community	NUTS ID	Community	NUTS ID	Community	NUTS ID	Community	NUTS ID	Community	NUTS ID	Community
FRM0	1	BE23	4	CY00	8	HU23	14	DE11	23	DE93	40
FR10	1	BE22	4	UKK1	8	HU31	14	DE12	23	UKK4	41
FRL0	1	BE21	4	UKJ4	8	HU33	14	DE14	23	UKK3	41
FRE2	1	BE10	4	UKJ2	8	HU22	14	DE13	23	DE24	42
FRY3	1	NL34	4	UKJ3	8	HU32	14	UKN0	24	DE25	42
FRB0	1	BE25	4	RO11	9	HU12	14	IE04	24	DE94	43
FRK2	1	LU00	4	RO41	9	HU11	14	IE05	24	DED2	44
FRJ1	1	ITC2	5	RO21	9	HU21	14	IE06	24	DEG0	45
FRI3	1	ITC1	5	RO32	9	DK04	15	UKE2	25	FRF1	46
FRI2	1	ITH3	5	RO31	9	DK02	15	UKE3	25	FRY1	47
FBI1	1	ITC4	5	BO42	ğ	DK03	15	UKE4	25	FBY2	47
FRHO	1	ITI4	5	BO12	ğ	DK01	15	UKC2	25	DED4	48
FB 12	1	ITF5	5	BO22	ğ	DK05	15	UKC1	25	FRF3	49
FRG0	1	ITE6	5	AT11	10	HR03	16	UKE1	25	ES62	50
ES70	2	ITF2	5	AT3/	10	MT00	16	DE60	26	FBD2	51
ES64	2	ITI1	5	AT33	10	SI03	16	DE80	20	FRF2	52
E563	2	1111	5	AT10 AT10	10	S103	16	DESO	20	ITF3	52
ES03	2	NI 29	5	AT12 AT12	10	1104	10	DEFU	20	DE72	55
E501	2	NL52 NL11	6	AT15 AT21	10	NO06	10	DE27	27	DEIS	04 EE
E505	2	NL11	6	A121 AT22	10	NO00	17	UKD1	21	DEA4	55
E501	2	NL12 NL12	6	A122 AT22	10	NO02	17	UKDI	20	EDC1	50
ES42	2	NL13	0	AI32	10	NO03	17	UKD6	28	FRUI	57
ES23	2	NL21	6	AT31	10	NO05	17	UKD3	28	DECO	58
ES24	2	NL33	6	SE23	11	NO07	17	UKD4	28	FRY4	59
ES30	2	NL42	6	SE33	11	NO04	17	UKD7	28	FRY5	59
ES41	2	NL31	6	SE21	11	NO01	17	UKM9	29	TTF4	60
ES11	2	NL23	6	SE22	11	EE00	18	UKM5	29	DE23	61
ES52	2	NL22	6	SE12	11	LV00	18	UKM6	29	DE72	62
PL62	3	NL41	6	SE11	11	LT02	18	UKM7	29	DE26	63
PL51	3	CZ06	7	SE32	11	LT01	18	UKM8	29	FRC2	64
PL52	3	SK04	7	FI20	11	CH04	19	DE30	30	DE22	65
PL61	3	CZ02	7	SE31	11	LI00	19	DE40	30	ITG1	66
PL63	3	CZ04	7	EL65	12	CH03	19	UKG3	31	ITI3	67
PL71	3	CZ03	7	EL53	12	CH05	19	UKG1	31	ITH2	68
PL72	3	CZ01	7	EL52	12	CH01	19	UKG2	31	ES22	69
PL81	3	CZ07	7	EL51	12	CH02	19	UKF1	32	ITI2	70
PL92	3	SK01	7	EL54	12	CH06	19	UKF2	32	DEB2	71
PL91	3	SK02	7	EL42	12	BG32	20	UKF3	32	ITH1	72
PL82	3	SK03	7	EL41	12	BG31	20	DE91	33	ITH4	73
PL43	3	CZ05	7	EL30	12	BG42	20	DE92	33	ITG2	74
PL41	3	CZ08	7	EL61	12	BG33	20	DE71	34	FRK1	75
PL42	3	UKH3	8	EL62	12	BG34	20	DEB1	35	PT15	76
PL84	3	UKJ1	8	EL63	12	BG41	20	DEB3	35	FRD1	77
PL21	3	UKK2	8	EL64	12	DEA2	21	DED5	36	ITF1	78
PL22	3	UKH1	8	EL43	12	DEA3	21	DEE0	36	ES43	79
BE35	4	UKH2	8	PT30	13	DEA5	21	ES12	37	ES13	80
BE34	4	UKI3	8	PT11	13	DEA1	21	ES21	37	CH07	81
BE33	4	UKI4	8	PT16	13	FI1D	22	UKL2	38	IS00	82
BE32	4	UKI5	8	PT17	13	FI1C	22	UKL1	38		
BE31	4	UKI6	8	PT18	13	FI1B	22	FRE1	39		
BE24	4	UKI7	8	PT20	13	FI19	22	DE50	40		

Table 14: Infomap community detection results.