

Phase transition in evolving networks that combine preferential attachment and random node deletion

Barak Budnick, Ofer Biham and Eytan Katzav

Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 9190401, Israel

E-mail: barak.budnick@mail.huji.ac.il, ofer.biham@mail.huji.ac.il, eytan.katzav@mail.huji.ac.il

Abstract.

Analytical results are presented for the structure of networks that evolve via a preferential-attachment-random-deletion (PARD) model in the regime of overall network growth and in the regime of overall contraction. The phase transition between the two regimes is studied. At each time step a node addition and preferential attachment step takes place with probability P_{add} , and a random node deletion step takes place with probability $P_{\text{del}} = 1 - P_{\text{add}}$. The balance between growth and contraction is captured by the parameter $\eta = P_{\text{add}} - P_{\text{del}}$, which in the regime of overall network growth satisfies $0 < \eta \leq 1$ and in the regime of overall network contraction $-1 \leq \eta < 0$. Using the master equation and computer simulations we show that for $-1 < \eta < 0$ the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ converges towards a stationary form $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ which exhibits an exponential tail. This is in contrast with the power-law tail of the stationary degree distribution obtained for $0 < \eta \leq 1$. Thus, the PARD model has a phase transition at $\eta = 0$, which separates between two structurally distinct phases. At the transition, for $\eta = 0$, the degree distribution exhibits a stretched exponential tail. While the stationary degree distribution in the phase of overall growth represents an asymptotic state, in the phase of overall contraction $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ represents an intermediate asymptotic state of a finite life span, which disappears when the network vanishes.

Keywords: Network growth models, preferential attachment, node deletion, degree distribution, scale-free networks.

1. Introduction

Network theory provides a conceptual and mathematical framework for the analysis of structure and dynamics in biological, social and technological networks [1–6]. It was found that empirical networks are typically small-world networks whose diameters scale logarithmically with the network size. Many of these networks exhibit fat-tailed degree distributions with scale free structures [7–9]. The growth processes that yield these structures were studied extensively. It was found that the added nodes tend to connect preferentially to nodes of high degree, which are more visible or prominent in the network. As a result, nodes of high degree tend to attract new connections at a higher rate. Highly connected nodes (or hubs) often provide better access to information, resources or opportunities within the network. New nodes tend to benefit from these advantages by connecting to high degree nodes, further reinforcing their centrality.

The preferential attachment mechanism gives rise to scale-free networks with power-law degree distributions of the form $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ [8–11]. These properties are captured by the Barabási-Albert (BA) model [8]. In this model, at each time step a new node is added to the network and connects to m of the existing nodes. The probability of an existing node of degree k to gain a link to the new node is proportional to k . The degree distribution of the BA network exhibits a power-law tail with $\gamma = 3$. Variants of the BA model were shown to yield power-law distributions with exponents in the range $2 < \gamma \leq 3$ [10–12]. In scale-free networks of a finite size, there is always a maximum degree k_{\max} , which is constrained by the network size N . For $\gamma \leq 2$ the mean degree $\langle K \rangle$ diverges in the limit of $k_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$. For $2 < \gamma < 3$ the mean degree is bounded while the second moment $\langle K^2 \rangle$ diverges algebraically. In the marginal case of $\gamma = 3$ the second moment diverges logarithmically, while in the regime of $\gamma > 3$ it is bounded.

The robustness of complex networks is crucial for ensuring functionality, security and stability of these networks. The mathematical framework of percolation theory provides useful tools for the analysis of network robustness against the deletion of nodes due to failures and attacks [13–24]. When the number of deleted nodes exceeds some threshold, the network disintegrates, resulting in a large number of disconnected components [13–15, 25–28]. In this context, it was shown that scale-free networks are resilient to random failures and attacks targeting random nodes [13], but are vulnerable to targeted attacks aimed at high degree nodes or hubs [14].

The evolution of the structure of networks that undergo contraction due to node deletion processes was recently studied [29, 30]. These processes include random, preferential and propagating node deletion. The process of random node deletion describes random failures or random attacks that do not target any specific type of nodes. The process of preferential node deletion describes attacks that target high degree nodes, where the probability of a node to be selected for deletion is proportional to its degree. Propagating node deletion describes processes that propagate in the network from an infected node to its neighbors. Using the master equation for the degree distribution $P_t(k)$, it was shown that for a broad class of network structures, when the

network contracts, its degree distribution evolves towards a Poisson distribution, namely it becomes an Erdős-Rényi (ER) network [31–33]. ER networks belong to an ensemble of maximum entropy random graphs [34].

The structure of networks that evolve under a combination of growth and contraction processes was studied in Refs. [35–37], which focus on the regime of overall network growth. More specifically, in the model studied by Moore et al. [35] the growth mechanism is based on the BA model [8], where each new node is connected to m existing nodes, which are selected preferentially, while the contraction process takes place via random node deletion. We thus refer to the model studied by Moore et al. [35] as the Barabási-Albert with random deletion (BARD) model. It was found that in the regime of overall network growth the asymptotic degree distribution of the BARD model exhibits a power-law tail. However, the complementary regime, in which the overall process is of network contraction has not been studied.

The case of overall network contraction occurs when the rate of node deletion exceeds the rate of node addition. For example, social networks contract when the number of users that leave the network is larger than the number of users that join [38, 39]. A similar situation may occur in networks of business firms in which the nodes represent individual companies, while the edges describe the connections between them. These networks evolve in time as companies are launched, grow, mature and may eventually decline and dissolve. A remarkable study of a declining network was done by Saavedra et al. [40], who analyzed the business network of the New York City garment industry, in which the nodes represent designers and contractors and the links represent coproductions of lines of clothing. The analysis is focused on the period of 19 years between 1985 and 2003, during which the network size had shrunk more than 10-fold. In spite of the dramatic decline in size, the network remained topologically robust in the sense that it resisted quick fragmentation and the degree distribution remained stationary, maintaining its truncated power-law form. This lasted until around the year 2000, when finite size effects became more pronounced. This robustness enabled the network to maintain its functionality in spite of the declining size. Using computer modeling and simulations, Saavedra et al. concluded that the deletion process is anti-preferential, namely the probability of a node to be deleted is inversely proportional to its degree. In simple terms it implies that the least connected nodes are the most vulnerable to deletion from the network. They also found that the deletion process is accompanied by a partial recovery process via preferential attachment. The robustness of the degree distribution as the network declines provides a strong motivation for the study of stationary solutions for the degree distribution of contracting networks.

In this paper we analyze the emerging structure of networks that evolve under a combination of growth, by node addition and preferential attachment, and contraction, by random node deletion, in the regime of overall network growth and in the regime of overall contraction. The phase transition between the two regimes is studied. Unlike the BARD model, in the model studied here, the new nodes added to the network are initially isolated. They gain links in subsequent time steps via the preferential

attachment process, that connects pairs of already existing nodes in the network. This model is referred to as the preferential-attachment-random-deletion (PARD) model.

Using the master equation we show that in the regime of overall network contraction, the degree distribution converges towards a stationary form $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which exhibits an exponential tail. This is in contrast with the case of growing networks for which the distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ is a power-law distribution. Thus, the PARD model has a phase transition between the growing phase and the contracting phase, where the stationary degree distribution changes in a qualitative way. At the transition, the network maintains its original size, apart from fluctuations, and the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ follows a stretched exponential form. It is found that the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of the PARD model is smooth and follows the same functional form over the whole range of degrees $k \geq 0$. This is in contrast with the BARD model that exhibits a cusp at $k = m$. This cusp separates between the regime of high degree nodes and the regime of low degree nodes. The steady state degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ behaves differently in the two regimes. These features make the PARD model somewhat easier to analyze than the BARD model.

The results obtained for the PARD model are in contrast with the random-attachment-random-deletion (RARD) model, in which $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ the same Poisson-like tail both in the overall growth and in the overall contraction phases with no phase transition between them [41]. Another model, which is similar to the RARD model in the case in which the network size remains fixed, was recently studied [42]. It was also found to exhibit a Poisson-like tail.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we present the PARD model. In Sec. 3 we present the master equation for the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ of the PARD model and obtain a differential equation for the generating function $G_t(u)$. In Sec. 4 we calculate the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ and show that there is a phase transition between the regimes of overall growth and overall contraction. In Sec. 5 we briefly consider the corresponding transition in the BARD model. The results are discussed in Sec. 6 and summarized in Sec. 7. In Appendix A we calculate the derivatives of the stationary generating function $G(u)$ in the special case of $\eta = 0$. In Appendix B we calculate the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of the BARD model.

2. The model

Starting from an initial network that consists of N_0 nodes at time $t = 0$, in the PARD model the network evolves according to the following procedure. At each time step starting from $t = 1$, one of two possible processes takes place: (a) *growth step*: with probability P_{add} , an isolated node (of degree $k = 0$) is added to the network. This is followed by the addition of m edges, by repeating the following step m times: each time a node, which is selected uniformly at random, is connected to another node, which is selected preferentially (namely, with a probability that is proportional to its degree), under the condition that the two nodes have not been connected before; (b) *contraction*

step: with probability $P_{\text{del}} = 1 - P_{\text{add}}$, a random node is deleted, together with its edges.

In case that a growth step is selected at time t , the size of the network increases to $N_{t+1} = N_t + 1$. In each one of the subsequent edge addition steps, the degrees of both the randomly selected node and of the preferentially selected node are increased by 1. When a contraction step is selected at time t , the size of the network decreases to $N_{t+1} = N_t - 1$. Consider a node of degree k , whose neighbors are of degrees k'_r , $r = 1, 2, \dots, k$. When such node is deleted, the degrees of its neighbors are reduced to $k'_r - 1$, $r = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

The expected number of nodes in the network at time t is given by

$$N_t = N_0 + \eta t, \quad (1)$$

where the growth/contraction rate

$$\eta = P_{\text{add}} - P_{\text{del}} \quad (2)$$

represents the expectation value of the change in the size of the network at each time step. The parameter η provides a useful classification of the possible scenarios of growth and contraction. The case of pure growth is described by $\eta = 1$. For $0 < \eta < 1$ the overall process is of network growth, while for $-1 \leq \eta < 0$ the overall process is of network contraction. In the special case of $\eta = 0$ the network size remains the same, apart from stochastic fluctuations. In the analysis below, it will be useful to express the probabilities P_{add} and P_{del} in terms of the parameter η , namely

$$P_{\text{add}} = \frac{1 + \eta}{2} \quad (3)$$

and

$$P_{\text{del}} = \frac{1 - \eta}{2}. \quad (4)$$

In the case of overall network contraction, namely for $-1 < \eta < 0$, it is useful to define the normalized time variable

$$\tau = \frac{|\eta|t}{N_0}, \quad (5)$$

which measures the expected fraction of nodes that are deleted from the network up to time t . The expected size of the contracting network at time t can be expressed by $N_t = N_0(1 - \tau)$. Note that the network vanishes at $\tau = 1$, which occurs at time

$$t_{\text{vanish}} = \frac{N_0}{|\eta|}. \quad (6)$$

In the PARD model, the m edges added at each growth step connect pairs of existing nodes, such that one end-node of each edge is selected uniformly at random and the other end-node is selected preferentially, namely with probability that is proportional to the degree of the node. The degrees of the random end-nodes may take values in

the range $k \geq 0$, while the degrees of the preferential end-nodes may take values in the range $k \geq 1$. An efficient way to implement the preferential selection of such end-node is by selecting a random edge and then choosing randomly one of the two end-nodes of the selected edge.

The PARD model is motivated by the dynamics of online social networks. In these networks the formation of a friendship between two users involves a two-step process, in which one user initiates the connection (by sending a friendship request) and the other user confirms it (by accepting the request). In spite of this asymmetric process, the resulting connection is mutual and symmetric, and is thus represented by an undirected edge. The user who initiated the connection is represented by a node selected uniformly at random, while the user who accepted the friendship request is represented by a node selected preferentially. This is due to the fact that users who have many friends are more likely to receive additional friendship requests than users who have few friends. The model also reflects the fact that users in online social networks typically initiate new friendships gradually over time rather than immediately upon joining the network. This process reflects real-world social dynamics, where relationships build and evolve over time. The contraction step in the PARD model accounts for users who deactivate or delete their social media accounts. This may be due to loss of interest, concerns about privacy or due to their migration to other social networks [38, 39].

In the BA model the degree of each new node upon its addition to the network is $k = m$, which later increases as it gains more links. This model is motivated by the growth dynamics of the World Wide Web, in which the initial m links of a new webpage represent outgoing hyperlinks from the new webpage to existing webpages. The connections that are gained at later times represent incoming hyperlinks from younger webpages. For simplicity, these hyperlinks are represented by undirected edges. Due to these growth rules, the degrees of all the nodes in the BA model satisfy $k \geq m$. As a result, the degree distribution of the BARD model is divided into two regimes: the regime of high degree nodes ($k > m$), which gained more links than they lost, and the regime of low degree nodes ($k < m$), which lost more links than they gained. The two regimes are separated by a cusp at $k = m$ [35]. In the PARD model the new nodes are added as an isolated nodes of degree $k = 0$ and gain links in a stochastic manner in subsequent time steps. Since these links are added one at a time, the resulting degree distribution exhibits the same functional form over the entire range of possible values of the degree k .

3. The master equation

Consider an ensemble of networks of size N_0 at time $t = 0$, whose initial degree distribution is given by $P_0(k)$. While the formalism applies to any form of the initial degree distribution, it is often convenient to start from an ER network or a BA network. The networks evolve under a combination of growth, via node addition and preferential attachment, and contraction, via random node deletion. Below we derive a master

equation [43,44] that describes the time evolution of the degree distribution

$$P_t(k) = \frac{N_t(k)}{N_t}, \quad (7)$$

where $N_t(k)$, $k = 0, 1, \dots$, is the number of nodes of degree k in the network at time t and $N_t = \sum_k N_t(k)$ is the network size at time t .

The master equation accounts for the time evolution of the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ over an ensemble of networks. All the network instances in the ensemble have the same initial size N_0 and their degree sequences are drawn from the same initial degree distribution $P_0(k)$. To derive the master equation, we first consider the time evolution of $N_t(k)$, which is expressed in terms of the forward difference

$$\Delta_t N_t(k) = N_{t+1}(k) - N_t(k). \quad (8)$$

Following the derivation presented in Ref. [41], we obtain a difference equation of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_t N_t(k) = & P_{\text{add}} \delta_{k,0} + m P_{\text{add}} \frac{N_t(k-1) - N_t(k)}{N_t} \\ & + m P_{\text{add}} \frac{(k-1)N_t(k-1) - kN_t(k)}{\langle K \rangle_t N_t} \\ & + P_{\text{del}} \frac{(k+1)[N_t(k+1) - N_t(k)]}{N_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta. The first term on the right hand side of Eq. (9) accounts for the addition of an isolated node. The second term accounts for the increased degree of the end-node selected randomly, while the third term accounts for the increased degree of the end-node selected preferentially. The last term accounts for the process of random node deletion. We use the convention in which the boundary condition $N_t(-1) = 0$ is imposed for all values of t .

Since nodes are discrete entities the processes of node addition and deletion are intrinsically discrete. Therefore, the replacement of the forward difference $\Delta_t N_t(k)$ on the left hand side of Eq. (9) by a time derivative of the form $dN_t(k)/dt$ involves an approximation. The error associated with this approximation was shown to be of order $1/N_t^2$, which quickly vanishes for sufficiently large networks [29]. Therefore, the difference equation (9) can be replaced by a differential equation.

To complete the derivation of the master equation we take the time derivative of Eq. (7), which is given by

$$\frac{dP_t(k)}{dt} = \frac{1}{N_t} \frac{dN_t(k)}{dt} - \frac{N_t(k)}{N_t^2} \frac{dN_t}{dt}. \quad (10)$$

Inserting the time derivative $dN_t(k)/dt$ from Eq. (9) and using the fact that $dN_t/dt = \eta$ [from Eq. (1)], we obtain the master equation [43,44]

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dP_t(k)}{dt} &= \frac{1+\eta}{2N_t} [\delta_{k,0} - P_t(k)] + \frac{m(1+\eta)}{2N_t} [P_t(k-1) - P_t(k)] \\
&+ \frac{m(1+\eta)}{2\langle K \rangle_t N_t} [(k-1)P_t(k-1) - kP_t(k)] \\
&+ \frac{1-\eta}{2N_t} [(k+1)P_t(k+1) - kP_t(k)], \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have also expressed P_{add} and P_{del} in terms of η , using Eqs. (3) and (4). The master equation consists of a set of coupled ordinary differential equations for $P_t(k)$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Note that the second term in the first square bracket on the right hand side of Eq. (11) is a result of the transformation from $N_t(k)$ to $P_t(k)$. More specifically, it comes from the second term on the right hand side of Eq. (10).

We denote the time-dependent generating function by

$$G_t(u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u^k P_t(k), \tag{12}$$

which is the Z-transform of the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ [45]. Multiplying Eq. (11) by u^k and summing up over k , we obtain a partial differential equation for the generating function, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
N_t \frac{\partial G_t(u)}{\partial t} &= \frac{1+\eta}{2} [1 - G_t(u)] + \frac{m(1+\eta)}{2} (u-1) G_t(u) \\
&+ \frac{m(1+\eta)}{2\langle K \rangle_t} (u-1) \frac{\partial G_t(u)}{\partial u} + \frac{1-\eta}{2} (1-u) \frac{\partial G_t(u)}{\partial u}. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms in Eq. (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(N_0 + \eta t) \frac{\partial G_t(u)}{\partial t} &+ \left[\frac{m(1+\eta)}{2\langle K \rangle_t} u - \frac{1-\eta}{2} \right] (1-u) \frac{\partial G_t(u)}{\partial u} \\
&+ \frac{1+\eta}{2} [m(1-u) + 1] G_t(u) = \frac{1+\eta}{2}. \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

This is a first order inhomogeneous partial differential equation of two variables. Note that the time dependent mean degree $\langle K \rangle_t$ appears as a coefficient in Eq. (14). Since the mean degree depends on the time dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ itself, the appearance of $\langle K \rangle_t$ in Eq. (14) makes the equation nonlinear.

The mean degree of the network at time t is given by

$$\langle K \rangle_t = \left. \frac{dG_t(u)}{du} \right|_{u=1}. \tag{15}$$

Differentiating equation (14) with respect to u and inserting $u = 1$, we obtain

$$(N_0 + \eta t) \frac{d\langle K \rangle_t}{dt} = -\langle K \rangle_t + m(1+\eta). \tag{16}$$

Solving this equation, we obtain an explicit expression for the time dependent mean degree:

$$\langle K \rangle_t = \begin{cases} \left(1 + \frac{\eta t}{N_0}\right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}} \langle K \rangle_0 + \left[1 - \left(1 + \frac{\eta t}{N_0}\right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}\right] m(1 + \eta) & 0 < \eta \leq 1 \\ e^{-\frac{t}{N_0}} \langle K \rangle_0 + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{t}{N_0}}\right) m & \eta = 0 \\ \left(1 - \frac{|\eta|t}{N_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{|\eta|}} \langle K \rangle_0 + \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{|\eta|t}{N_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{|\eta|}}\right] m(1 - |\eta|) & -1 < \eta < 0, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where the first two lines on the right hand side of Eq. (17) hold for $t \geq 0$, while the third line holds for $0 < t < t_{\text{vanish}}$. Note that Eq. (17) is identical to the result for $\langle K \rangle_t$ in the RARD model (Eq. (44) in Ref. [41]). For $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, in the long time limit, the mean degree converges towards its stationary value, given by

$$\langle K \rangle_{\text{st}} = m(1 + \eta), \quad (18)$$

as the network continues to grow for an unlimited period of time. In contrast, in the regime of overall network contraction, the mean degree $\langle K \rangle_t$ converges towards $\langle K \rangle_{\text{st}}$ while the network contracts and eventually vanishes. In all the cases of Eq. (17), the time scale for the convergence of $\langle K \rangle_t$ towards $\langle K \rangle_{\text{st}}$ is $|\eta|t_{\text{vanish}} = N_0$. In the case of overall network contraction, this implies that the stationary state exists in the time window between $|\eta|t_{\text{vanish}}$ and t_{vanish} . This time window becomes wider as $|\eta|$ is decreased. Note the remarkable result that $\langle K \rangle_{\text{st}}$ does not depend on the specific form of $P_t(k)$ and only on the initial mean degree $\langle K \rangle_0$.

4. The stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$

In the long time limit the generating function $G_t(u)$ converges towards an asymptotic form that satisfies $\partial G_t(u)/\partial t = 0$, which can be expressed by

$$G(u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u^k P_{\text{st}}(k). \quad (19)$$

In this limit the mean degree $\langle K \rangle_t$ converges towards $\langle K \rangle_{\text{st}}$. In this case, the differential equation (14) for the generating function can be simplified using Eq. (18), and is reduced to

$$(\eta + u - 1)(1 - u) \frac{dG(u)}{du} + (1 + \eta) [m(1 - u) + 1] G(u) = 1 + \eta. \quad (20)$$

This equation exhibits two singular points, one at $u = 1$ and the other at $u = 1 - \eta$. Note the plugging $u = 1$ into Eq. (20), recovers the normalization condition for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ and thus does not add new information. As long as $\eta \neq 0$ the points $u = 1$ and $u = 1 - \eta$ are two distinct regular-singular points [46]. Therefore, the radius of convergence of a series expansion for $G(u)$ around $u = 0$ is determined by the value of η . More specifically, the

radius of convergence R is equal to the distance from the origin of the singularity that is nearest to the origin. Thus, for $0 < \eta < 1$ the radius of convergence is $R = 1 - \eta$, while for $-1 < \eta < 0$ it is $R = 1$. In the special case of $\eta = 0$ the two singularities coalesce and become a single irregular-singular point at $u = 1$. These considerations suggest that the irregular-singular point at $\eta = 0$ represents a phase transition that separates between the domains of positive and negative values of η , which are of a different nature.

4.1. The case of $0 < \eta \leq 1$

Here we solve Eq. (20) in the case of overall network growth, namely for $0 < \eta \leq 1$. To this end we express the stationary generating function in the form

$$G(u) = G^{(p)}(u) + G^{(h)}(u), \quad (21)$$

where $G^{(h)}(u)$ is the solution of the homogeneous equation and $G^{(p)}(u)$ is a solution of the inhomogeneous equation. The homogeneous equation is given by

$$\frac{dG^{(h)}(u)}{du} = \frac{1 + \eta}{1 - \eta - u} \left(m + \frac{1}{1 - u} \right) G^{(h)}(u). \quad (22)$$

The homogeneous solution is

$$G^{(h)}(u) = C(1 - u)^{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}} (1 - \eta - u)^{-m(1 + \eta) - 1 - \frac{1}{\eta}}, \quad (23)$$

where C is an integration constant. The homogeneous solution diverges at $u = 1 - \eta < 1$, which is inconsistent with the fact that $G(u)$ is a probability generating function that should be bounded in the range $0 < G(u) < 1$ for $0 < u < 1$. This implies that $C = 0$. Thus, the solution for $G(u)$ consists only of the inhomogeneous term $G^{(p)}(u)$.

We now turn to the solution of the inhomogeneous equation. Multiplying Eq. (20) by the integration factor

$$M(u) = (1 - \eta - u)^{m(1 + \eta) + 1 + \frac{1}{\eta}} (1 - u)^{-1 - \frac{1}{\eta}}, \quad (24)$$

one obtains

$$\frac{d}{du} [G(u)M(u)] = -(1 + \eta)(1 - \eta - u)^{m(1 + \eta) + \frac{1}{\eta}} (1 - u)^{-2 - \frac{1}{\eta}}. \quad (25)$$

Integrating Eq. (25) between u and $1 - \eta$ and using the fact that $M(1 - \eta) = 0$, we obtain

$$G(u)M(u) = (1 + \eta) \int_u^{1 - \eta} (1 - \eta - v)^{m(1 + \eta) + \frac{1}{\eta}} (1 - v)^{-2 - \frac{1}{\eta}} dv. \quad (26)$$

Carrying out the integration, we find that

$$G(u) = \frac{1}{m\eta + 1} \left(\frac{1 - u}{\eta} \right)^{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} 2 + \frac{1}{\eta}, m(1 + \eta) + 1 + \frac{1}{\eta} \\ m(1 + \eta) + 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \end{matrix} \middle| 1 - \frac{1 - u}{\eta} \right], \quad (27)$$

where

$${}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix} \middle| z \right] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n (b)_n}{(c)_n} \frac{z^n}{n!} \quad (28)$$

is the hypergeometric function and

$$(x)_n = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 0 \\ \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (x+i) & n \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

is the Pochhammer symbol [47]. Note that the hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1[a, b; c; z]$ is undefined if c is a non-positive integer. We have verified that in all the expressions that include the hypergeometric function, c does not take any non-positive integer values, ensuring that the hypergeometric function is well-defined.

The stationary degree distribution is obtained by differentiating the generating function $G(u)$

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = \frac{1}{k!} \left. \frac{d^k G(u)}{du^k} \right|_{u=0}. \quad (30)$$

Using identity 15.5.6 from Ref. [47], we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = \frac{1}{m\eta + 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{1+\frac{1}{\eta}} \frac{(m + m\eta)_k}{\left(m + m\eta + 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \right)_k} \times {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} 2 + \frac{1}{\eta}, m(1 + \eta) + 1 + \frac{1}{\eta} \\ m(1 + \eta) + 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} + k \end{matrix} \middle| 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \right]. \quad (31)$$

In the large k limit, the hypergeometric function on the right hand side of Eq. (31) is dominated by the $n = 0$ term in the sum on the right hand side of Eq. (28), which is equal to 1. Approximating the ratio between the two Pochhammer symbols on the right hand side of Eq. (31) using the Stirling formula, we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) \simeq \frac{1}{m\eta + 1} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{1+\frac{1}{\eta}} \frac{\Gamma \left(m + m\eta + 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \right)}{\Gamma(m + m\eta)} k^{-2-\frac{1}{\eta}}, \quad (32)$$

where $\Gamma(x)$ is the Gamma function [47]. This result is consistent with the asymptotic results obtained in Refs. [35–37].

In the special case of pure network growth, where $\eta = 1$, the degree distribution is reduced to

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = \frac{4m(2m + 1)}{(k + 2m + 2)(k + 2m + 1)(k + 2m)}. \quad (33)$$

This result resembles the degree distribution of the Barabási-Albert model of network growth with preferential attachment [10,11]. Note that the second moment of the degree




Figure 1. Analytical results (solid line), obtained from Eq. (31), for the stationary degree distributions $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of a network that evolves via the PARD model in the regime of overall network growth with $\eta = 1/2$ and $m = 4$. We also present simulation results (circles) for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ of such network that has grown from an initial ER network of size $N_0 = 100$ with mean degree of $c = 3$, up to a size of $N = 10^4$. The simulation results for $P_t(k)$ coincide with the analytical results for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which implies that the degree distribution has fully converged to its asymptotic form. In the large k limit, the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ converges towards the asymptotic power-law tail (dashed line), given by Eq. (32).

distribution for $\eta = 1$, given by Eq. (33), diverges logarithmically. This is in contrast to the case of $0 < \eta < 1$, in which the second moment of the degree distribution, given by Eq. (31), is finite. This may be attributed to the fact that at $\eta = 1$ the regular-singular point of the differential equation (20) at $u = 1 - \eta$ converges towards $u = 0$. Since the generating function $G(u)$ is defined as a power series around $u = 0$ the existence of such a Taylor expansion is not guaranteed. Our solution shows that such an expansion indeed exists, but its analytical properties are not the same as obtained for $\eta < 1$.

In Fig. 1 we present analytical results (solid lines), obtained from Eq. (31), for the stationary degree distributions $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of networks that evolve via the PARD dynamics for $\eta = 1/2$. We also present simulation results (circles) for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ at $N = 10^4$. The initial network used in the simulations is an ER network of size $N_0 = 100$ with mean degree $c = 3$. The simulation results for $P_t(k)$ are in very good agreement with the analytical results for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$. The dashed line shows the asymptotic power-law tails, given by Eq. (32).

4.2. The case of $\eta = 0$

Specializing to the case of $\eta = 0$ in Eq. (20), we obtain

$$-(1-u)^2 \frac{dG(u)}{du} + [m(1-u) + 1] G(u) = 1. \quad (34)$$

Interestingly, the two singularities of Eq. (20) coincide in the case of $\eta = 0$ and become a quadratic singularity at $u = 1$. This is an indication for the existence of a phase transition at $\eta = 0$. The solution of the homogeneous equation is given by

$$G^{(h)}(u) = C(1-u)^{-m} \exp\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right), \quad (35)$$

where C is an integration constant. This solution diverges at $u = 1$. Since $G(1)$ should be finite, as it is a probability generating function, this solution is discarded.

Multiplying Eq. (34) by the integration factor

$$M(u) = (1-u)^m \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-u}\right), \quad (36)$$

and integrating both sides between u and 1, we obtain

$$G(u) = (1-u)^{-m} \exp\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right) \int_u^1 (1-v)^{m-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-v}\right) dv. \quad (37)$$

This generating function can be expressed in the form

$$G(u) = (1-u)^{-m} \exp\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right) \Gamma\left(-m+1, \frac{1}{1-u}\right), \quad (38)$$

where $\Gamma(a, z)$ is the upper incomplete gamma function [47].

In the analysis below we insert $G(u)$ from Eq. (38) into Eq. (30) and extract the degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$. To this end, in Appendix A we show that the k 'th derivative of $G(u)$ can be expressed in the form

$$\frac{d^k G(u)}{du^k} = (m)_k \exp\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right) \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} \Gamma\left(-m+1-i, \frac{1}{1-u}\right) \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{m+k+i}, \quad (39)$$

where $\binom{k}{i}$ is the binomial coefficient. Inserting $d^k G(u)/du^k$ from Eq. (39) into Eq. (30), we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = \frac{e}{k!} (m)_k \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} \Gamma(-m+1-i, 1). \quad (40)$$

Replacing the incomplete Gamma function by its integral representation, exchanging the order of the sum and the integral and carrying out the summation, we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = \frac{e}{k!} (m)_k \int_1^\infty t^{-m} e^{-t} \left(1 - \frac{1}{t}\right)^k dt. \quad (41)$$

Replacing the integration variable by $z = t - 1$ and using identity 13.4.4 in Ref. [47], we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = (m)_k U(k+1, 2-m, 1), \quad (42)$$

where $U(a, b, z)$ is Tricomi's confluent hypergeometric function [47]. To obtain an asymptotic expression of the tail of the degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, for $k \gg 1$, we use the asymptotic expansion (Eq. 13.8.8 in Ref. [47])

$$U(k+1, 2-m, 1) \simeq \frac{2\sqrt{e}}{k!} (1 - e^{-w})^{m-2} \sqrt{2\beta \tanh\left(\frac{w}{2}\right)} K_{m-1}[2\beta(k+1)], \quad (43)$$

where

$$w = \cosh^{-1} \left[1 + \frac{1}{2(k+1)} \right] \quad (44)$$

is a parameter that depends on the degree k ,

$$\beta = \frac{w + \sinh(w)}{2} \quad (45)$$

is a parameter that depends on w , and $K_\nu(x)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind [47]. In the limit of $k \gg 1$ these parameters can be further approximated by $w \simeq k^{-1/2}$ and $\beta \simeq k^{-1/2}$. Inserting these expressions into Eq. (42) and expanding the modified Bessel function and the Pochhammer symbol in the large k limit, we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) \simeq \frac{\sqrt{\pi e}}{(m-1)!} k^{\frac{2m-3}{4}} e^{-2\sqrt{k}}. \quad (46)$$

Therefore, the tail of the stationary degree distribution is dominated by a stretched exponential term. This result is consistent with the asymptotic results obtained in Refs. [35–37].

In Fig. 2 we present analytical results (solid line) for the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of networks that evolve via the PAR dynamics in the special case of $\eta = 0$, in which the expected size of the network remains fixed, apart from stochastic fluctuations. The initial network is an ER network of size $N_0 = 10^4$ with mean degree $c = 3$. The analytical results for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ are obtained from Eq. (42). The analytical results are in very good agreement with the simulation results (circles), which are shown for $t = 6N_0$, where the degree distribution has already converged to its asymptotic form $P_{\text{st}}(k)$. The dashed line shows the asymptotic stretched exponential tail, given by Eq. (46).

4.3. The case of $-1 < \eta < 0$

The first steps in the solution of the differential equation for the generating function $G(u)$ in the range of $-1 < \eta < 0$ are the same as shown above for $0 < \eta \leq 1$. The homogeneous part $G^{(h)}(u)$ of the solution diverges at $u = 1$ and is thus discarded. One is left with Eq. (25), which is also valid for $-1 < \eta < 0$. Integrating Eq. (25) between u and 1, we obtain




Figure 2. Analytical results (solid line), obtained from Eq. (42), for the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of a network that evolves via the PARD model with $m = 4$ in the special case of $\eta = 0$ in which the network size is fixed, apart from possible fluctuations. The initial network is an ER network of size $N_0 = 10^4$ with mean degree $c = 3$. We also present simulation results (circles) for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$, which are shown at time $t = 6N_0$. The simulation results coincide with the analytical results, which implies that the degree distribution has fully converged to its asymptotic form. In the large k limit, the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ converges towards the asymptotic stretched exponential tail (dashed line), given by Eq. (46).

$$G(u)M(u) = (1 + \eta) \int_u^1 (1 - \eta - v)^{m(1+\eta) + \frac{1}{\eta}} (1 - v)^{-2 - \frac{1}{\eta}} dv, \quad (47)$$

where we relied on the fact that $M(1) = 0$. The integral on the right hand side of Eq. (47) can be written in terms of a hypergeometric function, leading to

$$G(u) = \left(1 - \frac{1-u}{\eta}\right)^{-m(1+\eta) - 1 - \frac{1}{\eta}} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -m(1+\eta) - \frac{1}{\eta}, -1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \\ -\frac{1}{\eta} \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{1-u}{\eta} \right]. \quad (48)$$

Using Eq. (30) and identity 15.5.6 from Ref. [47], we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{-m(1+\eta) - 1 - \frac{1}{\eta}} \frac{(m + m\eta)_k}{\left(-\frac{1}{\eta}\right)_k} \times (1 - \eta)^{-k} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -m(1+\eta) - \frac{1}{\eta}, -1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \\ -\frac{1}{\eta} + k \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{1}{\eta} \right]. \quad (49)$$

In the large k limit, the hypergeometric function on the right hand side of Eq. (49) is dominated by the $n = 0$ term in the sum on the right hand side of Eq. (28), which is

equal to 1. Approximating the ratio between the two Pochhammer symbols on the right hand side of Eq. (49) using the Stirling formula, we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) \simeq \frac{\Gamma\left(-\frac{1}{\eta}\right)}{\Gamma(m+m\eta)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{m(1+\eta)+1+\frac{1}{\eta}} k^{m(1+\eta)+\frac{1}{\eta}} (1-\eta)^{-k}. \quad (50)$$

Thus, the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ exhibits an exponential tail of the form $P_{\text{st}}(k) \propto e^{-\alpha k}$, where $\alpha = \ln(1 + |\eta|)$.

The model studied in this paper has two parameters, namely the number m of edges that are added to the network in each growth step and the growth/contraction rate η , which takes values in the range of $-1 < \eta \leq 1$. It turns out that the parameter m affects the density of the network but has little effect on the phase diagram, which is essentially determined by η . For $\eta > 0$ the overall process is of network growth, while for $\eta < 0$ the overall process is of network contraction. Thus, in the overall growth phase the life time of the network is unlimited, while in the overall contraction phase the network eventually vanishes. In the analysis presented above it was shown that for $\eta > 0$ the stationary degree distribution exhibits a power-law tail of the form $P_{\text{st}}(k) \sim k^{-2-\frac{1}{\eta}}$. In contrast, for $\eta < 0$ the stationary degree distribution exhibits an exponential tail of the form $P_{\text{st}}(k) \sim (1 + |\eta|)^{-k}$. This degree distribution remains valid as long as the network size is not too small to support it. The transition from a power-law tail to an exponential tail of the degree distribution, which takes place at $\eta = 0$, is a structural phase transition. At the transition point the degree distribution exhibits a stretched exponential tail of the form $P_{\text{st}}(k) \sim \exp(-2\sqrt{k})$, which decays faster than a power-law but slower than an exponential. The appearance of such an intermediate behavior is common at second order phase transitions [48,49], thus providing further indication that there is a phase transition at $\eta = 0$.

The origin of this phase transition can be traced to the structure of singularities of Eq. (20). This equation exhibits two regular-singular points, one of them at $u = 1$ and the other at $u = 1 - \eta$. In the special case of $\eta = 0$ these singular points coalesce and the singularity at $u = 1$ becomes irregular, giving rise to the stretched exponential tail. The convergence of the power-series for $G(u)$ around the origin is determined by the singularity which is closer to the origin. Thus, for $\eta > 0$ the convergence is determined by the singularity at $u = 1 - \eta$, while for $\eta < 0$ it is determined by the singularity at $u = 1$.

In Fig. 3 we present simulation results (symbols) for the degree distributions of networks that evolve via the PARD dynamics in the regime of overall network contraction for (a) $\eta = -1/4$ and (b) $\eta = -1/2$. The initial degree distribution is given by $P_0(k) = P_{\text{st}}(k)$, namely, it coincides with the stationary degree distribution for $-1 < \eta < 0$, which is given by Eq. (49). In each frame the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ obtained from computer simulations with these initial conditions is shown for $\tau = 0$ (\circ), $\tau = 1/4$ ($+$), $\tau = 1/2$ (\times) and $\tau = 3/4$ (\triangle), where the normalized time τ is the fraction of nodes that have been deleted [Eq. (5)]. It is found that the degree distribution remains




Figure 3. Simulation results (symbols) for the time-dependent degree distributions $P_t(k)$ of networks that evolve via the PARD model with $m = 8$, in the regime of overall network contraction with (a) $\eta = -1/4$ and (b) $\eta = -1/2$. The initial degree distribution is given by $P_0(k) = P_{st}(k)$, namely, it coincides with the stationary distribution in the range of $-1 < \eta < 0$, which is given by Eq. (49). The simulation results are shown for $\tau = 0$ (\circ), $\tau = 1/4$ ($+$), $\tau = 1/2$ (\times) and $\tau = 3/4$ (\triangle), where the normalized time τ is the fraction of nodes that have been deleted [Eq. (5)]. It is found that the degree distribution remains stationary throughout the simulation and that it coincides with the stationary distribution $P_{st}(k)$ (solid lines), which is given by Eq. (49). This confirms that the stationary distribution is indeed stable for a long period of time even in the regime of overall network contraction.

stationary throughout the simulation and coincides with the stationary distribution $P_{st}(k)$ (shown by dashed lines), which is given by Eq. (49). This confirms that the stationary distribution $P_{st}(k)$ is indeed stable even under condition in which the network contracts. It implies that while the size of the network decreases, the local structure around a random node, which is captured by the degree distribution, remains stationary for a finite time window, before the network vanishes. This result is compatible with the empirical observations reported in Ref. [40].

In Fig. 4 we present simulation results (symbols) for the degree distributions of networks that evolve via the PARD dynamics in the regime of overall network contraction for (a) $\eta = -1/4$ and (b) $\eta = -1/2$. The initial networks are generated by growth via node addition and preferential attachment with (a) $m_0 = 6$ and (b) $m_0 = 4$, such that the mean degrees of the initial networks satisfy $\langle K \rangle_0 = 2\langle K \rangle_{st}$, and their size is $N_0 = 20,000$. In each frame the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ is shown (right to left) for $\tau = 0$, $\tau = 1/4$, $\tau = 1/2$ and $\tau = 3/4$, where the normalized time τ is the fraction of nodes that have been deleted [Eq. (5)]. The simulation results are in very good agreement with the results obtained from numerical integration of the master equation (solid lines). The stationary distribution $P_{st}(k)$ is also shown (dashed lines). As time evolves the time dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ converges towards the stationary distribution $P_{st}(k)$. The convergence becomes slower as η is decreased.




Figure 4. Simulation results (symbols) for the time dependent degree distributions $P_t(k)$ of networks that evolve via the PARD model with $m = 8$ in the regime of overall network contraction for (a) $\eta = -1/4$ and (b) $\eta = -1/2$. The size of the initial networks is $N_0 = 20,000$ and their mean degree satisfies $\langle K \rangle_0 = 2\langle K \rangle_{st}$, where $\langle K \rangle_{st}$ is given by Eq. (18). The initial networks are generated via the PARD model with $\eta = 1$. The degree distributions $P_t(k)$ are shown (right to left) for $\tau = 0$, $\tau = 1/4$, $\tau = 1/2$ and $\tau = 3/4$, where the normalized time τ is the fraction of nodes that have been deleted [Eq. (5)]. The simulation results are in very good agreement with the results obtained from numerical integration of the master equation (dashed lines). The stationary distributions $P_{st}(k)$ are also shown (solid lines). As time evolves, the time dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ converges towards the stationary distribution $P_{st}(k)$. The convergence becomes slower as η is decreased.

The mean degree $\langle K \rangle_{st} = m(1 + \eta)$, given by Eq. (18), exhibits the same functional form for $\eta > 0$, $\eta = 0$ and $\eta < 0$. Below we calculate the second moment $\langle K^2 \rangle_{st}$ and the variance $\text{Var}(K)$ of the stationary degree distribution $P_{st}(k)$. To this end, we first calculate the second factorial moment $\langle K(K - 1) \rangle_{st}$, which is given by

$$\langle K(K - 1) \rangle_{st} = \left. \frac{d^2 G(u)}{du^2} \right|_{u=1}. \quad (51)$$

Inserting into Eq. (51) the expressions for $G(u)$ from Eqs. (27), (38) and (48) for $\eta > 0$, $\eta = 0$ and $\eta < 0$, respectively, it is found that in all the three cases the second factorial moment is given by

$$\langle K(K - 1) \rangle_{st} = \frac{2m(1 + \eta)[m(1 + \eta) + 1]}{1 - \eta}. \quad (52)$$

Therefore, the second moment is given by

$$\langle K^2 \rangle_{st} = \frac{m(1 + \eta) [2m(1 + \eta) + 3 - \eta]}{1 - \eta}, \quad (53)$$

and the variance is given by

$$\text{Var}(K) = \frac{m(1+\eta)[m(1+\eta)^2 + 3 - \eta]}{1 - \eta}. \quad (54)$$

The variance $\text{Var}(K)$ is a monotonically increasing function of η . It vanishes in the limit of $\eta \rightarrow -1^+$ and diverges in the limit of $\eta \rightarrow 1^-$.

5. Phase transition in the BARD model

To examine the applicability of the results presented above beyond the specific case of the PARD model, we calculate in Appendix B the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of the BARD model. In the BARD model, at each time step, with probability P_{add} , a BA growth step takes place in which a new node is added to the network and is connected preferentially to m existing nodes. Otherwise, with the complementary probability $P_{\text{del}} = 1 - P_{\text{add}}$ a random node is deleted together with its links. Thus, upon formation each node connects to older nodes, while at later times it can receive links only from younger nodes.

The stationary degree distribution of the BARD model exhibits two distinct regimes: the regime of high degree nodes, where $k > m$ and the regime of low degree nodes, where $k < m$. While the regime of high degree nodes consists of nodes which have gained more links than they lost since they were added to the network, the regime of low degree nodes consists of nodes that have lost more links than they gained. The properties of the network are mainly characterized by the degree distribution of the high degree nodes, while the regime of low-degree nodes can be considered as a peculiarity of the model.

The degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ was calculated by Moore et al. [35] in the regime of $\eta \geq 0$. It was found that for $\eta > 0$ it exhibits a power-law tail while for $\eta = 0$ it exhibits a stretched exponential tail. Therefore, we focus in Appendix B on the case of $-1 < \eta < 0$, which has not been studied before. In Eq. (B.16) we present an exact result for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ in this regime. Taking the limit of $k \gg 1$ we obtain an approximation for the tail of $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ and find that it exhibits an exponential decay of the form $(1 - \eta)^{-k}$, which is identical to the exponential tail of the PARD model, given by Eq. (50). The two results differ in the algebraic dependence on k , which goes like $k^{\frac{1}{\eta}}$ in the BARD model, compared to $k^{m(1+\eta) + \frac{1}{\eta}}$ in the PARD model. These results confirm the existence of a phase transition in the BARD model between the regime of $\eta > 0$ in which $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ exhibits a power-law tail and the regime of $\eta < 0$ in which it exhibits an exponential tail.

For completeness, we also briefly consider the case of $\eta > 0$ and the special case of $\eta = 0$. The stationary degree distribution for $0 < \eta \leq 1$ is given by Eq. (B.18). This result is in perfect agreement with the corresponding results in Ref. [35]. In the special case of $\eta = 0$ the stationary degree distribution is given by Eqs. (B.21) and (B.22). For $k \gg 1$ it can be approximated by Eq. (B.26), and is found to exhibit a stretched-exponential tail, in agreement with the results of Ref. [35] and with the PARD




Figure 5. Analytical results (solid line), obtained from Eq. (B.18), for the stationary degree distributions $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of a network that evolves via the BARD model with $m = 4$, in the regime of overall network growth with $\eta = 1/2$. We also present simulation results (circles) for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ of a network that was grown from an initial ER network of size $N_0 = 100$ with mean degree $c = 3$, up to a size of $N = 10^4$. The simulation results for $P_t(k)$ coincide with the analytical results for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which implies that the degree distribution has fully converged to its asymptotic form. In the large k limit, the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ exhibits a power-law tail, which is given by Eq. (B.20).

model, where the tail of $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ is given by Eq. (46).

In Fig. 5 we present analytical results (solid line), obtained from Eq. (B.18), for the stationary degree distributions $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of network that evolved via the BARD model with $m = 4$, in the regime of overall network growth with $\eta = 1/2$. We also present simulation results (circles) for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ of a network that was grown from an initial ER network of size $N_0 = 100$ with mean degree $c = 3$, up to a size of $N = 10^4$. The simulation results for $P_t(k)$ coincide with the analytical results for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which implies that the degree distribution has fully converged to its asymptotic form. In the large k limit, the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ exhibits a power-law tail, which is given by Eq. (B.20). The power-law decay takes the form $k^{-2-\frac{1}{\eta}}$, in agreement with the PARD model, where the tail is given by Eq. (32).

In Fig. 6 we present analytical results (solid line), obtained from Eq. (B.16), for the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of a network that evolved via the BARD model with $m = 8$, in the regime of overall network contraction with $\eta = -1/4$. We also present simulation results (circles) for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ of a network that evolved starting from an initial ER network of size $N_0 = 20,000$ with mean degree $c = 8$, down to a final size of $N = 2,000$. The simulation results for $P_t(k)$ coincide with the analytical results for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which implies that the degree distribution has fully converged to its asymptotic form. In the large k limit, the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ exhibits an exponential tail, which is given by Eq. (B.17). The




Figure 6. Analytical results (solid line), obtained from Eq. (B.16), for the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of a network that evolves via the BARD model with $m = 8$, in the regime of overall network contraction with $\eta = -1/4$. We also present simulation results (circles) for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$ of a network that evolved starting from an initial ER network of size $N_0 = 20,000$ with mean degree $c = 8$, down to a final size of $N = 2,000$. The simulation results for $P_t(k)$ coincide with the analytical results for $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which implies that the degree distribution has fully converged to its asymptotic form. In the large k limit, the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ exhibits an exponential tail, which is given by Eq. (B.17).

left-most data point, for $k = 0$ represents the fraction of isolated nodes in the network. These are nodes that have lost all their connections due to the deletion of all their neighbors. Note that in the BARD model there no mechanism that would enable such isolated nodes to reconnect to other nodes.

6. Discussion

The process of network growth via node addition and preferential attachment gives rise to networks that exhibit a power-law degree distribution. Similarly, for a broad class of initial network structures the process of network contraction via random node deletion leads to networks that converge towards the ER structure, which exhibits a Poisson degree distribution whose mean degree decreases as time proceeds [29, 30]. The combination of growth via node addition and preferential attachment and contraction via random node deletion yields novel structures which depend on the balance between the rates of the two processes.

The behavior of the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ in the regime of overall network contraction $-1 < \eta < 0$ can be considered in the context of dynamical processes that exhibit intermediate asymptotic states [50, 51]. These are states that appear at intermediate time scales, which are sufficiently long for such structures to build up, but shorter than the time scales at which the whole system disintegrates. During

these intermediate times, the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ converges towards the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$. The intermediate time scales can be made arbitrarily long by increasing the initial size of the system, justifying the term ‘asymptotic’.

The results obtained here for the PARD and BARD models are qualitatively different from those obtained earlier for the RARD model in which the growth process involves random attachment [41]. In the limit of pure growth ($\eta = 1$), preferential attachment gives rise to a power-law degree distribution with $\gamma = 3$, while random attachment gives rise to an exponential degree distribution. Upon inclusion of the random node deletion process, in the RARD model the exponential degree distribution is replaced by a Poisson-like distribution. In contrast, the PARD and BARD models maintain the power-law degree distribution all the way down to $\eta = 0$. It implies that networks that grow by preferential attachment are more robust to random node deletion than networks that grow by random attachment.

The PARD and BARD models reveal intermediate-asymptotic states that persist within a finite time window, until the network vanishes. This behavior is in contrast with the pure deletion ($\eta = -1$) scenarios explored in Refs. [29, 30], where no steady state is reached. Instead, under pure deletion the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ evolves such that the mean degree $\langle K \rangle_t$ diminishes in tandem with the network itself. Surprisingly, despite lacking a target steady-state, an out-of-equilibrium Poisson degree distribution spontaneously arises. The underlying principle behind this emergent dynamical state is that it represents a maximum entropy network, whose mean degree $\langle K \rangle_t$ evolves according to the specific deletion scenario. Under such conditions, the initial structure is quickly forgotten, yielding a dynamically emergent state dominated by maximum entropy.

In light of the ubiquity of the preferential attachment mechanism and the inevitability of the loss of some nodes due to failures or attacks, it is likely that the evolution of some real world networks is dominated by processes that resemble the dynamical rules of the PARD model. In such cases, one may be able to use information on the instantaneous structure of a network at a given moment to gain insight into the dynamical processes that have shaped the network. For example, if the degree distribution of an evolving network exhibits a power-law tail, one may infer that the network is likely to be in the overall growth phase. In contrast, if the tail of the degree distribution exhibits an exponential decay, one may infer that the network is likely to be in the overall contraction phase. More specifically, in the case of a growing network, in which the degree distribution exhibits a power-law tail of the form $k^{-\gamma}$, one may be able to estimate the balance between the rates of the node addition and node deletion processes from the value of the exponent γ .

7. Summary

We presented analytical results for the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ of networks that evolve via a combination of growth, via node addition and preferential attachment,

and contraction, via random node deletion. To demonstrate the convergence towards the stationary state, we also presented results for the time-dependent degree distribution $P_t(k)$, obtained from direct numerical integration of the master equation and from computer simulations.

In case that the rate of node addition exceeds the rate of node deletion ($\eta > 0$), the overall process is of network growth, while in the opposite case ($\eta < 0$) the overall process is of network contraction. Using the master equation and the generating function formalism we obtained a closed form expression for the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which is reached at long times. The convergence towards a stationary degree distribution during growth or contraction implies that in spite of the change in the overall size of the network, the local neighborhood around typical nodes remains the same. The statistical properties of these local neighborhoods depend on the balance between the growth and contraction processes and are independent of the initial structure of the network.

In the overall growth scenario the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ converges towards a stationary distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which exhibits a power-law tail. The resulting network is thus a scale-free network. In the overall contraction scenario, during the contraction process the degree distribution $P_t(k)$ converges towards a stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ which exhibits an exponential tail. The stationary distribution persists for a finite time window, before the network vanishes. Thus, the intermediate state characterized by $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ plays the role of an intermediate asymptotic state.

We thus conclude that at $\eta = 0$ there is a phase transition between the phase of overall network growth, in which the stationary degree distribution exhibits a power-law tail and the phase of overall network contraction, in which the stationary degree distribution exhibits an exponential tail. At the transition, the stationary degree distribution exhibits a stretched exponential tail, which is characteristic of second order phase transitions [48, 49].

This work was supported by grant no. 2020720 from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) and by the United States National Science Foundation (NSF).

Appendix A. Calculation of $d^k G(u)/du^k$ in the case of $\eta = 0$

In this Appendix we prove by induction that in the case of $\eta = 0$ the k 'th derivative of the generating function obeys

$$\frac{d^k G(u)}{du^k} = (m)_k \exp\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right) \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} \Gamma\left(-m+1-i, \frac{1}{1-u}\right) \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{m+k+i}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

To this end, we first replace the variable u by

$$z = \frac{1}{1-u}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Using the chain rule, we find that

$$\frac{d}{du} = z^2 \frac{d}{dz}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We will also need identity 8.8.19 from Ref. [47], which states that

$$\frac{d}{dz} [e^z \Gamma(a, z)] = -(1-a)e^z \Gamma(a-1, z). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Inserting $k = 0$ in Eq. (A.1), it becomes identical with Eq. (38) in the main text, which provides a closed-form expression for $G(u)$, confirming the induction assumption. Assuming that Eq. (A.1) is valid up to k derivatives, we will show below that it is also valid in the case of $k + 1$ derivatives. From Eq. (A.3) we find that

$$\frac{d^{k+1}G(u)}{du^{k+1}} = z^2 \frac{d}{dz} \frac{d^k G(u)}{du^k}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Using the induction assumption for k , the derivative $d^k G(u)/du^k$ in Eq. (A.5) can be replaced by the right hand side of Eq. (A.1). We obtain

$$\frac{d^{k+1}G(u)}{du^{k+1}} = z^2 (m)_k \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} \frac{d}{dz} [e^z \Gamma(-m+1-i, z) z^{m+k+i}]. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Carrying out the derivative with respect to z and using Eq. (A.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^{k+1}G(u)}{du^{k+1}} = & \\ & (m)_k \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} (m+k+i) z^{m+k+1+i} e^z \Gamma(-m+1-i, z) \\ & + (m)_k \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (-1)^i \binom{k}{i-1} (m+i-1) z^{m+k+1+i} e^z \Gamma(-m+1-i, z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Separating the first and the last terms in the summations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^{k+1}G(u)}{du^{k+1}} = & (m)_k \binom{k}{0} (m+k) z^{m+k+1} e^z \Gamma(-m+1, z) \\ & + (m)_k \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i \left[\binom{k}{i} (m+k+i) + \binom{k}{i-1} (m+i-1) \right] \times \\ & z^{m+k+1+i} e^z \Gamma(-m+1-i, z) \\ & + (m)_k (-1)^{k+1} \binom{k}{k} (m+k) z^{m+2k+2} e^z \Gamma(-m-k, z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The terms in the square parentheses on the right hand side of Eq. (A.8) can be written in the form

$$\binom{k}{i}(m+k+i) + \binom{k}{i-1}(m+i-1) = \binom{k+1}{i}(m+k). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Using this result together with the identity

$$\binom{k}{k} = 1 = \binom{k+1}{k+1}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for the binomial coefficients and the identity $(m)_k \times (m+k) = (m)_{k+1}$ for the Pochhammer symbols, we obtain the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^{k+1}G(u)}{du^{k+1}} &= (m)_{k+1} \exp\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right) \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} (-1)^i \binom{k+1}{i} \times \\ &\Gamma\left(-m+1-i, \frac{1}{1-u}\right) \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{m+k+1+i}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

which is the desired result.

Appendix B. The stationary degree distribution of the BARD model

In the BARD model, the equation for time evolution of $N_t(k)$ differs from the corresponding equation for the PARD model [Eq. (9)]. It takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_t(k)}{dt} &= P_{\text{add}}\delta_{k,m} + mP_{\text{add}} \frac{(k-1)N_t(k-1) - kN_t(k)}{\langle K \rangle_t N_t} \\ &+ P_{\text{del}} \frac{(k+1)N_t(k+1) - kN_t(k)}{N_t} - P_{\text{del}} \frac{N_t(k)}{N_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The first term on the right hand side of Eq. (B.1) accounts for the addition of a new node, whose initial degree is always equal to m . The second term accounts for the increased degree of existing nodes that gain a link from the new node, in a preferential manner. The third term accounts for the loss of links of nodes that were connected to the deleted node, while the fourth term accounts for the loss of the deleted node.

Inserting the time derivative of $N_t(k)$ from Eq. (B.1) into Eq. (10), we obtain the master equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_t(k)}{dt} &= \frac{1+\eta}{2N_t} [\delta_{k,m} - P_t(k)] + \frac{m(1+\eta)}{2\langle K \rangle_t N_t} [(k-1)P_t(k-1) - kP_t(k)] \\ &+ \frac{1-\eta}{2N_t} [(k+1)P_t(k+1) - kP_t(k)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where the probabilities P_{add} and P_{del} are expressed in terms of η , using Eqs. (3) and (4). To obtain the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ we set $dP_t(k)/dt = 0$. Multiplying

Eq. (B.2) by u^k and summing up over k , we obtain a differential equation for the generating function $G(u)$ of the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, which is given by

$$(\eta + u - 1)(1 - u) \frac{dG(u)}{du} + (1 + \eta)G(u) = (1 + \eta)u^m. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Inspecting Eq. (B.3) we observe that it exhibits two singular points, at $u = 1$ and $u = 1 - \eta$. These points are identical to the singularities of the corresponding equation for the PARD model [Eq. (20)]. This implies that the phase diagrams of the two models share the same basic structure. More specifically, the two singular points coincide at $\eta = 0$, implying a structural transition at this point. Using the integration factor

$$M(u) = \left(\frac{1 - \eta - u}{1 - u} \right)^{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

we rewrite Eq. (B.3) in the form

$$\frac{d}{du} [G(u)M(u)] = -(1 + \eta)u^m \frac{(1 - \eta - u)^{\frac{1}{\eta}}}{(1 - u)^{2 + \frac{1}{\eta}}}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

In this analysis we follow the approach of Moore et al. [35], who considered the BARD model for $\eta \geq 0$.

In case that $-1 < \eta < 0$ the integration factor satisfies $M(1) = 0$. Using this result, we integrate Eq. (B.3) in the range between u and 1 and obtain

$$G(u) = (1 + \eta) \left(\frac{1 - u}{1 - \eta - u} \right)^{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}} \int_u^1 v^m \frac{(1 - v)^{-2 - \frac{1}{\eta}}}{(1 - \eta - v)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}} dv. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Changing the integration variable from v to $x = (1 - v)/(1 - u)$, we obtain

$$G(u) = - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1 - u}{\eta} \right)^{-1 - \frac{1}{\eta}} \int_0^1 dx [1 - (1 - u)x]^m \frac{x^{-2 - \frac{1}{\eta}}}{\left(1 - \frac{1 - u}{\eta} x \right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Using the binomial expansion

$$[1 + (u - 1)x]^m = 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^m \binom{m}{\ell} (u - 1)^\ell x^\ell, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G(u) = & - \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}}{\left(1 - \frac{1 - u}{\eta} \right)^{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}}} \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{-(2 + \frac{1}{\eta})}}{\left(1 - \frac{1 - u}{\eta} x \right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}} \\ & - \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}}{\left(1 - \frac{1 - u}{\eta} \right)^{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}}} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \binom{m}{\ell} (u - 1)^\ell \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{\ell - 2 - \frac{1}{\eta}}}{\left(1 - \frac{1 - u}{\eta} x \right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Carrying out the first integral on the right hand side of Eq. (B.9), we obtain

$$G(u) = 1 - \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}}{\left(1 - \frac{1-u}{\eta}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{\eta}}} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \binom{m}{\ell} (u-1)^\ell \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{\ell-2-\frac{1}{\eta}}}{\left(1 - \frac{1-u}{\eta}x\right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

To evaluate the integral on the right hand side of Eq. (B.10), we use the identity

$$\int_0^1 dx \frac{x^\beta}{(1-zx)^\gamma} = \frac{1}{(1-z)^{\gamma-1}} \frac{1}{z(\beta-\gamma+1)} + \frac{\beta}{z(\beta-\gamma+1)} \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{\beta-1}}{(1-zx)^\gamma}, \quad (\text{B.11})$$

which is obtained by integration by parts. Iterating this identity $\ell - 1$ times, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^\beta}{(1-zx)^\gamma} &= -\frac{1}{(1-z)^{\gamma-1}} \sum_{s=0}^{\ell-2} \frac{1}{z^{s+1}} \frac{\Gamma(\beta-\gamma+1-s)}{\Gamma(\beta-\gamma+2)} \frac{\Gamma(\beta+1)}{\Gamma(\beta+1-s)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{z^{\ell-1}} \frac{\Gamma(\beta-\gamma+3-\ell)}{\Gamma(\beta-\gamma+2)} \frac{\Gamma(\beta+1)}{\Gamma(\beta+2-\ell)} \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{\beta-\ell+1}}{(1-zx)^\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Plugging $\beta = \ell - 2 - 1/\eta$, $\gamma = -1/\eta$ and $z = (1-u)/\eta$ into Eq. (B.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \frac{x^{\ell-2-\frac{1}{\eta}}}{\left(1 - \frac{1-u}{\eta}x\right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}} dx &= \\ &- \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{1-u}{\eta}\right)^{-1-\frac{1}{\eta}}} \sum_{s=0}^{\ell-2} \left(\frac{\eta}{1-u}\right)^{s+1} \frac{(\ell-2-s)!}{(\ell-1)!} \frac{\Gamma\left(\ell-1-\frac{1}{\eta}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\ell-1-\frac{1}{\eta}-s\right)} \\ &+ \left(\frac{\eta}{1-u}\right)^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{(\ell-1)!} \frac{\Gamma\left(\ell-1-\frac{1}{\eta}\right)}{\Gamma\left(-\frac{1}{\eta}\right)} \int_0^1 \frac{x^{-1-\frac{1}{\eta}}}{\left(1 - \frac{1-u}{\eta}x\right)^{-\frac{1}{\eta}}} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Inserting the integral from Eq. (B.13) into Eq. (B.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G(u) &= 1 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \sum_{\ell=2}^m (-1)^\ell \binom{m}{\ell} \frac{\Gamma\left(\ell-1-\frac{1}{\eta}\right)}{(\ell-1)!} \times \\ &\sum_{s=0}^{\ell-2} \eta^{s+1} \frac{(\ell-2-s)!}{\Gamma\left(\ell-1-\frac{1}{\eta}-s\right)} (1-u)^{\ell-s-1} \\ &- C_{\eta,m} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) (u-1) \left(1 - \frac{1-u}{\eta}\right)^{-(1+\frac{1}{\eta})} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{\eta}, -\frac{1}{\eta} \\ 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{1-u}{\eta} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

where

$$C_{\eta,m} = -m\eta {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} 1 - m, -\frac{1}{\eta} \\ 2 \end{matrix} \middle| \eta \right]. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

The degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ can be extracted by inserting the generating function $G(u)$ from Eq. (B.14) into Eq. (30). To carry out the differentiation of $G(u)$ we use identity 15.5.6 in Ref. [47]. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{st}}(k) = & \delta_{k,0} + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \sum_{\ell=2}^m \binom{m}{\ell} (-1)^{k+\ell} \frac{\Gamma\left(\ell - 1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)}{(\ell - 1)!} \times \\ & \sum_{s=0}^{\ell-2} \eta^{s+1} \frac{(\ell - 2 - s)!}{\Gamma\left(\ell - 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} - s\right)} \binom{\ell - s - 1}{k} \\ & + C_{\eta,m} \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\eta}}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{\eta}}} \left\{ \frac{k!}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)_k} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{\eta}, -\frac{1}{\eta} \\ 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} + k \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{1}{\eta} \right] \right. \\ & \left. - (1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(1 - \eta)(k - 1)!}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)_{k-1}} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{\eta}, -\frac{1}{\eta} \\ -\frac{1}{\eta} + k \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{1}{\eta} \right] \right\} (1 - \eta)^{-k}. \quad (\text{B.16}) \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side of Eq. (B.16) consists of the Kronecker delta and contributes only in case that $k = 0$. The second term contributes only in the regime of $0 \leq k \leq m - 1$. This is due to the binomial term $\binom{\ell - s - 1}{k}$ that vanishes when $\ell - s - 1 < k$. Since $\ell - s - 1 \leq m - 1$ the binomial term must vanish for $k \geq m$. The third term contributes to $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ for all values of k and the fourth term contributes for any $k \neq 0$.

The tail of the degree distribution, where $k \gg 1$, can be approximated by

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) \simeq C_{\eta,m} \frac{1 + \eta}{\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{\eta}}} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right) k^{\frac{1}{\eta}} (1 - \eta)^{-k}, \quad (\text{B.17})$$

where $C_{\eta,m}$ is given by Eq. (B.15). This tail exhibits an exponential decay which is similar to the corresponding tail of the PARD model in the regime of overall network contraction, given by Eq. (50). While the exponential decay is identical, the algebraic dependence on k is slightly different, namely it follows $k^{\frac{1}{\eta}}$ while in the PARD model it follows $k^{m(1+\eta)+\frac{1}{\eta}}$. Since the tail is dominated by the exponential decay, this difference has little effect.

Using a similar approach, we calculate the stationary degree distribution $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ for $0 < \eta \leq 1$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\text{st}}(k) &= \delta_{k,0}(1-\eta)^m \tag{B.18} \\
&- \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \sum_{\ell=2}^m \binom{m}{\ell} (-1)^{k+\ell} \frac{\Gamma\left(\ell + 1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right)}{(\ell-1)!} \times \\
&\quad \sum_{s=0}^{\ell-2} \frac{(-\eta)^{s+1}}{(1-\eta)^{k-m+s+1}} \frac{(\ell-2-s)!}{\Gamma\left(\ell + 1 + \frac{1}{\eta} - s\right)} \binom{\ell-s-1}{k} \\
&- D_{\eta,m} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \frac{(1-\eta)^m}{\eta^{1+\frac{1}{\eta}}} \left\{ \frac{k!}{\left(3 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right)_k} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} 2 + \frac{1}{\eta}, 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \\ 3 + \frac{1}{\eta} + k \end{matrix} \middle| 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-1)!}{(1-\eta) \left(3 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right)_{k-1}} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} 2 + \frac{1}{\eta}, 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \\ 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} + k \end{matrix} \middle| 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \right] \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$D_{\eta,m} = \frac{m\eta}{2\eta+1} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} 1-m, 2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \\ 2 \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{\eta}{\eta-1} \right]. \tag{B.19}$$

The first term on the right hand side of Eq. (B.18) includes a Kronecker delta and contributes only in case that $k = 0$. The second term contributes only in the regime of $0 \leq k \leq m-1$ due to the binomial term $\binom{\ell-s-1}{k}$ that vanishes when $\ell-s-1 < k$. The third term contributes to $P_{\text{st}}(k)$ for all values of k and the fourth term contributes for any $k \neq 0$.

The tail of the degree distribution, where $k \gg 1$, can be approximated by

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) \simeq D_{\eta,m} \frac{(1+\eta)(1-\eta)^{m-1}}{\eta^{1+\frac{1}{\eta}}} \Gamma\left(3 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) k^{-2-\frac{1}{\eta}}, \tag{B.20}$$

where $D_{\eta,m}$ is given by Eq. (B.19). This tail exhibits a power-law decay of the form $k^{-2-\frac{1}{\eta}}$, which is identical to the corresponding tail of the PARD model in phase of overall network growth, given by Eq. (32).

In the special case of $\eta = 0$, we find that the stationary degree distribution can be expressed in the form

$$P_{\text{st}}(0) = 1 + \sum_{\ell=2}^m \sum_{s=1}^{\ell-1} (-1)^{s-1} \binom{m}{\ell} \frac{(s-1)!}{(\ell-1)!} - eA_m \Gamma(0, 1), \tag{B.21}$$

and

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) = \sum_{\ell=2}^m \sum_{s=1}^{\ell-1} (-1)^{s-k-1} \binom{m}{\ell} \binom{s}{k} \frac{(s-1)!}{(\ell-1)!} + A_m (k-1)! U(k+1, 2, 1), \tag{B.22}$$

for $k \geq 1$. The coefficient A_m is given by

$$A_m = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{(\ell-1)!} \binom{m}{\ell} = m {}_1F_1[1-m; 2; -1], \quad (\text{B.23})$$

where

$${}_1F_1[a; b; z] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n z^n}{(b)_n n!} \quad (\text{B.24})$$

is Kummer's confluent hypergeometric function [47].

To obtain a simplified expression for the tail of $P_{\text{st}}(k)$, we first note that the first term on the right hand side of Eq. (B.22) vanishes for $k \geq m$. Using identity 13.8.8 in Ref. [47], it is found that for $k \gg m$

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) \simeq \frac{2\sqrt{e}}{k(1-e^{-w})^2} \sqrt{2\beta \tanh\left(\frac{\beta}{2}\right)} K_1[2\beta(k+1)], \quad (\text{B.25})$$

where w and β are given by Eqs. (44) and (45), respectively, and $K_\nu(x)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind [47]. In the large k limit, one can approximate β and w by $\beta \simeq k^{-1/2}$ and $w \simeq k^{-1/2}$. Using the asymptotic expansion of $K_1(x)$, we obtain

$$P_{\text{st}}(k) \simeq A_m \sqrt{\pi e} k^{-\frac{3}{4}} e^{-2\sqrt{k}}. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

This tail exhibits a stretched exponential decay, which is similar to the corresponding tail of the PARD model in the special case of $\eta = 0$, given by Eq. (46). While the stretched exponential tail is identical in the two models, the algebraic dependence on k is different, namely in the BARD model it follows $k^{-\frac{3}{4}}$, while in the PARD model it follows $k^{\frac{m}{2}-\frac{3}{4}}$. Since the tail is dominated by the stretched exponential decay, this difference has little effect.

References

- [1] Dorogovtsev S N and Mendes J F F 2003 *Evolution of Networks: From Biological Nets to the Internet and WWW* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- [2] Latora V, Nicosia V and Russo G 2017 *Complex Networks: Principles, Methods and Applications* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [3] Havlin S and Cohen R 2010 *Complex Networks: Structure, Robustness and Function* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- [4] Newman M E J 2018 *Networks: an Introduction, Second Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- [5] Estrada E 2011 *The structure of complex networks: theory and applications* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- [6] Dorogovtsev S N and Mendes J F F 2022 *The Nature of Complex Networks* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- [7] Redner S 1998 How popular is your paper? An empirical study of the citation distribution *Eur. Phys. J. B* **4**, 131 (1998).
- [8] Barabási A -L and Albert R 1999 Emergence of scaling in random networks *Science* **286** 509

- [9] Albert R and Barabási A -L 2002 Statistical mechanics of complex networks *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74** 47
- [10] Krapivsky P L, Redner S and Leyvraz F 2000 Connectivity of growing random networks *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 4629
- [11] Dorogovtsev S N, Mendes J F F and Samukhin A N 2000 Structure of growing networks with preferential linking *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 4633
- [12] Bollobás B 2001 *Random Graphs, Second Edition* (London: Academic Press)
- [13] Cohen R, Erez K, ben-Avraham D and Havlin S 2000 Resilience of the Internet to random breakdowns *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 4626
- [14] Cohen R, Erez K, ben-Avraham D and Havlin S 2001 Breakdown of the Internet under intentional attack *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 3682
- [15] Albert R, Jeong H and Barabási A -L 2000 Error and attack tolerance of complex networks *Nature* **406** 378
- [16] Gao J, Liu X, Li D and Havlin S 2015 Recent progress on the resilience of complex networks *Energies* **8** 12187
- [17] Yuan X, Shao S, Stanley H E and Havlin S 2015 How breadth of degree distribution influences network robustness: Comparing localized and random attacks *Phys. Rev. E* **92** 032122
- [18] Shao S, Huang X, Stanley H E and Havlin S 2015 Percolation of localized attack on complex networks *New J. Phys.* **17** 023049
- [19] Havlin S, Stanley H E, Bashan A, Gao J and Kenett D Y 2015 Percolation of interdependent network of networks *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **72** 4
- [20] Shekhtman L M, Shai S and Havlin S 2015 Resilience of networks formed of interdependent modular networks *New J. Phys.* **17** 123007
- [21] Shekhtman L M, Danziger M M and Havlin S 2016 Recent advances on failure and recovery in networks of networks *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **90** 28
- [22] Yuan X, Dai Y, Stanley H E and Havlin S 2016 k-core percolation on complex networks: Comparing random, localized and targeted attacks *Phys. Rev. E* **93** 062302
- [23] Di Muro M A, La Rocca C E, Stanley H E, Havlin S and Braunstein L A 2016 Recovery of interdependent networks *Scientific Reports* **6** 22834
- [24] Vaknin D, Danziger M M and Havlin S 2017 Spreading of localized attacks in spatial multiplex networks *New J. Phys.* **19** 073037
- [25] Braunstein A, Dall'Asta L, Semerjian G and Zdeborová L 2016 Network dismantling *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **113** 12368
- [26] Zdeborová L, Zhang P and Zhou H -J 2016 Fast and simple decycling and dismantling of networks *Scientific Reports* **6** 37954
- [27] Molloy M and Reed B B 1995 A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence *Rand. Struct. & Algo.* **6** 161
- [28] Molloy M and Reed B B 1998 The size of the largest component of a random graph on a fixed degree sequence *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **7** 295
- [29] Tishby I, Biham O and Katzav E 2019 Convergence towards an Erdős-Rényi graph structure in network contraction processes *Phys. Rev. E* **100** 032314
- [30] Tishby I, Biham O and Katzav E 2020 Analysis of the convergence of the degree distribution of contracting random networks towards a Poisson distribution using the relative entropy *Phys. Rev. E* **101** 062308
- [31] P. Erdős P and A. Rényi A 1959 On random graphs I *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **6** 290
- [32] Erdős P and Rényi A 1960 On the evolution of random graphs *Publ. Math. Inst. Hungar. Acad. Sci.* **5** 17
- [33] Erdős P and Rényi A 1961 On the evolution of random graphs II *Bull. Inst. Internat. Statist.* **38** 343
- [34] Coolen A C C, Annibale A and Roberts E 2017 *Generating Random Networks and Graphs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

- [35] Moore C, Ghoshal G and Newman M E J 2006 Exact solutions for models of evolving networks with addition and deletion of nodes *Phys. Rev. E* **74** 036121
- [36] Ghoshal G, Chi L and Barabási A -L 2013 Uncovering the role of elementary processes in network evolution *Scientific Reports* **3** 2920
- [37] Bauke H, Moore C, Rouquier J B and Sherrington D 2011 Topological phase transition in a network model with preferential attachment and node removal *Eur. Phys. J. B* **83** 519
- [38] Török J and Kertész J 2017 Cascading collapse of online social networks *Scientific Reports* **7** 16743
- [39] Lőrincz L, Koltai J, Győr A F and Takács K 2019 Collapse of an online social network: Burning social capital to create it? *Social Networks* **57** 43
- [40] Saavedra S, Reed-Tsochas F and Uzzi B 2008 Asymmetric disassembly and robustness in declining networks *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **105** 16466
- [41] Budnick B, Biham O and Katzav E 2022 Structure of networks that evolve under a combination of growth and contraction *Phys. Rev. E* **106** 044305
- [42] Artime O 2022 Stochastic resetting in a networked multiparticle system with correlated transitions *J. Phys. A* **55** 484004
- [43] van Kampen N G 2007 *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry, 3rd Edition* (Amsterdam: North Holland)
- [44] Gardiner C 2004 *Handbook of Stochastic Methods: for Physics, Chemistry and the Natural Sciences, 3rd Edition* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag)
- [45] Phillips C L, Nagle H T and Chakraborty A 2015 *Digital Control System: Analysis and Design, Fourth Edition* (Harlow: Pearson Education)
- [46] Bender C M and Orszag S A 1999 *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers* (New York: Springer)
- [47] Olver F W J, Lozier D M, Boisvert R R and Clark C W 2010 *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [48] Schwartz M and Edwards S F 2001 The nature of the long-time decay at a second-order transition point *Europhys. Lett.* **56** 499
- [49] Schwartz M 2003 The Fokker–Planck operator at a continuous phase transition, *J. Phys. A* **36** 7507
- [50] Barenblatt G I 2003 *Scaling* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [51] Barenblatt G I 1996 *Scaling, self-similarity, and intermediate asymptotics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)