

Average distance in growing trees

K.Malarz*, J.Czaplicki, B.Kawecka-Magiera and K.Kulakowski†

*Department of Applied Computer Science, Faculty of Physics and Nuclear
Techniques, AGH University of Science and Technology
al. Mickiewicza 30, PL-30059 Kraków, Poland*

*E-mail: *malarz@agh.edu.pl, †kulakowski@novell.ftj.agh.edu.pl*

April 28, 2003

Abstract

Two kinds of evolving trees are considered here: the exponential trees, where subsequent nodes are linked to old nodes without any preference, and the Barabási–Albert scale-free networks, where the probability of linking to a node is proportional to the number of its pre-existing links. In both cases, new nodes are linked to $m = 1$ nodes. Average node-node distance d is calculated numerically in evolving trees as dependent on the number of nodes N . The results for N not less than a thousand are averaged over a thousand of growing trees. The results on the mean node-node distance d for large N can be approximated by $d = 2 \ln(N) + c_1$ for the exponential trees, and $d = \ln(N) + c_2$ for the scale-free trees, where the c_i are constant. We derive also iterative equations for d and its dispersion for the exponential trees. The simulation and the analytical approach give the same results.

Keywords: exponential trees, scale-free trees, evolving networks, small-world effect

1 Introduction

In recent five years, much attention has been paid to the problem of evolving networks [1, 2, 3]. For our purposes, the problem can be summarized as follows: we consider a graph, initially small, of N nodes. A new $(N + 1)$ -th node is linked to m nodes, selected randomly from N previously existing nodes, with probability of linking to a given node dependent on its degree, i.e. its number of edges k . If this probability is constant, we get the so-called exponential network — this term is due to the exponential distribution $P(k)$ of the number of edges of a node [2]. The distribution $P(k)$ is often treated as giving most essential local characteristics of the network. Example giving, for the Cayley tree $P(k) = \delta_{k,3}$. If the probability of linking to a node is proportional to the node degree k , the network is scale-free, i.e. the distribution $P(k) \propto k^{-\gamma}$, where $\gamma \approx 3.0$. This kind of networks is called “Barabási–Albert networks” from the names of the inventors [4]. The scale-free character has been discovered in many real networks: a network of web pages which are available one from another, a network of coauthors of scientific papers, a network of actors playing roles in the same movies and some others. In any case, the evolving procedure is to be considered as a non-equilibrium process.

Here we focus on the mean distance d between nodes in trees, where $m = 1$. In trees, the path between each two nodes is unique and it cannot be changed

	i=1	q	N+1	
j=1	0	1	2	3
	1	0	1	2
q	2	1	0	1
	2	1	2	3
N+1	3	2	1	0

Figure 1: Construction of the distance matrix.

during the system evolution. A number of results on d in trees has been derived recently for uncorrelated random networks [5, 6, 7, 8]. These results are based on scaling hypotheses and/or assumptions of lack of correlations between nodes. The goal of the present work is to calculate $d(N)$ numerically for the exponential trees and the Barabási–Albert $m = 1$ scale-free networks, and analytically for the exponential trees. Our analytical results are formulated in terms of iterative equations and they are exact also for small trees.

2 Numerical calculations and results

The numerical algorithm is as follows: an initial tree is composed of two nodes connected by an edge. Each time when a $(N+1)$ -th node is added to a q -th node, the distance $s(N+1, i)$ between the new node and any other (say, i -th one) is $1 + s(q, i)$. The set of distances can be presented as a symmetric matrix $s(i, j)$. Adding a new node is represented by an enlargement of the matrix size by one. The last $(N+1)$ -th column and row are equal to one plus the q -th column (or row), where q is the index of a node to which the new node is attached (see Fig. 1).

The mean distance, i.e. the average length d , is just the average over the nondiagonal matrix elements. Obviously, the diagonal elements are zero. The obtained curve $d(N)$ is an average over $N_{run} = 10^3$ trees.

The results on $\langle d \rangle$ (hereafter abbreviated as d) for the exponential trees and for the scale-free trees they are shown in Fig. 2.

For large N , the obtained curves can be well approximated as linear with $\ln(N)$. Namely we get $d(N) = 1.98 \ln(N) - 2.69$ for the exponential trees and $d(N) = 1.00 \ln(N) + 0.04$ for the scale-free trees. Preliminary numerical results on the dispersion for both kind of trees suggest that for large N , the dispersion $\sigma_d^2(N) = a \ln(N) + b$, where a is the same as for the average distance d , i.e. 2.0 and 1.0 respectively for the exponential and the scale-free trees.

3 Analytical considerations

During the tree growth, the size of the matrix $s(i, j)$ of distances between nodes increases. Then, the time evolution of a tree is equivalent to the evolution of the matrix size N . We consider the evolution of the ensemble average of the distance matrix $s(i, j)$. The mean distance $d(N)$ between nodes, averaged over




Figure 2: The average distance d for the exponential and the scale-free trees.

all pairs of nodes (i, j) and trees t_N with N nodes can be written as

$$d(N) = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_t P(t_N) \sum_{i,j \neq i}^N s_{i,j}(t_N), \quad (1)$$

where $P(t_N)$ is the probability of a tree t_N of size N , and it is normalized to unity within the set of all possible trees with N nodes. Although we are interested in d , it is easier to work just with the average matrix element $s(N)$, which includes diagonal elements $s(i, i)$

$$s(N) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_t P(t_N) \sum_{i,j=1}^N s_{i,j}(t_N). \quad (2)$$

The relation $(N-1)d(N) = Ns(N)$ comes from the obvious fact that the diagonal element $s(i, i) = 0$. The evolution of $s(N)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (N+1)^2 s(N+1) &= \sum_t P(t_{N+1}) \sum_{i,j=1}^{N+1} s_{i,j}(t_{N+1}) = \\ &= \sum_t P(t_{N+1}) \sum_{i,j=1}^N s_{i,j}(t_{N+1}) + 2 \sum_t P(t_{N+1}) \sum_{j=1}^N s_{i,N+1}(t_{N+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

because the matrix $s(i, j)$ is symmetrical and $s(N+1, N+1) = 0$. In the first sum of the latter expression, the average over trees with $(N+1)$ nodes is performed over the sum of matrix elements which depend on the subgraph t_N . That is why in fact $P(t_{N+1})$ is the boundary distribution $P(t_N)$, and the information on the $(N+1)$ -th node is averaged out. In the second sum,




Figure 3: The average distance d and its dispersion σ_d^2 for the exponential trees. Numerical results agree with those obtained from Eqs. (6) and (8).

$P(t_{N+1}) = P(t_N)P(q|t_N)$, where the latter is the conditional probability of attaching a new node to a preexisting node indexed by q . On the other hand, we have again $s(i, N+1) = 1 + s(i, q)$. This is the same rule which has been helpful in the numerical calculations, described above. Substituting all that to Eq. (3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 (N+1)^2 s(N+1) &= \sum_t P(t_N) \sum_{i,j=1}^N s_{i,j}(t_N) + 2N + \\
 &+ 2 \sum_t P(t_N) \sum_{q=1}^N P(q|t_N) \sum_{j=1}^N s_{i,q}(t_N).
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The first term on r.h.s. is nothing but $N^2 s(N)$; the problem is with the last term. For scale-free trees, the probability $P(q|t_N)$ is proportional to the degree of the node q in the tree t_N , i.e. it is equal to $\gamma k(q)$, where γ is a tree-dependent constant. Substituting it to Eq. (4), we obtain the relation between the average distance between nodes of trees with $(N+1)$ nodes and the average distance from a node of degree k to any other node in trees with N nodes. This relation, even if natural, seems hard to use further.

On the contrary, for the exponential trees $P(q|t_N) = 1/N$. This term can be extracted out from the sum and we get a compact iterative relation

$$(N+1)^2 s(N+1) = N^2 s(N) + 2N + 2N s(N). \tag{5}$$

Substituting $d(N) = N s(N)/(N-1)$, we get

$$d(N+1) = \frac{(N+2)(N-1)}{N(N+1)} d(N) + \frac{2}{N+1}. \tag{6}$$

The same manipulations are possible with the moments of higher order. The average of the squared matrix element is

$$e(N) = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_t P(t_N) \sum_{i,j \neq i}^N s_{i,j}^2(t_N). \quad (7)$$

Applying it to the exponential trees, we get the relation

$$e(N+1) = \frac{(N+2)(N-1)}{N(N+1)} e(N) + \frac{4(N-1)}{N(N+1)} d(N) + \frac{2}{N+1}. \quad (8)$$

We start from the only existing tree of $N=2$; obviously $d(2)=1$, $e(2)=1$. Successive values of $d(N)$, $\sigma_d^2(N) = e(N) - d^2(N)$ are shown in Fig. 3 together with the respective results of the simulation.

As we see, the agreement is good. For high values of N , the plots are linear with $\ln(N^2)$. For $10^5 \leq N \leq 10^7$, the obtained coefficients are: $d(N) = 2.0 \ln(N) - 2.84$, $\sigma_d^2(N) = 2.0 \ln(N) - 1.44$.

4 Conclusions

For both kinds of trees, the terms of d and σ_d^2 leading in N are proportional to $\ln(N)$, with apparently the same coefficients (2.0 and 1.0 for the exponential trees and the Barabási–Albert scale-free trees, respectively). This means, that in both cases the term in σ_d^2 proportional to $\ln^2(N)$ cancels.

The selecting of subsequent nodes to attach new nodes is equivalent to a random walk in the space of all trees. At each step, the number of possibilities — nodes where a new node can be attached — increases. In principle, the number N_{run} of trees used in the averaging procedure should increase in time to have a good statistics, but such a simulation would be time-consuming. If N_{run} is much smaller than the maximal size N of trees, the averaging is not ergodic and numerical errors can increase.

In our formulation, the weights of particular trees of size $(N+1)$ do depend on the weights of trees of size N from which they are formed. This dependence is specific for the process of growing of the trees. In consequence, our results differ from those obtained within the equilibrium statistical mechanics, e.g. in [8].

Acknowledgements. Two of the authors (K.M. and K.K.) are grateful to Prof. Dietrich Stauffer for illuminating discussions. Part of the calculations were carried out in ACK-CYFRONET-AGH. The machine time on SGI 2800 is financed by the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research (KBN).

References

- [1] R.Albert and A.-L.Barabási, Rev. Mod. Phys. **286** (2002) 47.
- [2] S.N.Dorogovtsev and J.F.F.Mendes, Adv. in Phys. **51** (2002) 1079.
- [3] M.E.J.Newman, SIAM Review **45** (2003) 167.

- [4] A.-L.Barabási and R.Albert, Science **286** (1999) 509.
- [5] Z.Burda, J.D.Correia and A.Krzywicki, Phys. Rev. **E56** (2001) 46118.
- [6] S.N.Dorogovtsev, J.F.F.Mendes and A.N.Samukhin, cond-mat/0210085.
- [7] A.Fronczak, P.Fronczak and J.Holyst, cond-mat/0212230.
- [8] P.Białas, Z.Burda, J.Jurkiewicz and A.Krzywicki, cond-mat/0211527.