

Random walk and Pair-Annihilation Processes on Scale-Free Networks

Jae Dong Noh and Sang-Woo Kim

Department of Physics, Chungnam National University, Daejeon 305-764, Korea

(Received September 29, 2018)

We investigate the dynamic scaling properties of stochastic particle systems on a non-deterministic scale-free network. It has been known that the dynamic scaling behavior depends on the degree distribution exponent of the underlying scale-free network. Our study shows that it also depends on the global structure of the underlying network. In random walks on the tree structure scale-free network, we find that the relaxation time follows a power-law scaling $\tau \sim N$ with the network size N . And the random walker return probability decays algebraically with the decay exponent which varies from node to node. On the other hand, in random walks on the looped scale-free network, they do not show the power-law scaling. We also study a pair-annihilation process on the scale-free network with the tree and the looped structure, respectively. We find that the particle density decays algebraically in time both cases, but with the different exponent.

I. INTRODUCTION

Networks composed of nodes and edges have been attracting a lot of research interest recently [1]. Unlike conventional networks such as a periodic regular network and a random network, many real-world networks have complex structure. Many of them belong to the class of so-called scale-free (SF) networks. Denoting the degree k of a node as the number of edges attached to it, a SF is characterized with the power-law degree distribution

$$P_{deg}(k) \sim k^{-\gamma} . \quad (1)$$

Here γ is called the degree distribution exponent.

The power-law degree distribution implies that the SF network has an inhomogeneous structure. On the one hand, it is a challenging problem to characterize and understand the organization principle of the SF network. On the other hand, it is also interesting to study thermodynamic or dynamic systems on such an inhomogeneous structure. Various physical problems have been studied. Examples include the ferromagnetic phase transitions in the Ising model [2], the non-equilibrium phase transition in the epidemic spreading model [3], the random walk process [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9], the dynamic scaling in pair-annihilation process [10, 11], and so on. In those studies, the γ -dependent scaling properties have been studied.

In the present work, we address the question how the global structure of the underlying SF network influences the dynamic scaling behavior of stochastic particle systems. For that purpose we study the random walk process and the pair-annihilation process, and investigate their dynamic scaling property. Both systems are studied on the *tree* structure SF (TSF) networks and the *looped* structure SF (LSF) networks, respectively.

To be specific, we study the stochastic systems on the Dorogovtsev-Mendes-Samukhin (DMS) network [12], which is a generalization of the Barabási-Albert (BA) network [13]. It is a *non-deterministic* model for a growing network: Each time step, a new node is added, and linked with m nodes which are selected among existing nodes with the probability given by $\Pi_i \propto (k_i + a)$. Here

the parameter a is called an initial attractiveness. The BA model corresponds to the $a = 0$ case of the DMS network. The resulting network is scale-free and the degree distribution exponent is given by

$$\gamma = 3 + \frac{a}{m} . \quad (2)$$

With the parameters m and a , one can vary the value of the degree exponent. At the same time, one can also generate a TSF network with $m = 1$ or a LSF network with $m \neq 1$. Hence, we can study the effect of the degree distribution exponent and the global network structure systematically.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we present the results on the random walk process. Section III is devoted to the scaling property of the pair-annihilation process. Summary will be given in Sec. IV.

II. RANDOM WALK PROCESS

As a basic and fundamental stochastic process, the random walk process [14] on complex networks has been attracting a lot of research interest [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. In this work we concentrate on relaxation dynamics on SF networks.

On a network with N nodes, a random walker is assigned to a starting node denoted by s at time $t = 0$. Then, at each unit time step $\Delta t = 1$, it hops to one of the neighboring nodes selected randomly with the equal probability. Defining $P(i, t; s, 0)$ as the probability to find the walker at node i at time t , one finds that it evolves in time as

$$P(i, t + 1; s, 0) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{A_{ij}}{k_j} P(j, t; s, 0) \quad (3)$$

with the initial condition $P(i, 0; s, 0) = \delta_{i,s}$. Here $\mathbf{A} = \{A_{ij}\}$ is the adjacency matrix whose elements are $A_{ij} = 1$ (0) if two nodes i and j are connected (disconnected).

The relaxation dynamics is studied with the so-called return probability $R_s(t) \equiv P(s, t; s, 0)$. For a given network, one can solve numerically the master equation




FIG. 1: The return probability R_H (open symbols) and R_P (filled symbols) in the DMS networks with $\gamma = 3$ and with $m = 1$ in (a) and $m = 2$ in (b).

Eq. (3) iteratively to obtain $R_s(t)$. We then average it over different realizations of the networks.

On a network with loops, the probability distribution converges to the stationary one $P_{stat.}(i) = k_i / (\sum_j k_j)$ in the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit [6]. Hence, the return probability converges to $R_s(t = \infty) = k_s / (\sum_j k_j)$. On the other hand, on a tree network, the probability distribution is oscillating in time, so is the return probability. The random walker cannot return to a starting node in odd time steps, which means that $R_s(t) = 0$ at odd t . In this case, we only measure the return probability at even time steps, which converges to stationary value $2k_s / (\sum_j k_j)$.

In a SF network, the node degree is distributed so broadly that one can define an exponent q_s for each node s describing the degree scaling with the network size:

$$k_s \sim N^{q_s}. \quad (4)$$

For instance, in the DMS network with the degree distribution exponent γ , a *peripheral node* with the minimum degree has $q = 0$, while the *hub* with the maximum degree has $q = 1/(\gamma - 1)$. Then, the return probability in the stationary state scales with the network size as

$$R_s(t \rightarrow \infty) \sim N^{-(1-q_s)}. \quad (5)$$

Due to the broad degree distribution, the return probability $R_s(t)$ may have a different scaling property at different starting node s with different values of q_s . So, we measured the return probability $R_H(t)$ for the hub and $R_P(t)$ for a peripheral node on the DMS networks. We present the numerical data for the return probability R_H and R_P in Fig. 1. We compare the data obtained from the TSF networks and the LSF networks. The data show that the return probability behaves distinctly depending on the global structure of the network, which will be discussed in detail in the following.

A. Random walks on tree networks

We perform the quantitative analysis of the scaling property in the TSF. From Fig. 1, one finds that the




FIG. 2: Relaxation time τ for $R_H(t)$ (open symbols) and $R_P(t)$ (filled symbols) on the tree structure SF networks. The solid line has the slope 1.

return probability relaxes much slower in the TSF network with $m = 1$. We estimated the relaxation time τ using the condition $R_s(t = \tau) = cR_s(t = \infty)$ with a constant $c = 2$. The relaxation time is plotted as a function of the network size N in Fig. 2. It shows that the relaxation time estimated from R_H and R_P follows a power-law scaling

$$\tau \sim N^z \quad (6)$$

with the same dynamic exponent

$$z = 1.0. \quad (7)$$

We provide a theoretical argument for the numerical result from the analysis of the mean first passage time (MFPT). The MFPT problem has been studied on complex networks recently [6, 7, 9], and some rigorous results are known [6, 7]. Consider the MFPT, denoted by $T_{j,i}$, from an arbitrary node i (degree k_i) to one of its neighboring node j . Let $\{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{k_i} = j\}$ denote the neighbors of the node i . Then, following Ref. [7], the MFPT on *tree* networks satisfies the recursion relation

$$T_{j,i} = k_i + \sum_{l \neq k_i} T_{i,n_l}. \quad (8)$$

Applying the recursion relation repeatedly until one arrives at dangling ends, one can find the explicit solution for $T_{j,i}$. Without the link between i and j , the tree network would be decomposed into two parts. Denoting the number of nodes in the i side by N_i , the MFPT is simply given by

$$T_{j,i} = 2N_i - 1. \quad (9)$$

Hence, for a typical adjacent nodes i and j , one has that $T_{j,i} \sim N^1$. For non-adjacent nodes i and j , the MFPT is given by the sum of the MFPT's given by Eq. (9) along the path between them. Hence, the MFPT between a typical node pair is given by $T \sim D_N N$, where D_N is the mean diameter of the networks. For SF networks, the mean diameter scales at most logarithmically with




FIG. 3: Scaling analysis of R_H (open symbols) and R_P (filled symbols) in the TSF networks with $\gamma = 3$ (a) and $\gamma = 4$ (b).

the network size [15]. Therefore, we conclude that the relaxation time follows the power-law scaling $\tau \sim N^z$ with the dynamic exponent $z = 1$.

The power-law scaling of the relaxation time suggests that the return probability decays algebraically as

$$R_s(t) \sim t^{-\delta_s} \quad (10)$$

with the decay exponent δ_s . For a node s with the degree scaling $k_s \sim N^{q_s}$, the decay exponent can be deduced from the finite-size-scaling ansatz

$$R_s(t) = N^{-(1-q_s)} f(t/N^z) \quad (11)$$

with the dynamic exponent $z = 1$. For large $t \gg N^z$, the return probability should converge to the stationary value $R_s(t = \infty) \sim N^{-(1-q_s)}$ (see Eq. (5)). It requires that the scaling function should behave as $f(x \gg 1) = \text{constant}$. The power-law scaling for $t \ll N^z$ requires that the scaling function should behave as $f(x \ll 1) \sim x^{-\delta_s}$, which yields that $R_s \sim t^{-\delta_s} N^{\delta_s z - (1-q_s)}$. Therefore, the finite-size-scaling ansatz predicts that the decay exponent is given by

$$\delta_s = 1 - q_s. \quad (12)$$

It is interesting to note that the decay exponent varies with the degree scaling exponent q_s of the starting node s . We confirm the scaling behavior with the scaling plot of $R_s N^{1-q_s}$ versus t/N for the hub and the peripheral node in Fig. 3. For $\gamma = 3$, $q_H = 1/(\gamma - 1) = 1/2$ for the hub and $q_P = 0$ for the peripheral node, which yields that $\delta_H = 1/2$ and $\delta_P = 1$. Similarly, for $\gamma = 4$, one expects that $\delta_H = 2/3$ and $\delta_P = 1$. One finds that all data from different network sizes collapse very well in the scaling plot, which supports the result in Eq. (12).

It is also interesting that the return probability decays as $R_s(t) \sim t^{-\delta_s}$ with the exponent $\delta_s \leq 1$ at all nodes. It indicates that the random walks are recurrent in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit [14].




FIG. 4: Plots of θ obtained from $R_P(t)$ on the DMS networks with $\gamma = 2.5, 3, 4$ and with $m = 2$ (open symbols) and $m = 4$ (filled symbols). θ is plotted against $1/N$ in (a) and $1/\ln N$ in (b).

B. Random walks on looped networks

From Fig. 1, one can see that the return probability decays much faster in the LSF networks. The downward curvature in the log-log plot implies that the decay is faster than a power-law decay. The relaxation time measurement also indicates a faster decay. We found that the relaxation time, measured using the condition that $R_s(\tau) = 2R_s(\infty)$, grows at most logarithmically with the network size N . This is in contrast to the power-law growth in the TSF networks. In this subsection, we address a question how the return probability decays in time in looped SF networks.

In the random network, it is known that the return probability follows a stretched exponential decay as

$$R_s(t) - R_s(\infty) \sim e^{-at^\theta} \quad (13)$$

with a constant a and the exponent $\theta = 1/3$ [16]. It was reported that the return probability in the small-world network follows the stretched exponential decay, too [17]. It might suggest that the looped SF network follow the stretched exponential decay, too.

On the DMS networks with $m \geq 2$, we measured $R_s(t)$ numerically and fitted the data to the form in Eq. (13) to estimate θ . If the return probability follows an exponential decay, one would have $\theta = 1$. On the other hand, one would have $\theta < 1$, if it follows the stretched exponential decay. In Fig. 4, we present the data for $\theta(N)$ for $R_P(t)$ obtained on the DMS networks with various values of $\gamma = 2.5, 3, 4$ and $m = 2, 4$ up to sizes $N \simeq 10^6$. Similar behaviors are observed in $\theta(N)$ for $R_H(t)$. At small values of N , the exponent seems to depend on m and to be smaller than 1. One may interpret that as an evidence of the stretched exponential decay with a non-universal exponent θ .

However, we observe that there is a very strong finite size effect. The plot of θ versus $1/\ln N$ in Fig. 4 (b) shows that the finite size effect is significant even for $N \simeq 10^6$. With this strong finite size effect, one can not exclude the possibility of the exponential decay with $\theta = 1$. We sug-

gest that an analytic approach be necessary to conclude whether the return probability follows the exponential or the stretched exponential decay.

Before closing this section, we remark on the previous studies on the random walks on *deterministic* SF networks [7, 9]. Unlike the non-deterministic LSF networks studied in this work, the deterministic LSF networks [18, 19, 20] behave similarly as the TSF networks. For example, in the hierarchical network [20] which has a looped structure, the relaxation time scales algebraically as $\tau \sim N$ [7]. The reason why the hierarchical network behaves as TSF networks is clear. The network has a symmetry, due to which the random walks on it can be mapped to the walks on TSF networks [7]. Therefore, our general conclusion should not be applied to the deterministic LSF networks with high symmetry.

III. PAIR-ANNIHILATION PROCESS

The pair-annihilation process is a diffusion-limited reaction-diffusion process. In this process, each node in a given network may be occupied by a particle (denoted by A) or empty (denoted by \emptyset). The particles perform random walks on the network, and annihilate pairwise whenever they meet at a same node ($A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$).

The pair-annihilation process on SF networks was studied numerically by Gallos and Argyrakis [10]. They found that the particle density decays algebraically $\rho(t) \sim t^{-\alpha}$ with the γ -dependent decay exponent $\alpha = \alpha(\gamma) \geq 1$. This is contrasted with the d -dimensional periodic lattice case where $\alpha = \alpha(d) \leq 1$. Namely, the particle density decays faster in SF networks.

Later on, Catanzaro *et al.* [11] developed a mean field theory for the pair-annihilation process, which will be reviewed briefly hereafter. Let us define ρ_k as the average particle density at nodes with degree k . It is related to the total density through the relation $\rho(t) = \sum_k P_{deg}(k) \rho_k(t)$. In a mean field level, one can write down the rate equation for ρ_k as

$$\frac{d\rho_k(t)}{dt} = -\rho_k(t) + \frac{k}{\langle k \rangle} [1 - 2\rho_k(t)] \rho(t), \quad (14)$$

where $\langle k \rangle$ is the mean degree. Multiplying $P_{deg}(k)$ and summing over k , one finds that

$$\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = -2\rho(t) \left[\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_k k P_{deg}(k) \rho_k(t) \right]. \quad (15)$$

Then, Catanzaro *et al.* made a quasistatic approximation neglecting the time derivative in Eq. (14). The approximation assumes that the particles adjust themselves so efficiently that their distribution ρ_k remains close to a stationary one at a given value of $\rho(t)$. It leads to the relation

$$\rho_k(t) = \frac{k\rho(t)/\langle k \rangle}{1 + 2k\rho(t)/\langle k \rangle}. \quad (16)$$




FIG. 5: (a) Density decay in the DMS networks with $m = 1$ and $m = 4$. The degree distribution exponent is $\gamma = 2.5$. (b) Density decay exponent α (circles) and β (squares) defined in Eq. (17) for the DMS networks with $m = 1$ (open symbols) and $m = 4$ (filled symbols).

Substituting it in Eq. (15) and solving the resulting equation, Catanzaro *et al.* obtained that the density decay follows a power law in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit as

$$\rho(t) \sim t^{-\alpha} (\ln t)^{-\beta}. \quad (17)$$

The decay exponent α is given by

$$\alpha(\gamma) = \begin{cases} 1/(\gamma - 2) & , 2 < \gamma < 3 \\ 1 & , 3 \leq \gamma \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

and the exponent for the logarithmic correction is given by $\beta = 1$ for $\gamma = 3$ and $\beta = 0$ for $\gamma \neq 3$. This result is qualitatively consistent with the simulation results of Refs. [10, 11].

In the previous works [10, 11], only the γ -dependent scaling behaviors have been studied. However, the study on the random walks in Sec. II suggests that the scaling behavior may also depend on the global structure of the underlying SF network. In this section, we present the results of our numerical works on the pair-annihilation process on the DMS networks with $m = 1$ (tree structure) and $m \neq 1$ (looped structure). Comparing the two different cases, we will show that the global structure does also matter for the scaling behavior of the pair-annihilation process.

We have performed the Monte Carlo simulations on the DMS networks of size $N = 1024000$ with various values of γ and m . The fully-occupied state is taken as the initial configuration. In Fig. 5 (a), the numerical data from the TSF networks ($m = 1$) and the LSF networks ($m = 4$) are compared. The data show that the particle density decay follows the power law in both cases but with a different exponent.

We estimate the decay exponent by fitting the data to the form in Eq. (17), and plot α and β as a function of γ in Fig. 5 (b). At $m = 4$, our result is qualitatively consistent with the previous works; $\alpha \simeq 1$ for $\gamma \geq 1$, and α varies with γ for $\gamma < 3$. And the logarithmic correction is prominent at $\gamma = 3$. However, at $m = 1$, we obtain a




FIG. 6: ρ_k vs. k at different time steps $t=2^0$ (top), $\dots, 2^8$ (bottom). The data are taken from the DMS network with $m=4$ (a) and $m=1$ (b). The network size is $N=1024000$ and the degree distribution exponent is $\gamma=2.5$ in both plots. The dashed lines have the slope 1.

completely different result; $\alpha \simeq 1.0$ at all values of γ and the logarithmic correction is present at all values of γ . These numerical results show that the global structure of the underlying SF networks affects the scaling behavior of the pair-annihilation process.

We speculate the origin for the different scaling behaviors. On the LSF networks, the scaling behavior seems to be consistent with the analytic mean field result in Eq. (18). In the analytic approach one adopts the quasistatic approximation [11] leading to the particle distribution given by Eq. (16). It can be rewritten as

$$\rho_k(t) \simeq \begin{cases} k\rho(t)/\langle k \rangle & , \text{ for } k \ll \langle k \rangle / \rho(t) \\ 1/2 & , \text{ for } k \gg \langle k \rangle / \rho(t) \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Note that $\rho_k \propto k$ for small k .

We investigate the particle distribution numerically. In Fig. 6 (a), we plot $\rho_k(t)$ against k for the DMS network with the looped structure ($m=4$). We find that the particle distribution $\rho_k(t)$ is fully consistent with Eq. (19). This supports that the analytic approach is appropriate on the LSF networks.

However, the particle distribution deviates from Eq. (19) on the TSF network. Figure 6 (b) shows that there are three different regimes: $\rho_k \sim k$ for $k < k_1$, $\rho_k \sim k^\eta$ for $k_1 < k < k_2$, and $\rho_k \simeq 1/2$ for $k_2 < k$. The scaling exponent η in the intermediate regime is found to be less than 1 and to vary with γ . This feature is inconsistent with the quasistatic approximation.

The quasistatic approximation assumes that particles rearrange themselves quickly upon the change in the total particle density via diffusion. It requires that the diffusion should be a fast process. In the previous section, we have shown that the diffusion is a slow process in the LSF networks. This explains why the quasistatic approximation is invalid in the TSF network whereas it is valid in the LSF network.

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, we have investigated the scaling properties of the random walk and the pair-annihilation processes on non-deterministic SF networks with the tree structure and the looped structure, respectively. In the random walk process on TSF networks, we find that the relaxation time scales as $\tau \sim N$ with the network size N and that the return probability decay follows the power law with the node-dependent exponent. The LSF network does not display the power-law scalings. In the pair-annihilation process, we find that the exponent describing the particle density decay is different in TSF and LSF networks. Our results show that the global structure of the SF network, as well as the degree distribution exponent, is the important ingredient in understanding the dynamic scaling behaviors.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Chungnam National University through the Internal Research Grant in 2004.

-
- [1] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 47 (2002); S.N. Dorogovtsev and J.F.F. Mendes, *Adv. Phys.* **51**, 1079 (2002); M.E.J. Newman, *SIAM Rev.* **45**, 167 (2003).
 - [2] A. V. Goltsev, S. N. Dorogovtsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 026123 (2003).
 - [3] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3200 (2001).
 - [4] J. Lahtinen, J. Kertész, and K. Kaski, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 057105 (2001).
 - [5] E. Almaas, R. V. Kulkarni, and D. Stroud, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 056105 (2003).
 - [6] J. D. Noh and H. Rieger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 118701 (2004).
 - [7] J. D. Noh and H. Rieger, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 036111 (2004).
 - [8] V. Sood, S. Redner, and D. ben-Avraham, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 109 (2005).
 - [9] E. M. Boltt and D. ben-Avraham, *New J. Phys.* **7**, 26 (2005).
 - [10] L. K. Gallos and P. Argyrakis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 138301 (2004).
 - [11] M. Catanzaro, M. Boguña, and R. Pastor-Satorras, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 056104 (2005).
 - [12] S. N. Dorogovtsev, J. F. F. Mendes, and A. N. Samukhin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 4633 (2000).
 - [13] A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999); A.-L. Barabási, R. Albert, and H. Jeong, *Physica A* **272**, 173 (1999).
 - [14] R.D. Hughes, *Random Walks and Random Environments* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1995), Vol. 1.

- [15] R. Cohen and S. Havlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 058701 (2003).
- [16] A. J. Bray and G. J. Rodgers, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 11461 (1988).
- [17] S. Jespersen, I. M. Sokolov, and A. Blumen, Phys. Rev. E **62**, 4405 (2000).
- [18] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, J. F. F. Mendes, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 066122 (2002).
- [19] S. Jung, S. Kim, and B. Kahng, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 056101 (2002)
- [20] E. Ravasz, A.L. Somera, D.A. Mongru, Z.N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabási, Science **297**, 1551 (2002); E. Ravasz and A.-L. Barabási, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 026112 (2003).