

Exact analytical solution of average path length for Apollonian networks

Zhongzhi Zhang^{1,2}, Lichao Chen^{1,2}, Shuigeng Zhou^{1,2,*}, Lujun Fang^{1,2}, Jihong Guan³, and Tao Zou^{1,2}

¹Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China

²Shanghai Key Lab of Intelligent Information Processing, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China and

³Department of Computer Science and Technology,
Tongji University, 4800 Cao'an Road, Shanghai 201804, China

(Dated: October 26, 2018)

With the help of recursion relations derived from the self-similar structure, we obtain the exact solution of average path length, \bar{d}_t , for Apollonian networks. In contrast to the well-known numerical result $\bar{d}_t \propto (\ln N_t)^{3/4}$ [Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 018702 (2005)], our rigorous solution shows that the average path length grows logarithmically as $\bar{d}_t \propto \ln N_t$ in the infinite limit of network size N_t . The extensive numerical calculations completely agree with our closed-form solution.

PACS numbers: 89.75.Hc, 89.75.Da, 02.10.Ox, 05.10.-a

One of the most important properties of complex networks is average path length (APL), which is the mean length of the shortest paths between all pairs of vertices (nodes) [1]. Most real networks have been shown to be small-world or ultra small-world networks [2, 3, 4, 5], that is, their APL d behaves a logarithmic or double logarithmic scaling with the network size N : $d \sim \ln N$ [6] or $d \sim \ln \ln N$ [7]. It has been established that APL is relevant in many fields regarding real-life networks. In the design or interpretation of routes in architectural design, signal integrity in communication networks, the propagation of diseases or beliefs in social networks or of technology in industrial networks, APL is a natural network statistic to compute and interpret. It is strongly believed that many processes such as routing, searching, and spreading become more efficient when APL is smaller. So far, much attention has been paid to the question of APL [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13].

Recently, on the basis of the well-known Apollonian packing [14], Andrade *et al.* introduced Apollonian networks [15] which were also proposed by Doye and Massen in Ref. [16] simultaneously. Apollonian networks belong to a deterministic growing type of networks, which have drawn much attention from the scientific communities and have turned out to be a useful tool [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31]. Many topological properties of Apollonian networks such as degree distribution, clustering coefficient, and correlations have been determined analytically [15, 16], and the effects of the Apollonian networks on several dynamical models have been intensively studied, including Ising model and a magnetic model [15, 32, 33, 34]. Despite the importance and usefulness of the quantity APL, there is no analytical calculations for the APL of Apollonian networks.

In this report, we derive an exact formula for the average path length characterizing the Apollonian networks. The analytic method is based on the recursive construction and self-similar structure of Apollonian networks.




FIG. 1: (a) Second construction method of Apollonian network. A_{t+1} is obtained by joining three copies of A_t denoted as $A_t^{(\varphi)}$ ($\varphi = 1, 2, 3$), which are connected to one another at the edge nodes (i.e., X, Y, Z , and O). Note that the central node is represented as O (marker not visible). (b) Illustration of the recursive definition of node classification. From the node classification of $A_t^{(1)}$, $A_t^{(2)}$, and $A_t^{(3)}$, we can derive recursively the classification of nodes in network A_{t+1} .

Our rigorous result shows that APL grows logarithmically with the number of nodes. The obtained analytical solution modifies the previous numerical result in [15], where the authors claimed that the APL of Apollonian networks scales sub-logarithmically with network size. Our analytical technique could provide a paradigm for computing the APL of deterministic networks.

The Apollonian network, denoted as A_t ($t \geq 0$) after t generations, is constructed as follows [15]: For $t = 0$, A_t is a triangle. For $t \geq 1$, A_t is obtained from A_{t-1} . For each of existing triangles created at step $t - 1$, we add a new vertex and join it to all the vertices of this triangle. Alternatively, Apollonian network can be also created in another method [35, 36]. Given the generation t , A_{t+1} may be obtained by joining at four edge nodes three copies of A_t , see Fig. 1(a). According to the latter construction algorithm, we can easily compute the total number of vertices of A_t is $N_t = (3^t + 5)/2$.

Apollonian network presents the typical characteristics of real-life networks in nature and society [6, 37]. It has a power-law degree distribution with exponent $\gamma = 1 + \ln 3 / \ln 2$ [15, 16], which belongs to the inter-

*Electronic address: sgzhou@fudan.edu.cn

val between 2 and 3. For any individual vertex with degree k , its clustering coefficient $C(k)$ is also approximately inversely proportional to its degree k as $C(k) = (6/k) - [2/(k-1)]$. The mean value C of clustering coefficients of all vertices is very large, which asymptotically reaches a constant value 0.8284. Moreover, the network is small world, and its diameter, defined as the longest shortest path length between all pairs of vertices, increases logarithmically with the number of vertices [38]. In fact, Apollonian network can be expanded to general cases [16, 34, 38] associated with other self-similar packings [39]. Analogously, we can construct the stochastic version of these networks [34, 40, 41, 42]. The main topological properties of the Apollonian type networks are controlled by the dimension of packings.

After introducing the Apollonian networks, we now investigate analytically the average path length. We represent all the shortest path lengths of network A_t as a matrix in which the entry g_{uv} is the shortest path length from node u to v . A measure of the typical separation between two nodes in A_t is given by the average path length \bar{d}_t defined as the mean of shortest path lengths over all couples of nodes, i.e., $\bar{d}_t = \frac{D_t}{N_t(N_t-1)/2}$, where $D_t = \sum_{u,v \in A_t, u \neq v} g_{uv}$ denotes the sum of the shortest path length between two nodes over all pairs.

By the second construction, it is obvious that Apollonian network has a self-similar structure. Thus, the total distance D_{t+1} satisfies the recursion relation

$$D_{t+1} = 3D_t + \Theta_t - 3, \quad (1)$$

where Θ_t is the sum over all shortest path length whose endpoints are not in the same A_t branch. The solution of Eq. (1) is

$$D_t = 3^{t-1} D_1 + \sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (3^{t-m-1} \Theta_m) - 3^{t-1}. \quad (2)$$

Thus, all that is left to obtain D_t is to compute Θ_m .

The paths that contribute to Θ_t must all go through at least one of the four edge nodes (X , Y , Z , and O) at which the different A_t branches ($A_t^{(1)}$, $A_t^{(2)}$, $A_t^{(3)}$) are connected. The analytical expression for Θ_t , named the crossing path length, can be derived as below.

Denote $\Theta_t^{\alpha,\beta}$ as the sum of all shortest paths with endpoints in $A_t^{(\alpha)}$ and $A_t^{(\beta)}$. Note that $\Theta_t^{\alpha,\beta}$ rules out the paths with endpoint at the edge of $A_t^{(\alpha)}$ and $A_t^{(\beta)}$. For example, each path contributed to $\Theta_t^{1,2}$ should not end at node O or X . Then the total sum Θ_t is given by $\Theta_t = \Theta_t^{1,2} + \Theta_t^{1,3} + \Theta_t^{2,3}$. By symmetry, $\Theta_t^{1,2} = \Theta_t^{1,3} = \Theta_t^{2,3}$, so that $\Theta_t = 3\Theta_t^{1,2}$, where $\Theta_t^{1,2}$ is given by the sum

$$\Theta_t^{1,2} = \sum_{u \in A_t^{(1)}, v \in A_t^{(2)}, u, v \neq X \cup u, v \neq O} g_{uv}. \quad (3)$$

To calculate the crossing path length $\Theta_t^{1,2}$, we classify nodes in network A_{t+1} into seven different parts according to their shortest path lengths to each of the three

vertices (i.e. X , Y , Z) of the peripheral triangle $\triangle XYZ$. Notice that vertices X , Y , and Z themselves are not classified into any of the seven parts represented as P_1 , P_2 , P_3 , P_4 , P_5 , P_6 , and P_7 , respectively. The classification of nodes is shown in Fig. 1(b). For any interior node v , we denote the shortest path lengths from v to X , Y , Z as a , b , and c , respectively. By construction, a , b , c can differ by at most 1 since vertices X , Y and Z are adjacent. Then the classification function $class(v)$ of a node v is defined to be

$$class(v) = \begin{cases} P_1 & \text{for } a < b = c, \\ P_2 & \text{for } b < a = c, \\ P_3 & \text{for } c < a = b, \\ P_4 & \text{for } a = c < b, \\ P_5 & \text{for } a = b < c, \\ P_6 & \text{for } b = c < a, \\ P_7 & \text{for } a = b = c. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

It should be mentioned that the definition of node classification is recursive. For instance, Class P_1 and P_4 in $A_t^{(1)}$ belongs to Class P_1 in A_{t+1} , Class P_2 and P_6 in $A_t^{(1)}$ belongs to Class P_2 in A_{t+1} , Class P_3 in $A_t^{(1)}$ belongs to Class P_7 in A_{t+1} , and Class P_5 and P_7 in $A_t^{(1)}$ belongs to Class P_5 in A_{t+1} . Since the three vertices X , Y and Z are symmetrical, in Apollonian network we have the following equivalent relations from the viewpoint of class cardinality: Classes P_1 , P_2 , and P_3 are equivalent to one another, and it is the same with Classes P_4 , P_5 , and P_6 . We denote the number of nodes in network A_t that belong to Class P_1 as N_{t,P_1} , the number of nodes in Class P_2 as N_{t,P_2} , and so on. By symmetry, we have $N_{t,P_1} = N_{t,P_2} = N_{t,P_3}$ and $N_{t,P_4} = N_{t,P_5} = N_{t,P_6}$. Therefore in the following computation we will only consider N_{t,P_1} , N_{t,P_4} , and N_{t,P_7} . It is easy to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} N_t &= N_{t,P_1} + N_{t,P_2} + N_{t,P_3} + N_{t,P_4} \\ &\quad + N_{t,P_5} + N_{t,P_6} + N_{t,P_7} + 3 \\ &= 3N_{t,P_1} + 3N_{t,P_4} + N_{t,P_7} + 3. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Considering the self-similar structure of Apollonian network, we can easily know that at time $t+1$, the quantities N_{t+1,P_1} , N_{t+1,P_4} , and N_{t+1,P_7} evolve according to the following recursive equations

$$\begin{cases} N_{t+1,P_1} = 2N_{t,P_1} + 2N_{t,P_4}, \\ N_{t+1,P_4} = N_{t,P_4} + N_{t,P_7}, \\ N_{t+1,P_7} = 3N_{t,P_1} + 1, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where we have used the equivalence relations: $N_{t,P_1} = N_{t,P_2} = N_{t,P_3}$ and $N_{t,P_4} = N_{t,P_5} = N_{t,P_6}$.

For a node v in network A_{t+1} , we are also interested in the smallest value of the shortest path length from v to any of the three peripheral vertices X , Y , and Z . We denote the shortest distance as f_v , which can be defined to be $f_v = \min(a, b, c)$. Let d_{t,P_1} denote the sum of f_v of all nodes belonging to Class P_1 in network A_t . Analogously, we can also define the quantities d_{t,P_2} , d_{t,P_3} , \dots , d_{t,P_7} . Again by symmetry, we have $d_{t,P_1} = d_{t,P_2} = d_{t,P_3}$,

$d_{t,P_4} = d_{t,P_5} = d_{t,P_6}$, and $d_{t,P_1}, d_{t,P_4}, d_{t,P_7}$ can be written recursively as follows:

$$\begin{cases} d_{t+1,P_1} = 2d_{t,P_1} + 2d_{t,P_4}, \\ d_{t+1,P_4} = d_{t,P_4} + d_{t,P_7}, \\ d_{t+1,P_7} = 3(d_{t,P_1} + N_{t,P_1}) + 1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Next we begin to determine the value of the crossing path length $\Theta_t^{1,2}$. Using the definition of f_v , $\Theta_t^{1,2}$ can be rewritten as

$$\Theta_t^{1,2} = \sum_{u \in A_t^{(1)}, v \in A_t^{(2)}, u, v \neq X \cup u, v \neq O} (f_u + f_v + \delta_{uv}), \quad (8)$$

where δ_{uv} can be 0 or 1 depending on whether the two paths corresponding to f_u and f_v may meet at the same vertex (X or O). If the two paths meet at the same vertex, $\delta_{uv} = 0$, $\delta_{uv} = 1$ otherwise. According to the above classification of nodes, $\Theta_t^{1,2}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_t^{1,2} = & \sum_{i=1}^7 \sum_{j=1}^7 \left(N_{t-1,P_j} d_{t-1,P_i} + N_{t-1,P_i} d_{t-1,P_j} \right. \\ & \left. + N_{t-1,P_i} N_{t-1,P_j} \delta_{P_i P_j} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where P_i and P_j are node classes of $A_{t-1}^{(1)}$ and $A_{t-1}^{(2)}$, respectively. The quantity $\delta_{P_i P_j}$ may equal to either 0 or 1, which are related to two kinds of paths: paths from nodes in P_i to the three peripheral vertices of $A_{t-1}^{(1)}$, and paths from nodes in P_j to the three peripheral vertices of $A_{t-1}^{(2)}$. If these two sorts of paths may meet at the same peripheral vertex, $\delta_{P_i P_j} = 0$; If they do not meet, $\delta_{P_i P_j} = 1$. Combining previous equations and results, we get the final expression for $\Theta_t^{1,2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_t^{1,2} = & \frac{1}{2178} \exp(-i\pi t) \left(2^t(-62 - 16i\sqrt{2}) \right. \\ & + 11i2^{\frac{t}{2}}(10i + 7\sqrt{2}) \exp\left(\frac{i\pi t}{2}\right) \\ & - 11i2^{\frac{t}{2}}(-10i + 7\sqrt{2}) \exp\left(\frac{3i\pi t}{2}\right) \\ & + i2^{1+t}(31i + 8\sqrt{2}) \exp(2i\pi t) + \exp(i\pi t) \\ & \left. (-484 + 11 \cdot 3^{2+t} + 9^{3+t} + 22t \cdot 9^{1+t}) \right) \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

Inserting Eq. (10) into Eq. (2) and using the initial condition $D_1 = 6$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_t = & \frac{1}{330(-3 + i\sqrt{2})(-3i + \sqrt{2})} \left[6655i + 155(-i)^t 2^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{t}{2}} \right. \\ & - 155i^t 2^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{t}{2}} + 5i(-i)^t 2^{4 + \frac{t}{2}} + 5i^t 2^{4 + \frac{t}{2}} \\ & + 31i(-1)^t 2^{2+t} + 133i3^{3+t} + 40i3^{2+2t} \\ & \left. + 55it3^{1+t} + 55it3^{1+2t} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$




FIG. 2: Average path length \bar{d}_t versus network order N_t on a semilogarithmic scale. The solid line is a guide to the eye, which clearly shows that the APL scales logarithmically with the network size.

Then the exactly analytic expression for average path length can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{d}_t = & \frac{4}{1815(15 + 8 \cdot 3^t + 9^t)} \left(6655 + 5(-i)^t 2^{4 + \frac{t}{2}} \right. \\ & + 5i^t 2^{4 + \frac{t}{2}} - 155i(-i)^t 2^{\frac{1+t}{2}} + 155i^t 2^{\frac{1+t}{2}} \\ & + 31(-1)^t 2^{2+t} + 133 \cdot 3^{3+t} + 40 \cdot 9^{1+t} \\ & \left. + 55t \cdot 3^{1+t}(1 + 3^t) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

which can be simplified according to t as follows:

$$\bar{d}_t = \begin{cases} \frac{4[6655 + 5 \cdot 2^{5 + \frac{t}{2}} + 31 \cdot 2^{2+t} + 133 \cdot 3^{3+t} + 40 \cdot 9^{1+t} + 55 \cdot 3^{1+t}(1+3^t)t]}{1815(15 + 8 \cdot 3^t + 9^t)}, \\ \frac{4[6655 - 155 \cdot 2^{\frac{3+t}{2}} - 31 \cdot 2^{2+t} + 133 \cdot 3^{3+t} + 40 \cdot 9^{1+t} + 55 \cdot 3^{1+t}(1+3^t)t]}{1815(15 + 8 \cdot 3^t + 9^t)}, \\ \frac{4[6655 - 5 \cdot 2^{5 + \frac{t}{2}} + 31 \cdot 2^{2+t} + 133 \cdot 3^{3+t} + 40 \cdot 9^{1+t} + 55 \cdot 3^{1+t}(1+3^t)t]}{1815(15 + 8 \cdot 3^t + 9^t)}, \\ \frac{4[6655 + 155 \cdot 2^{\frac{3+t}{2}} - 31 \cdot 2^{2+t} + 133 \cdot 3^{3+t} + 40 \cdot 9^{1+t} + 55 \cdot 3^{1+t}(1+3^t)t]}{1815(15 + 8 \cdot 3^t + 9^t)}, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

for $t \equiv 0, 1, 2, 3 \pmod{4}$ are given consecutively. In the infinite network size (i.e., large t), $\bar{d}_t \simeq \frac{4}{11}t \sim \ln N_t$. Thus, the APL grows logarithmically with increasing size of the network. We have checked our analytic result against numerical calculations for different network size up to $t = 13$ which corresponds to $N_{13} = 797164$. In all the cases we obtain a complete agreement between our theoretical formula and the results of numerical investigation, see Fig. 2.

We finally make a comment on the result presented in [15]. Using a combination of numerical experiments and heuristic arguments, Ref. [15] advances claims about the interesting quantity of average path length. The authors of [15] claimed that $\bar{d}_t \propto (\ln N_t)^{3/4}$. They thus concluded that ANs belong to a new class of networks which interpolates between *small* ($\bar{d}_t \propto \ln N_t$) and *ultrasmall* ($\bar{d}_t \propto \ln \ln N_t$) networks [7]. While the combinatorial arguments and simulation results are sound,

the behavior of APL as t grows is quite difficult to estimate numerically. Just as it is hard to verify with direct computation that the harmonic series diverges, the experimental results in [15] underestimate the asymptotic behavior of APL. In contrast to previous claims, our obtained precise value for APL shows that the conclusion of [15] seems questionable. The self-similar structure of Apollonian network allows us to compute precisely the quantity APL, which is difficult to apprehend through simulation.

In conclusion, in this report we have derived analytically exact solution for the average path length of Apollonian networks which has been attracting much research interest. We found that in the infinite network size limit Apollonian networks are small-world, the APL scales logarithmically with network size. However, some authors have been proved that conventional random scale-free networks with degree exponent $\gamma < 3$ show ultra small-

world property [7, 8, 9]. In future, it is interesting to do further studies to reveal this dissimilarity between Apollonian networks and those stochastic scale-free networks, which have different scaling for APL. Finally, we believe that the analytical calculation here can guide and shed light on related studies for deterministic network models.

The authors would like to thank T. Zhou and F. Comellas for many valuable suggestions. This research was supported by the National Basic Research Program of China under grant No. 2007CB310806, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 60496327, 60573183, 90612007, 60773123, and 60704044, the Postdoctoral Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 20060400162, the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University of China (NCET-06-0376), and the Huawei Foundation of Science and Technology (YJCB2007031IN).

-
- [1] L. da. F. Costa, F. A. Rodrigues, G. Travieso, and P. R. V. Boas, *Adv. Phys.* **56**, 167 (2007).
- [2] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 47 (2002).
- [3] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J.F.F. Mendes, *Adv. Phys.* **51**, 1079 (2002).
- [4] M. E. J. Newman, *SIAM Review* **45**, 167 (2003).
- [5] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavezf, and D.-U. Hwang, *Phy. Rep.* **424**, 175 (2006).
- [6] D.J. Watts and H. Strogatz, *Nature (London)* **393**, 440 (1998).
- [7] R. Cohen and S. Havlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 058701 (2003).
- [8] F. Chung and L. Lu, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99**, 15879 (2002).
- [9] S. N. Dorogovtsev, J. F. F. Mendes, and A.N. Samukhin, *Nucl. Phys.* **653**, 307 (2003).
- [10] A. Fronczak, P. Fronczak, and J. A. Hołyst, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 056110 (2004).
- [11] W. S. Lovejoy, C. H. Loch, *Soc. Netw.* **25**, 333 (2003).
- [12] J. A. Hołyst, J. Sienkiewicz, A. Fronczak, P. Fronczak, and K. Suchecki, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 026108 (2005).
- [13] S. N. Dorogovtsev, J. F. F. Mendes, and J. G. Oliveira, *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 056122 (2006).
- [14] D.W. Boyd, *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **25**, 303 (1973).
- [15] J.S. Andrade Jr., H.J. Herrmann, R.F.S. Andrade and L.R. da Silva, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 018702 (2005).
- [16] J.P.K. Doye and C.P. Massen. *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 016128 (2005).
- [17] A.-L. Barabási, E. Ravasz, and T. Vicsek, *Physica A* **299**, 559 (2001).
- [18] S.N. Dorogovtsev, A.V. Goltsev, and 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] F. Comellas, G. Fertin and A. Raspaud, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 037104 (2004).
- [21] Z. Z. Zhang, L. L. Rong, and S. G. Zhou, *Physica A* **377**, 329 (2007).
- [22] E. Ravasz, A.L. Somera, D. A. Mongru, Z. N. Oltvai, and A.-L. Barabási, *Science* **297**, 1551 (2002).
- [23] E. Ravasz and A.-L. Barabási, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 026112 (2003).
- [24] F. Comellas, J. Ozón, and J.G. Peters, *Inf. Process. Lett.* **76**, 83 (2000)
- [25] Z.Z. Zhang, L.L Rong and C.H. Guo, *Physica A* **363**, 567 (2006).
- [26] A. N. Berker and S. Ostlund, *J. Phys. C* **12**, 4961 (1979).
- [27] M. Hinczewski, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 061104 (2007).
- [28] Z.Z. Zhang, S. G. Zhou, and T. Zou, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **56**, 259 (2007).
- [29] L. Barrière, F. Comellas, and C. Dalfó, *J. Phys. A* **39**, 11739 (2006).
- [30] Z.Z. Zhang, S.G. Zhou, L.J. Fang, J.H. Guan, Y.C. Zhang, *EPL* **79**, 38007 (2007).
- [31] H. D. Rozenfeld, S. Havlin, and D. ben-Avraham, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 175 (2007).
- [32] R.F.S. Andrade and H.J. Herrmann, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 056131 (2005).
- [33] P. G. Lind, J.A.C. Gallas, and H.J. Herrmann, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 056207 (2004).
- [34] Z. Z. Zhang, L. L. Rong, and S. G. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. E*, **74**, 046105 (2006).
- [35] E. Bollt, D. ben-Avraham, *New J. Phys.* **7**, 26 (2005).
- [36] M. Hinczewski and A. N. Berker, *Phys. Rev. E* **73**, 066126 (2006).
- [37] A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert, *Science* **286**, 509 (1999).
- [38] Z.Z. Zhang, F. Comellas, G. Fertin and L.L. Rong, *J. Phys. A* **39**, 1811 (2006).
- [39] R. Mahmoodi Baram, H.J. Herrmann, and N.Rivier, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 044301 (2004).
- [40] T. Zhou, G. Yan, and B.H. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 046141 (2005).
- [41] Z.Z. Zhang, L.L. Rong and F. Comellas, *Physica A* **364**, 610 (2006).
- [42] Z. Z. Zhang and S. G. Zhou, *Physica A* **380**, 621 (2007).

(Dated: October 26, 2018)

Abstract

