

# Impact of hierarchical modular structure on ranking of individual nodes in directed networks

Naoki Masuda<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Yoji Kawamura<sup>3</sup>, and Hiroshi Kori<sup>4,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Graduate School of Information Science and Technology,  
The University of Tokyo,

7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan

<sup>2</sup> PRESTO, Japan Science and Technology Agency,  
4-1-8 Honcho, Kawaguchi, Saitama 332-0012, Japan

<sup>3</sup> Institute for Research on Earth Evolution,  
Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology,  
3173-25 Showa-machi, Kanazawa-ku, Yokohama, Kanagawa 236-0001, Japan

<sup>4</sup> Division of Advanced Sciences, Ochanomizu Academic Production,  
Ochanomizu University,  
2-1-1, Ohtsuka, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-8610, Japan

\* Author for correspondence (masuda@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp)

February 18, 2019

## Abstract

Many systems, ranging from biological and engineering systems to social systems, can be modeled as directed networks, with edges representing directed interaction between two nodes. To assess the importance of a node in a directed network, various centrality measures based on different criteria have been proposed. However, calculating the centrality of a node is often difficult because of the overwhelming size of the network or the incomplete information about the network. Thus, developing an approximation method for estimating centrality measures is an urgent and challenging problem. In this study, we focus on modular networks; many real-world networks are composed of modules, where connection is dense within a module and sparse across different modules. We show that ranking-type centrality measures including the PageRank can be efficiently estimated once the modular structure of a network is extracted. We develop an analytical method to evaluate the centrality of nodes by combining the local property (*i.e.*, indegree and outdegree of nodes) and the global property (*i.e.*, centrality of modules). The proposed method is corroborated with real data. Our results provide a linkage between the ranking-type centrality values of modules and those of individual nodes and reveal the hierarchical structure of networks laid out by modules of different relative importance. The present study raises a novel motive of identifying modules in networks.

# 1 Introduction

A variety of systems of interacting elements can be represented as networks. A network is a collection of nodes and edges; an edge connects a pair of nodes. Generally speaking, some nodes play central functions, such as binding different parts of the network together and controlling dynamics in the network. To identify important nodes in a network, various centrality measures based on different criteria have been proposed [1–3].

Edges of many real networks such as the World Wide Web (WWW), food webs, neural networks, protein interaction networks, and many social networks are directed or asymmetrically weighted. In contrast to the case of undirected networks, an edge in directed networks indicates an asymmetrical relationship between two nodes, for example, the control of the source node of an edge over the target node. The direction of an edge indicates the relative importance of the two nodes. Central nodes in a network in this sense would be, for example, executive personnels in an organizational network and top predators in a food web. Generally, more (less) central nodes are located at an upper level (a lower level) in the hierarchy of the network, where hierarchy refers to the distinction between upper and lower levels as relevant in, for example, biological [4, 5] and social [6] systems. This type of centrality measure is necessarily specialized for directed networks and includes the popularity or prestige measures for social networks [1], ranking systems for webpages such as the PageRank [7, 8] and HITS [9], adaptations of the PageRank to citation networks of academic papers [10, 11] and journals [10, 12–14], and ranking systems of sports teams [15]. We call them ranking-type centrality measures.

Under practical restrictions such as overwhelming network size or incomplete information about the network, it is often difficult to exactly obtain ranking-type centrality values of nodes. In such situations, the simplest approximators are perhaps those based on the degree of nodes (*i.e.*, the number of edges owned by a node). For example, the indegree of a node can be an accurate approximator of the PageRank of websites [16] and ranks of academic journals [13, 14]. However, such local approximations often fail [17–19], implying a significant effect of the global

structure of networks.

A ubiquitous global structure of networks that adversely affects local approximations is the modular structure. Both in undirected [20–22] and directed [1, 22–25] networks, nodes are often classified into modules (also called communities) such that the nodes are densely connected within a module and sparsely connected across different modules. In modular networks, some modules may be central in a coarse-grained network, where each module is regarded as a supernode [26]. However, relationships between the centrality of individual nodes and that of modules are not well understood. Using these relationships, we will be able to assess centralities of individual nodes only on the basis of coarse-grained information about the organization of modules or under limited computational resources.

In this study, we analyze the ranking-type centrality measures for directed modular networks. We determine the centrality of different modules, which reflects the hierarchical structure of the networks, and show that module membership is a chief determinant of the centrality of individual nodes. A node tends to be central when it belongs to a high-rank module and it is locally central by, for example, having a large degree. To clarify these points, we analytically obtain an approximation scheme for centrality values in modular networks on the basis of the matrix tree theorem. The approximation is based on a combination of local and global effects, *i.e.*, the degree of nodes and the centrality of modules. We corroborate the effectiveness of the proposed scheme using the *C. elegans* neural network, an email social network, and the WWW.

## 2 Ranking-type Centrality Measures

Consider a directed and weighted network of  $N$  nodes denoted by  $G = \{V, E\}$ .  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$  is a set of nodes, and  $E$  is a set of directed edges, *i.e.*,  $v_i$  sends a directed edge to  $v_j$  with weight  $w_{ij}$  if and only if  $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ . The weight represents the amplitude of the direct influence of the node  $v_i$  on the node  $v_j$ . We set  $w_{ij} = 0$  when  $(i, j) \notin E$ .

We analyze the effect of the modular structure on ranking of nodes using a centrality measure called *influence* because it facilitates theoretical analysis. The existence of a one-to-

one mapping from the influence to the PageRank [7,8,16,17] and to variations of the PageRank used for ranking academic journals and articles [10,12–14], which we have shown, enables us to adopt our results to the case of such ranking-type centrality measures. To show that our results are not specific to the proposed measure, we study the influence and the PageRank simultaneously.

We define the influence of  $v_i$ , denoted by  $F(i)$ , by the solution of the following set of  $N$  linear equations:

$$F(i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} F(j)}{k_i^{\text{in}}}, \quad (1 \leq i \leq N), \quad (1)$$

where  $k_i^{\text{in}} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ji}$  is the indegree of  $v_i$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^N F(i) = 1$  provides the normalization.  $F(i)$  is large if (i)  $v_i$  directly affects many nodes (*i.e.*, many terms probably with a large  $w_{ij}$  on the RHS of Eq. (1)), (ii) the nodes that receive directed edges from  $v_i$  are influential (*i.e.*, large  $F(j)$  on the RHS), and (iii)  $v_i$  has a small indegree.

Equation (1) is the definition for strongly connected networks;  $G$  is defined to be strongly connected if there is a path, *i.e.*, a sequence of directed edges, from any  $v_i$  to any  $v_j$ . If  $G$  is not strongly connected, there is no path from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$  for some  $i$  and  $j$ . Then,  $v_i$  cannot influence  $v_j$  even indirectly, and the problem of determining the influence of nodes is decomposed into that for each strongly connected component. Therefore, we assume that  $G$  is strongly connected.

The influence  $F(i)$  represents the importance of nodes in different types of dynamics on networks (see Appendix A for details). First,  $F(i)$  is equal to the fixation probability of a new opinion introduced at  $v_i$  in a voter-type interacting particle system [19]. Second, if all edges are reversed such that a random walker visits influential nodes with high probabilities,  $F(i)$  is the stationary density of the continuous-time simple random walk. Third,  $F(i)$  is the so-called reproductive value used in population ecology [27,28]. Fourth,  $F(i)$  is the contribution of an opinion at  $v_i$  to the opinion of the entire population in the consensus in the DeGroot model [29–31]. Fifth,  $F(i)$  is equal to the amplitude of the collective response in the synchronized dynamics when an input is given to  $v_i$  [32].

The influence can be mapped to the PageRank. The PageRank, denoted by  $R(i)$  for  $v_i$ , is

defined self-consistently by

$$R(i) = \frac{q}{N} + (1 - q) \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{w_{ji}}{k_j^{\text{out}}} R(j) + \delta_{k_i^{\text{out}}, 0} (1 - q) R(i), \quad (1 \leq i \leq N) \quad (2)$$

where  $k_i^{\text{out}} \equiv \sum_{j'=1}^N w_{ij'}$  is the outdegree of  $v_i$ ,  $\delta_{i,j} = 1$  if  $i = j$ , and  $\delta_{i,j} = 0$  if  $i \neq j$ . The second term on the RHS of Eq. (2) is present only when  $k_j^{\text{out}} > 0$ . Note that the direction of the edge in the PageRank has the meaning opposite to that in the influence;  $R(i)$  of a webpage is incremented by an incoming edge (hyperlink), whereas  $F(i)$  is incremented by an outgoing edge. The introduction of  $q > 0$  homogenizes  $R(i)$  and is necessary for the PageRank to be defined for directed networks that are not strongly connected, such as real web graphs. The normalization is given by  $\sum_{i=1}^N R(i) = 1$ .  $R(i)$  is regarded as the stationary density of the discrete-time simple random walk on the network [7, 8, 16], where  $q$  is the probability of a jump to a randomly selected node.

An essential difference between the two measures lies in normalization. In the influence, the total credit that  $v_j$  gives its neighbors is equal to  $\sum_{i=1}^N w_{ij} F(j) = k_j^{\text{in}} F(j)$ , while that in the PageRank is equal to  $\sum_{i=1}^N (w_{ji}/k_j^{\text{out}}) R(j) = R(j)$ . In the PageRank, the multiplicative factor of the total credit that  $v_j$  gives other nodes is set to  $\sum_{i=1}^N w_{ji}/k_j^{\text{out}} = 1$  to prevent nodes with many outgoing edges from biasing ranks of nodes. In the ranking of webpages, creation of a webpage  $v_i$  with many hyperlinks does not indicate that  $v_i$  gives a large amount of credit to recipients of an edge. Each neighbor of  $v_i$  receives the credit  $R(i)/k_i^{\text{out}}$  from  $v_i$ . We should refer to the PageRank when nodes can select the number of recipients of credit (*e.g.*, the WWW and citation-based ranking of academic papers and journals). We should use the influence when the importance of all edges is proportional to their weights (*e.g.*, opinion formation and synchronization mentioned above).

The PageRank is equal to the influence in a network modified from the original network  $G$  (see Appendix B for derivation). In particular, the PageRank in  $G$  for  $q = 0$  is given by

$$R(i) = k_i^{\text{out}} F(i; G^{\text{rev}}), \quad (3)$$

where  $G^{\text{rev}}$  is the network obtained by reversing all edges of  $G$ . We use this relation to extend our results derived for the influence to the case of the PageRank.

The influence has a nontrivial sense only in directed networks because  $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$  in Eq. (1) leads to  $F(i) = 1/N$ . Furthermore, any network with  $k_i^{\text{in}} = k_i^{\text{out}}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ) results in  $F(i) = 1/N$ . Therefore, from Eq. (3),  $R(i) = k_i^{\text{in}} / (\langle k \rangle N)$  for such a network, where  $\langle k \rangle \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N k_i^{\text{in}} / N = \sum_{i=1}^N k_i^{\text{out}} / N$  is the mean degree. In this case,  $F(i)$  and  $R(i)$  are not affected by the global structure of the network.

In general directed or asymmetrically weighted networks,  $F(i)$  and  $R(i)$  are heterogeneous. The mean-field approximation (MA) is the simplest ansatz based on the local property of a node. By using  $\sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} F(j) \approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} \bar{F} = k_i^{\text{out}} \bar{F}$ , where  $\bar{F} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N F(i) / N = 1/N$ , we obtain  $F(i) \propto k_i^{\text{out}} / k_i^{\text{in}}$ . Combination of this and Eqs. (3) yields the MA for the PageRank:  $R(i) \approx k_i^{\text{in}} / (\langle k \rangle N)$ .

We can calculate  $F(i)$  by enumerating spanning trees. To show this, note that Eq. (1) implies that  $F(i)$  is the left eigenvector with eigenvalue zero of the Laplacian matrix defined by  $L_{ii} = \sum_{j'=1}^N w_{j'i}$  and  $L_{ij} = -w_{ji}$  ( $i \neq j$ ), i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^N F(i) L_{ij} = 0$  ( $1 \leq j \leq N$ ). The  $(i, j)$  cofactor of  $L$  is defined by

$$\text{Co}(i, j) \equiv (-1)^{i+j} \det L(i, j), \quad (4)$$

where  $L(i, j)$  is an  $(N-1) \times (N-1)$  matrix obtained by deleting the  $i$ -th row and the  $j$ -th column of  $L$ . Because  $\sum_{j=1}^N L_{ij} = 0$ , ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ),  $\text{Co}(i, j)$  does not depend on  $j$ . Using Eq. (4) and the fact that  $L$  is degenerate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Co}(i, i) L_{ij} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Co}(i, j) L_{ij} \\ &= \det L = 0, \quad (1 \leq j \leq N). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Therefore,  $(\text{Co}(1, 1), \dots, \text{Co}(N, N))$  is the left eigenvector of  $L$  with eigenvalue zero, which yields

$$F(i) \propto \text{Co}(i, i) = \det L(i, i). \quad (6)$$

From the matrix tree theorem [33,34],  $\det L(i, i)$  is equal to the sum of the weight of all possible directed spanning trees rooted at  $v_i$ . The weight of a spanning tree is equal to the product of the weight of  $N - 1$  edges forming the spanning tree.

### 3 Centrality in Modular Directed Networks

Most directed networks in the real world are more structured than those captured by the MA. A ubiquitous global structure of networks is modular structure. Modular networks consist of several densely connected subgraphs called modules (also called communities), and modules are connected to each other by relatively few edges. As an example, a subnetwork of the *C. elegans* neural network [35,36] containing 4 modules is shown in Fig. 1(a). Modular structure is common in both undirected [20–22] and directed [22–25] networks.

Modular structure of directed networks often leads to hierarchical structure. By hierarchy, we refer to the situation in which modules are located at different levels. It is relatively easy to traverse from a node in an upper level to one in a lower level along directed edges, but not vice versa. The hierarchical structure leads to the deviation of  $F(i)$  from the value obtained from the MA.

As an example, consider the directed  $P$ -partite network schematically shown in Fig. 2. Layer  $P'$  ( $1 \leq P' \leq P$ ) contains  $N/P$  nodes, where  $N$  is divided by  $P$ . The nodes in the same layer are connected bidirectionally with weight  $w$ . Each node in layer  $P'$  ( $1 \leq P' \leq P - 1$ ) sends directed edges to all nodes in layer  $P' + 1$  with weight unity, and each node in layer  $P'$  ( $2 \leq P' \leq P$ ) sends directed edges to all the  $N/P$  nodes in layer  $P' - 1$  with weight  $\epsilon$ . The following results do not change if two adjacent layers are connected via just an asymmetrically weighted bridge, as shown in Fig. 1(b). Because of the symmetry, all nodes in  $P'$  have the same influence  $F(P')$ . From Eq. (1), we obtain

$$F(P') = \frac{\epsilon^{P'-1}(1 - \epsilon)P}{(1 - \epsilon^P)N}. \quad (7)$$

When  $\epsilon < 1$ , a node in a layer with small  $P'$  is more influential than a node in layer with large



$P'$ . The MA yields  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}} = \epsilon^{-1}$  for layer 1,  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}} = \epsilon$  for layer  $P$ , and  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}} = 1$  for the other layers. The actual  $F(P')$  decreases exponentially throughout the hierarchy, whereas  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$  does not. We observe a similar discrepancy in the case of the PageRank.

We develop an improved approximation for the influence in modular networks by combining the MA and the correction factor obtained from the global modular structure of networks. Consider a network of  $m$  modules  $M_I$  ( $1 \leq I \leq m$ ). For mathematical tractability, we assume that each module communicates with the other modules via a single portal node  $v_{I_p} \in M_I$ , as illustrated in Fig. 1(b); the network shown in Fig. 1(b) is a simplification of that shown in Fig. 1(a). We denote the weight of the edge  $(v_{I_p}, v_{J_p})$  by  $w_{I \rightarrow J}$  ( $I \neq J$ ).

We obtain  $F(i)$  in this modular network by enumerating spanning trees rooted at  $v_i \in M_I$ . Denote such a spanning tree by  $T$ . The intersection of  $T$  and  $M_I$  is a spanning tree restricted to  $M_I$  and rooted at  $v_i$ . This restricted spanning tree reaches all nodes in  $M_I$ .  $T$  enters  $M_J$  ( $J \neq I$ ) via a directed path from  $v_{I_p}$  to  $v_{J_p}$ . This path is provided by a spanning tree in the network of  $m$  modules, where each module is represented by a single node  $v_{I_p}$ . The other nodes in  $M_J$  are spanned by the intersection of  $T$  and  $M_J$ , which forms a spanning tree restricted to  $M_J$  and rooted at  $v_{J_p}$ . Therefore,  $T$  is a concatenation of (i) an intramodular spanning tree in  $M_I$  and rooted at  $v_i$ , (ii)  $m - 1$  intramodular spanning trees in  $M_J$  and rooted at  $v_{J_p}$  ( $J \neq I$ ), and (iii) a spanning tree in the network of  $m$  modules rooted at  $v_{I_p}$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}_\ell(M_I)$  ( $\ell$  for local) denote the number of spanning trees in  $M_I$  with an arbitrary root, and  $\mathcal{N}_g$  ( $g$  for global) denote the number of spanning trees in a network of  $m$  modules with an arbitrary root. Then, the number of spanning trees in  $G$  rooted at  $v_i$  is equal to  $\mathcal{N}_\ell(M_I)F_\ell(i) \left[ \prod_{J=1, J \neq I}^m (\mathcal{N}_\ell(M_J) F_\ell(J_p)) \right] \mathcal{N}_g F_g(M_I)$ , where  $F_\ell(i)$  is the influence of  $v_i \in M_I$  within  $M_I$  and  $F_g(M_I)$  is the influence of  $M_I$  in the network of  $m$  modules. The first, second, and third factors in the enumeration corresponds to the numbers of spanning trees of types (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively. Therefore, we obtain

$$F(i) \propto F_\ell(i) \left( \prod_{J=1, J \neq I}^m F_\ell(J_p) \right) F_g(M_I). \quad (8)$$

For nodes  $v_i, v_{i'} \in M_I$ , Eq. (8) yields  $F(i)/F(i') = F_\ell(i)/F_\ell(i')$ ; the relative influence of nodes in the same module is equal to their relative influence within the module. For nodes in different modules, *i.e.*,  $v_i \in M_I$  and  $v_j \in M_J$  ( $I \neq J$ ), Eq. (8) leads to

$$\frac{F(i)}{F(j)} = \frac{F_\ell(i)F_g(M_I)F_\ell(J_p)}{F_\ell(j)F_g(M_J)F_\ell(I_p)}. \quad (9)$$

If each module is homogeneous, we approximate  $F_\ell(i) \approx F_\ell(I_p)$ ,  $F_\ell(j) \approx F_\ell(J_p)$  and obtain  $F(i)/F(j) \approx F_g(M_I)/F_g(M_J)$ ; the global connectivity of modules determines the influence of each node. If each module is heterogeneous in degree, we use the MA, *i.e.*,  $F_\ell(i) \approx (k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}})/\sum_{i'; v_{i'} \in M_I} (k_{i'}^{\text{out}}/k_{i'}^{\text{in}})$  and  $F_\ell(j) \approx (k_j^{\text{out}}/k_j^{\text{in}})/\sum_{j'; v_{j'} \in M_J} (k_{j'}^{\text{out}}/k_{j'}^{\text{in}})$ . By assuming that  $I_p$  ( $J_p$ ) is a typical node in  $M_I$  ( $M_J$ ), we set  $F_\ell(I_p) \approx 1/\sum_{i'; v_{i'} \in M_I} (k_{i'}^{\text{out}}/k_{i'}^{\text{in}})$  and  $F_\ell(J_p) \approx 1/\sum_{j'; v_{j'} \in M_J} (k_{j'}^{\text{out}}/k_{j'}^{\text{in}})$ . Then, Eq. (9) is transformed into  $F(i)/F(j) \approx [(k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}) F_g(M_I)] / [(k_j^{\text{out}}/k_j^{\text{in}}) F_g(M_J)]$ . Therefore, we define an approximation scheme, called the MA-Mod, as

$$F(i) \propto \frac{k_i^{\text{out}}}{k_i^{\text{in}}} F_g(M_I), \quad (v_i \in M_I). \quad (10)$$

Equation (10) can be used for general modular networks in which different modules can be connected by more than one edges.

Two crucial assumptions underlie Eq. (10). First, a module is assumed to be well-mixed so that the MA is effective within the module. Note that the degree of nodes can be heterogeneously distributed. Second, most edges are assumed to be intramodular so that the local MA is simply given by  $F_\ell(i) \propto k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$ .

To obtain  $F_g(M_I)$  for general networks, we define  $w_{I \rightarrow J} = \sum_{i \in M_I, j \in M_J} w_{ij}$  and approximate  $F(i) \approx F_g(M_I)/[\sum_{I'=1}^m N_{I'} F_g(M_{I'})]$  ( $v_i \in M_I$ ), where  $N_{I'}$  is the number of nodes in  $M_{I'}$ . Then,  $\sum_{i=1}^N F(i) = \sum_{I=1}^m F_g(M_I) = 1$  is satisfied. Then, Equation (1) is transformed into

$$F_g(M_I) = \frac{\sum_{J \neq I} w_{I \rightarrow J} F_g(M_J)}{k_I^{\text{in}}}, \quad (1 \leq I \leq m), \quad (11)$$

where  $k_I^{\text{in}} \equiv \sum_{J' \neq I} w_{J' \rightarrow I} = \sum_{i \in M_I, j \notin M_I} w_{ji}$ . Equation (11) has the same form as Eq. (1). By solving the set of  $m$  linear equations, we obtain  $F_g(M_I)$ .

Equation (10) adopted for  $F(i; G^{\text{rev}})$  leads to  $F(i; G^{\text{rev}}) \approx (k_i^{\text{in}}/k_i^{\text{out}})F_g(M_I; G^{\text{rev}})$ . By combining this with Eq. (3), we obtain the MA-Mod scheme for the PageRank with  $q = 0$ :

$$R(i) \propto \frac{k_i^{\text{in}}}{k_I^{\text{out}}} R_g(M_I), \quad (12)$$

where  $k_I^{\text{out}} \equiv \sum_{J' \neq I} w_{I \rightarrow J'} = \sum_{i \in M_I, j \notin M_I} w_{ij}$ .

## 4 Application to Real Data

We examine the effectiveness of the MA-Mod scheme using three datasets from different fields.

### 4.1 Neural network

In the network of nematode *C. elegans*, a pair of neurons may be connected by chemical synapses, which are directed edges, or gap junctions, which are undirected edges. We calculate the influence of neurons on the basis of a connectivity dataset [35, 36]. The edge weight  $w_{ij}$  is assumed to be the sum of the number of chemical synapses from neuron  $i$  to neuron  $j$  and that of the gap junctions between  $i$  and  $j$ . The following results are qualitatively the same if we ignore the gap junction or the edge weight (see Appendix C for the results). The largest strongly connected component, which we simply call the neural network, contains 274 nodes and 2959 edges.

It is difficult to determine whether the influence or the PageRank is more appropriate from current biological evidence. If postsynaptic neurons linearly integrate different synaptic inputs, the influence may be an appropriate measure. In contrast, postsynaptic neurons may effectively select one synaptic input by a nonlinear mechanism. If each input is selected with the same probability in a long run and the activity level does not differ much across neurons, the PageRank may be appropriate. We examine both scenarios using power iteration (see Appendix D for the methodology).

Among 274 neurons, 54, 79, and 87 neurons are classified as sensory neurons, interneurons, and motor neurons, respectively [36]. By definition, sensory neurons directly receive external

input such as touch and chemical substances, motor neurons send direct commands to move the body, and interneurons mediate information processing in various ways. The other neurons are polymodal neurons or neurons whose functions are unknown. Neurons with a large  $F(i)$  are mostly sensory neurons. For example, among the 10 neurons with the largest  $F(i)$ , 8 are sensory neurons (ALMR, ASJL, ASJR, AVM, IL2VL, PHAL, PHAR, PVM) and 2 are interneurons (AIML, AIMR). Generally speaking, these neurons have a large  $F(i)$  not simply because their  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$  is large. The average of  $F(i)/(k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}})$  over the 10 neurons is equal to 3.456 (see Tab. A2 in Appendix C for the values of  $F(i)$  and  $F(i)/(k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}})$ ). These neurons are located at upper levels of the neural network in the global sense. The conclusion remains qualitatively the same if we use  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$ . Recall that the PageRank is calculated for  $G^{\text{rev}}$  because the meaning of the direction of the edge in the influence is opposite to that in the PageRank.

The average values of  $F(i)$  ( $R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$ ) for sensory neurons, interneurons, and motor neurons are equal to 0.009235 (0.006621), 0.003614 (0.005415), and 0.001032 (0.001323), respectively. The cumulative distributions of  $F(i)$  for different classes of neurons are shown in Fig. 3. Even though many synapses from motor neurons to interneurons and sensory neurons, and synapses from interneurons to sensory neurons exist, these numerical results indicate that the neural network is principally hierarchical. Generally speaking, sensory neurons are located at upper levels of the hierarchy, motor neurons are located at lower levels, and interneurons are located in between. Sensory neurons serve as a source of signals flowing to interneurons and motor neurons down the hierarchy.

The relation between  $F(i)$  and the MA is shown in Fig. 4(a) by the squares. They appear strongly correlated. However, the Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC; see Appendix E for definition) between  $F(i)$  and the MA is not large ( $= 0.5389$ ), as shown in Tab. 1, because  $F(i)$  tends to be larger than the MA for nodes with a large  $F(i)$ . Note that the data are plotted in the log-log scale in Fig. 4.

The neural network has modular structure [37]. To use the MA-Mod scheme (Eq. (10)), we apply a community detection algorithm [25] to the neural network. As a result, we obtain

$m = 13$  modules, calculate  $F_g(M_1), \dots, F_g(M_m)$  from the network of the  $m$  modules, and use Eq. (10).  $F(i)$  is plotted against the MA-Mod in Fig. 4(a), indicated by circles. The data fitting has improved compared to the case of the MA, in particular for small values of  $F(i)$ . The PCC between  $F(i)$  and the MA-Mod is larger than that between  $F(i)$  and the MA (Tab. 1). In this example, this holds true for the raw data and the logarithmic values of the raw data. As a benchmark, we assess the performance of the global estimator  $F(i) \approx F_g(M_I) / [\sum_{I'=1}^m N_{I'} F_g(M_{I'})]$  ( $v_i \in M_I$ ), which we call the Mod. The Mod ignores the variability of  $F(i)$  within the module and is exact for networks with completely homogeneous modules, such as the network shown in Fig. 2. The performance of the Mod is poor in the neural network, as indicated by the triangles in Fig. 4(a) and the PCC listed in Tab. 1.

The values of the PCC between the actual and approximated  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$  are also listed in Tab. 1. The results for the PageRank are qualitatively the same as those for the influence. With both measures, the module membership is a crucial determinant of centralities of individual nodes. Note that, on the basis of  $F(i) \approx F_g(M_I) / [\sum_{I'=1}^m N_{I'} F_g(M_{I'})]$ , the Mod for the PageRank is given by  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}}) / k_i^{\text{in}} \approx R_g(M_I; G^{\text{rev}}) / [k_I^{\text{in}} \sum_{I'=1}^m N_{I'} F_g(M_{I'})]$ , *i.e.*,  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}}) \propto k_i^{\text{in}} R_g(M_I; G^{\text{rev}}) / k_I^{\text{in}} \approx R_g(M_I; G^{\text{rev}}) / N_I$ . We approximate  $k_i^{\text{in}}$  by  $k_I^{\text{in}} / N_I$  because the information about local degree is unavailable for the Mod.

## 4.2 Email social network

Our second example is the largest strongly connected component of an email social network [38]. A directed edge exists between a sender and a recipient of an email. The network has modular structure [23]. In the weighted network that we consider here, the edge weight is defined by the number of emails. The following results do not qualitatively change even if we neglect the edge weight (see Appendix F). The largest strongly connected component has 9079 nodes and 23808 edges and is partitioned into 637 modules.

Whether the influence or the PageRank is appropriate for ranking nodes depends on the assumption about human behavior. If recipients spend the same amount of time on each

Table 1: The Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) between the centrality measures and different estimators.

network	<i>C. elegans</i>		Email		WWW		
$N$	274		9079		53968		
$m$	13		637		2977		
centrality	$F(i)$	$R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$	$F(i)$	$R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$	$F(i; G^{\text{rev}})$	$R(i)$	$R(i)$
$q$	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	0.15
MA	0.5389	0.3593	0.5066	0.3997	0.0073	0.0007	0.2162
Mod	0.2927	0.4346	0.5010	0.2452	0.0003	-0.0003	0.4104
MA-Mod	0.7295	0.5005	0.5066	0.2671	0.0000	0.0000	0.3166
MA (log)	0.8024	0.7073	0.3636	0.5353	0.3109	0.1289	0.4627
Mod (log)	0.5195	0.5503	0.8075	0.7147	0.7800	0.7147	0.4098
MA-Mod (log)	0.8736	0.8252	0.8798	0.9022	0.7964	0.7812	0.6256

incoming email (*i.e.*, the edge of weight unity),  $F(i)$  is relevant. In contrast, recipients may have a fixed amount of time for dealing with all incoming emails. Then, a recipient may equally distribute the total time available to each email depending on the number of incoming emails. Under this assumption, the PageRank is relevant. We analyze both  $F(i)$  and  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$ .

In Fig. 4(b), the values of  $F(i)$  are plotted against those obtained by different estimators. On the log-log scale, the MA-Mod performs considerably better than the MA. Remarkably, even the Mod performs better than the MA. This is a strong indication that the structure of the coarse-grained network of modules is a more important determinant of  $F(i)$  than the local structure (*i.e.*, degree) in this example. The values of the PCC summarized in Tab. 1 support our claim. The PCC for the MA-Mod and the Mod is considerably larger than that for the MA on the logarithmic scale, which implies that the MA-Mod is especially effective for nodes with a small  $F(i)$ . The values of the PCC between  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$  and the different estimators are listed in Tab. 1. These results are qualitatively the same as those for  $F(i)$ .

### 4.3 WWW

Our last example is the largest strongly connected components of a WWW dataset [39]. The original network contains 325729 nodes and 1469680 edges, and the largest strongly connected

component contains 53968 nodes and 296229 edges. The MA fits the PageRank (with  $q > 0$ ) of some WWW data when nodes of the same degree are grouped together [16] but not other data [17]. Because of the modular structure of the WWW [23], the MA-Mod is expected to perform better than the MA.

In Fig. 4(c),  $R(i)$  for  $q = 0$  is plotted against the MA, Mod, and MA-Mod. For nodes with small PageRanks, the MA-Mod, and even the Mod, are considerably better correlated with  $R(i)$  than the MA is (note the use of the log-log scale in Fig. 4(c); also see Tab. 1). These nodes are located at lower levels of hierarchy. The results are qualitatively the same if we use the influence (Tab. 1). Note that we reverse the edges and calculate  $F(i; G^{\text{rev}})$  because a directed edge in the WWW indicates an impact of the target node on the source node.

The MA-Mod for the PageRank can be extended to the case  $q > 0$ . From Eq. (2), the MA for the PageRank is given by

$$R(i) \approx \frac{q}{N} + (1 - q) \frac{k_i^{\text{in}}}{\langle k \rangle} \bar{R} = \frac{q + (1 - q) \frac{k_i^{\text{in}}}{\langle k \rangle}}{N}, \quad (13)$$

which implies that  $k_i^{\text{in}}$  in the MA for  $q = 0$  is replaced by  $q \langle k \rangle + (1 - q) k_i^{\text{in}}$  for general  $q$ . We define the MA-Mod for  $q > 0$  by  $R(i) \propto [q \langle k \rangle + (1 - q) k_i^{\text{in}}] R_g(M_I) / [q \sum_J k_J^{\text{out}} / m + (1 - q) k_I^{\text{out}}]$ . Note that this ansatz is heuristic, whereas Eq. (12) used for  $q = 0$  has an analytical basis. The PCCs between the PageRank with  $q = 0.15$  and the three estimates are listed in Tab. 1. The MA-Mod performs better than the MA. The advantage of the MA-Mod over the MA is smaller for  $q = 0.15$  than for  $q = 0$  because a larger  $q$  implies a heavier neglect of the network structure.

The definition of the PageRank given by Eq. (2) is not continuous with respect to the outdegree; the term  $\delta_{k_i^{\text{out}}, 0} (1 - q) R(i)$  is present for  $k_i^{\text{out}} = 0$  (*i.e.*, dangling node) and absent for  $k_i^{\text{out}} > 0$ . Therefore, dangling nodes can have large PageRanks. To improve the MA-Mod for  $q > 0$ , we should separately treat dangling nodes and other nodes in the same module. We do not explore this point because this situation seems to be specific to the working definition of the PageRank.

In practice, nodes with a small  $R(i)$  could be irrelevant to the performance of a search

engine, which outputs a list of websites with the largest PageRanks. However, nodes with a small PageRank constitute the majority of a network when the PageRank follows a power-law distribution. This is the case for the real WWW data, which are scale-free networks [16, 17]. Our method is considerably better than the MA especially for nodes with small PageRanks.

In general, the WWW is nested, with each level defined by webpages, directories, hosts, and domains. At the host level, for example, most edges are directed toward nodes within the same host [40]. By calculating the importance of the host, called the BlockRank, the PageRank can be efficiently computed [40]. In spirit, our  $R_g(M_I)$  is similar to the BlockRank, although our  $R_g(M_I)$  is used for identifying the hierarchical levels of networks and systematically approximating  $R(i)$ .

## 5 Discussion and Conclusions

We have shown that the hierarchical structure of directed modular networks considerably affects ranking-type centrality measures of individual nodes. Using the information about connectivity among modules, we have significantly improved the estimation of centrality values. Our theoretical development is based on the measure that we have proposed (*i.e.*, influence), but the conclusions hold true for both the influence and the PageRank. Our method can be implemented for variants of the PageRank including the eigenfactor [13, 14] and the so-called invariant method [10, 12] used for ranking academic journals.

The hierarchy discussed in this study is different from the nestedness of networks. Many networks are hierarchical in the sense that they are nested and have multiple scales [41–43]. A modular network is hierarchical in this sense, at least to a limited extent; two hierarchical levels are defined by the scale of the entire network and that of a single module. In contrast, we are concerned with hierarchical relationships among modules defined by the directionality of networks. This concept of hierarchy has been studied for, for example, food webs [4], transcription networks [5], and social dynamics [6], but its understanding based on networks is relatively poor in spite of its intuitive appeal. The influence and the PageRank quantify the hierarchical



position of individual nodes and of modules.

In real networks, nodes and edges are subjected to changes. Such changes affect nodes near the perturbed nodes, but may not significantly affect modules. In social networks, large groups change slowly over time as compared to small groups [21]. In addition, in the absence of complete knowledge of networks, modest understanding of networks at the level of the modular structure may be adequate. Nodes in a module may also have a common function. These are main reasons behind investigating the modular structure of networks. We have shown that the modular structure is also important in the context of directed networks, hierarchy, and ranking. The definition of module is complex in the case of directed networks as compared to undirected networks, and module detection in directed networks is currently under investigations (see [22] for a review). We hope that our results aid the development of the concept of modules and related algorithms in directed networks.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Jesper Jansson and Kei Yura for their valuable discussions. N.M. acknowledges the support through the Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (Nos. 20760258 and 20540382) from MEXT, Japan.

## Appendix A: Influence is obtained from various dynamical models on networks

### Fixation probability of evolutionary dynamics

$F(i)$  represents the probability that an ‘opinion’ introduced at  $v_i$  spreads to the entire network. We consider stochastic competitive dynamics between two equally strong types of opinions  $A$  and  $B$ ; each node takes either  $A$  or  $B$  at a given time. In the so-called link dynamics (LD) [44, 45], which is a network version of the standard voter model, one edge  $(v_i, v_j) \in E$  is selected for reproduction with an equal probability in each time step. Then, the type at  $v_i$

replaces that at  $v_j$ . This process is repeated until  $A$  or  $B$  takes over the entire network.

$F(i)$  coincides with the fixation probability denoted by  $F_i^{LD}$ , which is the probability that a new type  $A$  introduced at  $v_i$  in the network of the resident type  $B$  nodes takes over the entire network [19]. To calculate  $F_i^{LD}$ , fix a network and consider the initial configuration in which  $A$  is located at  $v_i$  and  $B$  is located at the other  $N - 1$  nodes. In the first time step, one of the following events occurs. With the probability  $w_{ij} / \sum_{i',j'} w_{i'j'}$ , the edge  $(v_i, v_j) \in E$  is selected for reproduction. Then, type  $A$  is located at  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . Let  $F_{\{i,j\}}^{LD}$  denote the fixation probability of type  $A$  for this new configuration. With the probability  $w_{ji} / \sum_{i',j'} w_{i'j'}$ , the edge  $(v_j, v_i) \in E$  is selected, type  $A$  becomes extinct, and the dynamics terminates. With the remaining probability  $\sum_{i' \neq i, j' \neq i} w_{i'j'} / \sum_{i',j'} w_{i'j'}$ , the configuration of types  $A$  and  $B$  on the network does not change. Therefore, we obtain

$$F_i^{LD} = \sum_j \frac{w_{ij}}{\sum_{i',j'} w_{i'j'}} F_{\{i,j\}}^{LD} + \frac{\sum_j w_{ji}}{\sum_{i',j'} w_{i'j'}} \times 0 + \frac{\sum_{i' \neq i, j' \neq i} w_{i'j'}}{\sum_{i',j'} w_{i'j'}} F_i^{LD}. \quad (14)$$

Because  $F_{\{i,j\}}^{LD} = F_i^{LD} + F_j^{LD}$  [19], Eq. (14) leads to Eq. (1) with  $F(i)$  replaced by  $F_i^{LD}$ .

## Continuous-time simple random walk

Consider a simple random walk on the network in continuous time. In a small time interval  $\Delta t$ , a walker at  $v_i$  is attracted to its neighbor  $v_j$ , where  $(v_j, v_i) \in E$ , with the probability  $\Delta t$ . Note that the direction of the edge is opposite to the convention because the directed edge in the present study indicates the influence of the source node of the edge on the target node of the edge. The master equation for the density of the random walker at  $v_i$ , denoted by  $F_i^{RW}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ), is represented by

$$\frac{dF_i^{RW}}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} F_j^{RW} - k_i^{\text{in}} F_i^{RW}. \quad (15)$$

Because the network  $G$  is strongly connected,  $F_i^{RW}$  converges to the unique stationary density. By setting the LHS of Eq. (15) to 0, we obtain  $F_i^{RW} = F(i)$ .

The simple random walk is closely associated with the fixation problem. The so-called dual process of the LD is the coalescing random walk. In the coalescing random walk, each of the  $N$  walkers basically performs the continuous-time simple random walk on the network with the direction of all edges reversed. Therefore, the random walker can traverse from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$  when  $(v_j, v_i) \in E$ . If two random walkers meet on a node, they coalesce into one walker. There is only one walker after sufficiently long time, and the duality between the two stochastic processes guarantees  $F_i^{RW} = F_i^{LD}$  [19].

## Reproductive value

In population ecology, the number of offsprings an individual contributes to is quantified as the reproductive value of the individual. The reproductive value of  $v_i$  is defined by Eq. (1) [27, 28]. In practice, a node represents a class of individuals defined by, for example, sex, age, or habitat.

## DeGroot model in social dynamics

The DeGroot model [29–31] is a discrete-time model that represents the propagation of information or opinions in social systems. The state of the individual at  $v_i$  is represented by a real value  $p_i(t)$ ;  $p_i(t)$  parameterizes the information that the individual at  $v_i$  has at time  $t$ . The weight  $w_{ij}$  is the probability that the individual at  $v_j$  copies the opinion at  $v_i$  in the next time step. The normalization is given by  $\sum_{i=1}^N w_{ij} = 1$ . The states of the  $N$  nodes evolve according to

$$p_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ji} p_j(t-1). \quad (16)$$

If the network is strongly connected and aperiodic, a consensus is reached asymptotically, *i.e.*,  $p_1(\infty) = \dots = p_N(\infty)$  [30, 31].

The extent to which the initial information at  $v_i$  influences the limiting common information in the continuous-time version of the DeGroot model is equal to  $F(i)$ . To show this, we start with the discrete-time dynamics given by Eq. (16). Suppose that  $F_i^{DG}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ) satisfies  $p_1(\infty) = \dots = p_N(\infty) = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i^{DG} p_i(0)$  for arbitrary  $p_1(0), \dots, p_N(0)$ . Because

the configuration  $\{p_1(0), \dots, p_N(0)\}$  and the configuration  $\{p_1(1), \dots, p_N(1)\}$  starting with  $\{p_1(0), \dots, p_N(0)\}$  end up with the identical  $p_1(\infty) = \dots = p_N(\infty)$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^N F_i^{DG} p_i(0) = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i^{DG} \left( \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ji} p_j(0) \right). \quad (17)$$

Since  $p_1(0), \dots, p_N(0)$  are arbitrary, we obtain

$$F_i^{DG} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} F_j^{DG}, \quad (18)$$

Equation (18) is of the same form as Eq. (1). However, the condition  $\sum_{i=1}^N w_{ij} = 1$  is imposed in Eq. (18) because the dynamics are defined in the discrete time. The continuous-time counterpart of the DeGroot model is defined in [31] as follows:

$$\frac{dp_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ji} (p_j(t) - p_i(t)). \quad (19)$$

If  $p_1(\infty) = \dots = p_N(\infty) = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i^{DG} p_i(0)$ , we obtain  $\sum_{i=1}^N F_i^{DG} dp_i(t)/dt = 0$ , which leads to

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \left( \sum_{j=1}^N F_j^{DG} w_{ij} - F_i^{DG} \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ji} \right) p_i(0) = 0 \quad (20)$$

for arbitrary  $p_1(0), \dots, p_N(0)$ . Therefore,  $F_i^{DG} = F(i)$ .

## Collective responses in coupled oscillator dynamics

According to [32], consider  $N$  coupled phase oscillators obeying

$$\dot{\phi}_i = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij} (\phi_j - \phi_i) + \sigma p_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (21)$$

where  $\phi_i \in [0, 2\pi)$  is the phase of the oscillator  $v_i$ ,  $\omega_i$  is the intrinsic frequency of the oscillator  $v_i$ ,  $\Gamma_{ij}$  is the effect of  $v_j$  on  $v_i$ , and  $p_i(t)$  is the input at time  $t$  applied to  $v_i$ . We assume that (i) in the absence of the input (*i.e.*,  $\sigma = 0$ ), the system is fully phase-locked, *i.e.*,  $\phi_i = \phi_i^0 + \Omega t$  for all  $i$  with some constants  $\phi_i^0$  and  $\Omega$  and that (ii) the input is small, *i.e.*,  $\sigma \ll 1$ , so that

the system is always close to the phase-locked state. Using the synchronization condition, *i.e.*,  $\omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{ij} (\phi_i^0 - \phi_j^0) = \Omega$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ), which is implied by assumption (i), we linearize Eq. (21) as

$$\dot{\psi}_i = \sum_{j=1}^N L_{ij} \psi_j + \sigma p_i(t), \quad (22)$$

where  $\psi_i \equiv \phi_i - \phi_i^0 - \Omega t$  is a small perturbation in the phase, and  $L$  is the Jacobian matrix given by  $L_{ij} = \left[ \sum_{j' \neq i} \Gamma'_{ij'} (\phi_i^0 - \phi_{j'}^0) \right] \delta_{ij} - \Gamma'_{ij} (\phi_i^0 - \phi_j^0) (1 - \delta_{ij})$ . Note that the effective weight of the edge from  $v_j$  to  $v_i$  is given by  $w_{ji} = -\Gamma'_{ij} (\phi_i^0 - \phi_j^0)$ . Because assumption (i) implies the stability of the phase-locked state, the real parts of all the eigenvalues of  $L$  are negative, except a zero eigenvalue. We define the collective phase by  $\Theta \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N F(i) \phi_i$ . Combination of  $\sum_{i=1}^N F(i) L_{ij} = 0$  ( $1 \leq j \leq N$ ), which is derived from Eq. (1), and Eq. (22) yields

$$\dot{\Theta} = \sum_{i=1}^N F(i) \dot{\phi}_i = \Omega + \sigma \sum_{i=1}^N F(i) p_i(t). \quad (23)$$

Assumption (ii) implies that  $\dot{\phi}_1 \approx \dots \approx \dot{\phi}_N \approx \dot{\Theta}$ . Therefore, Eq. (23) describes the dynamical behavior of each oscillator and that of the entire network. The response of the collective behavior to the input applied to  $v_i$  is weighted by  $F(i)$ .

## Appendix B: Relationship between the influence and the PageRank

To determine the relationship between the influence and the PageRank, we rewrite Eq. (2) as

$$R(i) = \sum_{j=1}^N \left[ \frac{q}{N} + (1-q) \frac{w_{ji}}{k_j^{\text{out}}} + (1-q) \delta_{i,j} \delta_{k_i^{\text{out}},0} \right] R(j). \quad (24)$$

From the original network  $G$ , define a complete and asymmetrically weighted network  $G'$  using the matrix of edge weights  $w'_{ij} = q/N + (1-q)w_{ji}/k_j^{\text{out}} + (1-q)\delta_{i,j}\delta_{k_i^{\text{out}},0}$ . Because  $\sum_{j=1}^N w'_{ji} = 1$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ),  $R(i)$  in  $G$  is equal to  $F(i)$  in  $G'$ , which we denote by  $F(i; G')$  for clarity. Because self loops do not affect the calculation of the influence, we can replace  $w'_{ij}$  by  $q/N + (1-q)w_{ji}/k_j^{\text{out}}$ .

In particular,  $R(i)$  for  $q = 0$  is equal to  $F(i; G')$ , where  $G'$  is defined by  $w'_{ij} = w_{ji}/k_j^{\text{out}}$ . In this case, the PageRank and the influence are connected by the simple relationship given by Eq. (3).

## Appendix C: Detailed analysis of the *C. elegans* neural network

The relative contribution of a chemical synapse and that of a gap junction to signal transduction in the *C. elegans* neural circuitry are unknown. In the main text, we have assumed that the neural network is a weighted network in which a chemical synapse has the same edge weight as a gap junction. Here we examine three other variants of *C. elegans* neural networks. In these three neural networks, we neglect the edge weight and/or gap junctions. The omission of the edge weight reflects the possibility that the intensity of the communication between two neurons may saturate as the number of synapses increases. The omission of gap junctions reflects the possibility that gap junctions may not contribute to signal processing as significantly as chemical synapses. Note that the largest strongly connected component shrinks to a network of 237 nodes with 1936 synapses by the omission of gap junctions.

For the three neural networks, the values of the PCC between the centralities of the nodes and the three approximators are listed in Tab. A1. We have examined both  $F(i)$  and  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$  with  $q = 0$ . In general, the MA-Mod predicts  $F(i)$  and  $R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$  better than the MA in the three networks. The results listed in Tab. A1 are consistent with those presented in the main text.

For the four neural networks, including the one in the main text, the 10 most influential neurons are listed in Tab. A2. This list of 10 neurons is largely consistent across different definitions of neural network. For the majority of these neurons,  $F(i)$  is larger than the value predicted from the MA.

## Appendix D: Power iteration

If we use a standard numerical method such as the Gaussian elimination, the computation time required for calculating  $F(i)$  and  $R(i)$  from Eqs. (1) and (2), respectively, is  $O(N^3)$ . For sparse networks, carrying out power iteration (also called Jacobi iteration) may be much faster. The convergence of this iteration is guaranteed, as explained below for the influence. The proof for the PageRank is almost the same.

We rewrite Eq. (1) as

$$F(i) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{w_{ij}}{\sum_{j'=1}^N w_{j'i}} F(j). \quad (25)$$

Equation (25) indicates that  $F(i)$  is the  $i$ -th element of the right eigenvector of the matrix  $M \equiv (M_{ij}) = \left( w_{ij} / \sum_{j'} w_{j'i} \right)$  for the eigenvalue equal to unity. Multiplying  $M$  by the diagonal matrix  $(\delta_{ij} / \sum_{i'} w_{i'j})$  on the right and its inverse on the left does not alter the spectrum of  $M$ . This operation yields a new matrix whose  $(i, j)$  element is given by  $(w_{ij} / \sum_{i'} w_{i'j})$ . The spectral radius of the new matrix is at most unity because its maximum row sum matrix norm [46, p.295] is equal to unity. Consequently, the spectral radius of  $M$  is equal to unity.

Consider the power iteration scheme in which the  $(t+1)$ -th estimate of  $F(i)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ) is given by the RHS of Eq. (25) in which the  $t$ -th estimate of  $F(i)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ) is substituted. If the network is strongly connected and aperiodic, the nonnegative matrix  $M$  is primitive, *i.e.*, the eigenvalue of the largest modulus, which is equal to unity in the present case, is unique [46, p.516]. Then, the convergence of power iteration to the correct  $(F(1), \dots, F(N))$  is guaranteed [46, p.523]. The Perron-Frobenius theorem [46] guarantees that the Perron vector  $(F(1), \dots, F(N))$  is uniquely determined and that  $F(i) > 0$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ). The power iteration converges quickly if the modulus of the second eigenvalue of  $M$  is considerably smaller than that of the largest eigenvalue, *i.e.*, unity.

Table A1: PCC between centrality measures and different estimators for *C. elegans* neural networks.

gap junction	yes		no		no	
edge	unweighted		weighted		unweighted	
$N$	274		237		237	
$m$	7		20		15	
centrality	$F(i)$	$R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$	$F(i)$	$R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$	$F(i)$	$R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$
MA	0.7420	0.6331	0.2145	0.0875	0.5153	0.4240
Mod	0.3727	0.2542	0.1577	0.1741	0.1583	0.2224
MA-Mod	0.8235	0.7401	0.3328	0.1189	0.4949	0.4659
MA (log)	0.8478	0.7942	0.6899	0.6152	0.7976	0.7726
Mod (log)	0.5190	0.1937	0.7018	0.7338	0.6743	0.6519
MA-Mod (log)	0.8995	0.8752	0.8475	0.8137	0.8785	0.8586

## Appendix E: PCC

The PCC between  $F(i)$  and an estimator  $F^{\text{est}}(i)$ , such as MA, Mod, and MA-Mod, is defined by

$$\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (F(i)F^{\text{est}}(i) - 1/N^2)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (F(i) - 1/N)^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (F^{\text{est}}(i) - 1/N)^2}}. \quad (26)$$

Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^N F(i)/N = \sum_{i=1}^N F^{\text{est}}(i)/N = 1/N$ .

## Appendix F: Results for unweighted email social network

The values of the PCC between the two centrality measures and different estimators for the unweighted email social network are listed in Tab. A3. The results are qualitative the same as those for the weighted network shown in the main text.



Table A2: Most influential neurons in *C. elegans* neural networks.  $F(i)/(\text{MA})$  indicates  $F(i)$  divided by the value obtained from the MA.

with gap junction			with gap junction			no gap junction			no gap junction		
weighted			unweighted			weighted			unweighted		
neuron	$F(i)$	$\frac{F(i)}{(\text{MA})}$	neuron	$F(i)$	$\frac{F(i)}{(\text{MA})}$	neuron	$F(i)$	$\frac{F(i)}{(\text{MA})}$	neuron	$F(i)$	$\frac{F(i)}{(\text{MA})}$
AIMR	0.08876	4.160	PHAL	0.04279	3.226	AIMR	0.06841	3.924	VC04	0.05899	4.594
ASJL	0.04287	3.588	PHAR	0.04117	3.449	ASJL	0.04835	3.467	VC05	0.04439	3.841
ALMR	0.03657	3.296	AIMR	0.04062	2.356	ALMR	0.03965	2.843	AIMR	0.03718	2.227
PHAR	0.03435	7.740	ASIL	0.02748	2.072	VC04	0.03334	2.988	AIML	0.02722	1.325
PHAL	0.03419	6.259	ASIR	0.02695	2.540	PVM	0.03246	2.116	AWAL	0.02715	1.510
ASJR	0.03319	4.094	AIML	0.02152	1.432	AVM	0.02847	1.047	AVG	0.02426	2.951
IL2VL	0.02647	0.456	IL2VL	0.02061	0.706	AIML	0.02304	2.447	AVM	0.01715	1.028
AVM	0.02273	1.816	ALMR	0.01982	2.135	AVG	0.02257	8.826	ASKR	0.01701	3.975
AIML	0.02133	2.231	VC05	0.01719	2.160	ASJR	0.02217	2.649	ALMR	0.01692	1.647
PVM	0.01860	1.816	VC04	0.01505	2.838	ADLL	0.01777	0.593	IL2VL	0.01546	0.669

Table A3: PCC between centrality measures and different estimators for unweighted email social network.

$N$	9079	
$m$	599	
centrality	$F(i)$	$R(i; G^{\text{rev}})$
$q$	N/A	0
MA	0.6628	0.5536
Mod	0.6537	0.3290
MA-Mod	0.6692	0.4774
MA (log)	0.2552	0.4203
Mod (log)	0.8719	0.7754
MA-Mod (log)	0.8898	0.9042

## References

- [1] Wasserman S and Faust K 1994 *Social Network Analysis* (New York: Cambridge University Press)
- [2] Newman M. E. J. 2003 *SIAM Rev.* **45** 167
- [3] Boccaletti S, Latora V, Moreno Y, Chavez M and Hwang D-U 2006 *Phys. Rep.* **424** 175
- [4] Garlaschelli D, Caldarelli G and Pietronero L 2003 *Nature* **423** 165
- [5] Lagomarsino M C, Jona P, Bassetti B and Isambert H 2007 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **104** 5516
- [6] Castellano C, Fortunato S and Loreto V 2009 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** 591
- [7] Brin S and Page L 1998 Proc. 7th Int. World Wide Web Conf. (Brisbane, Australia, 14–18 April) 107–117.
- [8] Berkhin P 2005 *Internet Math.* **2** 73
- [9] Kleinberg J M 1999 *J. ACM* **46** 604
- [10] Palacios-Huerta I and Volij O 2004 *Econometrica* **72** 963
- [11] Chen P, Xie H, Maslov S and Redner S 2007 *J. Informetrics* **1** 8
- [12] Pinski G and Narin F 1976 *Info. Proc. Man.* **12** 297
- [13] Davis P M 2008 *J. Amer. Soc. Info. Sci. Tech.* **59** 2186
- [14] Fersht A 2009 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **106** 6883
- [15] Park J and Newman M E J 2005 *J. Stat. Mech.* P10014

- [16] Fortunato S, Flammini A, Menczer F and Vespignani A 2006 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103** 12684
- [17] Donato D, Laura L, Leonardi S and Millozzi S 2004 *Eur. Phys. J. B* **38** 239
- [18] Restrepo J G, Ott E and Hunt B R 2006 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** 094102
- [19] Masuda N and Ohtsuki H 2009 *New. J. Phys.* **11** 033012
- [20] Newman M E J 2004 *Eur. Phys. J. B* **38** 321
- [21] Palla G, Barabási L-A and Vicsek T 2007 *Nature* **446** 664
- [22] Fortunato S 2009 arXiv:0906.0612v1
- [23] Palla G, Farkas I J, Pollner P, Derényi I and Vicsek T 2007 *New J Phys* **9** 186
- [24] Leicht E A and Newman M E J 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 118703
- [25] Rosvall M and Bergstrom C T 2008 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105** 1118
- [26] Everett M G and Borgatti S P 1999 *J. Math. Sociol.* **23** 181
- [27] Taylor P D 1990 *Amer. Natur.* **135** 95
- [28] Taylor P D 1996 *J. Math. Biol.* **34** 654
- [29] DeGroot M H 1974 *J. Am. Stat. Asso.* **69** 118
- [30] Jackson M O 2008 *Social and Economic Networks* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- [31] Olfati-Saber R, Fax J A and Murray R M 2007 *Proc. IEEE* **95** 215
- [32] Kori H, Kawamura Y, Nakao H, Arai K and Kuramoto Y 2008 arXiv:0812.0118v1
- [33] Biggs N 1997 *Bull. L. Math. Soc.* **29** 641

- [34] Agaev R P and Chebotarev P Y 2000 *Autom. Rem. Cont.* **61** 1424
- [35] Chen B L, Hall D H and Chklovskii D B 2006 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103** 4723
- [36] <http://www.wormatlas.org>
- [37] Müller-Linow M, Hilgetag C C and Hütt M-T 2008 *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **4** e1000190
- [38] Ebel H, Mielsch L-I and Bornholdt S 2002 *Phys. Rev. E* **66** 035103(R)
- [39] Albert R, Jeong H and Barabási A-L 1999 *Nature* **401** 130
- [40] Kamvar S D, Haveliwala T H, Manning C D and Golub G H 2003 In: Proc 12th Int World Wide Web Conf, May 2003.
- [41] Ravasz E, Somera A L, Mongru D A, Oltvai Z N and Barabási A-L 2002 *Science* **297** 1551
- [42] Guimerà R and Amaral L A N 2005 *Nature* **433** 895
- [43] Sales-Pardo M, Guimerà R, Moreira A A and Amaral L A N 2007 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **104** 15224
- [44] Antal T, Redner S and Sood V 2006 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 188104
- [45] Sood V, Antal T and Redner S 2008 *Phys. Rev. E* **77** 041121
- [46] Horn R A and Johnson C R 1985 *Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).




Figure 1: (a) Modular network composed of four modules of *C. elegans* neural network. The values indicate the numbers of directed edges from one module to another. (b) Approximation of intermodular connectivity by edges between portal nodes.




Figure 2: Schematic of hierarchical multipartite network.




Figure 3: Cumulative distribution of  $F(i)$  for 54 sensory neurons, 79 interneurons, and 87 motor neurons in *C. elegans* neural network.




Figure 4: (a)  $F(i)$  for neural network, (b)  $F(i)$  for email social network, and (c)  $R(i)$  for WWW with  $q = 0$ . The quantities placed on the horizontal axis are the MA (*i.e.*, the normalized  $k_i^{\text{out}}/k_i^{\text{in}}$  for  $F(i)$  and the normalized  $k_i^{\text{in}}$  for  $R(i)$ ) (red squares), Mod (green triangles), and MA-Mod (blue circles).