

Efficient method for profiling core-periphery structures in complex networks

Jiaqi Nie,^{1,2} Qi Xuan,^{1,2} Dehong Gao,^{3,2} and Zhongyuan Ruan^{1,2,*}

¹*Institute of Cyberspace Security, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou, 310023, China*

²*Binjiang Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou, 310056, China*

³*School of Cybersecurity, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an 710072, China*

Profiling core-periphery structures in networks has attracted significant attention, leading to the development of various methods. Among these, the rich-core method is distinguished for being entirely parameter-free and scalable to large networks; however, the cores it identifies are not always optimal. Here, we propose an improved method building upon the rich-core framework. Instead of relying solely on node degree, our approach incorporates both the node's coreness k and its centrality within the k -core. We apply the approach to twelve real-world networks, and find that the cores identified are generally denser compared to those derived from previous rich-core method. Additionally, we demonstrate that the proposed method provides a natural way for identifying an exceptionally dense core, i.e., a clique, which often approximates or even matches the maximum clique in many real-world networks. Furthermore, we extend the method to multiplex networks, and show its effectiveness in identifying dense multiplex cores across several well-studied datasets. Our study may offer valuable insights into exploring the meso-scale properties of complex networks.

Many real-world networks exhibit core-periphery structures, characterized by a densely connected core surrounded by sparsely connected peripheral nodes. The rich-core method provides a practical and scalable approach to profiling such structures, even in large-scale networks. However, the cores identified by this method are not always optimal. In this paper, we propose an improved method that retains the key advantages of the rich-core approach, such as being parameter-free and scalable to large networks, while achieving a denser core. We apply our method to both single-layer and multiplex networks, and demonstrate its effectiveness in identifying dense cores in these networks. Moreover, for simple (single-layer) networks, our approach can effectively identify a fully connected core (i.e., a clique), which is often very close to the network's maximum clique.

I. INTRODUCTION

Investigating the meso-scale structure of networks is crucial for understanding their properties. Of the meso-scale features, community structure is one of the most well-known and has drawn significant attention from researchers [1–4]. Community structure refers to nodes that are densely connected within a group, but sparsely connected to nodes in other groups. The core-periphery structure is another important type of meso-scale feature, which suggests that the network can be divided into two parts [5–10]: a densely connected core and a sparsely connected periphery. Unlike community structure, the nodes in the core are often well-connected not only to each other but also reasonably well-connected to the nodes in the periphery [5]. This distinctive structure has been observed in numerous real-world networks, including the world airline network, which features a small, almost fully connected core (accounting for approximately 2.5% of the airports) surrounded by an

extensive, nearly tree-like periphery [11, 12], as well as the world trade network [13], the autonomous internet network [14], and others [15, 16].

Many approaches have been proposed to profile the core-periphery structure in networks [6, 17–21]. However, most are complex and may face challenges when applied to very large networks. To address this, Ma and Mondragón developed a simple, fast, and parameter-free method, known as the rich-core method, to effectively profile the core-periphery structure [20]. This method is pragmatic and highly suitable for application to large-scale networks. In their algorithm, nodes are ranked in descending order based on degree, and their links are categorized as connecting to higher or lower-ranked nodes. A core is identified by locating the node ranked at r^* , where the number of links to higher-ranked nodes is maximized. The underlying idea is intuitive and can be linked to random walks in the network. Specifically, the persistence probability of a cluster (the likelihood that a random walker remains within the cluster) increases with the cluster's size. This growth, however, transitions from rapid to gradual at a specific point, where the second derivative of the persistence probability equals to zero. This critical point defines the boundary of the rich core.

The above method has been successfully applied to various real-world systems, ranging from collaboration networks to biological networks [22, 23]. Despite its high efficiency in identifying core-periphery structures in networks, the identified cores may not always be optimal. In this paper, we propose an improved method that retains many advantages of the rich-core approach, such as its non-parametric nature and suitability for large-scale networks, while achieving a denser core. In the following, we first apply our method to a number of real-world single-layer networks and demonstrate its superiority in identifying dense cores. Beyond this, we find that our method naturally provides an effective way to detect exceptionally dense cores, i.e., cliques, within networks. Remarkably, the identified cliques are often very close to, or even equal to the maximum cliques in many networks. We then extend our method to multiplex networks and demonstrate its effectiveness in identifying multiplex cores in the complex sys-

*Electronic address: zyuanyuan@gmail.com

tems.

II. METHOD

Consider an unweighted and undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, where V denotes the set of nodes and E the set of links. For each node i in the network, its coreness k_i is calculated using the k -core decomposition algorithm [24]. Next, we analyze how a node with coreness k ($k = 1, 2, \dots$) interacts with other nodes within the k -core — the subgraph consisting of nodes whose coreness is at least k . To do so, we employ various node centrality measures within the k -core, such as degree centrality or eigenvector centrality (denoted as \tilde{m}). Based on this information, we define the richness (or importance) of node i as $\mu_i = (k_i, \tilde{m}_i)$. Then, we rank the nodes in the network in descending order of their richness. Specifically, nodes are first ranked by their coreness values k_i , and for nodes with the same coreness, we use their centrality measure \tilde{m}_i to further rank them. The rank of node i is represented as an integer r_i , where nodes with smaller r_i indicate greater richness. For example, the node ranked first has the highest richness, and so on. It is worth noting that, multiple nodes may share the same value of richness. In this case, these nodes are ranked at random.

For each node i , its links are divided into two groups: those connecting to nodes with a higher rank (denoted as d_i^+), and those connecting to nodes with a lower rank (denoted as d_i^-). Consequently, the degree of node i can be expressed as $d_i = d_i^+ + d_i^-$. Starting with the first node ($r = 1$), we sequentially calculate d_i^+ for each subsequent node and plot it as a function of its rank, r_i . From this analysis, a turning point r^* can be identified, corresponding to the maximal value of d^+ . This turning point determines the core-periphery boundary of the network: all nodes with ranks smaller than r^* are assigned to the core, while the remaining nodes (with ranks greater than r^*) are assigned to the periphery.

As an illustrative example, Figure 1 (a) demonstrates the detailed ranking process for a small graph consisting of 12 nodes. For instance, consider node F , which has a coreness value of 2, indicating that it belongs to the 2-core (comprising nodes A to H). The degree centrality of this node within the 2-core can be calculated as $\tilde{m}_F = \frac{\tilde{d}}{\tilde{n}-1} = 3/7$, where \tilde{d} is the degree of the node within the 2-core, and \tilde{n} is total number of nodes in the 2-core. Therefore, the richness of node F is represented as $\mu_F = (2, 3/7)$. Following this approach, we compute the richness of all nodes and rank them in descending order. We then calculate d^+ for each node sequentially and plot it as a function of node rank, as shown in Fig. 1 (b). The maximum value of d^+ occurs at $r = 5$, which defines the boundary of a core.

Furthermore, this method allows us to effectively identify an exceptionally dense core, specifically a clique, within the network. Note that the upper bound of $d_i^+(r_i)$ for any node i (ranked at r_i) is $r_i - 1$, as it connects to all nodes ranked before it. This implies that the $d^+(r)$ curve always lies below the line $d^+(r) = r - 1$. The nodes ranked at the front (starting with the node ranked first) that lie exactly on the line $d^+(r) = r - 1$




FIG. 1: (a) An illustrative example for ranking nodes based on their richness. Here the richness of a node is defined as a combination of the node coreness k and its degree centrality within the k -core, denoted as \tilde{m} . (b) Number of links d^+ that a node ranked at r connects to nodes with higher ranks as a function of node rank. The value of r corresponding to the maximum $d^+(r)$ (denoted as r^*) defines the boundary of the core-periphery structure. The dot-dash line represents $d^+(r) = r - 1$, which is the upper limit of the $d^+(r)$ curve. Nodes ranked at the top that fall exactly on this line collectively form a clique.

collectively form a clique. For example, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (b), the first three nodes together constitute a clique. This initially identified clique can be further expanded through an additional process: we examine subsequent nodes one by one to determine whether each newly considered node connects to all nodes in the existing clique. If it does, the node is added to the clique; otherwise, the process continues with the next node until the end of the rank. As we will demonstrate below, the identified clique is very close to (or even equal to) the maximum clique in many real-world networks.

III. EXPERIMENTS ON SINGLE-LAYER NETWORKS

A. Datasets

In this section, we will apply our method to various real-world networks. Specifically, we consider the following 12 datasets:

1. **Karate Club.** This is a widely studied social network in network science. Nodes in the network represent the members of the karate club, and links denote social ties or friendships between pairs of members.
2. **Dolphins.** This dataset describes the social interactions within a group of dolphins, illustrating their behavioral connections.
3. **Les Misérables.** This is a social network which describes the co-appearance of characters in Les Misérables, the novel by Victor Hugo.
4. **Jazz.** This dataset portrays relationships among jazz musicians who belong to the same band.
5. **Facebook.** This dataset consists of “circles” (or “friend lists”) for a subset of users on Facebook.
6. **Email.** This is an email communication network at Rovira i Virgili University in southern Catalonia, Spain.

7. **Netscience**. This is a co-author network composed of scientists engaged in network theory and experiments. Nodes represent researchers, and a link between two nodes indicates that the corresponding researchers have co-authored at least one paper together.

8. **CoAuthorsDBLP**. This is a co-author network extracted from the DBLP (Digital Bibliography & Library Project) computer science bibliography.

9. **CoAuthorsCiteseer**. This is a co-author network derived from the Citeseer database.

10. **Power Grid**. This is an undirected network containing information about the power grid in the western states of the United States.

11. **IPv4**. This is a communication network representing the structure of IPv4 routing. Nodes represent Autonomous Systems (AS), and edges represent the connectivity between them.

12. **IPv6**. This is a communication network representing the structure of IPv6 routing.

The basic properties of these networks are summarized in Table I, including the number of nodes V , the number of links E , the maximum node coreness M_{core} , and the size of the maximum clique S_{mc} in each network. The method we use to determine the maximum clique is based on the Bron-Kerbosch algorithm and its improved version [35–37]. In the worst-case scenario, the time complexity of the method is $O(3^{n/3})$, where n is the number of nodes in the network, making it computationally expensive for large-scale networks in some cases.

B. Results

For simplicity, hereafter we will refer to the method proposed in section II as MCC, where the richness of a node is determined by its coreness k and its centrality measures within the k -core. In our experiments, we specifically focus on degree centrality (denoted as MCC-D) and eigenvector centrality (denoted as MCC-E). Using the dataset of Les Misérables as an example, Figure 2(a) illustrates the curve d_i^+ as a function of node rank r_i based on MCC-E. For comparison, Figure 2(b) presents the results obtained using the rich-core method [20], where the richness of a node is simply defined by its degree. It is evident that the cores identified by the two methods differ. For instance, the core identified by our method has a size of $r^* = 10$, which is smaller than the size of 17 identified by the rich-core method. To measure the density of the core, we define the density coefficient (also known as the rich-club coefficient) as follows

$$\phi = \frac{2E_{core}}{V_{core}(V_{core} - 1)}, \quad (1)$$

where V_{core} and E_{core} denote the number of nodes and links in the core, respectively. Notice that $\phi \in [0, 1]$, and a higher value of ϕ indicates a more tightly connected core. Our results show that the core identified by MCC-E is significantly denser ($\phi = 1.0$) than the one identified using the rich-core method ($\phi = 0.52$).




FIG. 2: Number of links $d^+(r)$ that a node ranked at r connects to nodes with higher ranks as a function of node rank for the Les Misérables dataset, under the methods of (a) MCC-E, and (b) rich-core. (c) Density of the identified core [as defined in Eq. (1)] for each network is compared across different methods, including rich-core, MCC-D and MCC-E.

Table I provides detailed information about the identified cores across all 12 datasets, obtained using different methods, including rich-core, MCC-D, and MCC-E. Generally, compared to the rich-core method, the cores identified by our method contain fewer nodes, while exhibit a higher density coefficient (meaning that they are denser). A visualization of the density coefficient for these cores is shown in Fig. 2(c). Moreover, it is observed that MCC-D and MCC-E produce similar results for nearly half of the datasets. However, in certain cases (e.g., the IPv4 and IPv6 networks), MCC-D outperforms MCC-E, whereas in others (e.g., Dolphins and Power Grid), MCC-E shows better performance.

It is important to note that the core identified by our method may contain a denser substructure. Taking the MCC-E method as an example, we plot $d^+(r)$ as a function of node rank r for a subset of high-ranking nodes across all 12 datasets. The top-ranked nodes that fall precisely on the line $d^+(r) = r - 1$ form a clique, as shown in Fig. 3 (the green shaded areas). Using the additional operation introduced in Sec. II, the clique can be further expanded by incorporating the subsequent nodes (the light blue shaded areas in Fig. 3). Finally, the sizes of these cliques (denoted as S_c) are listed in Table I. Remarkably, our method proves highly efficient: in 7 out of the 12 networks, it successfully identifies the maximum clique. For the remaining networks, the cliques identified are only slightly smaller than the maximum cliques. It should be emphasized that the rich-core method (with the additional operation) is not effective at identifying the cliques. Given that finding the maximum clique in a network is an NP-hard problem, our method offers a simple yet effective approach to ap-

TABLE I: The properties of the networks, including the number of nodes (V), the number of links (E), the maximum node coreness (M_{core}), and the size of the maximum clique (S_{mc}). The size of the identified cores (V_{core}), the core density coefficient (ϕ), and the size of the identified cliques (S_c) under different methods.

Datasets	V	E	M_{core}	S_{mc}	rich-core			MCC-E			MCC-D		
					V_{core}	ϕ	S_c	V_{core}	ϕ	S_c	V_{core}	ϕ	S_c
Karate Club [25]	34	78	4	5	9	0.5556	3	5	1.0000	5	6	0.8000	5
Dolphins [26]	62	159	4	5	24	0.2210	4	12	0.4849	4	20	0.2632	3
Les Misérables [27]	77	254	9	10	17	0.5367	4	10	1.0000	10	10	1.0000	10
Jazz [28]	198	2,742	29	30	82	0.3716	9	30	1.0000	30	30	1.0000	30
Email [29]	1,133	5,451	11	12	154	0.0825	4	184	0.0816	12	137	0.1040	12
Netscience [30]	1,461	2,743	19	20	27	0.5499	9	20	1.0000	20	10	1.0000	20
Facebook [31]	4,039	88,234	115	69	273	0.3854	7	140	0.9355	67	139	0.9369	67
Power Grid [32]	4,941	6,594	5	6	78	0.0153	3	10	0.6000	3	9	0.6111	3
IPv6 [33]	8,827	47,315	48	30	110	0.3933	18	97	0.6772	27	61	0.7705	27
IPv4 [33]	46,172	176,994	76	44	210	0.3381	18	133	0.7358	39	104	0.8081	39
coAuthorsCiteseer [34]	227,320	814,134	86	87	489	0.0515	3	87	1.0000	87	87	1.0000	87
coAuthorsDBLP [34]	299,067	977,676	114	115	311	0.1627	26	115	1.0000	115	115	1.0000	115




FIG. 3: $d^+(r)$ as a function of node rank r across all 12 networks under the MCC-E method. The dot-dash line represents $d^+(r) = r - 1$, which is the upper bound of the $d^+(r)$ curve. Nodes within the green shaded region that successively align with the dot-dash line are fully connected, which form a clique. This initial clique can be further expanded by examining subsequent nodes in the rank to see if they connect to all nodes in the existing clique. Nodes that meet this condition are highlighted in the light blue shaded areas.

proximate this solution. This can be understood by observing that nodes in a clique, especially one of large size, typically have high coreness values and are, therefore, more likely to be ranked near the top.

IV. EXPERIMENTS ON MULTIPLEX NETWORKS

The above method can be easily extended to multiplex networks, which are a special case of multilayer networks and are widely used to model various real-world systems, such as social networks, infrastructure networks, and biology networks [38–41]. In a multiplex network, the same set of nodes is connected by multiple layers, with each layer representing a distinct type of link or relationship. Let us consider a multiplex network consisting of M layers. The adjacency matrix of each layer α is denoted as $A^{[\alpha]} = \{a_{ij}^{[\alpha]}\}$, where $a_{ij}^{[\alpha]} = 1$ if node i and j are connected in layer α , and $a_{ij}^{[\alpha]} = 0$, otherwise.

For each layer α , we apply the k -core decomposition algorithm and assign each node i a coreness value $k_i^{[\alpha]}$. Additionally, we compute its centrality value $\tilde{m}_i^{[\alpha]}$ within the $k_i^{[\alpha]}$ -core. The richness of node i at layer α is then defined as $\mu_i^{[\alpha]} = (k_i^{[\alpha]}, \tilde{m}_i^{[\alpha]})$. Consistent with prior definitions, when eigenvalue centrality (or degree centrality) is used, the method is referred to as MCC-E (or MCC-D). Finally, we obtain the multiplex richness of node i by aggregating all layers

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^M \mu_i^{[\alpha]} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^M k_i^{[\alpha]}, \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^M \tilde{m}_i^{[\alpha]} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, in analogy to the single-layer case as described in Sec. II (with slight modifications), for each node i in layer α , we divide its links into two groups: those toward nodes with higher richness in layer α (denoted as $d_i^{[\alpha]+}$) and those toward nodes with lower richness in layer α (denoted as $d_i^{[\alpha]-}$). It should be noted that, in this context, we simply calculate the number of neighboring nodes with higher richness for each node i , as studied in [23], instead of ranking all nodes

TABLE II: The properties of the five multiplex networks, including the number of nodes (V), the number of links $E^{[i]}$ in each layer i , as well as the size of the identified multiplex cores (V_{core}) and the corresponding core density coefficient ϕ [as defined in Eq. (4)] under different methods.

Datasets	V	$E^{[1]}$	$E^{[2]}$	$E^{[3]}$	rich-core		MCC-E		MCC-D	
					V_{core}	ϕ	V_{core}	ϕ	V_{core}	ϕ
Vickers-Chan-7thGraders [42]	29	240	126	152	20	0.8578	11	1.0000	11	1.0000
Lazega-Law-Firm [43]	71	717	399	726	28	0.6931	12	0.8787	26	0.7200
Noordin-Top [44]	79	259	437	200	24	0.5434	20	0.6684	20	0.6684
Celegans-Connectome [45]	279	514	888	1703	48	0.2739	7	0.9523	8	0.9285
Sanremo-2016 [46]	56,562	210,308	91,658	10,514	332	0.0962	26	0.5107	21	0.4952

in layer α and counting the links connecting node i to nodes ranked higher. The two approaches are equivalent when all nodes in the network have distinct richness values. However, in practical scenarios where nodes may share the same richness, discrepancies can arise. We then define the multiplex links of a node toward richer nodes as

$$d_i^+ = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^M d_i^{[\alpha]+}. \quad (3)$$

Based on the above information, we first rank the nodes according to their multiplex richness μ_i , such that the node ranked first (i.e., $r_i = 1$) has the highest richness, and so on. Then, we compute d_i^+ for each node i in order and plot it as a function of the rank r_i . The rank corresponding to the maximum value of d_i^+ defines the boundary of the core-periphery structure, with nodes ranked below this value being classified as part of the multiplex core.

To quantify the density of the multiplex core, we define the density coefficient by integrating all layers as follows

$$\phi = \frac{2}{V_{core}(V_{core} - 1)} \sum_{\alpha=1}^M E_{core}^{[\alpha]}, \quad (4)$$

where V_{core} represents the number of nodes in the multiplex core, and $E_{core}^{[\alpha]}$ denotes the number of links among these nodes in layer α .

We analyze five datasets with multiplex structures, detailed as follows:

1. **Vickers-Chan-7thGraders.** This network consists of three layers of relationships among 7th graders in Victoria, Australia: getting along, best friends, and preferred work partners.
2. **Lazega-Law-Firm.** This network represents three types of relationships between partners and associates of a corporate law firm: coworkers, friendship, and advice.
3. **Noordin-Top.** This network comprises three layers of relationships within an international crisis group: trust, operational interactions, and communication.
4. **Celegans-Connectome.** This network includes three types of synaptic connections in the *Caenorhabditis elegans* connectome: electric (“ElectrJ”), chemical monadic (“MonoSyn”), and polyadic (“PolySyn”).
5. **Sanremo-2016.** This network contains three layers of social relationships among Twitter users during the Sanremo Music Festival Final: retweets, mentions, and replies.

The properties of the networks, including the number of nodes and links in each layer (with all layers having the same number of nodes), are summarized in Table II. We apply our methods, MCC-E and MCC-D, to analyze these multiplex networks. For comparison, the results obtained using the rich-core method are also provided. Overall, our method demonstrate superior performance in identifying dense multiplex cores, with MCC-E notably achieving the highest ϕ values.

V. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have proposed an efficient method for profiling core-periphery structures in networks. Our approach builds upon the rich-core framework by first ranking the nodes in the network according to their richness. Rather than defining a node’s richness solely by its degree, we characterize it as a combination of the node’s coreness and its centrality within the k -core. Subsequently, we compute the number of links each node has to higher-ranked nodes (denoted as d^+) and examine how this quantity varies with node rank r . The rank corresponding to the maximum of this quantity defines the boundary of the core-periphery structure.

We applied this algorithm to 12 real-world networks and found that, compared to the traditional rich-core method, the cores identified by our approach are generally denser. Additionally, we demonstrated that there is an upper bound for the $d^+(r)$ curve, and the top-ranked nodes lying exactly on this upper bound form a clique. Remarkably, the clique identified by this straightforward way is often close to, or even identical to the maximum clique in many real-world networks. Finally, we extended the method to multiplex networks, which offer a more realistic representation of many complex systems, and demonstrated its effectiveness in identifying dense multiplex cores, particularly on five well-studied datasets. Our study may provide a valuable framework for effectively analyzing the meso-scale organization, specifically the core-periphery structure, of diverse real-world systems spanning various fields such as biology, sociology, and transportation. We hope it will offer meaningful insights into understanding their structural properties as well as the various dynamic processes that take place on the networks [47–49].

Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part by the Key Research and Development Program of Zhejiang under Grants 2022C01018

and 2024C01025, by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants U21B2001 and 62103374, by the Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant ZCLY24F0302.

-
- [1] M. E. J. Newman, “Detecting community structure in networks,” *Eur. Phys. J. B* **38**, 321-330 (2004).
- [2] M. E. J. Newman, “Modularity and community structure in networks,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 8577-8582 (2006).
- [3] S. Fortunato, M. E. J. Newman, “20 years of network community detection,” *Nat. Phys.* **18**, 848-850 (2022).
- [4] S. Fortunato and D. Hric, “Community detection in networks: A user guide,” *Phys. Rep.* **659**, 1-44 (2016).
- [5] P. Rombach, M. A. Porter, J. H. Fowler, and P. J. Mucha, “Core-Periphery Structure in Networks (Revisited),” *SIAM Review* **59**, 619 (2017).
- [6] S. P. Borgatti and M. G. Everett, “Models of core/periphery structures,” *Social networks* **21**, 375-395 (2000).
- [7] P. Holme, “Core-periphery organization of complex networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 046111 (2005).
- [8] A. Elliott, A. Chiu, M. Bazzi, G. Reinert, M. Cucuringu, “Core-periphery structure in directed networks,” *Proc. R. Soc. A* **476**, 20190783 (2020).
- [9] R. J. Gallagher, J. G. Young, B. F. Welles, “A clarified typology of core-periphery structure in networks,” *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabc9800 (2021).
- [10] A. Polanco, M. E. J. Newman, “Hierarchical core-periphery structure in networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **108**, 024311 (2023).
- [11] T. Verma, N. A. Araújo, and H. J. Herrmann, “Revealing the structure of the world airline network,” *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 5638 (2014).
- [12] T. Verma, F. Russmann, N. A. M. Araújo, J. Nagler, H. J. Herrmann, “Emergence of core-peripheries in networks,” *Nat. Comm.* **7**, 10441 (2016).
- [13] G. Fagiolo, J. Reyes, and S. Schiavo, “The evolution of the world trade web: a weighted-network analysis,” *J. Evol. Econ.* **20**, 479-514 (2010).
- [14] F. D. Rossa, F. Dercole, and C. Piccardi, “Profiling core-periphery network structure by random walkers,” *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 1467 (2013).
- [15] M. Elliott, B. Golub, and M. O. Jackson, “Financial networks and contagion,” *Am. Econ. Rev.* **104**, 3115-3153 (2014).
- [16] N. Masuda and N. Konno, “Vip-club phenomenon: Emergence of elites and masterminds in social networks,” *PLoS One* **28**, 297-309 (2006).
- [17] S. H. Lee, M. Cucuringu, and M. A. Porter, “Density-based and transport-based core-periphery structures in networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 032810 (2014).
- [18] S. Kojaku and N. Masuda, “Finding multiple core-periphery pairs in networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 052313 (2017).
- [19] X. Zhang, T. Martin, M. E. J. Newman, “Identification of core-periphery structure in networks,” *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 032803 (2015).
- [20] A. Ma and R. J. Mondragón, “Rich-cores in networks,” *PLoS One* **10**, e0119678 (2015).
- [21] R. J. Mondragón, “Network partition via a bound of the spectral radius,” *J. Complex Netw.* **5**, 513-526 (2017).
- [22] A. Ma, R. J. Mondragón, and V. Latora, “Anatomy of funded research in science,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 14760-14765 (2015).
- [23] F. Battiston, J. Guillon, M. Chavez, V. Latora, and F. De Vico Fallani, “Multiplex core-periphery organization of the human connectome,” *J. R. Soc. Interface* **15**, 20180514 (2018).
- [24] M. Kitsak, L. K. Gallos, S. Havlin, F. Liljeros, L. Muchnik, H. E. Stanley, and H. A. Makse, “Identification of influential spreaders in complex networks,” *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 888 (2010).
- [25] W. W. Zachary, “An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups,” *J. Anthropol. Res.* **33**, 452-473 (1977).
- [26] D. Lusseau, K. Schneider, O. J. Boisseau, P. Haase, E. Slooten, and S. M. Dawson, “The bottlenose dolphin community of doubtful sound features a large proportion of long-lasting associations: can geographic isolation explain this unique trait?” *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **54**, 396-405 (2003).
- [27] D. E. Knuth, *The Stanford GraphBase: a platform for combinatorial computing*, (AcM Press, New York, 1993).
- [28] P. M. Gleiser and L. Danon, “Community structure in jazz,” *Adv. Complex Syst.* **6**, 565-573 (2003).
- [29] R. Guimera, L. Danon, A. Diaz-Guilera, F. Giralt, and A. Arenas, “Self-similar community structure in a network of human interactions,” *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 065103 (2003).
- [30] M. E. Newman, “Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices,” *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 036104 (2006).
- [31] B. Viswanath, A. Mislove, M. Cha, and K. P. Gummadi, “On the evolution of user interaction in facebook,” In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM workshop on Online social networks (ACM, 2009)*, pp. 37-42.
- [32] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, “Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks,” *Nature* **393**, 440-442 (1998).
- [33] See https://catalog.caida.org/dataset/as_relationships_serial_1 for information about the AS relationship network.
- [34] R. A. Rossi and N. K. Ahmed, “The network data repository with interactive graph analytics and visualization,” In *Proceedings of 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ACM, 2015)*, pp. 4292-4293.
- [35] C. Bron and J. Kerbosch, “Algorithm 457: finding all cliques of an undirected graph,” *Commun. ACM* **16**, 575-577 (1973).
- [36] E. Tomita, A. Tanaka, and H. Takahashi, “The worst-case time complexity for generating all maximal cliques and computational experiments,” *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **363**, 28-42 (2006).
- [37] F. Cazals and C. Karande, “A note on the problem of reporting maximal cliques,” *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **407**, 564-568 (2008).
- [38] S. Boccaletti, G. Bianconi, R. Criado, C.I. del Genio, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, M. Romance, I. Sendiña-Nadal, Z. Wang, and M. Zanin, “The structure and dynamics of multilayer networks,” *Phys. Rep.* **544**, 1-122 (2014).
- [39] K. M. Lee, B. Min, and K. I. Goh, “Towards real-world complexity: an introduction to multiplex networks,” *Eur. Phys. J. B* **88**, 1-20 (2015).
- [40] G. Shen, X. Fan, and Z. Ruan, “Totally asymmetric simple exclusion process on multiplex networks,” *Chao* **30**, 023103 (2020).
- [41] Z. Ruan, C. Wang, P. M. Hui, and Z. Liu, “Integrated travel network model for studying epidemics: Interplay between journeys and epidemic,” *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 11401 (2015).

- [42] M. Vickers and S. Chan, "Representing classroom social structure," Victoria Institute of Secondary Education, Melbourne (1981).
- [43] E. Lazega, *The collegial phenomenon: The social mechanisms of cooperation among peers in a corporate law partnership* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2001).
- [44] F. Battiston, V. Nicosia, V. Latora, "Structural measures for multiplex networks," *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 032804 (2014).
- [45] B. L. Chen, D. H. Hall, and D. B. Chklovskii, "Wiring optimization can relate neuronal structure and function," *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 4723-4728 (2006).
- [46] M. De Domenico and E. G. Altmann, "Unraveling the origin of social bursts in collective attention," *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 4629 (2020).
- [47] R. Pastor-Satorras, C. Castellano, P. V. Mieghem, and A. Vespignani, "Epidemic processes in complex networks," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**(3), 925 (2015).
- [48] Z. Ruan, G. Iñiguez, M. Karsai, and J. Kertész, "Kinetics of social contagion," *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **115**, 218702 (2015).
- [49] Y. Moreno, M. Nekovee, A. Pacheco A, "Dynamics of rumor spreading in complex networks," *Phys Rev E* **69**, 066130 (2004).