Random matrix analysis of complex networks

Sarika Jalan and Jayendra N. Bandyopadhyay^y

Max-Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex System s, Nothnitzerstr. 38, D-01187 D resden, G erm any

C ontinuing our random matrix analysis of complex network, in this paper we perform next nearest neighbor spacing distribution analysis and spectral rigidity test to probe long range correlations among the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of the various model networks. We show our results for random, scale-free and small-world networks. We nd that the spectral rigidity of these networks follows RMT prediction of linear behavior in sem i-logarithm ic scale with the slope being $1 = {}^2$. R andom and scale-free networks follow RMT prediction for very large scale. Small-world network follows it for the su ciently large scale, but much less than the random and scale-free networks.

PACS num bers: 89.75 H c,64.60 C n,89.20 -a

I. IN TRODUCTION

In our previous papers [1, 2] we analyzed complex networks under random matrix theory (RMT) framework. We studied nearest-neighbor spacing distribution (NNSD) of eigenvalues spectra of adjacency and Laplacian matrices of various networks studied recently in the literature. W e found that the NNSD of these networks follow Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE) statistics, which is one of the most celebrated result of random matrix theory (RMT).We also showed that transition to the small-world and GOE occurs at the same value of random connections in the network. In this paper we make further investigations of the RMT properties of com plex networks. NNSD analyzed in [1] carries information on the correlation between two adjacent eigenvalues, but it tells nothing about the correlations between two adjacent spacings. To know about longe range correlations am ong the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of networks we perform spectral rigidity test via well known 3-statistic of RMT.We nd that spectral rigidity of these networks follow RM T prediction for very large scale. W e also study the next-nearest-neighbor spacing distribution (NNNSD) of the adjacency matrix of various networks. We show our results for various model networks vastly studied in the recent literature, namely, random , scale-free and small-world networks.

The paper is organized as follows: after this introductory section, Sec. II explains various aspects of complex networks studies. In Sec. III, we describe some basics of RM T relevant to our studies. In Sec. IV, we analyze next-nearest-neighbor spacing distribution and the $_3$ -statistic of various networks, namely random, scale-free and sm all-world networks. Finally, in Sec. V, we sum – m arize and discuss about some possible future directions.

II. COMPLEX NETWORKS

Last 10 years have witnessed a rapid advancem ent in the studies of complex networks. The main concept of the network theory is to de ne complex systems in term s of networks of m any interacting units. Few exam ples of such systems are interacting molecules in living cell, nerve cells in brain, com puters in Internet com munication, social networks of interacting people, airport networks with ight connections, etc [3, 4, 5]. Mathem atically networks are investigated under the fram ework of graph theory. In the graph theoretical term inology, units are called nodes and interactions are called edges [6]. Various m odel networks are introduced to study the behavior of com plex system s having underlying network structures. These model networks are based on some simple principles and still capture essential features of the system s.

A. Structural properties

Erdos and Renyiwere the rst one to model com plex systems by using random graph (ER model). In this model any two nodes are connected with probability p. One of the most interesting characteristics of ER model was the emergence of giant cluster through a phase transition. With the increase in p, while number of nodes in the graph remain constant, a giant cluster em erges through the phase transition. ER model assumed that interaction between the nodes are random [7]. Recently, with the availability of large maps of real world networks, it is observed that the random graph m odel is not appropriate for studying the behavior of real world networks. Hencem any new models are introduced. W atts and Strogatz proposed a model, popularly known as 'sm all-world network', which has the properties of sm all diam eter and high clustering [8]. This model shows the small-world transition with the netuning of the number of random connections. M oreover, this model network is very sparse : network with a very few num ber of edges, another property shown by many real-world networks. In addition to above m entioned properties, Barabasi and A lbert show

E lectronic address: sarika@m pipks-dresdenm pg.de

^yE lectronic address: jayendra@ m pipks-dresden m pg.de

that degree distributions of m any real-world networks have power-law, i.e. degree distribution p(k), fraction of nodes that have k number of connections with other nodes, decays as p(k) / k, where depends on the topology of the networks. The scale-free nature of networks in plies that som e nodes are m uch m ore connected than the others are [9].

Barabasi-A lbert's scale-free (SF) m odel [9] and W atts-Strogatz's sm all-world (SW) m odel have contributed im m ensely in understanding the evolution and behavior of the real system s having network structures. Following these two new models came an outbreak in the eld of networks. These studies have revealed that apart from power law degree distributions and sm all diam eter, real world networks also have modular structures [10, 11]. M odules are the division of network nodes into various groups within which the network connections are dense, but between which they are sparser. The modularity concept assumes that system functionality can be partitioned into a collection of modules and each module is a discrete entity of several components and performs an identiable task, separable from the functions of other m odules. Studies of real world networks have also given clues to solve the network coloring problem, scale-free networks turned out to be di cult and sm all-world easier [12].

B. Spectral properties

A part from the above mentioned investigations which focus on direct m easurem ents of the structural properties of the networks, there exists a vast literature dem onstrating that properties of networks or graphs could be well. characterized by the spectrum of associated ad jacency (A) and Laplacian (L) matrix [13, 15]. For a unweighted graph, adjacency matrix is de ned in the following way : A_{ij} = 1, if i and j nodes are connected and zero otherw ise. For undirected networks, this matrix is symmetric and consequently have real eigenvalues. Eigenvalues of graph are called graph spectra and they give inform ation about som e basic topological properties of the underlying network [13, 14, 15, 16]. Spectral properties of networks are also used to understand som e of the dynam ical properties of interacting chaotic units on networks, for exam ple largest eigenvalue of the ad poency m atrix determ ines the transition to the synchronized state [17].

III. RANDOM MATRIX STATISTICS

RM T was initially proposed to explain the statistical properties of nuclear spectra [18]. Later this theory was successfully applied in the study of the spectra of di erent com plex system s such as disordered system s, quantum chaotic system s, large com plex atom s, etc [19]. Recently, RM T is also shown to be useful in understanding the statistical properties of the empirical cross-correlation m a-

works [1, 2]. In the random matrix study of eigenvalues spectra, one has to consider two kinds of properties : (1) global properties, like spectral density or distribution of eigenvalues (), and (2) local properties, like eigenvalue uctuations around (). Among these, the eigenvalue uctuations is the most popular one. The eigenvalue uctuations are generally obtained from the NNSD of the eigenvalues. The NNSD follows two universal properties depending upon the underlying correlations among the eigenvalues. For correlated eigenvalues, the NNSD follows W igner-Dyson formula of Gaussian orthogonal ensem ble (GOE) statistics of RMT; whereas, it follows Poisson statistics of RM T for uncorrelated eigenvalues. W e denote the eigenvalues of network by i; i = 1; ...; N, where N is the size of the network. In order to get universal properties of the eigenvalues uctuations, one has to remove the spurious e ects due to variations of the spectral density and to work at constant spectral density on the average. Thereby, it is custom ary in RMT to unfold the eigenvalues by a transform ation $_{i}$ = N ($_{i}$), $m_{\rm min}$ (⁰) d ⁰ is the averaged integrated where \overline{N} () = eigenvalue density [18]. Since we do not have any analytical form for \overline{N} , we numerically unfold the spectrum by polynomial curve tting. Using the unfolded spectra, we calculate the nearest-neighbor spacings as _____; and due to the above unfolding, the $s_1^{(i)} = \frac{1}{i+1}$ average nearest-neighbor spacings hs1 i becom es unity, being independent of the system . The NNSD P $(\!s_1\!)$ is de ned as the probability distribution of these $s_1^{(i)}$'s. In case of Poisson statistics, P $(s_1) = \exp(s_1)$; whereas for GOE P (s₁) = $\frac{s_1}{2}$ s₁ exp $\frac{s_1^2}{4}$. For the interm ediate cases, NNSD is described by Brody formula [24]: P $(s_1) = A s_1 \exp B s_1^{+1}$; where A and B are determ ined by the parameter . This is a sem iem pirical form ula characterized by the single parameter . As goes from 0 to 1, the Brody form ula sm oothly changes from Poisson to GOE.

A part from NNSD, the next-nearest-neighbor spacings distribution (NNNSD) is also studied in RMT.We calculate the distribution P (s₂) of next-nearest-neighbor spacings $s_2^{(i)} = (\bar{i}_{i+2} \bar{i}_i)=2$ between the unfolded eigenvalues. Here we put a factor two at the denominator to make the average of the next-nearest-neighbor spacings hs₂i unity. A coording to Ref. [18], the NNNSD of GOE matrices is identical to the NNSD of G aussian sym plectic ensemble (GSE) matrices, i.e.,

P (s₂) =
$$\frac{2^{18}}{3^{6-3}} s_2^4 \exp - \frac{64}{9} s_2^2$$
 : (1)

The NNSD and NNNSD re ect only local correlations



FIG.1: (Color online) N ext-nearest-neighbor spacings distribution (NNNSD)P(s₂) of the adjacency matrices of di erent networks [(a) random network, (b) scale-free network, and (c) sm all-world network] is compared with the nearest-neighbor spacings distribution (NNSD) of GSE matrices. Figures are plotted for average over 10 realization of the networks. All networks have N = 2000 nodes and an average degree k = 20 per node.

am ong the eigenvalues. The spectral rigidity, measured by the $_3$ -statistic of RMT, gives information about the long-range correlations among the eigenvalues and is more sensitive test for RMT properties of the matrix under investigation [18, 20]. Following we describe the procedure to calculate this quantity.

The $_3$ -statistic measures the least-square deviation of the spectral staircase function representing the cumulative density N () from the best straight line thing for a nite interval L of the spectrum, i.e.,

$${}_{3}(L;x) = \frac{1}{L} \min_{\substack{a,b \\ x}}^{Z_{x+L}} N(\bar{}) a b^{2} d (2)$$

where a and b are obtained from a least-square t. Average over several choices of x gives the spectral rigidity $_3$ (L). The most rigid spectrum is the \picket fence" with all spacings equal (e.g., 1D harmonic oscillator), therefore maximally correlated with constant $_3$ (L) (= 1=12). At another extrem e, for the uncorrelated eigenvalues, $_3$ (L) = L=15, re ecting strong uctuations around the spectral density (). The GOE case is interm ediate of these two extrem es. Here $_3$ (L) depends by arithm ically on L, i.e.,

$$_{3}$$
 (L) $\frac{1}{2}$ ln L: (3)



FIG.2: (Coloronline) $_3$ (L) statistic for eigenvalues spectra of the random network. The circles are num erical results and the solid curve is GOE prediction of RMT. Inset shows the $_3$ (L) in sem i-logarithm ic scale. Figure is plotted for average over 10 realizations of the networks. All networks have N = 2000 nodes and an average degree k = 20 per node.

IV. RESULTS

Following we present the results of the ensemble averaged NNNSD and $_3$ statistic of random, scale-free and sm all-world networks.

A. Random network

First we consider random network generated by using Erdos and Renyialgorithm . We take N = 2000 nodes and with probability p = 0:01 we make random connections between the pairs of nodes. This method yields a connected network with average degree p = N = 20. Note that for very small value of p one gets several unconnected component. Our choice of p is such that it should be high enough to give large connected com ponent typically spanning all the nodes. Spectral density and NNSD of the adjacency matrix of this network follow sem icircular and GOE distribution, respectively [1]. We calculate the NNNSD of the adjacency matrix of this network.WeplotNNNSD in the Fig.1 (a). As expected the NNNSD of the adjacency matrix of this network agrees wellwith the NNSD of GSE matrices. For completeness, we plot the spectral density of this network in the inset of this gure. Fig. 2 shows the $_3$ (L) statistic for the spectrum of the adjacency matrix of this network. Here we see that $_{3}$ (L) statistic for the random network agrees very good with the RM T predictions for very large L, ie., L 300. Inset of this gure shows the same in sem i-logarithm ic scale. Here we see expected linear behavior of 3 (L) with slope 0:0978 which is very close to



0.5

of the scale-free network. The circles are num erical results and the solid curve is the GOE prediction of RM T. Inset plots the $_3$ (L) in sem i-logarithm is scale, in this scale it has the slope 0.0975. Figure is plotted for the average over 10 realizations of the networks. All networks have N = 2000 nodes and an average degree k = 20 per node.

the RM T predicted value 1 = 2 0:1013 [see Eq.(3)].

B. Scale-free network

Scale-free network is generated by using the model of Barabasi and A lbert [9]. Starting with a sm all number, m $_0$ of the nodes, a new node with m m₀ connections is added at each time step. This new node connects with a already existing node i with the probability $(k_i) / k_i$ (preferential attachm ent), where k_i is the degree of the node i. After time steps the model leads to a network with N = $+ m_0$ nodes and m connections. This m odel leads to a scale-free network, i.e., the probability P (k) that a node has degree k decays as a power law, k, where is a constant and for the type of P (k) probability law (k) that we have used = 3. Other form s for the probability (k) are possible which give di erent values of . The results reported here are independent of the value of . Density distribution of the network has the triangular distribution with a peak at

(0), and NNSD followsGOE statistics [1]. In Fig. 1(b), we show that the NNNSD of the adjacency matrix of this network agrees well with the NNSD of the GSE matrices. In the inset of this gure, we plot the well-known triangular distribution of the spectral density of scale-free network. Fig. 3 shows the $_3$ (L) statistic for the adjacency matrix of the scale-free network. Here we see that

 $_3$ (L) statistic for the scale-free network agrees very well with the RM T predictions for very large L, i.e., L 150, and deviations begin to be seen after L = 150. This in-



FIG. 4: (Color online) $_3$ (L) statistic for the eigenvalues spectra of the small-world network. The circles are num erical results and the solid curve is GOE prediction of RMT. Inset plots the $_3$ (L) upto L = 30 in sem i-logarithm ic scale, in this scale $_3$ (L) has the slope 0.1024. Figure is plotted for the average over 10 realizations of the networks. A llnetworks have N = 2000 nodes and an average degree k = 20 per node.

dicates that the scale-free network is very much random but not as much as ER random networks, it has some specic features that cannot be modeled by RMT. Inset of this gure shows the expected linear behavior of $_3$ (L) in semi-logarithm ic scale for L . 150 with slope 0.0975, a value very close to the RMT predicted value 1= ².

C. Sm all-world network

Sm all-w orld netw orks are constructed using the follow ing algorithm of W atts and Strogatz [8]. Starting with a one-dimension ring lattice of N nodes in which every node is connected to its k=2 nearest neighbors, we random ly rew ire each connection of the lattice with the probability p such that self-loop and multiple connections are excluded. Thus p = 0 gives a regular network and p = 1gives a completely random network. The typical smallworld behavior is observed around p = 0.005 [1]. We take N = 2000 and average degree k = 20. Spectral density of this network is complicated with several peaks. One peak is at = 0. For di erent values of k the exact positions of other peaks m ay vary but overall form of spectral density remains similar [1]. The spacing distribution again follow sGOE statistics with Brody parameter 1 [1].We plot NNN SD of the adjacency matrix of the small-world network in the Fig. 1 (c). We see that the NNNSD agrees well with the NNSD of GSE matrices. Here again in the inset of this gure, we plot the spectral density of this network showing typical multi-peak behavior of smallworld networks. Fig. 4 shows the $_3$ (L) statistic for the

spectrum of the adjacency matrix corresponding to the small-world network with p = 0.005. Here we see that $_3(L)$ statistic for the small-world network agree very good with the RMT predictions for su ciently large L, i.e., L 30, but much less than the same for random and scale-free networks. This again in plies that, besides random ness, small-world network has some speci c features. Inset of this gure shows the expected linear behavior of $_3(L)$ in sem i-logarithm ic scale for L . 30 with slope

3 (L) If sail Hogalinin L scale bit L . So with slope 0:1024, a value very close to the RMT predicted value $1=^{2}$.

V. DISCUSSIONS

In our previous work [1], following RMT, we introduce a new tool to study com plex networks. W e showed that inspite of spectral density of the adjacency matrices A being di erent for di erent m odel networks and realworld networks, their eigenvalue uctuations are same and follow GOE statistics of RMT.We attributed this universality to the existence of the minimal amount of random ness in all these networks. We also showed that random ness in the network connections can be quantied by the B rody parameter coming from the RMT. This is a very interesting fact which directs us to make further investigations of the properties of com plex networks under the fram ework of RMT.We showed that there exists one to one correlation between the diam eter of the network and the eigenvalue uctuations of the adjacency matrix. By changing number of connections in the network we get transition to the GOE distribution. As Erdos and Renyiobserved that with the ne tuning of network param eter all nodes get connected with a sudden transition; under the RMT fram ework our analysis suggests transition to some kind of spreading of random ness over the whole network.

In this paper we study spectral rigidity via $_3$ -statistic of RM T of the model networks studied extensively in the literature. We show that the spectral rigidity of these networks follow universal GOE statistics. $_3$ -statistic of the random matrices following GOE statistics also have long-range correlations among the eigenvalues. From RM T analogy it tells that there exists long range correlations among the eigenvalues. From relations among the eigenvalues. Moreover, we nd that the slope of the spectral rigidity function com es 1= 2 as calculated for the GOE statistics theoretically [Eq.(3)]. A dditionally we show that NNNSD of the eigenvalues of these model networks are identical to the NNSD of GSE matrices. Note that NNNSD of the matrices whose NNSD follow GOE statistics also follow GSE statistics.

Above ndings show that the statistics of the bulk of the eigenvalues of the model networks is consistent with those of a real symmetric random matrix and deviation from this could be understood as a system dependent part.

3 analysis show that the random network follows RMT prediction for very long range of L, which is not very surprising as random network follows RMT at each level starting from sem i-circular density distributions. However interestingly scale-free and small-world networks also follows RMT for su ciently large value of L. Beyond this value of L deviation in the spectral rigidity is seen, indicating a possible breakdown of universality. This is quite understandable as small-world network is highly clustered and scale-free network also has speci c features like hubs, so it is natural that they are not as random as the random network. particularly sm all-world network we consider here is generated using Strogatz and W atts algorithm and we take the SW networks exactly at the small-world transition which generates networks with very high clustering coe cient and very less number of random connection. Our results show that these very small num ber of random connections make network suf-

ciently random to introduce the correlations am ong the eigenvalues for the su ciently long range. A coording to the many recent studies, random ness in the connection is one of the most important and desirable ingredients for the proper functionality or the e cient perform ance of the system s having underlying network structures. For instance, information processing in the brain is considered to be because of random connections among di erent modular structure [25]. We feel that we can study the role of random connections, and behavior and evolution of such systems better under the RMT framework. A lso this RM T approach may be used to detect the connections most responsible to increase the complexity of networks. For example e ect of oxygen molecule on biochem ical network of the metabolic network is recently studied and is shown to increase the complexity of networks leading to a major transition in the history of life [26].

In summary, we introduce RM T analysis of complex networks and we show that these networks follow RM T prediction with the universal GOE statistics. These results tell that we can apply random matrix theory to study the behavior and properties of complex networks. So far we have only concentrated on the model networks studied vastly in the recent literature to provide a basis, future investigations would involve the study of realworld networks [27]. Future investigations would also include eigenvector analysis of real-world networks [27].

- [1] J. N. Bandyopadhyay and S. Jalan, e-print : nlin AO/0608028.
- [2] S. Jalan and J. N. Bandyopadhyay, e-print : cond-m at/0611735.
- [3] S.H.Strogatz, Nature 410, 268 (2001).
- [4] R.Albert and A.-L.Barabasi, Rev.M od. Phys. 74, 47 (2002) and references therein.
- [5] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, D.-U.

Hwang, Phys. Rep. 424, 175 (2006).

- [6] B.Bollobas, Random Graphs (Second edition, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001).
- [7] P.Erdos and A.Renyi, Publ.M ath.Inst.Hungar.Acad. Sci.5, 17 (1960).
- [8] D.J.W atts and S.H. Strogatz, Nature 440, 393 (1998).
- [9] A.-L. Barabasi and R. Albert, Science 286, 509 (1999).
- [10] M.Girvan and M.E.J.Newman, Proc.Natl.Acad.Sci. USA 99, 7821 (2002); A.Clauset, M.E.J.Newman, and C.Moore, Phys.Rev.E 70, 066111 (2004); M.E. J.Newman, Social Networks 27, 39 (2005); M.E.J. Newman, Proc.Natl.Acad.Sci.USA 103, 8577 (2006).
- [11] R. Guimera and L. A. N. Amaral, Nature 433, 895 (2005).
- [12] M.Keams, S.Suri, and N.Montfort, Science 313, 824 (2006).
- [13] D. M. Cvetkovic, M. Doob and H. Sachs, Spectra of Graphs : theory and applications, (A cadem ic Press, 3rd R evised edition, 1997).
- [14] M. Doob in Handbook of Graph Theory, edited by J.L. Gross and J.Yellen (Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2004).
- [15] F. R. K. Chung, Spectral G raph Theory, Number 92, (American M athem atical Sociaty, 1997).
- [16] R.Grone, R.Merris and V.S.Sunder, SIAM J.Matrix

Analysis and Appl. 11, 218 (1990).

- [17] J.G.Restrepo, E.Ott, and B.R.Hunt, Phys. Rev. E 71, 036151 (2005); Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 094102 (2006).
- [18] M.L.Mehta, Random Matrices, 3rd ed. (Elsevier Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2004).
- [19] T. Guhr, A. Muller-Groeling and H. A. Weidenmuller, Phys. Rep. 299, 189 (1998).
- [20] O.Bohigas, M.-J.Giannoni and C.Schmidt, in Chaotic behaviour in quantum system s edited by G.Casati, p.103 (Plenum Press, New York 1985).
- [21] L. Laloux, P. Cizeau, J.-P. Bouchaud, and M. Potters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1467 (1999); V. Plerou, P. Gopikrishnan, B. Rosenow, L.A. N. Am aral, and H. E. Stanley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1471 (1999); V. Plerou, P. Gopikrishnan, B. Rosenow, L. A. N. Am aral. T. Guhr and H. E. Stanely, Phys. Rev. E 65, 0661261 (2002).
- [22] P.Seba, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 198104 (2003).
- [23] M. S. Santhanam and P. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. E 64, 016102 (2001).
- [24] T.A.Brody, Lett. Nuovo C im ento 7, 482 (1973).
- [25] J.D.Cohen and F.Tong, Science 293, 2405 (2001).
- [26] J.Raym ond and D. Segre, Science 311, 1764 (2006).
- [27] S. Jalan and J. N. Bandyopadhyay (under preparation).