Jawad Chowdhury: 801135477 In [3]: #### import import networkx as nx import numpy as np import matplotlib import matplotlib.pyplot as plt import matplotlib.gridspec as gridspec 1. Signed Networks (Slashdot) 1a. compute the number of triangles in the network In [4]: file name = "datasets/soc-sign-Slashdot081106.txt" uG s = nx.read edgelist(file name, nodetype=int, data=(("sign", int),)) In [5]: | dict_triangles = nx.triangles(uG_s) In [6]: print("The number of triangles in the network: ", sum(nx.triangles(uG s).values()) / 3) The number of triangles in the network: 548054.0 1b. Report the fraction of balanced triangles and unbalanced triangles. (assume network is undirected; if there is a sign for each direction, randomly pick one.) In [7]: triangles = [c for c in nx.cycle_basis(uG_s) if len(c) == 3] triangle types={} for triangle in triangles: tri=nx.subgraph(uG s,triangle) triangle types[tuple(tri.nodes())]=np.product([x[2]['sign'] for x in tri.edges(data=True)]) In [8]: | n_bal = 0 $n_{imbal} = 0$ for k, v in triangle_types.items(): **if** v==1: $n_bal +=1$ else: $n_{imbal} +=1$ f_bal = n_bal/(n_bal+n_imbal) f_imbal = n_imbal/(n_bal+n_imbal) In [9]: print("Fraction of balanced triangles : ", f_bal) print("Fraction of unbalanced triangles : ", f_imbal) Fraction of balanced triangles : 0.838768747820021 Fraction of unbalanced triangles : 0.16123125217997908 1c. Compare the frequency of signed triads in real and "shuffled" networks (refer slides) (assume network is undirected; if there is a sign for each direction, randomly pick one.) In [10]: triangles = [c for c in nx.cycle_basis(uG_s) if len(c) == 3] In [11]: triangle_types={} for triangle in triangles: tri=nx.subgraph(uG_s,triangle) triangle_types[tuple(tri.nodes())]=np.sum([x[2]['sign'] for x in tri.edges(data=True)]) In [12]: | triangle_type_t3 = {} triangle_type_t2 = {} triangle_type_t1 = {} triangle_type_t0 = {} for k,v in triangle_types.items(): **if** v==3: triangle type t3[k] = v**elif** v==1: $triangle_type_t2[k] = v$ elif v==-1: triangle type t1[k] = velif v==-3: $triangle_type_t0[k] = v$ In [13]: n_real_t3=len(triangle_type_t3.items()) n_real_t2=len(triangle_type_t2.items()) n_real_t1=len(triangle_type_t1.items()) n_real_t0=len(triangle_type_t0.items()) In [14]: n_real = n_real_t3 + n_real_t2 + n_real_t1 + n_real_t0 print(n_real_t3/n_real, n_real_t2/n_real, n_real_t1/n_real, n_real_t0/n_real) $0.6367718869898848 \ \ 0.12722357865364492 \ \ 0.20199686083013604 \ \ 0.034007673526334145$ In [15]: cpos=0 cneg=0 for e in uG_s.edges(data=True): **if** e[2]['sign'] == 1: cpos +=1 else: cneg +=1 $cpos_cneg = [1]*cpos + [-1]*cneg$ import random random.shuffle(cpos_cneg) In [16]: | uG_s_shuffled = uG_s.copy() In [17]: | i=0 for e in uG_s_shuffled.edges(data=True): e[2]['sign']=cpos_cneg[i] In [18]: shuffled triangles = [c for c in nx.cycle basis(uG s shuffled) if len(c) == 3] In [19]: shuffled triangle types={} for triangle in shuffled triangles: tri=nx.subgraph(uG_s_shuffled,triangle) shuffled_triangle_types[tuple(tri.nodes())]=np.sum([x[2]['sign'] for x in tri.edges(data=True)]) In [20]: shuffled triangle type t3 = {} shuffled triangle type t2 = {} shuffled_triangle_type_t1 = {} shuffled_triangle_type_t0 = {} for k, v in shuffled triangle types.items(): **if** v==3: shuffled triangle type t3[k] = v**elif** v==1: shuffled_triangle_type_t2[k] = v elif v==-1: shuffled_triangle_type_t1[k] = v **elif** v==-3: shuffled triangle type t0[k] = v In [21]: n_shuffled_t3=len(shuffled_triangle_type_t3.items()) n shuffled t2=len(shuffled triangle type t2.items()) n shuffled t1=len(shuffled triangle type t1.items()) n shuffled t0=len(shuffled triangle type t0.items()) In [22]: n shuffled = n shuffled t3 + n shuffled t2 + n shuffled t1 + n shuffled t0 print(n shuffled t3/n shuffled, n shuffled t2/n shuffled, n shuffled t1/n shuffled, n shuffled t0/n shu ffled) $0.4262690298674048 \ 0.4238135631054958 \ 0.1355864101075941 \ 0.014330996919505335$ Triad Real, P(T) Shuffled, P(T₀) Consistent with Balance? T_3 (Balanced) 0.64 Yes 0.43 T_1 (Balanced) 0.20 0.14 Yes T_2 (Unbalanced) 0.13 0.42 Yes T_0 (Unbalanced) 0.01 0.03 No 1d. Compute "Gen. Surprise" (assume directed signed networks) for each of the 16 types # dG s2 = nx.read edgelist(file name, nodetype=int, data=(("sign", int),), create using=nx.DiGraph) # dG s=nx.subgraph(dG s2,list(range(300))) dG s = nx.read edgelist(file name, nodetype=int, data=(("sign", int),), create using=nx.DiGraph) In [24]: | uG_s = dG_s.to_undirected() triangles = [c for c in nx.cycle basis(uG s) if len(c) == 3] In [25]: $t={}$ for i in range (1, 17, 1): t[i]=[] In [26]: def get_t(t,a,b,x,dG_s): $sg = nx.subgraph(dG_s, [a,b,x])$ sg edges = sg.edges() sg_edges_data = sg.edges(data=True) if (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[1]: t[1].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[2]: t[2].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[5]: t[5].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_dat a: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[6]: t[6].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[3]: t[3].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[4]: t[4].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[7]: t[7].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (a,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_dat a: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[8]: t[8].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[9]: t[9].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[10]: t[10].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[13]: t[13].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (x,b,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_dat a: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[14]: t[14].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[11]: t[11].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[12]: t[12].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':1}) in sg_edges_data **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[15]: t[15].append((a,b,x))elif (a,b) in sg_edges and (x,a,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_data and (b,x,{'sign':-1}) in sg_edges_dat a: **if** (a,b,x) **not in** t[16]: t[16].append((a,b,x)) return t In [27]: **for** utriad **in** triangles: (a,b,x) = utriad $t=get_t(t,a,b,x,dG_s)$ (a,x,b) = utriadt=get t(t,a,b,x,dG s)(b,a,x) = utriad $t=get_t(t,a,b,x,dG_s)$ (b,x,a) = utriadt=get t(t,a,b,x,dG s)(x,a,b) = utriad $t=get_t(t,a,b,x,dG_s)$ (x,b,a) = utriad $t=get_t(t,a,b,x,dG_s)$ In [28]: **for** k, v **in** t.items(): print(k,len(v)) 1 34308 2 2294 3 14375 4 1449 5 3749 6 1645 7 2491 8 1773 9 11811 10 1259 11 544 12 142 13 1213 14 2915 15 132 16 86 In [29]: import math def get gen surprise(v=[]): k=0list_pgai = [] for t in v: if dG s[t[0]][t[1]]['sign']==1: ai=t[0] ai gen edges = dG s.out edges(ai) n ai gen edges = len(ai gen edges) if n ai gen edges==0: list pgai.append(0) continue for e in ai_gen_edges: if dG s[e[0]][e[1]]['sign']==1: prob gen ai = (cp/n ai gen edges) list_pgai.append(prob_gen_ai) sum of pgai = 0sum of pgai mul comp pgai = 0 for e in list pgai: sum of pgai +=e sum of pgai mul comp pgai += e*(1-e) result = (k-sum of pgai)/math.sqrt(sum of pgai mul comp pgai) return result In [30]: print("Gen. Surprise (for each of 16 types)") for k, v in t.items(): print('T=',k,' : ',get_gen_surprise(v)) Gen. Surprise (for each of 16 types) T= 1 : 38.20467542285642T= 2 : -34.3655383422227T= 3 : 24.758926384494785T= 4 : -18.55978615212179T=5:-9.382142936100609T= 6 : 6.033886456950722 : -11.643346429787199 T=7: 17.288710145967435 T=8T= 9 : 28.507429633591315 T=10:-18.963198203816113T= 11 : 4.7700135762088385 T= 12 : -3.76480214332523T= 13 : -4.842128283177797T= 14 : 1.0251980073754139 T = 15 : -1.371184672192175T= 16 : 0.4980906392657173 In []: 1e. Rewrite the formula for "Rec. Surprise" using the idea introduced in "Gen. Surprise" Formula for 'Rec. Surprise': $S_r(X) = rac{k - \sum_{i=1}^n P_r(A_i)}{\sqrt{P_r(A_i) * (1 - P_r(A_i))}}$ In []: 1f. Compute "Rec. Surprise" for all each of the 16 types. In [31]: import math def get_rec_surprise(v=[]): k=0list_prai = [] for t in v: if dG_s[t[0]][t[1]]['sign']==1: ai=t[0] ai_rec_edges = dG_s.in_edges(ai) n ai rec edges = len(ai rec edges) if n_ai_rec_edges==0: list_prai.append(0) continue cp=0 for e in ai_rec_edges: if dG_s[e[0]][e[1]]['sign']==1: cp+=1 prob rec ai = (cp/n ai rec edges) list_prai.append(prob_rec_ai) $sum_of_prai = 0$ sum_of_prai_mul_comp_prai = 0 for e in list_prai: sum_of_prai +=e sum_of_prai_mul_comp_prai += e*(1-e) result = (k-sum_of_prai)/math.sqrt(sum_of_prai_mul_comp_prai) return result In [32]: print("Rec. Surprise (for each of 16 types)") for k, v in t.items(): print('T=',k,' : ',get_rec_surprise(v)) Rec. Surprise (for each of 16 types) T= 1 : 81.24812745525661 T= 2 : -35.34180242799213T= 3 : 53.07907920727959T= 4 : -12.033104064438797T=5: -48.32696247477239T=6:-6.4338609629776276T = 7 : -43.775847935209235T= 8 : 0.8675958669642168 T= 9 : 31.452897821542905 T= 10 :-32.85991135169408 T= 11 : 4.757702452562508 T= 12 : -4.544570803451088T= 13 : 10.80308754750378T= 14 : 29.737014750336794 T= 15 : 3.468028789194091 T= 16 : 6.542325796837684 In []: 2. The SIR Model of Disease Spreading ### algorithm 1 In [57]: from collections import Counter import random def subtract list(x,y): return list((Counter(x) - Counter(y)).elements()) def algorithm 1(G): beta, delta = 0.05, 0.5V = list(G.nodes())I = [random.choice(V)]S = subtract_list(V,I) while len(I) != 0: $S_{prime} = []$ $I_prime = []$ $J_prime = []$ $R_{prime} = []$ for u in V: if u in S: $list_edge_uv = G.edges(u)$ for uv in list edge uv: v = uv[0] if uv[0] != u else uv[1]if v in I: r = random.uniform(0, 1)if r <= beta:</pre> if u not in S_prime: S_prime.append(u) if u not in I prime: I prime.append(u) elif u in I: r = random.uniform(0,1)if r <= delta:</pre> if u not in J prime: J_prime.append(u) if u not in R_prime: R prime.append(u) S = list(set(subtract_list(S, S_prime))) I = list(set(subtract list((I + I prime), J prime))) R = list(set(R + R prime))return len(S),len(I),len(R) In []: In [58]: # reading datasets uG actor = nx.read edgelist('datasets/imdb actor edges.tsv', nodetype=int, data=(("num movies", int),)) uG_erdos = nx.read_edgelist('datasets/SIR_erdos_renyi.txt', nodetype=int) uG prefer = nx.read edgelist('datasets/SIR preferential attachment.txt', nodetype=int) In []: 2a. For a node with d neighbors, what is its probability of getting infected in a given round? We know that a node can either be susceptible, infected or recoverd. Let, for a given round, the number of nodes in susceptible set is = S, number of nodes in infected set is =Iand the number of nodes in recovered set is =Rtherefore, total number of nodes, n=S+I+RTo get infected, the node has to be in the susceptible set and probability of a node in susceptible set is, $p(S) = \frac{S}{S + I + R}$ Also, a node can be infected only by its neighbors who are already infected, Given, the node has d neighbors, probable number of infected neighbor, $n(neigh_I) = \frac{d*I}{S+I+R}$ Each of these infected neighbor can infect that node with a probability of = β so, the probability of that node getting infected is $= p(S) * n(neigh_I) * \beta$ 2b. Run 100 simulations of SIR model with β = 0.05 and δ = 0.5 for each of the three graphs. In [66]: n=100 list percent actor = [] list percent erdos = [] list percent prefer = [] In [67]: **for** sim **in** range(n): s1, i1, r1 = algorithm_1(uG_actor) p1 = r1/(s1+i1+r1)list percent actor.append(p1) In [68]: for sim in range(n): s2, i2, r2 = algorithm 1(uG erdos) p2 = r2/(s2+i2+r2)list percent erdos.append(p2) In []: for sim in range(n): s3, i3, r3 = algorithm 1(uG prefer)p3 = r3/(s3+i3+r3)list_percent_prefer.append(p3) In []: In [94]: e1 = np.sum([1 for pa in list_percent_actor if pa >= 0.5]) e2 = np.sum([1 for pe in list percent erdos if pe >= 0.5])e3 = np.sum([1 for pp in list_percent_prefer if pp >= 0.5]) **Proportion of Epidemics** In [124]: print("Proportion of simulations that infected at least 50% of the network (graph - Actor) : ", e1, print("Proportion of simulations that infected at least 50% of the network (graph - Erdos) : ", e2, print("Proportion of simulations that infected at least 50% of the network (graph - Preferential attac hment) : ", e3, '%') Proportion of simulations that infected at least 50% of the network (graph - Actor): 60 % Proportion of simulations that infected at least 50% of the network (graph - Erdos): 69 % Proportion of simulations that infected at least 50% of the network (graph - Preferential attachment) : 74 % In []: Pairwise Chi-Square Test (test statistic and p-values) In [125]: ### (e1,e2), (e1,e3), (e2,e3) from scipy.stats import chi2 contingency X = 1 = 2 = chi2 contingency([[e1, 100-e1], [e2, 100-e2]]) $X_e1_e3 = chi2_contingency([[e1, 100-e1], [e3, 100-e3]])$ $X_e2_e3 = chi2_contingency([[e2, 100-e2], [e3, 100-e3]])$ In [126]: # print(X_e1_e2,X_e1_e3,X_e2_e3) In [127]: print("Pair (Actor-Erdos): chi-square statistic = ",X_e1_e2[0], " and p-value Pair (Actor-Erdos): chi-square statistic = 1.3975324817119774 and p-value = 0.23713715085236137 In [128]: print("Pair (Actor-Preferential): chi-square statistic = ",X_e1_e3[0], " and p-value = ", X_e1_e3[1]) Pair (Actor-Preferential): chi-square statistic = 3.821800090456807 and p-value = 0.05058986011471 8624 In [129]: | print("Pair (Erdos-Preferential): chi-square statistic = ",X_e2_e3[0], " and p-value = ", X_e2_e3[1]) Pair (Erdos-Preferential): chi-square statistic = 0.39258986627407677 and p-value = 0.530941190070 1313 In []: Ques-Ans about the two synthetic (Erdos, Preferential) networks: 1. Does the Erdos-Renyi graph appear to be more/less susceptible to epidemics than the Preferential Attachment graph? In [136]: **if** (e2 > e3): print("The Erdos-Renyi (", e2, "%) graph appears to be MORE susceptible to epidemics than preferen tial attachment (",e3,"%).") **elif** (e2 == e3): print("The Erdos-Renyi (", e2, "%) graph appears to be EQUALLY susceptible to epidemics than prefe rential attachment (",e3,"%).") print("The Erdos-Renyi (", e2, "%) graph appears to be LESS susceptible to epidemics than preferen tial attachment (",e3,"%).") The Erdos-Renyi (69 %) graph appears to be LESS susceptible to epidemics than preferential attachmen t (74 %). In []: 2. In cases where an epidemic does take off, does Erdos-Renyi graph appear to have higher/lower final percentage infected? In [137]: c erdos = 0 c prefer = 0 for i in range (100): if list percent erdos[i] >= 0.5 and list percent prefer[i] >= 0.5: # condition where epidemic take if list percent erdos[i] > list percent prefer[i]: c erdos +=1 else: c prefer +=1 print("In cases where an epidemic does take off --->") if (c_erdos > c_prefer): print("Erdos-Renyi graph appears to have HIGHER final percentage infected in most cases.") else: print("Erdos-Renyi graph appears to have LOWER final percentage infected in most cases.") In cases where an epidemic does take off ---> Erdos-Renyi graph appears to have HIGHER final percentage infected in most cases. In []: 3. Overall, which of these two networks seems to be more susceptible to the spread of disease? In [138]: avg erdos = np.mean(list percent erdos) avg_prefer = np.mean(list_percent_prefer) In [140]: print(avg_erdos,avg_prefer) 0.5582118677817602 0.5491079251294306 In terms of epidemics, we have seen that erdos-renyi is **slightly less susceptible** than preferential attachment graph. But, in those cases, erdos-renyi network used to converge with a higher percentage of final infected population than the preferential attachment. Overall (including epidemic and non-epidemic cases both), if we take the mean % of the infected population after those 100 simulations, both of the networks (erdos-renyi and preferential attachment) have very close results where the erdos-renyi graph seenms slightly more susceptible by a very small margin. In []: 4. Give one good reason why you might expect to see these significant differences (or lack thereof) between Erdos-Renyi and Preferential Attachment? (2–3 sentences) In [145]: print(e2, e3) print("Pair (Erdos-Preferential): chi-square statistic = ", X e2 e3[0], " and p-value = ", X e2 e3[1]) Pair (Erdos-Preferential): chi-square statistic = 0.39258986627407677 and p-value = 0.530941190070 1313 In []: We see that Preferential Attachment graph use to be slightly more susceptible to epidemics, but the statistical significance test comes up with a smaller test statistics. It appears from the results of these 100 simulations that the two observed graph sequences are not much far from each other. The differences we have seen in these two graph networks, is more related to the structure through which these graph used to form (they have different strategies to form the network). And as we see that these differences are not much significant might be due to the fact that they both are simulated networks with similar graph properties and we see the test statistics is quite higher when we compare any of them with the real (Actor) network.