

# 复杂网络部分知识点复习

---

**walk**: a sequence of edges

**Trail**: edges distinct

**Path**: nodes distinct

**Isomorphism** 同构

if there is a **one-one correspondence** between the nodes of  $G_1$  and those of  $G_2$ , with the property that the number of edges joining any two nodes of  $G_1$  is equal to the number of edges joining the two corresponding nodes of  $G_2$

**homeomorphism** 同胚 add nodes of degree 2

A graph is **planar** if and only if it contains no **subgraphs homeomorphic** to  $K_5$  or

$K_{3,3}$

**Euler graph**. close trail( edge distinct

methods: all nodes has even degree

**Hamiltonian graph**: closed trail(nodes distinct)

methods:  $k_i + k_j \geq N$  for all  $i, j$  in nodes set, and  $i \neq j$

$G$  with  $N$  nodes has  $K$  components.

$N - K \leq M \leq 1/2(N-K)(N-K+1)$

when  $K = 1$ ,  $N - 1 \leq M \leq N(N-1)/2$

**disconnecting set**: A set of edges,  $E_0(G)$ , after it is being removed, the graph  $G$  will become unconnected.

**cut-set**: minimum disconnecting set

**corenest**.  $K$ -core, remove  $k-1$  degree

**node betweenness**:

$$\frac{B'(1)}{(N-1)(N-2)/2}$$

**edge betweenness**:

$$\frac{B'(1)}{N(N-1)/2}$$

homeogeneous 同质

heterogeneous 异质

Chinese postman. odd degree  $\rightarrow$  even degree, then add loop which is not larger than the half of all corresponding existing loops.

两点最短距离 dijkstra, 最小生成树 kruskal

random network. probability P

WS small-world k-ring-shape, probability p rewiring edges

NW small-world k-ring-shape, probability p add edges

Kleinberg's Navigable Networks consider distance  $P(u, v) = \beta d_{uv}^{-\alpha}$

### BA Scale-Free Network Model

add new nodes:

Add 1 new node into the network:

This node is connected to m ( $m \leq m_0$ ) existing nodes simultaneously

Add new edges:

The way to add the m new edges into the network: Every existing node is to be chosen with probability  $k_i/k$

### EBA

probability p. add one new node

Re-wiring:

With probability q, m ( $m \leq m_0$ ) edges are rewired

add new edges the same as BA

Casell: Sync region  $S = (\alpha_1, \infty)$

condition:  $c\lambda_2 > \alpha_1$

The synchronizability is determined by the smallest nonzero eigenvalue  $\lambda_2$  of its Laplacian matrix L.

The larger the  $\lambda_2$ , the smaller the c is needed, so the better or stronger the synchronizability of the network.

case III: Sync region  $S = (\alpha_2, \alpha_3)$

condition:  $0 < \frac{\lambda_N}{\lambda_2} < c\alpha$

The synchronizability is characterized by the ratio  $\lambda_N/\lambda_2$  of the largest and smallest nonzero eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix L.

The smaller the ratio  $\lambda_N/\lambda_2$ , the smaller the c is needed, so the better the synchronizability of the network.

Synchronizability of **small-world** and **scale-free** networks will increase as the node betweenness decreases

**homogeneous** networks — there is a **clear** correlation between betweenness and synchronizability. Betweenness up,  $|\frac{\lambda_N}{\lambda_2}|$  up.

**heterogeneous** networks — there is **no clear** correlation between betweenness and synchronizability

Lemma 1: For any given connected undirected graph  $G$ , all its **nonzero eigenvalues increase** monotonically with the number of **added edges**, i.e., by adding any edge  $e$ , one has  $\lambda_i(G + e) \geq \lambda_i(G)$

If the synchronized region is **unbounded**, then **adding edges never decreases** the synchronizability.

Main reason:  $\lambda_i(G + e) \geq \lambda_i(G)$

Lemma 2: For any given graph  $G$ :

- (i) the largest eigenvalue of  $G$ ,  $\lambda_N(G)$ , satisfies  $\lambda_N(G) \leq N$ ,
- (ii)  $\lambda_N(G) = N$  if and only if  $G^c$  is **disconnected**. Moreover, if  $G^c$  has (exactly)  $q$  connected components, then the multiplicity of  $\lambda_N(G) = N$  as an eigenvalue of  $G$  is  $q-1$
- (iii)  $\lambda_i(G^c) = N - \lambda_{N-i+2}(G), 2 \leq i \leq N$

example. ( $G$  has 6 nodes.)

$G^c$  is disconnected. The largest eigenvalue of  $G_1$  is 6, which remains the same for the graph with any more edges being added. Hence, Lemma 1 → the synchronizability of all the networks built on graph  $G_1$  never decrease with edge-adding.

recalled lemma1: If the synchronized region is **unbounded**, then **adding edges never decreases** the synchronizability.

think about bounding,  $\frac{\lambda_N}{\lambda_2}$ .  $\lambda_N = N$  因此不会更大了, 而  $\lambda_2$  up, 于是  $\frac{\lambda_N}{\lambda_2}$  down, and synchronizability up.

Remark 4: The **multiplicity** of the **largest eigenvalue** of a graph  $G$  is related to the number of **connected components** of its **complement**  $G^c$ . In order to **reduce** the number of **edges needed** to **enhance** the **synchronizability**, the **multiplicity** of the **largest eigenvalue** of  $G^c$  (i.e., the **multiplicity** of the **least nonzero eigenvalue** of  $G$ ) should be **large**.

Therefore, better understanding and careful manipulation of complementary graphs are useful for enhancing the network synchronizability; and, at least for dense networks, the complementary graphs are easier to analyze than the original graphs, e.g.,  $G_1^c$  is simpler than  $G_1$ .

