A Letters Journal Exploring the Frontiers of Physics

February 2010

EPL, **89** (2010) 49901
www.epljournal.org
doi: 10.1209/0295-5075/89/49901

Addendum

Local assortativeness in scale-free networks

M. Piraveenan[1,2], M. Prokopenko[1(a)] and A. Y. Zomaya[2]

[1] *CSIRO Information and Communications Technology Centre - PO Box 76, Epping, NSW 1710, Australia*
[2] *Centre for Distributed and High Performance Computing, School of Information Technologies, The University of Sydney - NSW 2006, Australia*

Original article: *Europhysics Letters (EPL)*, **84** (2008) 28002.

PACS 99.10.Qr – Addenda

Network assortativity is typically defined as

$$r = \frac{1}{\sigma_q^2}\left[\left(\sum_{jk} jke_{j,k}\right) - \mu_q^2\right], \tag{1}$$

where $e_{j,k}$ is the link distribution of the network, μ_q is the expectation of the excess degree distribution $q(k)$ and σ_q is the standard deviation of this distribution.

In the original paper the local assortativity of a given node v was introduced using the following formula:

$$\rho_v = \frac{\alpha_v - \beta_v}{\sigma_q^2} = \frac{(j+1)\left(j\overline{k} - \mu_q^2\right)}{2M\sigma_q^2}, \tag{2}$$

where j is the node's excess degree, $\overline{k}$ is the average excess degree of its neighbours, $\sigma_q \neq 0$. The contribution α_v of the node v to the first term in (1), *i.e.*, $\sum_{jk} jke_{j,k}$, and contribution β_v to the second term in (1), *i.e.*, μ_q^2, are

$$\alpha_v = (j+1)\,\frac{j\overline{k}}{2M}, \qquad \beta_v = (j+1)\,\frac{\mu_q^2}{2M}. \tag{3}$$

We subsequently found that this formulation has a bias which favours peripheral nodes over hubs, and provide here a better measure (5) which should replace expression (2) in the original paper. The new derivation is summarised below. While the component α_v captures the precise contribution of each node to the term $\sum_{jk} jke_{j,k}$, the component β_v represents the contribution of each node to the term μ_q^2 with an imprecise scaling. Specifically, the scaling factor $(j+1)/2M$ in (3) is the correct scaling factor for μ_q, rather than μ_q^2, and hence, β_v has a bias towards peripheral nodes. The unbiased contribution instead is given by:

$$\hat{\beta}_v = (j+1)\frac{j\mu_q}{2M}. \tag{4}$$

Hence, local assortativity is

$$\hat{\rho}_v = \frac{\alpha_v - \hat{\beta}_v}{\sigma_q^2} = \frac{j\,(j+1)\left(\overline{k} - \mu_q\right)}{2M\sigma_q^2}. \tag{5}$$

If the neighbours' average $\overline{k}$ is higher than the global average μ_q, then the node is assortative. Otherwise, the node is disassortative. Hence, the local assortativity is a scaled difference between the average excess degree of the node's neighbours and the global average excess degree.

[(a)] E-mail: mikhail.prokopenko@csiro.au



Fig. 1: (Colour on-line) Internet Autonomous System level, August, 2008. Local assortativity profiles ρ (+) and $\hat{\rho}$ ($\Diamond$).

The difference between $\rho(d)$, defined by (2), and $\hat{\rho}(d)$, defined by (5), is illustrated for Internet Autonomous Systems level (August 2008) in fig. 1. Clearly, $\hat{\rho}(d) > \rho(d)$ for nodes with smaller d, and $\hat{\rho}(d) < \rho(d)$ for the hubs.

* * *

The authors thank Prof. G. Q. Zhang from the Chinese National Academy of Sciences for posing the question regarding the contribution to μ_q^2.