# Matching centrality measures for networks

Mary Aprahamian Stefan Güttel

March 2016

### Contents

1	Introduction	1
<b>2</b>	Power network example	<b>2</b>
3	Exponential centrality	<b>2</b>
4	Resolvent centrality	3
<b>5</b>	References	6

#### 1 Introduction

The analysis of complex networks using tools from linear algebra has recently regained popularity. One way to define the *relative importance* of a network's node, known as *centrality*, is to quantify its ability to initiate walks around the network. The connection to linear algebra is that with each graph we can associate an adjacency matrix A, so that  $A_{ij} = 1$  if there is an edge (either directed or undirected) from i to j, and  $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The number of walks of length k between nodes i and j is obtained as the (i, j)element of  $A^k$ . The total number of walks originating from node i is the *i*-th element of the vector  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A^k \mathbf{1}$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the vector of all ones.

In applications it may be unreasonable to weigh very short and very long walks equally, so walks of length k are penalized by a parameter  $0 < \alpha_k \leq 1$ . Two choices of  $\alpha_k$  have been particularly popular:  $\alpha_k = \alpha^k$  with  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , and  $\alpha_k = 1/k!$ . In the former case we assume further that  $\alpha < 1/\rho(A)$ , where  $\rho(A)$  is the spectral radius of A. In this case the vector centrality scores are the elements of  $(I - \alpha A)^{-1} \mathbf{1}$ . This resolvent-based measure is known as *Katz centrality* [4]. In the second case the vector of centrality scores is  $\exp(A)\mathbf{1}$ . This exponential-based measure is known as *total communicability* [2].

Depending on the application, either the exponential centrality or the resolvent centrality may be more appropriate to rank the importance of nodes, but also computational considerations may determine the choice of centrality. An interesting question is the following: for which value of the Katz parameter  $\alpha$  will both centrality measures be most similar? This question is, of course, a simple rational approximation problem. For example, if we aim to minimize the 2-norm difference between the centrality vectors (allowing for some scaling), the problem becomes: find (real) parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  such that

$$\|\exp(A)\mathbf{1} - \beta(I - \alpha A)^{-1}\mathbf{1}\|_2 \to \min.$$

Note that if we are only interested in the ranking of nodes, the scaling of the resolvent centralities by  $\beta$  will have no effect on the ordering of the nodes.

#### 2 Power network example

We now demonstrate how RKFIT [3] can be used to determine good values for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , a problem that is equivalent to finding a type (0,1) rational approximant  $r(A)\mathbf{1}$ ,  $r(z) = \beta/(1-\alpha z)$ , of the exponential centrality  $\exp(A)\mathbf{1}$ .

We consider a network arising as a topological representation of the Western States Power Grid of the USA. The network is available from the Florida Sparse Matrix collection (http://www.cise.ufl.edu/research/sparse/matrices/Newman/power.html). As a first step we load the adjacency matrix A of the network and plot its associated graph:



## 3 Exponential centrality

We now compute the exponential centralities using the function expmv available from http://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/29576-matrix-exponential-times-a-vector/content/expmv.m. By sorting the entries of the vector  $exp(A)\mathbf{1}$ , we can identify the 10 highest ranked nodes in the power network:

## 4 Resolvent centrality

Now let us apply RKFIT for finding a Katz parameter  $\alpha$  and the scaling  $\beta$  so that the resolvent-based centrality is closest to the exponential-based centrality in the 2-norm. The **residue** command allows us to easily convert the found **ratfun** into partial fraction form, which will have a single term here:

```
xi = inf; % initial guess for the pole
param = struct('real', 1, 'maxit', 5, 'k', -1);
[xi, ratfun, misfit] = rkfit(F, A, b, xi, param);
[beta, xi] = residue(ratfun);
alpha_rkfit = 1/xi;
```

Let us investigate the error of the type (0,1) best rational approximation to the exponential centrality vector of  $\exp(A)\mathbf{1}$  as we vary the parameter  $\alpha$ . Note that, for given  $\alpha$ , finding the optimal  $\beta$  such that  $\|\exp(A)\mathbf{1} - \beta(I - \alpha A)^{-1}\mathbf{1}\|_2$  is smallest possible amounts to a linear least squares problem which we can solve by projection:

```
rhoA = eigs(A, 1);
Alph = linspace(0.1, 1.05/rhoA, 500);
for j = 1:length(Alph),
    res = (speye(size(A)) - Alph(j)*A)\b;
    res = res/norm(res);
    beta = res'*centr_exp;
    best_approx = beta*res;
    Dist(j) = norm(centr_exp - best_approx)/norm(centr_exp);
end
figure, plot(Alph, Dist, 'LineWidth', 1), hold on
plot([alpha_rkfit, alpha_rkfit], [0, 1], 'r', 'LineWidth', 1)
plot([1/rhoA, 1/rhoA], [0, 1], 'k--', 'LineWidth', 1)
legend('best scaled resolvent', 'RKFIT parameter', ...
    '1/\rho(A)', 'Location', 'SouthWest')
xlabel('Katz parameter \alpha'), axis tight
```



We note that RKFIT has done a very good job in locating the minimum, called  $\alpha_{\text{rkfit}}$ . Moreover, we find that  $\alpha_{\text{rkfit}}$  also satisfies the condition on the Katz parameter to be smaller than  $1/\rho(A)$ .

Another approach for choosing  $\alpha$  has been suggested in [1]. There the aim was to minimize the distance between the two *unscaled* centrality vectors  $\|\exp(A)\mathbf{1} - (I - \alpha A)^{-1}\mathbf{1}\|_2$  (i.e.,  $\beta = 1$ ). The authors recommend a value for the Katz parameter  $\alpha_{\min}$  depending on the largest eigenvalue  $\rho(A)$  of the adjacency matrix,  $\alpha_{\min} = (1 - \exp(-\rho(A))/\rho(A)$ . For our power network the values  $\alpha_{\min}$  and  $\alpha_{\text{rkfit}}$  are very close:

alpha\_min = (1 - exp(-rhoA))/rhoA; disp([ alpha\_min, alpha\_rkfit ]) 1.3356e-01 1.3162e-01

Here are the 15 highest ranked nodes using the exponential centrality measure and the resolvent centrality measures obtained using the parameters  $\alpha_{\text{rkfit}}$  chosen by RKFIT and  $\alpha_{\text{min}}$  suggested in [1]:

```
centr_rkfit = (speye(size(A)) - alpha_rkfit*A)\b;
[~, ind_rkfit] = sort(centr_rkfit, 'descend');
centr_min = (speye(size(A))-alpha_min*A)\b;
[~, ind_min] = sort(centr_min, 'descend');
[ (1:15) ', ind_exp(1:15), ind_rkfit(1:15), ind_min(1:15) ]
ans =
                      4346
                                    4382
                                                  4382
            1
            2
                      4382
                                    4346
                                                  4346
            3
                      4337
                                    4337
                                                  4337
            4
                      4333
                                                  4333
                                    4333
            5
                      4353
                                    4353
                                                  4353
            6
                                    4385
                      4396
                                                  4385
            7
                      4385
                                    4403
                                                  4403
            8
                      4374
                                    4348
                                                  4348
            9
                      4348
                                    4396
                                                  4396
           10
                      4403
                                    4374
                                                  4374
                      4362
                                    4362
                                                  4399
           11
           12
                      4399
                                    4399
                                                  4362
           13
                      4402
                                    4402
                                                  4402
                      4414
                                                  4414
           14
                                    4414
                      4409
                                    4409
                                                  4409
           15
```

Both parameters provide a good resolvent-based match to the exponential centrality. In fact, the nodes ranked in the top 10 using the resolvent are the same with  $\alpha_{\rm rkfit}$  and  $\alpha_{\rm min}$ . The first difference between these two is in the 11-th and 12-th nodes which swap their positions when  $\alpha_{\rm min}$  is used.

Finally, let us plot again the graph with the nodes being coloured according to the RKFITbased centralities. Blue color indicates nodes of low centrality, and nodes with high centrality are plotted in magenta. The sizes of the nodes reflect their degrees.

```
figure
deg = degree(G);
plot(G, 'MarkerSize', 2*log(deg+1), ...
        'NodeCData', log(centr_rkfit), ...
        'LineWidth', 1, 'EdgeColor', [0, 0, 0]);
colormap(cool)
axis([-5.7, 7.5, -7, 6.5]), axis off
```



### 5 References

[1] M. Aprahamian, D. J. Higham, and N. J. Higham. *Matching exponential-based and resolvent-based centrality measures*, Journal of Complex Networks, 4(2):157–176, 2015.

[2] M. Benzi and C. Klymko. *Total communicability as a centrality measure*, Journal of Complex Networks, 1(2):124–149, 2013.

[3] M. Berljafa and S. Güttel. *The RKFIT algorithm for nonlinear rational approximation*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 39(5):A2049–A2071, 2017.

[4] L. Katz. A new status index derived from sociometric analysis, Psychometrika 18(1):39–43, 1953.