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## Who is the Most Critical?

Would you use the president of your university to reach a colleague?


## How is it Done Today?

| Network | \# Nodes |
| :---: | :--- |
| Karate Club | 34 |
| RPI | 8,000 |
| DBLP | 74,443 |
| IMDB | 33,557 |
| Facebook | 1 Billion |
| Twitter | 1 Billion |
| World | 7 Billion |



- degree-centrality
- pagerank
- closeness-centrality
- betweenness-centrality

A node has high betweenness centrality if many shortest paths use the node.

Motivation: capture how critical a node is to the flow of information between other pairs of nodes.

## Betweenness



## What's Wrong?

- Nodes on shortest paths are over emphasized $(A, B)$; Nodes on almost shortest paths are marginalized $(C)$.
- Information flow from $X$ to $Y$ uses just one path?
- How does $X$ know the shortest path to $Y$ ?


Methods have evolved to address this:
flow-betweenness; random walk betweenness

## Flow-Betweenness



## Random Walk-Betweenness



## How it's Done Today


(scores renormalized so that max is 1 )

## Attentive Betweenness-Centrality (ABC)



- Imagine a unit of "information flow" starting at $A$
- Only $\frac{1}{2 n-1}$ of the flow to $C$ makes it to $B$.
- The total flow to $B$ is therefore $\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2 n-1}$.
- The fraction of this total that flowed through $C$ is $\frac{1}{2 n}$


## Attention Devalues High Degree Nodes


"In critical and baffling situations, it is always best to return to first principle and simple action"

\author{

- Sir Winston Churchill
}


## Information Flow is the Basis of Betweenness

- $A$ sends information to $B$
- $X$ is critical to some of this $A \rightarrow B$ flow.

$$
\operatorname{Bet}_{A \rightarrow B}(X)=\frac{A \rightarrow B \text { information flow through } X}{A \rightarrow B \text { information flow }}
$$

- The betweenness of $X$ is the average.

$$
\operatorname{Bet}(X)=\operatorname{average}_{A, B}\left[\operatorname{Bet}_{A \rightarrow B}(X)\right]
$$



## Four "Axioms" of Information Flow

## I. Forward Propagation

An actor will not send information back along edges from where the information came.

## II. Locality

An actor cannot process global information and perform global algorithms in determining how to forward.

## III. Attention

Actors have a finite attention they can give a piece of information - cannot service all neighbors all the time.

## IV. Multipath

Information may flow along multiple paths; longer paths are less valuable than shorter ones.

## ABC-Centrality Satisfies the Four Axioms

|  | Betweenness measure |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bet. | ABC | Flow | Rand Walk |
| Forw. Prop. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\mathbf{X}$ |
| Locality | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Attention | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ |
| Non-shortest | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Complexity | $O(m n)$ | $O(m n)$ | $O\left(m^{2} n\right)$ | $O\left(m n^{2}\right)$ |

- Efficient BFS-like algorithm.
- Applies to directed and weighted graphs.

Attenuation parameter $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ determines how important longer paths are.
$\alpha \rightarrow 0: \mathrm{ABC}$ is similar to betweenness with attention.


## ABC Works Well in Stylized Networks



| Measure | $A$ | $B$ | $C$ | $D$ | $E$ | $X$ | $Y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BET | 0.71 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| FLOW | 0.62 | 1.00 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.62 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Random Walk | 0.75 | 1.00 | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.50 | 0.38 |
| PageRank | 0.83 | 1.00 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.83 | 0.66 | 0.66 |
| ABC | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 0.10 |

## Random Walk has Trouble Differentiating (Karate Club)



Centrality score correlation matrix

|  | BET $^{2}$ | $\mathrm{ABC}^{1}$ | $\mathrm{ABC}^{0^{+}}$ | RW | DEG | CL | FLOW | PG |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{BET}^{\mathrm{ABC}^{1}}$ | 1 | .98 | $1^{-}$ | .51 | .92 | .72 | .95 | .92 |
| $\mathrm{ABC}^{0^{+}}$ | $1^{-}$ | 1 | .98 | .98 | .51 | .96 | .77 | .96 |
| .97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RW | .51 | .51 | .51 | .51 | .92 | .73 | .96 | .93 |
| DEG | .92 | .96 | .92 | .41 | .41 | .32 | .53 | .42 |
| CL | .72 | .77 | .73 | .32 | .77 | 1 | .91 | $1^{-}$ |
| FLOW | .95 | .96 | .96 | .53 | .91 | .59 | 1 | .74 |
| PG | .92 | .97 | .93 | .42 | $1^{-}$ | .74 | .93 | 1 |

BET=betweenness; RW=Random Walk; DEG=degree; CL=closeness; PG=PageRank

## ABC Works in Real Networks (IMDB)

Betweenness and ABC are correlated

- Very high betweenness gets dampened;
- Low betweenness nodes can improve.


Most "critical" actors are diverse


ABC scores correlate better with diversity


## Wrapping Up

## Critical nodes are Caring Conduits

- Information flow is at the hear of betweenness.

|  | Betweenness measure |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bet. | ABC | Flow | Rand Walk |
| Forw. Prop. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\mathbf{x}$ |
| Locality | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Attention | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{x}$ |
| Non-shortest | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Complexity | $O(m n)$ | $O(m n)$ | $O\left(m^{2} n\right)$ | $O\left(m n^{2}\right)$ |

Our principles of information flow are very general.

- ABC-centrality satisfies the basic principles, yet captures the essence of betweenness.
- Validated on stylized and real networks.
- Software: http://www.cs.rpi.edu/Ifdlab


## Thank You

## Questions?

