

**The Rationality of Four Metrics of Network Robustness
A Viewpoint of Robust Growth of Generalized Meshes**

Yang, Xiaofan; Zhu, Yuanrui; Hong, Jing; Yang, Lu-Xing; Wu, Yingbo; Tang, Yuan Yan

DOI

[10.1371/journal.pone.0161077](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0161077)

Publication date

2016

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

PLoS ONE

Citation (APA)

Yang, X., Zhu, Y., Hong, J., Yang, L.-X., Wu, Y., & Tang, Y. Y. (2016). The Rationality of Four Metrics of Network Robustness: A Viewpoint of Robust Growth of Generalized Meshes. *PLoS ONE*, 11(8), 1-13. Article e0161077. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0161077>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Rationality of Four Metrics of Network Robustness: A Viewpoint of Robust Growth of Generalized Meshes

Xiaofan Yang¹, Yuanrui Zhu¹, Jing Hong², Lu-Xing Yang^{1,3*}, Yingbo Wu¹, Yuan Yan Tang⁴

1 School of Software Engineering, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 400044, P.R. China, **2** Department of Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30309, United States of America, **3** Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, Delft University of Technology, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands, **4** Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Macau, Avenida da Universidade, Taipa, Macau, P.R. China

* ylx910920@gmail.com



CrossMark
click for updates

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Yang X, Zhu Y, Hong J, Yang L-X, Wu Y, Tang YY (2016) The Rationality of Four Metrics of Network Robustness: A Viewpoint of Robust Growth of Generalized Meshes. PLoS ONE 11(8): e0161077. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077

Editor: Irene Sendiña-Nadal, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, SPAIN

Received: May 11, 2016

Accepted: July 29, 2016

Published: August 12, 2016

Copyright: © 2016 Yang et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper.

Funding: This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 61572006 [XY], 71301177 [YW]), National Sci-Tech Support Plan (Grant No. 2015BAF05B03 [YW]), and Natural Science Foundation of Chongqing (Grant No. cstc2013jcyjA40011 [YW]). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abstract

There are quite a number of different metrics of network robustness. This paper addresses the rationality of four metrics of network robustness (the algebraic connectivity, the effective resistance, the average edge betweenness, and the efficiency) by investigating the robust growth of generalized meshes (GMs). First, a heuristic growth algorithm (the Proximity-Growth algorithm) is proposed. The resulting proximity-optimal GMs are intuitively robust and hence are adopted as the benchmark. Then, a generalized mesh (GM) is grown up by stepwise optimizing a given measure of network robustness. The following findings are presented: (1) The algebraic connectivity-optimal GMs deviate quickly from the proximity-optimal GMs, yielding a number of less robust GMs. This hints that the rationality of the algebraic connectivity as a measure of network robustness is still in doubt. (2) The effective resistance-optimal GMs and the average edge betweenness-optimal GMs are in line with the proximity-optimal GMs. This partly justifies the two quantities as metrics of network robustness. (3) The efficiency-optimal GMs deviate gradually from the proximity-optimal GMs, yielding some less robust GMs. This suggests the limited utility of the efficiency as a measure of network robustness.

1 Introduction

Nowadays, we live in a highly networked world, where numerous critical facilities are connected together by various networks. For the critical facilities to work properly, the underlying networks must be robust, that is, the performance of the surviving network degrades gradually with the increase of failing nodes/edges in such a network. To measure the robustness of a network, a number of metrics, such as the connectivity [1], the algebraic connectivity [2–7], the effective resistance [8–10], the average edge betweenness [9, 10], and the efficiency [10], have been proposed. However, the rationality of these metrics of network robustness is still in question.

In the process of infrastructural construction, it is often required that the robustness of an existing network be enhanced by adding an additional set of edges. Mosk-Aoyama [11] proved that the problem of maximizing the algebraic connectivity of an edge-growing network is NP-hard. Ghosh and Boyd [12] proposed a heuristic algorithm for solving the problem. Wang and Van Mieghem [13] designed and compared two heuristic algorithms for stepwise maximizing the algebraic connectivity of an edge-growing network. Abbas and Egerstedt [14] solved the problem of stepwise minimizing the effective resistance of an edge-growing network starting from an empty network. Wang et al. [15] proposed and compared four heuristic algorithms for stepwise minimizing the effective resistance of an edge-growing network starting from any given network. In the construction of infrastructures, it is also required that new nodes be linked to an existing network so as to form a most robust network. To our knowledge, however, problems of this sort have not yet been addressed.

A generalized mesh (GM) is a network that has a finite subset of integral points in the plane as the node set, where two nodes are adjacent if and only if they are one unit of Euclidean distance apart. GMs have widespread applications in areas such as parallel computing [16, 17], fault-tolerant communication [18–20], optical communication [21], city planning [22], percolation theory [23], and network epidemics [24–29].

This paper addresses the rationality of the four metrics of network robustness (the algebraic connectivity, the effective resistance, the average edge betweenness, and the efficiency) by investigating the robust growth of generalized meshes (GMs). First, a heuristic growth algorithm (the Proximity-Growth algorithm) is proposed. The resulting proximity-optimal GMs are intuitively robust and hence are adopted as the benchmark. Then, a generalized mesh (GM) is grown up by stepwise optimizing a given measure of network robustness. The following findings are presented: (1) The algebraic connectivity-optimal GMs deviate quickly from the proximity-optimal GMs, yielding a number of less robust GMs. This hints that the rationality of the algebraic connectivity as a measure of network robustness is still in doubt. (2) The effective resistance-optimal GMs and the average edge betweenness-optimal GMs are in line with the proximity-optimal GMs. This partly justifies the two quantities as metrics of network robustness. (3) The efficiency-optimal GMs deviate gradually from the proximity-optimal GMs, yielding some less robust GMs. This suggests the limited utility of the efficiency as a measure of network robustness.

The subsequent materials are organized in this fashion. Section 2 provides the preliminary knowledge. Section 3 describes a heuristic growth algorithm of networks. Sections 4–7 address the rationality of four different metrics of network robustness by examining the robustness of the corresponding node-growing networks, respectively. Finally, Section 8 summarizes this work.

2 Preliminary knowledge

2.1 Graph theory

For fundamental knowledge on graph theory, see Ref. [1]. Given a node u of graph G , let $d_G(u)$ denote the degree of u in G , and let $d_G^{(k)}(u)$ denote the number of nodes of G that are each distance k apart from u in G . Clearly, $d_G^{(1)}(u) = d_G(u)$.

Definition 1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, $S \subseteq V$.

1. S is referred to as a separating set of G if $V - S$ is disconnected.
2. The connectivity of G , denoted $\kappa(G)$, is defined as follows.
 $\kappa(G) = \min\{|S|: S \text{ is a separating set of } G\}$ if G is not complete;
 $\kappa(G) = |V| - 1$ if G is complete.




Fig 1. Two small-sized unlabeled meshes.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g001

The connectivity is an early proposed measure of network robustness: a network with larger connectivity is intuitively more robust than a network with smaller connectivity. As one network may be intuitively more robust than another network with equal connectivity, it is necessary to introduce additional metrics of network robustness so as to fully capture the robustness of a network.

2.2 Mesh, infinite mesh and generalized mesh

Let $\mathbb{Z}_n = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, $\mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$. An $m \times n$ mesh, denoted $\mathbf{M}_{m \times n}$ is a graph with $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ as the node set, where two nodes, (i_1, j_1) and (i_2, j_2) , are adjacent if and only if either (a) $i_1 = i_2$ and $j_1 = j_2 \pm 1$, or (b) $j_1 = j_2$ and $i_1 = i_2 \pm 1$. $\mathbf{M}_{n \times n}$ is abbreviated as \mathbf{M}_n . Fig 1 depicts two small-sized unlabeled meshes.

An *infinite mesh*, denoted \mathbf{M}_∞ , is an infinite graph with $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ as the node set, where two nodes, (i_1, j_1) and (i_2, j_2) , are adjacent if and only if either (a) $i_1 = i_2$ and $j_1 = j_2 \pm 1$, or (b) $j_1 = j_2$ and $i_1 = i_2 \pm 1$. Fig 2 depicts an infinite mesh.




Fig 2. An infinite mesh.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g002




Fig 3. Two generalized meshes.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g003

A *generalized mesh* (GM, for short) is a graph with a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^2 as the node set, where two nodes, (i_1, j_1) and (i_2, j_2) , are adjacent if and only if either (a) $i_1 = i_2$ and $j_1 = j_2 \pm 1$, or (b) $j_1 = j_2$ and $i_1 = i_2 \pm 1$. Clearly, meshes are special GMs. Fig 3 depicts two GMs.

2.3 The robust growth of GMs

An initially small GM can grow up by stepwise adding new nodes. In real-world applications, it is often desired that the addition of a new node to a GM leads to a new GM with the best robustness. However, what the best robustness means is not clear, because there are quite a number of different metrics of network robustness. Indeed, given any metric of network robustness, λ , a GM can be grown up by adding a new node so that the resulting GM achieves the optimal λ value. Now, let us introduce some relevant notations and terminologies as follows.

Definition 2. Given a metric of network robustness, λ . Consider a growth process of M_2 by stepwise adding new nodes so that each resulting GM achieves the optimal λ value.

1. The process is referred to as a λ -optimal growth.
2. A sequence of GMs produced in this growth process is referred to as a λ -optimal sequence.
3. Each GM in a λ -optimal sequence is referred to as a λ -optimal GM. Let $\mathbf{GM}_\lambda(N)$ denote a λ -optimal GM with N nodes.

Sections 4–7 of this paper will examine the λ -optimal sequence, where λ is algebraic connectivity, effective resistance, average edge betweenness, and efficiency, respectively.

3 Heuristic growth of GMs

Given a generalized mesh G , define a sequence of subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^2 - V(G)$, D_1, D_2, \dots , recursively as follows.

1. $D_1 = \{u \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - V(G) : d_{G+u}(u) \text{ attains the maximum; } v \not\cong w \text{ for any } v, w \in D_1, v \neq w\}$.
2. For $k \geq 2$, $D_k = \{u \in D_{k-1} : d_{G+u}^{(k)}(u) \text{ attains the maximum; } v \not\cong w \text{ for any } v, w \in D_k, v \neq w\}$.

Clearly, $D_1 \supseteq D_2 \supseteq \dots$, and $D_{|V(G)|} = \emptyset$.

Below let us describe a heuristic algorithm for the robust growth of GMs.

Algorithm: Proximity-Growth

Input: a generalized mesh G .

Output: a generalized mesh $G + u$, $u \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - V(G)$.

begin

$k := 1$;

while $D_k \neq \emptyset$,

if $|D_k| = 1$, let $D_k = \{u\}$, return (u);

```

else k++;
endwhile;
arbitrarily choose  $u \in D_{k-1}$ , return ( $u$ );
end

```

Intuitively, this algorithm grows a GM in a most robust way, because the newly added node is best connected to the GM. Clearly, the Proximity-Growth algorithm applies not only to GMs but to any other class of networks.

For our purpose, let us introduce the following notations and terminologies.

Definition 3. Consider a growth process of M_2 by repeatedly running the Proximity-Growth algorithm.

1. This process is referred to as a proximity growth.
2. A sequence of GMs produced in a proximity growth is referred to as a PR-sequence.
3. Each GM in a PR-sequence is referred to as a PR-GM. Let $GM_{PR}(N)$ denote a PR-GM with N nodes.

Theoretical analysis reveals that, up to isomorphism, the proximity growth of GMs is as follows.

1. If the current GM is M_n and n is even, then grow M_n to M_{n+1} in the following node-adding order:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(n, \frac{n-2}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(n, \frac{n}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(n, \frac{n-4}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(n, \frac{n+2}{2}\right) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (n, 0) \rightarrow (n, n-1) \\
 & \left(\frac{n}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n-2}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n+2}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n-4}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n+4}{2}, n\right). \\
 & \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (0, n) \rightarrow (n, n).
 \end{aligned}$$

2. If the current GM is M_n and n is odd, then grow M_n to M_{n+1} in the following node-adding order:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(n, \frac{n-1}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(n, \frac{n-3}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(n, \frac{n+1}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(n, \frac{n-5}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(n, \frac{n+3}{2}\right) \\
 & \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (n, 0) \rightarrow (n, n-1). \\
 & \left(\frac{n-1}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n+1}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n-3}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{n+3}{2}, n\right) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (0, n) \rightarrow (n, n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Fig 4 shows a proximity growth of $GM_{PR}(144)$, where the numbers in the circles stand for the node-adding order. Fig 5 displays a proximity growth of M_3 to M_4 . Intuitively, the PR-GMs are most robust. In the sequel, we shall compare the GMs grown up by optimizing some other measures of network robustness with the PR-GMs.

4 Algebraic connectivity-optimal growth of GMs

The algebraic connectivity (AC, for short) of a network G , denoted $\alpha(G)$, is defined as the second smallest Laplacian eigenvalues of G . The algebraic connectivity is widely recognized as a rational measure of network robustness [2-7, 11-13].

Let $GM_{AC}(N)$ denote an algebraic connectivity-optimal GM with N nodes. Numerical calculations give a AC-optimal growth of $GM_{AC}(64)$, see Fig 6. The following facts can be concluded from this figure.




Fig 4. A proximity growth of $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(144)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g004

1. For $4 \leq N \leq 10$, $\mathbf{GM}_{AC}(N)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(N)$.
2. $\mathbf{GM}_{AC}(11)$ is not isomorphic to $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(11)$, see Figs 7 and 8. $\mathbf{GM}_{AC}(11)$ is less robust than $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(11)$, because

$$\kappa(\mathbf{GM}_{AC}(11)) = 1 < 2 = \kappa(\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(11)).$$

3. $\mathbf{GM}_{AC}(18)$ is not isomorphic to $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(18)$, see Figs 9 and 10. $\mathbf{GM}_{AC}(18)$ is less robust than $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(18)$, because

$$\kappa(\mathbf{GM}_{AC}(18)) = 1 < 2 = \kappa(\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(18)).$$

4. Similar phenomena occur frequently in a AC-optimal growth of GMs.

The above discussions demonstrate that, at least in some situations, the algebraic connectivity is not suited to serve as a metric of network robustness. Hence, the utility of the algebraic connectivity as a metric of network tolerance is still in doubt.




Fig 5. A proximity growth of M_3 to M_4 .

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g005




Fig 6. A stepwise AC-optimal growth of $GM_{AC}(64)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g006




Fig 7. A AC-optimal growth of $GM_{AC}(10)$ to $GM_{AC}(11)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g007




Fig 8. A proximity growth of $GM_{PR}(10)$ to $GM_{PR}(11)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g008




Fig 9. A AC-optimal growth of $GM_{AC}(17)$ to $GM_{AC}(18)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g009




Fig 10. A proximity growth of $GM_{PR}(17)$ to $GM_{PR}(18)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g010

5 Effective resistance-optimal growth of GMs

The effective resistance (ER, for short) of a network, denoted $ER(G)$, is defined as follows. First, regard the network as an electrical network with one Ohm resistor on each link. Second, calculate the effective resistance between each pair of nodes by invoking the Kirchhoff's circuit law. Third, sum up the effective resistances over all pairs of nodes to get the ER of the original network.

The effective resistance of a network has been advised as a measure of robustness of the network; the smaller the ER, the more robust the network [8]. The effective resistance outperforms the algebraic connectivity, because the former decreases strictly when a new edge is added to a network, whereas the latter may or may not rise up [30].

Let $0 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ denote the Laplacian spectrum of a connected network G . Klein and Randić [30] found that the effective graph resistance of a connected network can be written as a function of all non-zero Laplacian eigenvalues of the network. Specifically,

$$ER(G) = n \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{1}{\lambda_k}$$

This equation offers a method for numerically calculating the ER of a network.

Let $\mathbf{GM}_{ER}(N)$ denote an effective resistance-optimal GM with N nodes. calculations show that for $4 \leq N \leq 144$, $\mathbf{GM}_{ER}(N)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(N)$. Hence, it is concluded that the ER is a reasonable measure of network robustness.

6 Average edge betweenness-optimal growth of GMs

The *betweenness centrality* of an edge of a network is defined as the number of the node-pair shortest paths that go through the edge [31]. The notion of edge betweenness centrality was originally proposed by Girvan and Newman [32] to find the bottlenecks of a network; an edge with a high edge betweenness centrality score represents a bridge-like connector between two parts of a network, and the removal of which may affect the communication between many pairs of nodes [33, 34].

The *average edge betweenness* (AEB, for short) of a network G , denoted $AEB(G)$ is defined as the arithmetic average of the betweenness centralities of all edges of G [8–10]. Ellens [9] suggest the AEB as a metric of network robustness, because, intuitively, the lower the AEB, the more robust the network.

Let $\bar{d}(G)$ denote the average distance of a network G , then

$$AEB(G) = \frac{v(G)[v(G) - 1]}{2\varepsilon(G)} \bar{d}(G),$$

where $v(G)$ and $\varepsilon(G)$ denote the number of nodes and edges of G , respectively [9]. This equation offers a method for numerically calculating the AEB of a network.

Let $\mathbf{GM}_{AEB}(N)$ denote an average edge betweenness-optimal GM with N nodes. calculations show that for $4 \leq N \leq 144$, $\mathbf{GM}_{AEB}(N)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{GM}_{PR}(N)$. This partly justifies the AEB as a metric of network robustness.

7 Efficiency-optimal growth

The *efficiency* of a network G is defined as

$$EFF(G) = \frac{2}{v(G)[v(G) - 1]} \sum_{\substack{u, v \in V(G) \\ u \neq v}} \frac{1}{d_G(u, v)},$$

where $d_G(u, v)$ denotes the distance between nodes u and v . The notion of efficiency was originally proposed by Latora and Marchiori [35, 36] to characterize the closeness of a network. Ellens and Kooij [10] proposed to use the efficiency as a metric of network robustness, because,




Fig 11. An efficiency-optimal growth of $GM_{EFF}(64)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g011

intuitively, the higher the efficiency, the more robust the network. One advantage of this measure is that it can be used for unconnected networks.

Let $GM_{EFF}(N)$ denote an algebraic connectivity-optimal GM with N nodes. Numerical calculations give an efficiency-optimal growth of $GM_{EFF}(64)$, see Fig 11. The following facts can be derived from this figure.

1. Up to isomorphism, the efficiency-optimal growth of $GM_{EFF}(54)$ coincides with the proximity growth of $GM_{PR}(54)$.
2. $GM_{EFF}(55)$ is not isomorphic to $GM_{PR}(55)$, see Figs 12 and 13. $GM_{EFF}(55)$ is less robust than $GM_{PR}(55)$, because

$$\kappa(GM_{EFF}(55)) = 1 < 2 = \kappa(GM_{PR}(55)).$$

The above discussions show that the utility of the efficiency as a metric of network robustness is limited.

8 Conclusions

This paper has addressed the rationality of four metrics of network robustness (the algebraic connectivity, the effective resistance, the average edge betweenness, and the efficiency) by investigating the robust growth of generalized meshes (GMs). A heuristic algorithm for the




Fig 12. An efficiency-optimal growth of $GM_{EFF}(54)$ to $GM_{EFF}(55)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g012




Fig 13. A proximity growth of $GM_{PR}(54)$ to $GM_{PR}(55)$.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0161077.g013

robust growth of GMs has been proposed. Some GMs have been grown up by optimizing a measure of network robustness. A comparative analysis shows that (1) the effective graph resistance and the average edge betweenness can serve as metrics of network robustness, (2) the utility of the efficiency as a metric of network robustness is limited, and (3) the utility of the algebraic connectivity as a metric of network robustness is highly in doubt.

In our opinion, this work should be extended to other types of networks, such as the hexagonal networks [37–39] and the honeycomb networks [40–43].

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: XY LY.

Performed the experiments: YZ JH.

Analyzed the data: XY YZ LY.

Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: YW JH.

Wrote the paper: XY YZ LY YT.

References

1. Xu JM. A First Course in Graph Theory. Science Press; 2015.
2. Fiedler M. Algebraic connectivity of graphs. Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal 1973; 23: 298–305.
3. de Abreu NMM. Old and new results on algebraic connectivity of graphs. Linear Algebra and its Applications 2007; 423: 53–73. doi: [10.1016/j.laa.2006.08.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2006.08.017)
4. Liu W, Sirisena H, Pawlikowski K, McInnes A. Utility of algebraic connectivity metric in topology design of survivable networks. 7th International Workshop on the Design of Reliable Communication Networks 2009; pp. 131–138.
5. Lal AK, Patra KL, Sahoo BK. Algebraic connectivity of connected graphs with fixed number of pendant vertices. Graphs and Combinatorics 2011; 27: 215–229. doi: [10.1007/s00373-010-0975-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-010-0975-0)
6. Tian G, Huang T, Cui S. Bounds on the algebraic connectivity of graphs. Advances in Mathematics 2012; 41: 217–224.
7. Martín-Hernández J, Wang H, Mieghem PV, D'Agostino G. Algebraic connectivity of interdependent networks. Physica A 2014; 404: 92–105. doi: [10.1016/j.physa.2014.02.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2014.02.043)
8. Ellens W, Spieksma FM, Mieghem PV, Jamakovic A, Kooij RE. Effective graph resistance. Linear Algebra and its Applications 2011; 435: 2491–2506. doi: [10.1016/j.laa.2011.02.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2011.02.024)
9. Ellens W. Effective Resistance and Other Graph Measures for Network Robustness. Master thesis, Leiden University, 2011.
10. Ellens W, Kooij RE. Graph measures and network robustness. Arxiv 2013; 18: 359–378.
11. Mosk-Aoyama D. Maximum algebraic connectivity augmentation is NP-Hard. Operations Research Letters 2008; 36: 677–679. doi: [10.1016/j.orl.2008.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2008.09.001)
12. Ghosh A, Boyd S. Growing well-connected graphs. In Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Conference on Decision & Control, San Diego, CA, USA, 2006; pp. 6605–6611.
13. Wang H, Mieghem PV. Algebraic connectivity optimization via link addition. Bionetics, Hyogo, 2008; pp. 25–28.
14. Abbas W, Egerstedt M. Robust graph topologies for networked systems. in 3rd IFAC Workshop on Distributed Estimation and Control in Networked Systems, 2012; pp. 85–90.
15. Wang X, Pournaras E, Kooij RE, Mieghem PV. Improving robustness of complex networks via the effective graph resistance. The European Physical Journal B 2014; 87: 221. doi: [10.1140/epjb/e2014-50276-0](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2014-50276-0)
16. Dong Q, Yang X, Zhao J, Tang YY. Embedding a family of disjoint 3D meshes into a crossed cube. Information Sciences 2008; 178: 2396–2405. doi: [10.1016/j.ins.2007.12.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2007.12.010)
17. Dong Q, Yang X, Wang D. Embedding multi-dimensional meshes into twisted cubes. Computers & Electrical Engineering 2010; 36: 1021–1026. doi: [10.1016/j.compeleceng.2010.03.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compeleceng.2010.03.003)
18. Yang X, Luo J, Li S. Fault-tolerant Hamiltonicity in a class of faulty meshes. Applied Mathematics and Computation 2006; 182: 1696–1708. doi: [10.1016/j.amc.2006.06.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2006.06.009)
19. Yang X, Dong Q, Tang YY. Embedding faulty meshes/tori in faulty crossed cubes. Information Processing Letters 2010; 110: 559–564. doi: [10.1016/j.ipl.2010.04.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2010.04.007)
20. Xiang D, Zhang Y, Pan Y. Practical deadlock-free fault-tolerant routing in meshes based on the planar network fault model. IEEE Transactions on Computers 2009; 58: 620–633. doi: [10.1109/TC.2008.211](https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.2008.211)
21. Pradhan AK, Araiya S, De T. Design of light-tree based multicast traffic grooming in WDM mesh networks. Journal of Optics 2014; 43: 330–340. doi: [10.1007/s12596-014-0211-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12596-014-0211-z)
22. Domanski Z, Kesy J. Distribution of Manhattan distance in square and triangular lattices. Scientific Research of the Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science 2005; 4: 34–37.
23. Grimmett G. Percolation (2nd Edition). Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg; 1999.
24. Li C, van de Bovenkamp R, Mieghem PV. Susceptible-infected-susceptible model: A comparison of N-intertwined and heterogeneous mean-field approximations. Physical Review E 2012; 86: 026116. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevE.86.039901](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.86.039901)
25. van de Bovenkamp R, Mieghem PV. Time to metastable state in SIS epidemics on graphs. Tenth International Conference on Signal-Image Technology and Internet-Based Systems (SITIS), 2014; pp. 347–354.

26. Yang LX, Draief M, Yang X. The impact of the network topology on the viral prevalence: a node-based approach. *PLoS one* 2015; 10: e0134507. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0134507](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134507) PMID: [26222539](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26222539/)
27. Yang LX, Draief M, Yang X. The optimal dynamic immunization under a controlled heterogeneous node-based SIRS model. *Physica A* 2016; 450: 403–415. doi: [10.1016/j.physa.2016.01.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2016.01.026)
28. Yang X, Li P, Yang LX, Wu Y. Reducing the spectral radius of a torus network by link removal. *PLoS one* 2016; 11: e0155580. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0155580](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0155580) PMID: [27171372](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27171372/)
29. Yang LX, Draief M, Yang X. Heterogeneous virus propagation in networks: a theoretical study. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*.
30. Klein DJ, Randić M. Resistance distance. *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry* 1993; 12: 81–95. doi: [10.1007/BF01164627](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01164627)
31. Lu L, Zhang M. Edge betweenness centrality. *Encyclopedia of Systems Biology*; pp. 647–648.
32. Girvan M, Newman MEJ. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of USA*, 2002; 99: 7821–7826. doi: [10.1073/pnas.122653799](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.122653799)
33. Yoon J, Blumer A, Lee K. An algorithm for modularity analysis of directed and weighted biological networks based on edge-betweenness centrality. *Bioinformatics Applications Note* 2006; 22: 3106–3108. doi: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btl533](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btl533)
34. Cuzzocrea A, Papadimitriou A, Katsaros Dimitrios, Manolopoulos Y. Edge betweenness centrality: A novel algorithm for QoS-based topology control over wireless sensor networks. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 2012; 35: 1210–1217. doi: [10.1016/j.jnca.2011.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnca.2011.06.001)
35. Latora V, Marchiori M. Efficient behavior of small-world networks. *Physical Review Letters* 2001; 87: 198701. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.87.198701](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.87.198701) PMID: [11690461](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11690461/)
36. Latora V, Marchiori M. A measure of centrality based on network efficiency. *New Journal of Physics* 2007; 9: 188. doi: [10.1088/1367-2630/9/6/188](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/9/6/188)
37. Garcia Nocetti F, Stojmenovic I, Zhang J. Addressing and routing in hexagonal networks with applications for tracking mobile users and connection rerouting in cellular networks. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 2002; 13: 963–971. doi: [10.1109/TPDS.2002.1036069](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2002.1036069)
38. Decayeux C, Seme D. 3D hexagonal network: modeling, topological properties, addressing scheme, and optimal routing algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 2005; 16: 875–884. doi: [10.1109/TPDS.2005.100](https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2005.100)
39. Kresch E. Comparison of hexagonal and rectangular processor arrays. *2015 International Conference on High Performance Computing & Simulation (HPCS)*, 2015; pp. 371–376.
40. Stojmenovic I. Honeycomb networks: Topological properties and communication algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 1997; 8: 1036–1042. doi: [10.1109/71.629486](https://doi.org/10.1109/71.629486)
41. Yang X, Tang YY, Cao J, Lu Q. Embedding even-length cycles in a hexagonal honeycomb mesh. *International Journal of Computer Mathematics* 2008; 85: 201–209. doi: [10.1080/00207160701421144](https://doi.org/10.1080/00207160701421144)
42. Xu D, Fan J, Jia X, Zhang S, Wang X. Hamiltonian properties of honeycomb meshes. *Information Sciences* 2013; 240: 184–190. doi: [10.1016/j.ins.2013.03.044](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2013.03.044)
43. Holub P, Miller M, Pérez-Rosés H, Ryane J. Degree diameter problem on honeycomb networks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 2014; 179: 139–151. doi: [10.1016/j.dam.2014.07.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2014.07.012)