Communication dynamics in finite capacity social networks
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In communication networks structure and dynamics are tightly coupled. The structure controls the flow of information and is itself shaped by the dynamical process of information exchanged between nodes. In order to reconcile structure and dynamics, a generic model, based on the local interaction between nodes, is considered for the communication in large social networks. In agreement with data from a large human organization, we show that the flow is non-Markovian and controlled by the temporal limitations of individuals. We confirm the versatility of our model by predicting simultaneously the degree-dependent node activity, the balance between information input and output of nodes and the degree distribution. Finally, we quantify the limitations to network analysis when it is based on data sampled over a finite period of time.

Limitations on the processing capacities of nodes and links have a profound impact on the flow of information in online communication networks [1, 2], the spreading of diseases in human encounter networks [3], and in social networks [4–7], where links between interacting individuals can be highly volatile [8]. It is often assumed that communication takes place in an unrestrained way on a set of established connections, thereby neglecting that structure and dynamics are interdependent. Here we consider the evolution of a network where links form as a result of non-Markovian interaction between nodes. In a time-limited environment, communication demands prioritization which is evident from the analysis of correspondence patterns [7, 9]. Hence, information flow on a network is a result of individuals’ choices which are influenced by the state of surrounding nodes. In natural [10] and online [11–15] social networks, the nodes’ activity is a non-trivial function of their degree. The activity level can be quantified by the number of social relationships simultaneously maintained by an individual. This number has been suggested to reflect basic cognitive capabilities of primates [10] and humans [11, 14, 15]. Here we model a network of individuals acting under time constraints and compare with a complete dataset of email communication in a large organization. The model is discussed in the context of other communication networks. We predict the information processing capacity of individuals as well as the structure of the network that they form.

We use representative communication data from a large social organization, the University of Oslo. The data comprise a complete time-ordered list of $2.3 \times 10^7$ emails between 5600 employees, 30 000 students and approximately $10^6$ people outside the organization over a period of three months (Sep-Nov 2010). The email content was not recorded and identities of individuals were encrypted. We limit the influence of unsolicited bulk emails by disregarding those simultaneously sent to more than five recipients. However, the results are not sensitive to the filtering of bulk emails [19]. Previous work on email data has considered static network structures [17, 22].
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**Figure 1.** Weighted random, unweighted random and directed information flow. The error bars are estimated by bootstrapping. Inset: Similar plot using model data. The quantitative discrepancy between model and data results from the relative dominance of degree-one nodes in the empirical data.

**Results**  – We show that the communication is non-Markovian by comparing random and directed information flow: (i) Random flow is given by random walks on the network. The walker follows an empirical time-independent jump-probability $p_{ij} = N_{ij} / \sum_k N_{ik}$ from node $i$ to node $j$. The sum is taken over all nodes and $N_{ij}$ is the number of emails sent from $i$ to $j$ during the timespan of the data. (ii) Directed flow is given by the chronological email exchange. Starting from a random node $i$, we wait for $i$ to send an email, say to $j$. We then jump to $j$ and wait for the next message $j$ sends either back to $i$ or to a new node $k$. Repeating this, we obtain a finite trajectory within the timespan of the data. The number of unique nodes visited by the directed and random flow as function of the number of jumps are compared by averaging over trajectories originating from all nodes (Fig. 1). On average, directed flow visits relatively
fewer nodes than random flow, indicating a significant correlation between sent and received messages.

\[ \Delta t \text{ is the sum } \delta = \delta_0 + \delta_1 + \delta_2. \]

Analogously, messages received by a node in the same timestep are termed \( \alpha \equiv \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \). Nodes have an average lifetime \( \tau \) and are therefore removed from the network with a probability \( \Delta t/\tau \). For every node removed, a new node with a single random connection to an existing node is introduced. \( \tau \) is estimated to be 5.8 years from the known mean email user turnover time in the organization. The parameters \( r_{ini}, r_{req} \) and \( N_{max} \) are determined below.

According to (c), a link is established between \( i \) and \( j \) if one of the nodes sends a message to the other and receives a reply. The probability, \( P_{ij} \), that a message is sent from \( i \) to \( j \) in \( \Delta t \) is proportional to \( k_j \),

\[ P_{ij} = \frac{r_{req} k_j}{N(k)} \approx \frac{r_{req} k_j}{N(k)} , \tag{1} \]

where we in the approximation assume that \( k_i \ll \sum_k k_i \).

According to (a), the mean number of requests that \( j \) receives during a timestep is proportional to \( r_{req} \) and \( k_j \).

The probability for \( j \) to reply to a request from nodes of degree \( k \) is proportional to \( \beta \langle n(k) \rangle \), where \( \beta \) is a constant and \( n(k) \) is the number of nodes with degree \( k \). The number of replies written by \( j \) is the product of \( P_{ij} \) and the integral over nodes

\[ \frac{r_{req} k_j}{N(k)} \int \beta k n(k) \, dk = \beta r_{req} k_j . \tag{2} \]

Since nodes reply to requests and therefore establish new links with a probability proportional to the sender degree, \( kn(k) \), the mean degree \( k_e \) of a node’s contacts is \( k_e \equiv \int k^2 n(k) \, dk / \int k n(k) \, dk = \langle k^2 \rangle / \langle k \rangle \), a number generally larger than the mean degree \( \langle k \rangle \). An example is Twitter data where the degree distribution follows from the consideration that during \( \Delta t \), a fraction of nodes \( n(k) \) of degree \( k \) changes their degree, \( r_0 [(k-1)n(k) - kn(k)] \), and a fraction \( 1/\tau \) is removed. A continuum-limit approximation yields

\[ \frac{\partial n(k)}{\partial t} = - r_0 \left[ k \frac{\partial n(k)}{\partial k} + n(k) - \frac{n(k)}{\tau} \right] . \tag{3} \]

The steady-state solution has the form \( n(k) = n(1) \cdot k^{-\gamma} \), where \( \gamma \equiv (1 - 1/2 \beta r_{req} \tau)^{-1} \). The constant \( n(1) \) is fixed by integrating Eq. (3) over \( k \) and by demanding that the total number of nodes \( N = \int \, dk \, n(k) \) be constant. This yields \( n(1) = N(\gamma - 1) \). The condition \( 0 < n(1) < N \).
from existing contacts (distributed as $\rho_1$), and back-and-forth messages (distributed as $\rho_2$). Each iteration of back-and-forth communication acts as a shift in the distribution of recipients relative to the distribution of senders $F \rho_1 \equiv \beta \rho_2$. The distribution $\rho_2$ accounts for all high-order shifts. To close the equations for $\alpha_2$ and $\delta_2$, we use that the reply probability for each iteration is reduced by a factor $\beta$ to approximate $\rho_2 \approx \rho_2$. Inserting Eq. (4), $\alpha_0$ and $\alpha_1$ in Eq. (5) yields $\delta_2 = \beta (\alpha_0(k) + \alpha_1 k + k_{k_c}(\delta_0 + \delta_1)) / f(k_i)$ where we introduce $f(k_i) \equiv 1 - \beta^2 k_i k_c \leq 1$. Summing over $\delta_0$, $\delta_1$ and $\delta_2$ we get

$$\delta = r_{req} + r_{ini} k_i + \frac{\beta k_i}{f(k_i)} (r_{req} + r_{ini} k_c + \beta k_c (r_{req} + r_{ini} k_i)) \quad \quad (6)$$

Here the first three terms (referred to as $\delta_c$) are messages sent to recipients selected according to $\rho_1$ and with mean degree $k_c$. The other terms, $\delta_s$, are messages to recipients distributed according to the higher order distribution $\rho_2$ which has a mean $k^*_c \equiv (k^2) / (k^2) > k_c$ and contribute significantly only for large $k_i$. The mean of the weighted recipient degree (weighted by number of messages received) is $\langle k^*_c \rangle = k_c \rho_c / \delta + k^*_c \rho_s / \delta_i$ which departs from $k_c$ when $\delta_s$ becomes appreciable (Fig. 3). For low $k_i$ ($k_i = 1$), the ratio of sent to received messages becomes $\delta / \alpha \simeq (r_{req} + r_{ini}) / (r_{req} / k + r_{ini}) > 1$. Conversely, $\delta / \alpha = 1$ when $k_i = \langle k \rangle$, hence an average node has a “balanced” email account. When $k_i$ becomes larger than $\langle k \rangle$, $i$ will increasingly receive requests and responses to its messages (Fig. 2).

The Dunbar number $k_D$ is the degree where $\delta$ reaches the capacity limit ($\delta = N_{max}$) and $\delta / k$ is maximal. The scale break in the degree distribution ($k_{sb} \approx 250$), Fig. 2 (inset), and $k_D \approx 230$, Fig. 4 nearly coincide. In fact $k_{sb}$ is related to $k_D$ because nodes beyond $k_D$ have a reduced probability to form new links. To determine $k_{sb}$, consider the evolution of the nodes’ degree in the limit where all capacity is used for replying, hence $\delta_1 = 0$. Using that $\delta_0 \ll \delta_2$, we get $\delta \approx \delta_2 = N_{max} \delta_i$ in turn yields $k_{sb} = \beta^{-1} N_{max} f(k_{sb}) (r_{req} + r_{ini} k_c)^{-1}$. $k_{sb}$ is found by solving this implicit equation. $k_D$, then follows from Eq. (6).

The parameters $r_{ini} = 0.023$, $r_{req} = 0.13$ and $N_{max} = 12$ are determined by the data in Fig. 2. From $r_{req}$ and $\gamma$ we obtain $\beta \approx 0.004$. Larger $N_{max}$ increases the limit of $\delta$. $r_{req}$ is constrained by the offset at low $\alpha$ and $r_{ini}$ effects the skewness of the curve which follows from analysis of Eqs. (4) and (6). Fig. 4 shows the model prediction of $\delta / k_i$ and the corresponding email data. We complement our analysis with numerical computations. Using a large number of nodes, $N = 10,000$, we iterate actions (a)-(c) until steady-state is reached. While the mean-field prediction (Figs. 3 and 4) is close to the numerical solution, some differences exist, e.g., at small $k$, $\rho(k)$ is not a strict power-law in the numerical solution due to the discrete-
number of emails per out-link per day, \( \delta k \) is the sender degree \( k \approx (\text{and-forth communication between well-connected nodes}) \)

This is due to slight overestimation of the repeated back-and-forth communication between well-connected nodes (Fig. 4) which is narrower than in the empirical data.

Concluding remarks – The finite capacity of agents in social networks induces an upper limit on the number of possible interactions [11, 13, 15]. We propose a comprehensive model that reconciles structure and dynamics of networks with finite capacity agents that dynamically form or lose links. In agreement with a complete set of email data and results from other social networks [13, 23], our model predicts a scale-free degree distribution up to a distinct scale-break induced by the capacity limit. Further, as agents gain importance in the network, the per-link-activity first increases with node-degree, peaks at intermediate degrees and declines at large degrees. The model and data therefore support the hypothesis of a general limit on the number (150-250) of active social relations that an individual can maintain [10] and is in agreement with empirical observations on social networks [11, 24].
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FIG. 4. Average number of emails sent per link per day. Gray circles represent the average activity of all users of a certain out-degree and the red (blue) lines represent coarse grained mean (median) values in the real communication network; boxes mark upper and lower quartiles. Best fit with the model (simulation) is shown by the green lines (diamonds). At small \( k < k_D \), messages per day, hence \( \delta/k \) parameters at \( k > k_D \), nodes limited to \( N_{max} \) messages per day, hence \( \delta/k \approx N_{max}/k \).

Discussion – The data were recorded over three months and the communication network is therefore a finite-time projection of the real network. The projection reduces the number of links. More active links will more likely persist through the projection than less active links. Fig. 3 shows the mean recipient degree \( k_{rec} \) as function of the sender degree \( k_i \) for three observation time intervals. Consider again Eq. (6) and remember that recipients of the \( \delta_z \) messages are distributed as \( \rho_1 \) (\( \rho_2 \)). When observing only a single day, the probability for an out-link between \( i \) to \( j \) not to be active is \( P_{ij}(\Delta t) = 1 - \delta_z k_j/k_i - \delta_j k_i/k_i \). For \( \rho \) days we obtain \( P_{ij}(\Delta t) = P_{ij}(\Delta t)^d \). To produce the projected curves in Fig. 3 \( P_{ij}(\Delta t) \) is applied to both axes, \( k \) and \( k_{rec}(k) \). Averaging w.r.t. all recipients \( j \) (distributed as \( \rho_1 \)), the projected sender out-degree becomes \( k_i^{(d)} = k_i(1 - P_{ij})^{\rho_1} \). Similarly one can consider the projection of the mean recipient degree leading to a similar reduction in the degree for finite-time data. For example, consider the data for the quarter period \( (d \approx 23) \) in Fig. 3. We have \( P_{ij}(\Delta t)^d \approx (1 - r_{ini})^d \) and therefore \( k_i^{(d)}/k_i < 1/2 \) hence less than half the links persist.
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