

On the Importance of Hubs in Hopfield Complex Neuronal Networks under Attack

E. P. Rodrigues, M. S. Barbosa,* and L. da F. Costa
Institute of Physics of São Carlos - University of São Paulo,
São Carlos, SP, PO Box 369, 13560-970, Brazil.
 (Dated: February 2, 2008)

The organizational principles behind the connectivity of a complex network are known to influence its behavior. In this work we investigate, using the Hopfield model, the influence of the network architecture on the performance for associative recall while the network is under hub and edge attack. We show, by using four different attack strategies, that although the importance of hubs is more definite for Barabási-Albert neuronal networks, the random removal of the same amount of edges as in a hub may imply a greater reduction of memory recall.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

A great deal of the current interest on networks, neuronal or complex, stems from the fact that the functionality of network systems is highly influenced, and even determined, by their respective connectivity (e.g. [8]). While most neuronal network models were initially fully connected, increasing interest has been focused more recently on systems with diluted (e.g. [13, 14, 22, 23]) and/or structured (e.g. [4, 7, 12, 17, 20, 25, 27, 28]) connectivity. A series of interesting points and questions are implied by such investigations, especially regarding structured networks of connections, i.e. models departing from uniformly random connections. For instance, given that metabolic and spatial biological pressures constraining the number of dendrites and axons in a neuronal cell, it is virtually impossible to have fully-connected biological networks (e.g. [19]). What are the functional implications of such unavoidable partial connections? Which partially connected structure (e.g. random, small world, scale free) allows the best functionalities? Are hubs particularly important for scale-free neuronal networks? In which sense they affect the recall of patterns in associative networks such as the Hopfield model?

Because they concentrate connections, hubs have been found to play a fundamental role in defining the connectivity of scale free complex networks (e.g. [1, 11, 24]). For instance, as they connected to many nodes, hubs provide bypasses between a large number of pair of nodes, contributing to the overall reduction of the mean shortest path in the network. It is intuitive to expect that hubs would also be particularly important for the dynamics of systems with scale-free connectivity, such as the Hopfield complex neuronal networks considered in [12, 25]. Such a question provided the main motivation for the present article. In order to try to answer it, we performed node and edge attack on random and Hopfield complex networks and monitor the effect over the recall performance. Among the reported experiments, we successively remove

hubs from scale free Hopfield models, and then remove the same number of edges by node and edge attack on random models. Although hubs are confirmed to have special importance for the memory capacity of the network, it was remarkably found that their removal is not so impacting as the random elimination of the same number of edges from complex or random networks. One explanation for such a phenomenon is the fact that a hub is most directly and strongly associated to a single bit of the patterns to be trained and recovered.

The article starts by reviewing the Hopfield model and complex networks, and follows by describing the simulation framework and the obtained results. It concludes by interpreting and discussing the results and their implications for further researches.

II. METHODOLOGY

The Hopfield model [16] is a model of autoassociative memory which has been studied and generalized thoroughly since its first appearance. Today, the value of the original model is mostly epistemologic, as practical implementations are constrained by several issues such as limited efficiency for storing several patterns. Nevertheless, being a simple and intuitive model, it provides an effective framework for performance studies under varying conditions while allowing the quantification of the impact of the choice of specific influencing elements.

In this paper we follow closely the implementation described by [15]. A set of M binary string patterns are represented by vectors as $P_i = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n]^T$, whose N elements are in either of the possible states $p_j = \pm 1$, randomly chosen. This information is stored in a weight matrix W , according to the follow expression

$$W = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^M P_i P_i^T - MI, \quad (1)$$

In order to retrieve a pattern stored initially, say $Q_n = [q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n]^T$, it is necessary to iterate the following expression

$$Q_{n+1} = \text{sgn} [W Q_n], \quad (2)$$

*marconi@ifsc.usp.br

random removal of the same quantity of edges as in a large hub from the same network has a stronger effect on the recall performance than removing that hub. This property is supported by the fact that the curves, in Figure 7, for hub (node) attack are higher than the respective edge attack curves. This is a direct consequence of the fact that the removal of the hub implies more localized connectivity deterioration, affecting predominantly the single bit of the recovered pattern which is directly related to the hub.

All in all, it has become clear that hub and edge attack, even when involving the same number of links, have quite distinct effects on the memory recall of Hopfield networks

running on random and Barabási-Albert networks.

Future works related to the currently reported investigation should consider the effect of edge and hub attack on other network topologies such as small-world [1] and Sznajd [9]. It would also be interesting to extend such experimental analyses to artificial neuronal network models such as the perceptron [15] and self-organizing maps [21].

Acknowledgments

The authors are financially supported by grants FAPESP(02/02504-01 and 99/12765-2) and CNPQ(308231/03-1).

-
- [1] Réka Albert and Albert-László Barabási. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Reviews of modern physics*, 74(1):47–97, 2002.
 - [2] L. A. N. Amaral, A. Scala, M. Barthélémy, and H. E. Stanley. Classes of small-world networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 97:11149, 2000.
 - [3] A. L. Barabási, E. Ravasz, and T. Vicsek. Deterministic scale-free networks. *Physica A*, 299:559–564, 2001.
 - [4] Ginestra Bianconi. Size of quantum networks. *Physical Review E*, 67(056119), 2003.
 - [5] B. Bollobás. *Modern Graph Theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
 - [6] F. Buckley and F. Harary. *Distance in Graphs*. Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1990.
 - [7] I. Perez Castillo, B. Wemmenhove, J. O. L. Hatchett, et al. Analytic solution of attractor neural networks on scale-free graphs. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 37:8789–8799, 2004.
 - [8] L. da F. Costa. Morphological complex networks: can individual morphology determine the general connectivity and dynamics of networks? *q-bio:MN/0503041*, 2005.
 - [9] L. da F. Costa. Sznajd complex networks. *Cond-mat*, cond-mat/0501010, 2005.
 - [10] L. da F. Costa, M. S. Barbosa, V. Coupez, and D. Stauffer. Morphological hopfield networks. *Brain and Mind*, 4:91, 2003.
 - [11] L. da F. Costa, F. A. Rodrigues, G. Travieso, and P. R. Villas Boas. Characterization of complex networks: A survey of measurements. *cond-mat:mat/0505185*, 2005.
 - [12] L. da F. Costa and D. Stauffer. Associative recall in non-randomly diluted neuronal networks. *Physica A*, 330:37–45, 2003.
 - [13] B. M. Forrest. Vectorized multi-site coding for nearest-neighbour neural networks. *J. Phys. France*, 50:2003–2017, 1989.
 - [14] Burcu Akan Yigit Gündüç. Storage capacity of extremely diluted hopfield model. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C*, 15(3):393–401, 2004.
 - [15] S. Haykin. *Neural Networks: A Comprehensive Foundation*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, 1999.
 - [16] J. J. Hopfield. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 79:2554–2558, 1982.
 - [17] Jun ichi Inoue and Bikas K. Chakrabarti. Competition between ferro-retrieval and anti-ferro orders in a hopfield-like network model for plant intelligence. *Physica A*, 346:58–67, 2005.
 - [18] IEEE. *High capacity associative memories and small world networks*, 2004.
 - [19] J. Karbowski. Optimal wiring principle and plateaus in the degree of separation for cortical neurons. *Physical Review Letters*, 86:3674–3677, 2001.
 - [20] Beom Jun Kim. Performance of networks of artificial neurons: The role of clustering. *Physical Review E*, 69(045101), 2004.
 - [21] T. Kohonen. *Self-Organizing Maps*, volume 30 of *Springer Series in Information Sciences*. Springer, Berlin, 2001.
 - [22] K. E. Kürten. Quasi-optimized memorization and retrieval dynamics in sparsely connected neural networks models. *J. Phys. France*, 51:1585–1594, 1990.
 - [23] Vladimir Miljković et al. Pattern recognition in damaged neural networks. *Physica A*, 295:526–536, 2001.
 - [24] M. E. J. Newman. Structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Review*, 45(2):167–256, 2003.
 - [25] D. Stauffer, A. Aharony, L. da F. Costa, and J. Adler. Efficient hopfield pattern recognition on a scale-free neural network. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 32:395–399, 2003.
 - [26] K. Sznajd-Weron and J. Sznajd. Opinion evolution in closed community. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. C*, 11:1157, 2000.
 - [27] J. J. Torres, J. Marro, P. L. Garrido, J. M. Cortes, F. Ramos, and M. A. Muñoz. Effects of static and dynamic disorder on the performance of neural automata. *Biophysical chemistry*, 115:285–288, 2005.
 - [28] J. J. Torres, M. A. Muñoz, J. Marro, and P. L. Garrido. Influence of topology on the performance of a neural network. *Neurocomputing*, 58-60:229–234, 2004.