

# The web of federal crimes in Brazil: topology, weaknesses, and control

Bruno Requião da Cunha<sup>1,2,\*</sup> and Sebastián Gonçalves<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Polícia Federal, Brazil*

<sup>2</sup>*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil*

(Dated: September 28, 2018)

Law enforcement and intelligence agencies worldwide struggle to find effective ways to fight and control organized crime. However, illegal networks operate outside the law and much of the data collected is classified. Therefore, little is known about criminal networks structure, topological weaknesses, and control. In this contribution we present a unique criminal network of federal crimes in Brazil. We study its structure, its response to different attack strategies, and its controllability. Surprisingly, the network composed of multiple crimes of federal jurisdiction has a giant component, enclosing more than a half of all its edges. This component shows some typical social network characteristics, such as small-worldness and high clustering coefficient; however it is much “darker” than common social networks, having low levels of edge density and network efficiency. On the other side, it has a very high modularity value,  $Q = 0.96$ . Comparing multiple attack strategies, we show that it is possible to disrupt the giant component of the network by removing only 2% of its edges or nodes, according to a module-based prescription, precisely due to its high modularity. Finally, we show that the component is controllable, in the sense of the exact network control theory, by getting access to 20% of the driver nodes.

PACS numbers: 64.60.aq, 89.75.Fb

## INTRODUCTION

Despite recent efforts of Brazilian law enforcement agencies in combating organized crime, the horizon looks no promising: homicide rates have spiked in 2014 reaching 29.1 deaths per hundred thousand people [1], the country has become the second greatest consumer of cocaine in the world —turning into one of the most important corridors for international drug trafficking—, corruption and money laundry have pervaded major enterprises and important political figures nationwide [2].

The problem is multivariable, from cultural and historical issues to the structure of the judicial and law enforcement systems. However, from the network science point of view, another important reason lies on the structure of the web of crime and on the characteristics of traditional police interventions. Law enforcement actions consist mainly in random arrests and operations focusing on big criminal leaders, in a strategy loosely resembling a degree-based attack. Nonetheless, it was shown that the social structure of criminal activities is, in fact, highly resilient to the traditional law enforcement approach [3–5]. In this sense, as pointed out in earlier studies, there is a lack of directions or focused strategy in crime fighting which, most of the times, is reactive, always standing one step behind criminal undertakings [6–9]. Thence, the necessity to address law enforcement in a proactive framework and crime as a collective complex system brings us to the study of this criminal network.

The sociological literature vastly supports both theoretically and experimentally the adoption of network methods in studying criminal rings [10–13]. For instance, the social facilitation model [14, 15] states that the impulse of an individual to criminal actions is somehow

strengthened by his or hers membership to a criminal organization. Therefore, atomizing the network structure of a criminal organization would lower, theoretically, the crime rates. In this sense, many studies in social science have focused in efficient ways to dismantle this dreadful phenomenon. However, these contributions are mostly based on qualitative and loose aspects of individuals rather than on their quantitative and collective role in maintaining the network functioning as a whole (*i.e.* their topological centralities) [16, 17]. Several researchers have recently illustrated the benefits of applying network science and statistical physics [18] to study the structure and fragility of the criminal phenomenon. For instance, Agreste *et al.* have recently studied the network structure and resilience of the Sicilian Mafia (often known as *Cosa Nostra*) [19]. In that paper, the cooperation with Italian law enforcement agencies yield to a bipartite network (contact and criminal), which showed different robustness to network attacks —the contact network is much more fragile to targeted attacks than the criminal one. Despite that, the authors did not study the Mafia network’s modularity and its robustness to Module-Based Attacks(MBA) [20] or other more efficient methods of attack [21]. Besides, other authors have studied Mafia syndicates, pointing to the strong hierarchical networked organization with a few *cappos* (bosses) commanding the criminal activities [22].

Due to the economic-driven nature of organized crime, a common feature of criminal systems is the balance between the secrecy of its illegal activities and the efficiency of its communications and operations. As shown in earlier researches, these traits are directly related to the network structure of the criminal phenomenon [23]. Therefore, such systems need stable action-based relationships




FIG. 1. Representation of the largest connected component of the federal crimes network consisting of 9,887 individuals and 91 modules. Colors represent nodes from the same communities as extracted by the Louvain method.

which increases network efficiency and consequently results in higher risks for the illegal enterprise. Precisely because of that, criminal networks tend to be fragile to targeted attacks [24]. However, Duijn *et al.* [25] pointed out recently, when studying a drug related network from the Dutch Police, that criminal organizations may become more efficient as a response to targeted attacks. The positive counterpart is the decrease of the network's security, offering strategic opportunities for law enforcement and intelligence agencies to plan effective network disruption operations.

In order to address precisely this phenomenon, as part of an ongoing collaboration with Brazilian Federal Police, we had access to data collected from several federal crimes which result in a web of almost 24,000 individuals across several layers of criminal relationships. This unique set of data allows us to study the social networks adjacent to the criminal phenomenon and its topological weaknesses. Therefore, it is of high practical importance to search for the most efficient way to shatter these social networks in order to help reducing criminal levels

Consequently, in this contribution we aim at describing the structure of such network, finding effective methods to disrupt it, and to control the activities on such a system.

The paper is organized as follows: we first present the collected data, next we describe the underlying topology of the resulting network; then, we study the network's

fragility to targeted attacks; after that, we explore the controllability of the network. At the end, the main results are summarized and conclusions are drawn.

## DATASET AND METHOD

The dataset was obtained by the office of the Brazilian Federal Police at Rio Grande do Sul and anonymized before releasing for scientific, academic, and collaborative purposes. The record of criminal investigations were gathered from April 2013 to August 2013 and consist of information provided directly by each case's investigator who would inform, through a computer application (*i.e.* a digitized version of card files), the proper relationship among the individuals investigated by he or she resulting in  $N = 23,666$  individuals (nodes) and  $E = 35,913$  relationships (edges). The query consisted of investigations concerning all federal crimes, a set of very different crimes such as organized crime, money laundering, international drug trafficking, terrorism, international pedophilia rings and corruption schemes. The original police database of criminal records contains classified information. On account of that, data was filtered and anonymized in order to protect individual rights and comply with legal requirements. Topological features of the relationships were preserved in order to study the adjacent network structure. The anonymized network data is available at Konect (<http://konect.uni-koblenz.de/>).

The resulting undirected and unweighted network has 3,425 unconnected components with a medium size of only 7 individuals. However, the degree dispersion  $\langle k^2 \rangle / \langle k \rangle = 7.42$  is much higher than the Molloy-Reed criterion meaning the network is actually in a regime which there is a giant component pervading the whole system [26]. This is the first important result of our study, for it was not expected that a giant component would rise in a set of actors committing criminal actions not related in principle to one another—such as drug trafficking and pedophilia. Therefore, from now on we focus only on the giant component of the system, since the fragmented pieces might be considered as a residual criminal phenomenon characteristic of every society while the largest connected component represents a generalized and self-organized criminal phase that is more dangerous from a national security point of view that should be concerned carefully by federal and national law enforcement and intelligence agencies. The largest connected component consists of 9,887 nodes and 19,744 edges (40% of the total number of nodes and 54% of the total number of edges, see Fig. 1)

	N	E	$\delta$	$\eta$
Facebook (NIPS)	2888	2981	0.0071	29.3%
Hamsterster	2426	16631	0.0056	20.8%
Crime	829	1473	0.0043	21.5%
PF (Fig. 1)	9887	19744	0.0004	8.4%

TABLE I. Comparative data between the federal crimes network and other social networks: Number of nodes ( $N$ ), number of edges ( $E$ ), edge density ( $\delta$ ), and graph efficiency ( $\eta$ ) for four distinct social networks: a Facebook user-user friendship network [27, 28], a friendship network for the user of the website hamsterster.com [29], a criminal dataset recorded by St Louis Police in the 1990s [30], and the federal crimes network of this contribution.

## NETWORK STRUCTURE

The density and the efficiency of a criminal network is usually related to the “brightness” of the system in the sense that a large number of connections among criminals means that if one actor is caught by law enforcement or intelligence agencies it would be possible, at first, to extract critical information about the network’s structure [25]. On the other hand, a darker network means the direct transfer of information within the system is slowed down due to the decreased number of possible path among criminals. Therefore, both the network density and the network efficiency informs us about the compromise between security and effective diffusion of information and data. This is precisely the case of our network which is “darker” than some traditional social networks, *i.e.* it has lower edge density levels, and at the same time it has a very low graph efficiency (see Table I). The radar chart presented in Fig. 2 shows the topological differences between the criminal network and its randomized version, where all edges are rewired. The data highlight the small-worldness [26] of the system since the network has small average shortest path length as compared to the network’s diameter but with a larger clustering coefficient.

The degree distribution of a graph is of utmost importance in unraveling the nature of its adjacent system. For instance, besides other practical implications, networks with homogeneous degree distributions, which the probability  $p(k)$  that an arbitrary node has degree  $k$  decays exponentially for large values of  $k$ , face a transition from a fully connected to a disconnected phase if a fraction  $q_c$  is randomly removed from it [31]. On the other hand, graphs in which  $p(k)$  has a heterogeneous distribution are usually robust to random failure of nodes but weak to targeted attacks to its most central nodes or hubs [31]. Examples of heterogeneous systems include the Internet, the World Wide Web, and in general most (large-scale) social systems [26]. In this sense, degree distributions that follow a power-law ( $p_i \propto k_i^{-\gamma}$ , where  $p_i$  is the probability a node attaches to  $i$ , which has already a degree  $k_i$ ) are usually known as scale-free and reveal a generative




FIG. 2. The radar chart displays the following network parameters for the federal crimes data (gray pattern) and its randomized counterpart (red pattern): diameter ( $D = 49$  and 15), average shortest path length ( $\lambda = 14.43$  and 6.78), assortativity ( $\Lambda = 0.017$  and 0.001), clustering coefficient ( $CC = 0.391$  and 0.001) and modularity ( $Q = 0.96$  and 0.52).

model with preferential attachment in which nodes tend to connect to the more popular nodes in a rich-gets-richer mechanism. However, in real systems the degree might not be the only factor which attracts connections, in social networks for instance several qualities might interest reciprocal relationships such the sharing of same political or ethical vision. Such attributes are therefore called the vertex’s fitness and might generally be expressed by hybrid multiplicative processes such as the Log-normal Fitness Attachment (LNFA) [32]

$$p_i(k) \propto k_i \prod_l \phi_{il} \quad (1)$$

where  $\phi$  represents the set of attributes of node  $i$ . When the number of attributes are sufficiently large and statistically independent, it is shown that the fitness is log-normally distributed, regardless of the type of the particular distribution of each attribute [33, 34]. In the same way, the degree distribution of the federal crime network has an approximate log-normal behavior, with a power-law regime in the middle of the cumulative representation showing an exponent  $\gamma \simeq 2.34$  (see Fig. 3), which is very similar to the Mafia network studied by Agreste *et al.* [19] which shows a power-law regime with  $\gamma \simeq 2.5$ . This means that in this criminal system there is an interplay between at least two distinct phenomena: the tendency of individuals to connect not only to hubs, but also to fittest criminals. This particular multiplicative statistic




FIG. 3. Cumulative degree distribution for the federal crimes network with log-log axis and a power law fit in the middle region ( $6 < k < 53$ ):  $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$  with  $\gamma \simeq 2.34$ .

can be explained by group affinities such as gangs, mafia and mobs which also explains the modular architecture of the network as it is shown later in the text— Brazil has a long history of well defined and competing criminal syndicates such as the *Primeiro Comando da Capital* (First Command of the Capital or PCC) and the *Comando Vermelho* (Red Command or CV) among others, summing up more than 10,000 individuals nationwide [35]. That is, among individuals with similar number of connections (degree), new criminals will connect most likely to the ones belonging to the criminal gang with stronger influence in their social medium (higher fitness). Conversely, if the fitnesses are similar, the vertex with highest degree will more probably be selected.

### NETWORK DISRUPTION & CONTROLLABILITY

From a network science point of view, a graph can be refrained from functioning as a whole either by removing its nodes or by removing only its edges (maintaining the nodes). In this sense, law enforcement operations usually aim at identifying and arresting criminals. Therefore, the arrest of individuals is directly related to the removal of edges, since the nodes are not in fact deleted from the network. On the other hand, the deletion of nodes means the complete removal of that individual from the criminal network— a scenario that would only occur either by death or by re-socialization and not directly by law enforcement actions. In a topological perspective, node removal is more effective in atomizing complex networks causing more damage per elimination than edge removal since the deletion of a single node from the network results in the elimination of all links attached to it [36, 37]. This is a second important result, with impor-

tant sociological implications, *ie* from a network science perspective, re-socialization (*eg* by education or by work) is in general a more effective strategy to lower crime levels than imprisonment. Still, it should be noted that according to this rationale, even though reprehensible ethically and legally, the death of the key individuals would reach similar results, *ceteris paribus*.

We now simulate both edge and node disruptions to the network's giant component by considering two different procedures: high centrality attacks, when a fraction of nodes or edges is deleted simultaneously according to a list previously ordered by a chosen centrality index (which is not unique and measures the structural importance of nodes and edges in keeping the network cohesive) and high centrality adaptive attacks when we attack individual components of the network in accordance with a list iteratively ordered by a centrality index and updated after each removal [31]. To test the network's structural fragility we disrupt the network by node-based High Degree Adaptive (HDA), High Betweenness Adaptive (HBA), High Degree (HD), High Betweenness (HB) and Module-Based (MBA) attacks and edge-based High Betweenness Adaptive (HBA), High Betweenness (HB), Module-Based attacks (MBA) and Collective Influence (CI) (see Fig. 4). The degree centrality is just the number of connections a node has and the betweenness centrality basically measures the fraction of shortest paths passing through a given vertex [36]. The collective influence of a node takes into account the degree of its neighbors at a given distance  $l$  from it in the following way

$$CI_k(i) = (k_i - 1) \sum_{j \in \partial Ball(i, l)} (k_j - 1) \quad (2)$$

where  $k_i$  is the node's degree and the  $\partial Ball(i, l)$  is the set of all nodes at a distance  $l$  from node  $i$ . This method was proven to be very close to the minimum disman-




FIG. 4. The figures show the fragmentation curves of the federal crimes network by the relative size of the largest connected component  $G$  as a function of the fraction of nodes or edges removed  $q$ , according to different procedures: (A), node-based High Degree Adaptive (HDA - blue dot dashed line), High Betweenness Adaptive (HBA - black dashed line), Module-Based attacks (MBA - red solid line), and Collective Influence (CI - magenta two dashed line); (B), node-based High Betweenness (HB - light blue dotted line), High Degree (HD - golden long dashed line), and Module-Based (MBA - red solid line) attacks; (C), edge-based High Betweenness Adaptive (HBA - black dashed line), High Betweenness (HB - light blue dotted line), and Module-Based attacks (MBA - red solid line).






FIG. 5. The histograms show the performance of the three best attacks on the federal crimes network. Panel (A) shows Module-Based (MBA - horizontal red shades), High Betweenness (HB - inclined blue shades) and High Degree (HD - vertical golden shades) strategies for node removal, while panel (B) depicts MBA, HB and High Betweenness Adaptive (HBA - inclined black shades) attacks for edge-based attacks.

tle set [21]. The Module-Based attack [20] is related to the modular nature of real networks, *i.e.* the feature that complex networks tend to group into clusters densely connected internally but only weakly connected among them, those clusters are also called modules or communities. The density of links connecting different communities when compared to the internal density of edges is usually measured by the network's modularity,  $Q$  which ranges from  $-1$  to  $1$ , and depends slightly on the community extraction algorithm used [38]. It was previously shown that highly modular networks are fragile to MBA [20]. In this sense, one would expect organized crime to show highly modular features since the weak connection among communities would favor the network's obscurity while the high internal density of communities would make a proper scenario to efficiently run business internally. Indeed, the network has a very high modularity either using Louvain [39] ( $Q = 0.96$ ) or using Infomap [40] ( $Q = 0.88$ ) methods.

To quantify the effects of each disruption strategy on the network we measure the size of the largest connected component relative to the network's original size,  $G(q)$ , as a function of the fraction of removed objects,  $q$ . As pointed out in [41] the generalized robustness of a network to a given attack strategy is given by the metric:

$$R = \frac{1}{N(1 - G_{min})} \sum_{q=0}^{q_{max}} G(q) \quad (3)$$

where  $N$  is the number of nodes in the network,  $q_{max}$  is the point at which the attack ends and  $G_{min}$  is the value of the relative size of the largest connected component at  $q_{max}$ . Nonetheless, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of each strategy, it is also important to measure the trade-off between robustness ( $R$ ) and the time ( $t$ ) needed to compute the attack list. In this sense, the performance of an attack is measured by the relation  $\mathcal{P} = t^{-1} \times R^{-1}$  where  $t$  is the time taken to complete the procedure in seconds and  $R$  is the robustness [41].

In accordance with these considerations, the attack strategy with highest performance (see Fig. 5) is MBA both for node and edge attacks, as expected for the network's high modularity. However, the network is a little less robust to HBA, which in turn takes much more time to compute. In other words, the network would be fully atomized after removing approximately 2% of its vertices and almost 5% of its edges by HBA. Besides, the deactivation point at which all communities are detached from the core of the original graph is reached by the MBA prescription when nearly 2% of its edges or nodes are removed. These results mean that even though node attacks are in general more efficient than edge attacks, particularly in this network both strategies are very similar—for instance the edge MBA has higher performance and similar robustness than the node HBA. This is another important result, since the network would fragment completely by traditional law enforcement actions (random attacks) after the random failure of 80% of nodes and 86% of edges. Another important feature is that the system is much weaker to HBA and MBA attacks than to the novel CI strategy as depicted in Fig. 4

The assortativity ( $A$ ) is another important aspect of the network. In assortative networks ( $A > 0$ ) nodes tend to connect to others with similar degree and in disassortative networks ( $A < 0$ ) high degree vertices tend to attach to low degree nodes. For the federal crimes system,  $A = 0.02$ . This is a well known phenomenon in social networks [42, 43], *ie* highly prosperous people prefer to relate to people in the same social layer, in business relationships entrepreneurs prefer to collaborate with other big names in search for success, reputation, influence and social status. Apparently, the same goes with criminal networks which loosely is just a particular case of a business network.

A dynamic system is said to be controllable if one can get it to evolve from any initial state to an arbitrary final state in a finite time by an appropriate choice of external inputs. However, for very large systems such as real networks it is more suitable to search for a minimum subset of nodes whose control guarantees mathematical control of the whole system. For instance, a dynamic variable such as opinion, wealth or general tendency to commit a crime evolving in time constricted to the criminal network's topology is reducible to a minimum or zeroth level at least in principle if the system is controllable. Recently, Liu *et al* [44] developed the so-called structural controllability theory of directed networks, which consists into identifying a minimum set of individual driver nodes to achieve full control of complex networks, which was shown to be equivalent to problem of maximum matching. More recently, it was shown that structural controllability can be achieved with a single time-varying input suggesting that nodal dynamics is the key factor in determining network controllability [45]. Nonetheless, the proposal is restricted to directed networks, which is not the case studied here. Therefore, the exact controllability theory by Yuan *et al* [46] is more suited to this criminal system. This framework is based on using the maximum geometric multiplicity of the adjacency matrix to find the minimum set of drivers required to fully control the system. In this sense, consider a linear system described by the following set of ordinary differential equations:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}, \quad (4)$$

where the vector  $\mathbf{x}$  stands for the states of the nodes,  $\mathbf{A}$  is the adjacency matrix of the network whose elements are  $a_{ij} = 1$  if nodes  $i$  and  $j$  are connected and  $a_{ij} = 0$  otherwise,  $\mathbf{u}$  is the vector of controllers and  $\mathbf{B}$  is the control matrix. This system is said to be controllable according to the framework proposed by Yuan *et al* [46] if we control a minimum fraction of nodes (called drivers or controllers) given by:

$$n_D = \frac{1}{N} \max\{1, N - \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})\}, \quad (5)$$

In their seminal article Liu *et al* have shown that, counter-intuitively, social networks usually have very low

$n_D$  values if compared to biological or infrastructure networks. Confirming those results, the criminal network studied here has a fraction of drivers  $n_D = 0.21$ , suggesting that the whole criminal system could be, in principle, controlled by only 2,076 individuals.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Thanks to a recent network data acquisition program by the Brazilian Federal Police, we were able to study the network structure, robustness and control of a large and unique criminal network covering different classes of federal crimes all over Brazil. The system was built directly by Federal Agents assigned to each investigation and consists of 23,666 individuals in 35,913 undirected and unweighted relationships. Surprisingly, the network has a giant component holding more than 40% of the nodes and 54% of the edges. We have showed that the network shows small-world and scale-free behaviors being “darker” than traditional social networks, *ie*. combining both low edge density values and low network efficiency.

The network is particularly weak to high betweenness adaptive attacks and module-based attacks due mostly to its high modular nature. The MBA attacks show a higher performance, meaning the deactivation point where all communities are disjointed is reached at the expense of less computational effort than the fully atomized phase reached by centrality-based attacks with both critical points being not far from each other.

Counter-intuitively, the network is highly controllable in the sense that it is possible, in principle, to take any dynamical variable (like opinion, wealth or criminal tendency) from its initial state to arbitrary final states by controlling approximately only 20% of its nodes, in what appears to be a typical behavior of social networks. However, even though the mathematical controllability of this criminal system is guaranteed by the control of less than a quarter of its nodes, it is not clear what this means in practical terms for social systems. For instance, one is usually interested in finding a desired stable final state or else the system will easily move away, therefore mathematical controllability *per se* does not provide fully useful results. Besides, in social networks the drivers are people and even the task of engineering a single input becomes unclear and arguable both ethically and juridically. Thence a deep understanding of social control is still a very open subject.

We argue that traditional imprisonment is equivalent to edge-based attacks, while node-based attacks are more related to the death or complete re-socialization of criminals. However, although in general it is more efficient to remove nodes than edges, particularly in this network both strategies have similar results. Besides that, the criminal data-bank is continuously growing (at the moment we submitted this paper the size of the dataset

reached more than 100,000 nodes) making it virtually impossible to generate iteratively  $N$  betweenness-based attack lists, which grows at best as  $(N \times E)^2$ . Therefore, the best strategy to reduce criminality levels in accordance with the topology of federal crimes in Brazil would be either by educational or by prison policies with the targets chosen by a modular approach depending on the political and practical feasibility of each strategy—for instance the prison system would have to really work in cutting prisoners’ social ties and in re-socializing or educating them, which are *de facto* very hard tasks.

Our future research will focus experimentally on criminal networks dynamics and effective control. We hope our results will help change the approach of law enforcement agencies worldwide and thence lowering crime level specially in Brazil. The authors would like to thank the Institutional Defense Unit and the Organized Crime Fighting Unit of the Brazilian Federal Police at Rio Grande do Sul.

---

\* cunha.brc@dpf.gov.br

† sgonc@if.ufrgs.br

- [1] Daniel Cerqueira, Helder Ferreira, Renato Sergio de Lima, Samira Bueno, Olaya Hanashiro, Filipe Batista, and Patricia Nicolato. *Atlas da Violência 2016*. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (Ipea), 2016.
- [2] UNODC. *State of crime and criminal justice worldwide*. United Nations, 2015.
- [3] Carlo Morselli. *Inside criminal networks*. Springer, 2009.
- [4] Toine Spapens. Interaction between criminal groups and law enforcement: the case of ecstasy in the netherlands. *Global crime*, 12(1):19–40, 2011.
- [5] Carlo Morselli and Katia Petit. Law-enforcement disruption of a drug importation network. *Global Crime*, 8(2):109–130, 2007.
- [6] Mangai Natarajan. Understanding the structure of a large heroin distribution network: A quantitative analysis of qualitative data. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 22(2):171–192, 2006.
- [7] Jerzy Sarnecki. *Delinquent networks: Youth co-offending in Stockholm*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [8] Hsinchun Chen, Wingyan Chung, Jennifer Jie Xu, Gang Wang, Yi Qin, and Michael Chau. Crime data mining: a general framework and some examples. *Computer*, 37(4):50–56, 2004.
- [9] Rafał Dreżewski, Jan Sepielak, and Wojciech Filipkowski. The application of social network analysis algorithms in a system supporting money laundering detection. *Information Sciences*, 295:18–32, 2 2015.
- [10] Jean McGloin. Policy and intervention considerations of a network analysis of street gangs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4(3):607–635, 2005.
- [11] Raaj Kumar Sah. Social osmosis and patterns of crime: A dynamic economic analysis. *Journal of political Economy*, 99(6), 1991.
- [12] Edward L. Glaeser, Bruce Sacerdote, and JoséA. Scheinkman. Crime and social interactions. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111(2):507–548, 05 1996.
- [13] Carlo Morselli. Career opportunities and network-based privileges in the cosa nostra. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 39(4):383–418, 2003.
- [14] Giovanni Mastrobuoni and Eleonora Patacchini. Organized crime networks: An application of network analysis techniques to the american mafia. *Review of Network Economics*, 11(3):1–43, 2012.
- [15] Terence P Thornberry, Marvin D Krohn, Alan J Lizotte, and Deborah Chard-Wierschem. The role of juvenile gangs in facilitating delinquent behavior. *Journal of research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(1):55–87, 1993.
- [16] Coralio Ballester, Antoni Calvo-Armengol, and Yves Zenou. Who’s who in networks. wanted: the key player. *Econometrica*, 74(5):1403–1417, 2006.
- [17] Stephen P Borgatti. Identifying sets of key players in a social network. *Computational & Mathematical Organization Theory*, 12(1):21–34, 2006.
- [18] Maria R. D’Orsogna and Matjaž Perc. Statistical physics of crime: A review. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 12:1–21, 3 2015.
- [19] Santa Agreste, Salvatore Catanese, Pasquale De Meo, Emilio Ferrara, and Giacomo Fiumara. Network structure and resilience of mafia syndicates. *Information Sciences*, 351:30 – 47, 2016.
- [20] Bruno Requião da Cunha, Juan Carlos González-Avella, and Sebastián Gonçalves. Fast fragmentation of networks using module-based attacks. *PLoS ONE*, 10(11):e0142824–, 11 2015.
- [21] Flaviano Morone and Hernán A Makse. Influence maximization in complex networks through optimal percolation. *Nature*, 2015.
- [22] Baris Cayli. Italian civil society against the mafia: From perceptions to expectations. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 41(1):81–99, 2013.
- [23] Noemi Toth, László Gulyás, Richard O. Legendi, Paul Duijn, Peter M. A. Sloot, and George Kampis. The importance of centralities in dark network value chains. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 222(6):1413–1439, 2013.
- [24] Carlo Morselli, Cynthia Giguère, and Katia Petit. The efficiency/security trade-off in criminal networks. *Social Networks*, 29(1):143–153, 2007.
- [25] Paul AC Duijn, Victor Kashirin, and Peter MA Sloot. The relative ineffectiveness of criminal network disruption. *Scientific reports*, 4, 2014.
- [26] Sergei N Dorogovtsev and JoséFF Mendes. *Evolution of networks: From biological nets to the Internet and WWW*. OUP Oxford, 2013.
- [27] The Koblenz Network Collection. Facebook (nips) network dataset – KONECT, August 2014.
- [28] Julian McAuley and Jure Leskovec. Learning to discover social circles in ego networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 548–556. 2012.
- [29] Hamsterster full network dataset – KONECT, jul 2016.
- [30] Crime network dataset – KONECT, jul 2016.
- [31] Albert-László Barabási. *Network Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [32] Shilpa Ghadge, Timothy Killingback, Bala Sundaram, and Duc A Tran. A statistical construction of power-law networks. *International Journal of Parallel, Emergent and Distributed Systems*, 25(3):223–235, 2010.
- [33] Khanh Nguyen and Duc A Tran. *Fitness-based generative models for power-law networks*, pages 39–53. Springer, 2012.



- [34] Michael Bell, Supun Perera, Mahendrarajah Piraveenan, Michiel Bliemer, Tanya Latty, and Chris Reid. Network growth models: A behavioural basis for attachment proportional to fitness. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 2017.
- [35] Bryan McCann. Criminal networks in urban brazil. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, pages 13–19, 2007.
- [36] Swami Iyer, Timothy Killingback, Bala Sundaram, and Zhen Wang. Attack robustness and centrality of complex networks. *PLoS ONE*, 8(4):e59613, 04 2013.
- [37] Paolo Crucitti, Vito Latora, Massimo Marchiori, and Andrea Rapisarda. Error and attack tolerance of complex networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 340(1-3):388–394, Sep 2004.
- [38] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(12):7821–7826, 2002.
- [39] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2008(10):P10008, 2008.
- [40] M. Rosvall, D. Axelsson, and C. T. Bergstrom. The map equation. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 178(1):13–23, 2009.
- [41] Bruno Requião da Cunha and Sebastián Gonçalves. Performance of attack strategies on modular networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:xxxx*, 2016.
- [42] M. E. J. Newman. Assortative mixing in networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 89:208701, 2002.
- [43] Mark EJ Newman. Mixing patterns in networks. *Physical Review E*, 67(2):026126, 2003.
- [44] Y. Y. Liu, J. J. Slotine, and A. L. Barabási. Controllability of complex networks. *Nature*, 473:167–173, 2011.
- [45] Noah J Cowan, Erick J Chastain, Daril A Vilhena, James S Freudenberg, and Carl T Bergstrom. Nodal dynamics, not degree distributions, determine the structural controllability of complex networks. *PloS one*, 7(6):e38398, 2012.
- [46] Z. Yuan, C. Zhao, Z. Di, W. X. Wang, and Y. C. Lai. Exact controllability of complex networks. *Nat. Commun.*, 4:2447, 2013.