

Discrete-Time Open Quantum Walks for Vertex Ranking in Graphs

Supriyo Dutta

Department of Mathematics,
National Institute of Technology Agartala,
Jirania, West Tripurs, India - 799046.
Email: dosupriyo@gmail.com

Abstract

This article utilizes the inspiration to apply the Wyel operators for producing the Kraus operators, which are crucial in the discrete-time open quantum walk. It assists us in extending the idea of discrete-time open quantum walk on arbitrary directed and undirected graphs. We make the new model of quantum walk useful to build up a quantum PageRank algorithm. In classical computation, Google's PageRank is a significant algorithm for arranging web pages on the World Wide Web. In general, it is also a fundamental measure for quantifying the importance of vertices in a network. Similarly, the new quantum PageRank also represents the importance of the vertices of a network. We can compute the new quantum PageRank algorithm in polynomial time using a classical computer. We compare the classical PageRank and the newly defined quantum PageRank for different types of complex networks, such as the scale-free network, Erdős-Rényi random network, Watts-Strogatz network, spatial network, Zachary Karate club network, random_k_out_graph, binary tree graph, GNC network, Barabási and Albert network, etc.

Keywords: PageRank, Quantum walk, Kraus operator, Complex Network.

1 Introduction

The presence of networks in our modern life is ubiquitous [1]. As a consequence, there has been significant research in the field of network analysis, which is applied to the World Wide Web (WWW) [2], and various types of virtual, social, economic, and biological systems [3, 4]. Collecting useful information from a network is a crucial task in network science. In classical computing, there are efficient algorithms for searching, retrieving and ordering information which is available from the network. In quantum computing, building a quantum network is a fundamental goal in quantum communication [5] as it might be useful in developing the future internet and a scalable quantum computer. Thus, we need quantum mechanical algorithms which can efficiently interact with the information available in a quantum network.

In classical computing, Google's PageRank algorithm [6] is well-known for arranging the information available in WWW [7]. The WWW is a collection of pages or documents with information. It has a crucial hyperlink structure. A hyperlink is a text on a page that carries the reader to another page. Mathematically, WWW is a directed graph whose vertices are the pages and the directed edges are the hyperlinks from one page to the other. The PageRank algorithm arranges the pages in WWW based on their importance, such that, a reader can go through the most relevant page, first. In general, it indicates the importance of the vertices in a graph. The PageRank algorithm is a polynomial time algorithm from the perspective of computational complexity, which utilizes the idea of the random walk on a directed graph. We include a brief description of PageRank in section 2.2.

There are multiple attempts to develop the PageRank algorithm in the literature of quantum computing which we can precisely classify into two different approaches. In one of the initial works on quantum PageRank [8] (qPageRank), an adiabatic quantum computing algorithm was demonstrated. The other proposals replace the random walk of classical PageRank with a quantum walk. In quantum computing

we quantize the idea of random walk on the graphs with quantum walk [9]. There are different proposals of quantum walk, such as the discrete-time quantum walk [10], continuous-time quantum walk [11], Szegedy’s quantum walk [12, 13], open quantum walk [14], and many others. The qPageRank based on the discrete-time quantum walk is proposed in [15]. In [16] and [17] qPageRanks based on continuous-time open quantum walk are discussed. Articles [18, 19, 20], and [21] study different aspects of qPageRank based on Szegedy’s quantum walk. Article [22] compares the classical and quantum PageRanks on different types of networks. A number of classical computing aspects of qPageRank are discussed in [23]. Article [24] utilizes graph Fourier transformation on directed graphs and the quantum HHL algorithm [25] to calculate the classical page rank. A qPageRank based on the stochastic quantum walk is proposed in [26]. All these articles include numerical experiments on various models of complex networks to establish the justification for the efficiency of the newly developed algorithms, such as the outerplanar hierarchical network [18, 22, 24], the scale-free network [18, 22, 20, 21, 24, 26], Erdős–Rényi random network [22, 24, 26], Watts-Strogatz network [26], spatial network [26], Zachary Karate club network [26], random_k_out_graph [17], binary tree graph [20], GNC network [20], Barabási and Albert network [24], etc. The PageRank is an important measure of centrality on graphs. There are articles which quantize the notion of centrality using quantum walk for instance [27, 28]. The experimental realization of qPageRank and centrality measures are discussed in [29, 30, 31]. As qPageRank is not unique, we assume that they should satisfy the following properties which were proposed in [15]:

- (i) The classical PageRank is defined on the directed graphs. Hence, the qPageRank should also be defined on the directed graphs.
- (ii) The values of qPageRank of the vertices should be in $[0, 1]$. Also, the sum of all qPageRanks in a graph is 1.
- (iii) The qPageRank must admit a quantized Markov Chain description.
- (iv) The classical algorithm to compute qPageRank of the vertices in a graph belongs to the computational complexity class [32] BQP. This criterion can be further restricted to enforce that the computational complexity of qPageRank must be P .

It is crystallized from the literature that various quantum walks play a crucial role in developing the idea of qPageRank. As we want to define qPageRank for all graphs, the quantum walk should also be properly defined. In this article, we utilize the discrete-time open quantum walk, which was not considered earlier to quantize PageRank, because it was primarily discussed on a few undirected regular graphs, such as the infinite path graph, or \mathbb{Z} [14, 33, 34]. To construct qPageRank with this quantum walk, it is essential to extend its definition which should be applicable for all graphs. This model of quantum walk essentially uses the Kraus operators. We observe that the Wyel operators [35, 36] can also be utilized to construct the Kraus operators. It assists us in extending the idea of an open quantum walk for arbitrary directed and undirected graphs. To the best of our knowledge, we employ the Wyel operators to define the open quantum walk for the first time in literature. Utilizing this novel quantum walk we propose a qPageRank algorithm, in this article. The discrete-time open quantum walk utilizes a Hilbert space of dimension n^2 , where n is the number of vertices in the graph. We justify that we can reduce the size of the Hilbert space to a subspace of dimension n for computing the qPageRank on a graph. We calculate the qPageRank for the vertices of a number of complex networks, such as the scale-free network, Erdős–Rényi random network, Watts-Strogatz network, spatial network, Zachary Karate club network, random_k_out_graph, binary tree graph, GNC network, as well as Barabási and Albert network.

This article is distributed as follows. Section 2 collects all the preliminary ideas to go through this article. It has three subsections. We begin with an introduction to graph theory. In section 2.2, we discuss the original idea of classical PageRank. We end this section with a discussion on quantum states and channels in higher dimensions. We demonstrate a new idea of discrete-times open quantum walk in section 3. Section 4 models how an internet surfer can restart surfing from another randomly chosen node, in a quantum mechanical way. Section 5 is dedicated to the qPageRank of the vertices of a graph. We

discuss our qPageRank algorithm in Procedure 1. In this section, we justify that a classical computer can calculate the new PageRank algorithm in polynomial time on an n dimensional Hilbert space. Section 6 contains our numerical experiments. Here, we compare the classical and quantum PageRanks for different types of graphs and networks. Then, we conclude this article.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 An introduction to graph theory

A graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ is a combinatorial object consisting of a set of vertices $V(G)$ and a set of edges $E(G) \subset V(G) \times V(G)$ [37]. Throughout this article, n denotes the number of vertices in a graph G . We consider different types of edges in this article. We denote a directed edge from the vertex u to a vertex v by $\overrightarrow{(u, v)}$. An undirected edge between vertices u and v is denoted by (u, v) , which can be considered as a combination of two directed edges, one from u to v , that is $\overrightarrow{(u, v)}$ and another from v to u , that is $\overrightarrow{(v, u)}$. In this article, there are no edges to join a vertex with itself. Also, there are no weights on the vertices and on the edges. All the edges of a directed graph are directed. Also, all the edges of an undirected graph are undirected, in this article.

We pictorially represent a vertex with a dot which may be marked or non-marked. An undirected edge between vertices u and v is depicted by a straight line between u and v . A directed edge from the vertex u to the vertex v is represented by an arrow from u to v . We denote a directed graph by \vec{G} and its edge set by $E(\vec{G})$.

In a directed graph \vec{G} , the directed edges or links incident to a vertex v may be classified into inlinks and outlinks. The directed edges $\overrightarrow{(u, v)}$ coming into a vertex v from a vertex u are called inlinks of v . The number of inlinks of v is called the indegree of v which is denoted by $d_v^{(i)}$. The set of vertices u for which there is an inlink $\overrightarrow{(u, v)}$ to v is denoted by $B(v)$, in this article. If there is a link from u to v , we say that the vertex u is pointing to v . Similarly, the outlinks of vertex v are the directed edges $\overrightarrow{(v, u)}$ going out of the vertex v to another vertex u . The number of outlinks of v is its outdegree, which is denoted by $d_v^{(o)}$. Also, the set of vertices u for which there is an outlink $\overrightarrow{(v, u)}$ from v is denoted by $\text{Nbd}(v)$, in this article. It is not necessary that all the vertices are incident to both types of edges. A dangling vertex in a graph has no outlink.

In an undirected graph G , a vertex v is said to be adjacent to another vertex u if there is an edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$. The degree of a vertex v is denoted by d_v which is the number of vertices u adjacent to v . The set of the adjacent vertices of v is called the neighbourhood of v and denoted by $\text{nbd}(v)$. Every undirected graph can be considered as a directed graph by assigning two opposite directions on every edge. Therefore, in an undirected graph for every vertex v , we have $\text{nbd}(v) = B(v) = \text{Nbd}(v)$ and $d_v = d_v^{(o)} = d_v^{(i)}$. Also, there is no dangling vertex in an undirected graph.

2.2 An introduction to Google's PageRank

To build up the mathematical model of information retrieval from WWW, we utilize the idea of an internet graph, which is a directed graph. Recall that the vertices of the internet graph represent webpages in WWW. The directed edges from one vertex to another represent the hyperlinks from one page to another, correspondingly. Although Google's PageRank was developed to quantify the importance of webpages, it is a crucial measure to quantify the importance of vertices in any network. Hence, in this article, we present the definitions to be applicable to arbitrary graphs.

Definition 1. The PageRank of a vertex v in a directed graph \vec{G} is denoted $r(v)$ and defined by

$$r(v) = \sum_{u \in B(v)} \frac{r(u)}{d_u^{(o)}}, \quad (1)$$

where $B(v)$ is the set of vertices pointing into v and d_u^o is the number of outlinks from page u .

As equation (1) needs the PageRanks of all adjacent vertices of v to calculate its PageRank, the inventors defined an iterative process. Let $r_k(v)$ be the PageRank of page v at iteration k , then

$$r_{k+1}(v) = \sum_{u \in B(v)} \frac{r_k(u)}{d_u^o}. \quad (2)$$

Initially, $r_0(v) = \frac{1}{n}$ for all vertices v , where n is the total number of vertices in \vec{G} . A PageRank vector $\Pi^{(k)}$ is a vector of order $1 \times n$ which contains the PageRanks of the vertices at k -th iteration for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Initially, we consider that the walker starts walking from any vertex of the graph, which is chosen uniformly and randomly. Therefore, the initial page rank vector is $\Pi^{(0)} = \frac{1}{n}(1, 1, \dots, 1(n\text{-times}))$. The hyperlink matrix of the graph is defined by $H = (h_{u,v})_{n \times n}$, where

$$h_{u,v} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d_u^o} & \text{if } (\overrightarrow{u,v}) \in E(\vec{G}); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Equation (2) suggests that in the $(k+1)$ -th iteration the PageRank vector is updated to

$$\Pi^{(k+1)} = \Pi^{(k)} H. \quad (4)$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. We want to convert this iterative process to a Markov process [38] on graphs. The matrix H depends on \vec{G} . Hence, it is not always a stochastic matrix. Therefore, the convergence of this iterative process is not guaranteed. To ensure convergence we make the following adjustments to the matrix H :

1. **Stochasticity adjustment:** Let v be a dangling node. Recall that there are no outgoing edges from v to any other vertex. After entering a dangling node, we assume that the walker can move to any page randomly. Therefore, we replace the the matrix H by $S = H + \frac{1}{n}|a\rangle\langle e|$, where $|a\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ are the column vectors of order n . The vector $|e\rangle$ is the all 1 vector. Also, the vector $|a\rangle$ consists of the elements $a_v = 1$ if v is a dangling node and 0 otherwise. We can prove that the matrix S is a stochastic matrix.
2. **Primitivity adjustment and restart in surfing:** Although the surfer follows the hyperlink structure of the Web, sometimes they may get bored. Then, they abandon the hyperlink method of surfing by teleporting to a new destination, where he begins hyperlink surfing again until the next teleportation. If $(1 - \alpha)$ is the probability of teleportation, we can define Google matrix as

$$\mathcal{G} = \alpha S + \frac{(1 - \alpha)}{n} ee^T. \quad (5)$$

Usually, the value of $\alpha = .85$.

The matrix \mathcal{G} is a primitive matrix, which is both irreducible and aperiodic [39]. This crucial characteristic of \mathcal{G} ensures the uniqueness of the PageRank vector in the iterative process. The power method is applicable on \mathcal{G} for finding PageRank by

$$\Pi^{(k+1)} = \Pi^{(k)} \mathcal{G}. \quad (6)$$

2.3 Quantum states and channels in higher dimensional system

In quantum mechanics and information theory, a pure state is equivalent to a vector in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}^n of dimension n . For simplicity, we consider the standard basic of \mathcal{H}^n which is $\{|i\rangle : |i\rangle =$

$(0, 0, \dots, 1(i\text{-th position}), \dots, 0)^\dagger\}$. A mixed quantum state in \mathcal{H}^n is represented by a density matrix ρ , which is a positive semidefinite Hermitian matrix of order n and $\text{trace}(\rho) = 1$.

A quantum channel is a communication channel that can transmit quantum information. Mathematically, the quantum channels are completely positive, trace-preserving maps between the spaces of operators. This work is developed on finite-dimensional spaces. Here, a quantum channel $\Psi : C^{n \times n} \rightarrow C^{n \times n}$ can be represented by a set of Kraus operators $\mathcal{K} = \{K_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, d; d \leq n\}$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^d K_i^\dagger K_i = I_n$ [40, 41]. When we transmit a quantum state represented by a density matrix ρ of order n via a quantum channel Ψ represented by \mathcal{K} we find another density matrix

$$\Psi(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^d K_i \rho K_i^\dagger. \quad (7)$$

In this work, we construct the Kraus operator using the Weyl operators [35, 36, 42], which are unitary operators. In general, they are defined by

$$U_{r,s} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{n} ir\right) |i\rangle \langle i \oplus s| \text{ for } 0 \leq r, s \leq n-1, \quad (8)$$

where \oplus denotes addition modulo n . As $U_{r,s}$ are unitary operators, we have $U_{r,s}^\dagger U_{r,s} = I_n$ for all r, s .

3 Discrete-time open quantum walk on arbitrary directed graph

We define discrete time open quantum walk for arbitrary directed graphs, in this section. Let us assume that at time t the walker is present at the vertex v with out-degree $d_v^{(o)} \neq 0$. There are directed edges from the vertex v to each of u_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d_v^{(o)}$, anywhere the walker can move at time $(t+1)$. Also, we consider that the walker may not move from vertex v at time $(t+1)$. Therefore, the set of vertices where the walker may be available at time $(t+1)$ is $\text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\} = \{v, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_d\}$. If for a vertex v the out-degree $d_v^{(o)} = 0$, then $\text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\} = \{v\}$. In this case the walker can not move from the vertex v .

The movement of a walker of discrete-time quantum walk is determined by a set of coin operators and shift operators. Now, we construct a set of coin operators for every vertex v . Let $(v, u_1), (v, u_2), \dots, (v, u_{d_v^{(o)}})$ be the outgoing edges from vertex v . Now, we construct $(d_v^{(o)} + 1)$ Weyl operators $I_n, U_{v,u_1}, U_{v,u_2}, \dots, U_{v,u_{d_v^{(o)}}}$ where I_n acts for no movement from vertex v and U_{v,u_i} acts for the movement from vertex v to u_i . Also, if the vertex v is a pendent vertex, then the walker can not move to any other vertex from v using the hyperlink structure of the internet graph. Then, only I_n will be applied to lead the quantum dynamics. As U_{v,u_i} are unitary operators for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d_v^{(o)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_n I_n^\dagger + U_{v,u_1}^\dagger U_{v,u_1} + U_{v,u_2}^\dagger U_{v,u_2} + \dots + U_{v,u_{d_v^{(o)}}}^\dagger U_{v,u_{d_v^{(o)}}} &= (d_v^{(o)} + 1) I_n \\ \text{or } \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} I_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} I_n^\dagger &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u_1}^\dagger \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u_1} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u_2}^\dagger \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u_2} \\ &+ \dots + \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u_{d_v^{(o)}}}^\dagger \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u_{d_v^{(o)}}} = I_n. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It leads us to construct $(d_v^{(o)} + 1)$ coin operators for the vertex v which are

$$C_{v,u_i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u_i} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, d_v^{(o)} \text{ and } C_{v,v} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} I_n. \quad (10)$$

The set of Kraus operators corresponding to the vertex v is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_v = \left\{ C_{v,u} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(d_v^{(o)} + 1)}} U_{v,u}, u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \right\} \cup \{C_{v,v}\}, \quad (11)$$

which we consider as the set of coin operators at vertex v .

Now, corresponding to an edge $\overrightarrow{(v, u_i)}$ we can construct a shift operator $S_{v,u_i} = |u_i\rangle \langle v|$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d_v^{(o)}$. As the walker may not move from vertex v at time t , we consider $S_{v,v} = |v\rangle \langle v|$ as a shift operator. The set of all shift operators at vertex v is

$$\mathcal{S}_v = \{S_{v,u}, u \in \text{Nbd}(v)\} \cup \{S_{v,v}\}. \quad (12)$$

The construction of \mathcal{C}_v and \mathcal{S}_v suggests that for every directed edge $\overrightarrow{(v, u)}$ there are a coin operator $C_{v,u}$ and a shift operator $S_{v,u}$. When we consider the evaluation on the graph \vec{G} , we need all of the operators corresponding to every directed edge. Combining the operators $C_{v,u}$ and $S_{v,u}$ for the edge $\overrightarrow{(v, u)}$ we get new set of Kraus operators $K_{v,u} = C_{v,u} \otimes S_{v,u}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v)} K_{v,u}^\dagger K_{v,u} &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} \left(C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes S_{v,u}^\dagger \right) (C_{v,u} \otimes S_{v,u}) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} \left(C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes |v\rangle \langle u| \right) (C_{v,u} \otimes |u\rangle \langle v|) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \left(\sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} C_{v,u}^\dagger C_{v,u} \right) \otimes |v\rangle \langle u|u\rangle \langle v| \\ &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} I_n \otimes |v\rangle \langle v| \quad [\text{using equation (9)}] \\ &= I_n \otimes I_n = I_{n^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{K} = \{K_{v,u} : v \in V(G), u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}\} \quad (14)$$

forms a set of Kraus operators on the graph \vec{G} . We use them to lead the movement of the quantum walker on \vec{G} .

Recall that the objective of this work is building up a qPageRank algorithm. In the construction of classical PageRank we assumed that at $t = 0$ the internet surfer initiates surfing from any vertex chosen uniformly and randomly. We should consider this assumption, for developing our qPageRank algorithm. Hence, we define the initial density matrix as

$$\rho^{(0)} = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{n^2} I_n \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|, \quad (15)$$

where I_n is identity matrix of order n . Note that $\rho^{(0)}$ is a density matrix of a quantum state because it is a positive semi-definite, Hermitian matrix and $\text{trace}(\rho^{(0)}) = 1$. The probability of getting the walker at vertex v is

$$p_v^{(0)} = \text{trace} \left((I \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|) \rho^{(0)} (I \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|) \right) = \text{trace} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} I_n \otimes |v\rangle \langle v| \right) = \frac{1}{n^2} \text{trace}(I_n) \times 1 = \frac{1}{n}. \quad (16)$$

Due to the particular tensor product structure of the initial state and Kraus operators, we can assume that the state of the walker can be expressed as

$$\rho^{(t)} = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|, \quad (17)$$

where $\rho_v^{(t)}$ is a positive semi-definite and Hermitian matrix, whose trace is not necessarily 1. Recall that at $t = 0$ we have $\rho_v^{(0)} = \frac{I_n}{n^2}$, which is not a density matrix. But, $\rho^{(t)}$ is a density matrix for all t . The probability of getting the walker at the vertex v at time t

$$\begin{aligned} p_v^{(t)} &= \text{trace} \left((I \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|) \rho^{(t)} (I \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|) \right) \\ &= \text{trace} \left((I \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|) \left(\sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \otimes |v\rangle \langle v| \right) (I \otimes |v\rangle \langle v|) \right) \\ &= \text{trace} \left(\rho_v^{(t)} \otimes |v\rangle \langle v| \right) = \text{trace} \left(\rho_v^{(t)} \right) \times 1 = \text{trace} \left(\rho_v^{(t)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The state of the walker at $(t+1)$ -th step governed by the Kraus operators in \mathcal{K} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_K^{(t+1)} &= \Psi_K(\rho^{(t)}) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} K_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} \otimes |v\rangle \langle v| K_{v,u}^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes S_{v,u} |v\rangle \langle v| S_{v,u}^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes |u\rangle \langle v| |v\rangle \langle v| \langle v| \langle u| \\ &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes |u\rangle \langle u|. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Recall that $u \in \text{Nbd}(v)$ indicates that there is a directed edge $\overrightarrow{(v, u)}$ in the graph. Also, existence of the edge $\overrightarrow{(v, u)}$ indicates that $v \in B(u)$. Therefore, equation (19) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_K^{(t+1)} &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{u \in \text{Nbd}(v) \cup \{v\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes |u\rangle \langle u| \\ &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{v \in B(u) \cup \{u\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes |u\rangle \langle u|. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The equation (20) reduces the Hilbert space of our consideration. The state $|u\rangle \langle u|$ remains unchanged in all the steps. We update the coin space corresponding to a vertex from time to time. Therefore, the Hilbert space for our calculations is \mathcal{H}^n , which is a space of dimension n .

4 Kraus operators to restart the walking in discrete-time open quantum walk

In subsection 2.2, we discussed that the movement of a surfer may not be limited to the hyperlinked vertices. The random walker can move to any vertex of the graph in the next time instance and restart surfing from there. To model this phenomenon using open quantum walk we also develop a set of Kraus operators. Given any vertex u there are n operators $S_{uv} = |u\rangle \langle v|$, such that

$$S_{uv} |v\rangle \langle v| S_{uv}^\dagger = |u\rangle \langle v| |v\rangle \langle v| \langle v| \langle u| = |u\rangle \langle u|. \quad (21)$$

Also, we have

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} S_{uv}^\dagger S_{uv} = \sum_{v \in V(G)} |v\rangle \langle v| = I_n. \quad (22)$$

Considering all possible pairs of the vertices u, v in the graph we have n^2 operators $S_{u,v}$. We define a set of operators

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ D_{u,v} : D_{u,v} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(I_n \otimes S_{u,v}) \right\}. \quad (23)$$

The set \mathcal{D} is a set of Kraus operators because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V(G)} D_{u,v}^\dagger D_{u,v} &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(I_n \otimes S_{u,v})^\dagger \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(I_n \otimes S_{u,v}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} (I_n \otimes S_{u,v}^\dagger S_{u,v}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left(I_n \otimes \sum_{v \in V(G)} S_{u,v}^\dagger S_{u,v} \right) = \frac{1}{n} I_n \otimes I_n = \frac{I_{n^2}}{n} \\ \text{or } \sum_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{v \in V(G)} D_{u,v}^\dagger D_{u,v} &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{I_{n^2}}{n} = I_{n^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Now applying the operators of \mathcal{D} on $\rho^{(t)}$ mentioned in equation (17) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_D^{(t+1)} &= \Psi_D(\rho^{(t)}) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{v \in V(G)} D_{u,v} \rho^{(t)} D_{u,v}^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(I_n \otimes S_{u,v}) \left(\sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \otimes |v\rangle \langle v| \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(I_n \otimes S_{u,v})^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \otimes S_{u,v} |v\rangle \langle v| S_{u,v}^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \right) \otimes |u\rangle \langle u|. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Note that we find an average of all matrices $\rho_v^{(t)}$ at the vertex u after application of the operators in \mathcal{D} . Also, the dimension of the evaluation is again limited to the coin space \mathcal{H}^n . Equation (25) assists us to restart the walker during internet surfing as discussed in subsection 2.2.

5 qPageRank of the vertices of a graph

Till now we have demonstrated two types of evaluations on the state $\rho^{(t)}$ to generate a new state of the walker which are mentioned in equation (19) and (25). These movements are governed by the sets of Kraus operators mentioned in equation (11) and (23), respectively. Following equation (5), we can update the dynamics of the walker as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(t+1)} &= \alpha \sum_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{v \in B(u) \cup \{u\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger \otimes |u\rangle \langle u| + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \right) \otimes |u\rangle \langle u| \\ &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left(\alpha \sum_{v \in B(u) \cup \{u\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger \right) \otimes |u\rangle \langle u| + \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left(\frac{(1 - \alpha)}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \right) \otimes |u\rangle \langle u| \\ &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left[\alpha \sum_{v \in B(u) \cup \{u\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger + \frac{(1 - \alpha)}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)} \right] \otimes |u\rangle \langle u| \\ &= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \rho_u^{(t+1)} \otimes |u\rangle \langle u|, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where

$$\rho_u^{(t+1)} = \alpha \sum_{v \in B(u) \cup \{u\}} C_{v,u} \rho_v^{(t)} C_{v,u}^\dagger + \frac{(1-\alpha)}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \rho_v^{(t)}. \quad (27)$$

In equation (26), the state $|u\rangle\langle u|$ remains unchanged in every time instance. We only update the coin space corresponding to a vertex from time to time using equation (27). Therefore, an n dimensional Hilbert space is sufficient for our calculation. A classical computer can perform the matrix multiplications and additions which are required in equation (27) in polynomial time.

Recall from equation (18) that the probability of getting the walker at vertex u at time $(t+1)$ is given by

$$p_u^{(t+1)} = \text{trace } \rho_u^{(t+1)}. \quad (28)$$

Equation (26) provides the time evolution of the surfer on the internet graph, who follows discrete-time open quantum walk. In every time instance, the probability of getting the walker at different vertices becomes updated and converges to a limit as the dynamics is Markovian. We consider the limiting probability distribution as our qPageRank of the vertices.

Definition 2. We define the quantum PageRank vectors as

$$q\Pi = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (p_1^{(t)}, p_2^{(t)}, \dots, p_n^{(t)}), \quad (29)$$

where $p_u^{(t)}$ is the probability of getting the walker at vertex u at time t determined by equation (28).

Below, we mention a summary of steps involved in our algorithm for calculating qPageRank of the vertices in any directed graph. We also mention the steps of the calculations using a classical computer.

Procedure 1. Follow the below steps to calculate the qPageRank of the vertices in a given graph:

1. **Preparation of initial state:** The initial state $\rho^{(0)}$ of the system to be prepared following equation (15). Classically, we make a list \mathcal{L} of length n with the matrices $\frac{I_n}{n^2}$ corresponding to the vertices.
2. **Construction of operators:** Corresponding to every directed edge in the graph, we construct the coin operators following equation (10).
3. **Quantum evolution:** We evaluate the quantum state iteratively following equation (26). Classically, to reduce the size of our calculations, we apply equation (27) to update elements in the list \mathcal{L} .
4. **qPageRank measurement:** We calculate the ranking of a vertex by measuring the state after a few iterations following the equation (28). Classically, we calculate the trace of the matrices in \mathcal{L} after a few time instances. The qPageRank of a vertex is the trace of the corresponding matrix in the list \mathcal{L} .

If the graph is undirected, we can assign two opposite orientations on every edge and make it a directed graph. Hence, we can apply the above procedure for calculating the qPageRank of the vertices in an undirected graph.

6 qPageRanks of nodes on various networks


In this section, we present our observations from the numerical experiments with Procedure 1 on a number of networks. We also compare the qPageRank with the classical PageRank for both directed and undirected graphs. We plot bar diagrams to represent the importance of different vertices based on PageRank and qPageRank. We discuss our calculations and observations for the undirected path graph and directed trinary tree in detail. For a few other graphs, we summarize our observations in tables. In all the bar diagrams, the blue bars represent classical PageRank and the orange bars represent qPageRank. Our calculations utilize the Python library *NetworkX* [43].

6.1 Undirected graphs


Recall that, we have considered every undirected graph as a directed graph where every edge has two different orientations. We initiated our study with a path graph with ten vertices which is depicted in figure 1a. The PageRank and qPageRank of different vertices are mentioned in the table below.

vertices	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
PageRank	0.0644	0.1162	0.1093	0.1058	0.1043	0.1043	0.1058	0.1093	0.1162	0.0644
qPageRank	0.0804	0.1102	0.1051	0.1027	0.1017	0.1017	0.1027	0.1051	0.1102	0.0804

We represent this data as a bar diagram in figure 1b. We place the vertices in X axis as well as the PageRanks and qPageRanks in Y axis. It can be observed that the corresponding values of qPageRank and PageRank are different at each node. But, the returned ranks are identical.



(a) The Path graph with 10 vertices.




(b) The blue and orange bars represent the qPageRank and PageRank of different vertices of a path graph.

Figure 1: Comparison between the PageRank and qPageRank of vertices on path graph with 10 vertices.

Also, note the symmetry in the values of PageRank and qPageRank. The extreme vertices 0 and 9 have equal PageRank and qPageRank. Similarly, the pairs of vertices (1, 8), (2, 7), (3, 6) and (4, 5) have equal PageRanks and qPageRanks. The rankings based on PageRank and qPageRank are also identical.

In addition, we consider undirected cycle graph, star graph, wheel graph, complete graph, balanced tree, barbell graph, Watts-Strogatz graph [44], Karate Club [45], as well as Barabási and Albert graph [46] for our investigations. Table 1 contains the bar diagrams representing the pageRank and qPageRank of different graphs. In case of the cycle and the complete graphs, the values of PageRank and qPageRank are identical for every vertex. For other graphs, these values are different for all the vertices, but the ranking of the vertices based on PageRank and qPageRank are equal.

Graphs	Figure	Comparison between PageRank and qPageRank
Cycle Graph	<pre>graph LR 0 --- 1 1 --- 2 2 --- 3 3 --- 4 4 --- 5 5 --- 6 6 --- 7 7 --- 8 8 --- 9 9 --- 10 10 --- 11 11 --- 12 12 --- 13 13 --- 14 14 --- 15 15 --- 16 16 --- 17 17 --- 18 18 --- 0</pre>	









Watts-Strogatz model (20, 3, .3)		
Karate Club		
Barabási and Albert (20, 3)		

Table 1: Comparison between PageRank and qPageRank of the vertices in different classes of undirected graphs.

6.2 Directed graphs

In this subsection, we consider the directed graphs where most of the edges have only one direction. Due to this assumption, PageRank and qPageRank may behave differently. We try to realize how the ranks of the vertices generated by PageRank and qPageRank are correlated. We rank the vertices of the graph with the integers $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ based on PageRank and qPageRank values separately. We break the ties arbitrarily if occur in both of the cases. We denote the ranking of the vertices with pRank if it is calculated using PageRank formula. Similarly, we denote the ranking of the vertices with qRank when they are calculated based on qPageRank. The formula for correlation coefficient which we use here is


$$\rho = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{pRank}_i - \overline{\text{pRank}})(\text{qRank}_i - \overline{\text{qRank}})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{pRank}_i - \overline{\text{pRank}})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{qRank}_i - \overline{\text{qRank}})^2}}, \quad (30)$$

where pRank_i and qRank_i are the pRank and qRank of the i -th vertex, respectively, as well as $\overline{\text{pRank}}$ and $\overline{\text{qRank}}$ are the average values of the pRank and qRank, respectively.


We consider a directed trinary tree for our calculation, which is depicted in 2a. The values and PageRank and qPageRank of both the graphs are available in table 2. Using bar diagrams, we represent the PageRanks and qPageRanks of the vertices in figure 2b. We observe that the PageRank and qPageRank hold the same pattern of ranking. We also calculate pRank and qRank for the vertices, which are also available in table 2. We observe that the correlation coefficient between pRank and qRank is 1.

Vertex	PageRank	pRank	qPageRank	qRank
0	0.1195	13	0.2319	13
1	0.3384	10	0.4583	10
2	0.1195	11	0.0646	11
3	0.1195	12	0.0646	12
4	0.0337	1	0.0201	1
5	0.0337	2	0.0201	2
6	0.0337	3	0.0201	3
7	0.0337	4	0.0201	4
8	0.0337	5	0.0201	5
9	0.0337	6	0.0201	6
10	0.0337	7	0.0201	7
11	0.0337	8	0.0201	8
12	0.0337	9	0.0201	9

Table 2: PageRank and qPageRank of a Trinary tree.



(a) Trinary tree.



(b) Bar diagrams representing the PageRank and qPageRank for trinary tree.

Figure 2: PageRank and qPageRank of trinary trees.

We also calculate PageRank and qPageRank for directed scale-free graph [47], Erdos-Renyi random graph [48], Random k-out graph [49], and CNG graph [50]. The values are represented as bar diagrams and collected in table 3. The correlation coefficient between two rankings is not necessarily 1 for these directed graphs.

Graphs	Figure	Comparison between PageRank and qPageRank	Rank correlation
Scale free graph			0.7429







Erdos-Renyi random graph ($n = 20$, $p = .1$)			0.9684
Random k out graph ($n = 20$, $k = 3$)			0.99
GNC graph			0.8947

Table 3: Comparison between PageRank and qPageRank for different classes of directed graphs.

7 Conclusion

This article has two contributions. Firstly, it generalizes the idea of the discrete-time open quantum walk and makes it applicable to all directed and undirected graphs. Earlier, this quantum walk was defined for a limited class of graphs. Secondly, it discusses a new quantum PageRank for all graphs.

Corresponding to every directed edge in the graph, we construct a Kraus operator using Weyl unitary matrices. Therefore, the walker state is transported through different quantum channels for different vertices in the network. In contrast, every vertex applies the same quantum channel on the state in the standard definition of discrete time open quantum walk. Therefore, our quantum walk is a generalization of the existing idea in literature.

We apply the new idea of discrete-time open quantum walk for ranking the vertices in a graph. We produce a new quantum PageRank algorithm using this quantum walk. To define the qPageRank we maintain the procedure to calculate the classical PageRank in a quantum mechanical way. As our definition of the quantum walk fits with all graphs, the qPageRank can also be calculated for all graphs. We have considered different types of graphs for our numerical experiments. We observe that the new quantum ranking matches with classical PageRank exactly for the undirected graphs.

In future, an interested reader can apply the discrete-time open quantum walk to find the quantum mechanical counterparts of various classical algorithms depending on a random walk.

Acknowledgment

SD is thankful to Monika Rani and Subashish Banerjee for some discussions.

Funding

This work was supported by the SERB Funded Project entitled “Transmission of quantum information using perfect state transfer” (Grant no. CRG/2021/001834).

Data Availability Statement

Python programs related to this article are available in the [GitHub](https://github.com/dosupriyo/qPageRank) repository <https://github.com/dosupriyo/qPageRank>.

References

- [1] Ernesto Estrada. *The structure of complex networks: theory and applications*. American Chemical Society, 2012.
- [2] James Gillies and Robert Cailliau. *How the Web was born: The story of the World Wide Web*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2000.
- [3] Steven H Strogatz. [Exploring complex networks](#). *Nature*, 410(6825):268–276, 2001.
- [4] Stefano Boccaletti, Vito Latora, Yamir Moreno, Martin Chavez, and D-U Hwang. [Complex networks: Structure and dynamics](#). *Physics Reports*, 424(4-5):175–308, 2006.
- [5] Kun Fang, Jingtian Zhao, Xiufan Li, Yifei Li, and Runyao Duan. [Quantum NETWORK: from theory to practice](#). *Science China Information Sciences*, 66(8):180509, 2023.
- [6] Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, Terry Winograd, et al. [The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web](#). 1999.
- [7] Amy N Langville and Carl D Meyer. *Google’s PageRank and beyond: The science of search engine rankings*. Princeton University Press, 2006.
- [8] Silvano Garnerone, Paolo Zanardi, and Daniel A Lidar. [Adiabatic quantum algorithm for search engine ranking](#). *Physical Review Letters*, 108(23):230506, 2012.
- [9] Renato Portugal. *Quantum walks and search algorithms*, volume 19. Springer, 2013.
- [10] Dorit Aharonov, Andris Ambainis, Julia Kempe, and Umesh Vazirani. [Quantum walks on graphs](#). In *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 50–59, 2001.
- [11] Chris Godsil. [Periodic graphs](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:0806.2074*, 2008.
- [12] Mario Szegedy. [Quantum speed-up of Markov chain based algorithms](#). In *45th Annual IEEE symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 32–41. IEEE, 2004.
- [13] Mario Szegedy. [Spectra of Quantized Walks and a \$\sqrt{\delta\epsilon}\$ rule](#). *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0401053*, 2004.
- [14] Stephane Attal, Francesco Petruccione, Christophe Sabot, and Ilya Sinayskiy. [Open quantum random walks](#). *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 147(4):832–852, 2012.

- [15] Giuseppe Davide Paparo and Miguel Angel Martin-Delgado. [Google in a quantum network](#). *Scientific Reports*, 2(1):444, 2012.
- [16] Eduardo Sánchez-Burillo, Jordi Duch, Jesús Gómez-Gardenes, and David Zueco. [Quantum navigation and ranking in complex networks](#). *Scientific Reports*, 2(1):605, 2012.
- [17] Paola Boito and Roberto Grena. [Ranking nodes in directed networks via continuous-time quantum walks](#). *Quantum Information Processing*, 22(6):246, 2023.
- [18] Giuseppe Davide Paparo, Markus Müller, Francesc Comellas, and Miguel Angel Martin-Delgado. [Quantum google in a complex network](#). *Scientific Reports*, 3(1):2773, 2013.
- [19] Giuseppe Davide Paparo, Markus Müller, F Comellas, and Miguel Angel Martin-Delgado. [Quantum Google algorithm: Construction and application to complex networks](#). *The European Physical Journal Plus*, 129:1–16, 2014.
- [20] Prateek Chawla, Roopesh Mangal, and C Madaiah Chandrashekar. [Discrete-time quantum walk algorithm for ranking nodes on a network](#). *Quantum Information Processing*, 19:1–21, 2020.
- [21] Sergio A Ortega and Miguel A Martin-Delgado. [Generalized quantum PageRank algorithm with arbitrary phase rotations](#). *Physical Review Research*, 5(1):013061, 2023.
- [22] Tania Loke, Judy W Tang, Jeremy Rodriguez, Michael Small, and Jingbo B Wang. [Comparing classical and quantum PageRanks](#). *Quantum Information Processing*, 16:1–22, 2017.
- [23] Hao Tang, Ruoxi Shi, Tian-Shen He, Yan-Yan Zhu, Tian-Yu Wang, Marcus Lee, and Xian-Min Jin. [TensorFlow solver for quantum PageRank in large-scale networks](#). *Science Bulletin*, 66(2):120–126, 2021.
- [24] Théodore Chapuis-Chkaiban, Zeno Toffano, and Benoît Valiron. [On new PageRank computation methods using quantum computing](#). *Quantum Information Processing*, 22(3):138, 2023.
- [25] Aram W Harrow, Avinatan Hassidim, and Seth Lloyd. [Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations](#). *Physical Review Letters*, 103(15):150502, 2009.
- [26] Colin Benjamin and Naini Dudhe. [Resolving degeneracies in Google search via quantum stochastic walks](#). *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2024(1):013402, 2024.
- [27] Paola Boito and Roberto Grena. [Quantum hub and authority centrality measures for directed networks based on continuous-time quantum walks](#). *Journal of Complex Networks*, 9(6):cnab038, 2021.
- [28] Yang Wang, Shichuan Xue, Junjie Wu, and Ping Xu. [Continuous-time quantum walk based centrality testing on weighted graphs](#). *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):6001, 2022.
- [29] Kunkun Wang, Yuhao Shi, Lei Xiao, Jingbo Wang, Yogesh N Joglekar, and Peng Xue. [Experimental realization of continuous-time quantum walks on directed graphs and their application in PageRank](#). *Optica*, 7(11):1524–1530, 2020.
- [30] Josh A Izaac, Xiang Zhan, Zhihao Bian, Kunkun Wang, Jian Li, Jingbo B Wang, and Peng Xue. [Centrality measure based on continuous-time quantum walks and experimental realization](#). *Physical Review A*, 95(3):032318, 2017.
- [31] Tong Wu, JA Izaac, Zi-Xi Li, Kai Wang, Zhao-Zhong Chen, Shining Zhu, JB Wang, Xiao-Song Ma, et al. [Experimental parity-time symmetric quantum walks for centrality ranking on directed graphs](#). *Physical Review Letters*, 125(24):240501, 2020.

- [32] Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational complexity: a modern approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [33] Ilya Sinayskiy and Francesco Petruccione. *Open quantum walks: a short introduction*. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, volume 442, page 012003. IOP Publishing, 2013.
- [34] Ameer Dhahri and Farrukh Mukhamedov. *Open quantum random walks, quantum Markov chains and recurrence*. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 31(07):1950020, 2019.
- [35] Charles H Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Claude Crépeau, Richard Jozsa, Asher Peres, and William K Wootters. *Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels*. *Physical Review Letters*, 70(13):1895, 1993.
- [36] Reinhold A Bertlmann and Philipp Krammer. *Bloch vectors for qudits*. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 41(23):235303, 2008.
- [37] Douglas Brent West. *Introduction to graph theory*. Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, 2001.
- [38] David Aldous and James Fill. *Reversible Markov chains and random walks on graphs.(monograph in preparation.)*, 2002.
- [39] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [40] ECG Sudarshan, PM Mathews, and Jayaseetha Rau. Stochastic dynamics of quantum-mechanical systems. *Physical Review*, 121(3):920, 1961.
- [41] Karl Kraus, Arno Böhm, John D Dollard, and WH Wootters. *States, Effects, and Operations Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory: Lectures in Mathematical Physics at the University of Texas at Austin*. Springer, 1983.
- [42] Supriyo Dutta, Subhashish Banerjee, and Monika Rani. *Qudit states in noisy quantum channels*. *Physica Scripta*, 98(11):115113, 2023.
- [43] Aric Hagberg, Pieter Swart, and Daniel S Chult. *Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using NetworkX*. Technical report, Los Alamos National Lab.(LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States), 2008.
- [44] Duncan J Watts and Steven H Strogatz. *Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks*. *Nature*, 393(6684):440–442, 1998.
- [45] Wayne W Zachary. *An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups*. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 33(4):452–473, 1977.
- [46] Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. *Emergence of scaling in random networks*. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
- [47] Béla Bollobás, Christian Borgs, Jennifer T Chayes, and Oliver Riordan. *Directed scale-free graphs*. In *SODA*, volume 3, pages 132–139. Baltimore, MD, United States, 2003.
- [48] Paul Erdős, Alfréd Rényi, et al. *On the evolution of random graphs*. *Publ. math. inst. hung. acad. sci*, 5(1):17–60, 1960.
- [49] Nicholas R Peterson and Boris Pittel. *Distance between two random k-out digraphs, with and without preferential attachment*. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 47(3):858–879, 2015.
- [50] Pavel L Krapivsky and Sidney Redner. *Network growth by copying*. *Physical Review E*, 71(3):036118, 2005.