

# Radial Structure of the Internet

Petter Holme,<sup>1</sup> Josh Karlin,<sup>1</sup> and Stephanie Forrest<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Computer Science, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, U.S.A.*

<sup>2</sup>*Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501, U.S.A.*

The structure of the Internet at the Autonomous System (AS) level has been studied by both the Physics and Computer Science communities. We extend this work to include features of the core and the periphery, taking a radial perspective on AS network structure. New methods for plotting AS data are described, and they are used to analyze data sets that have been extended to contain edges missing from earlier collections. In particular, the average distance from one vertex to the rest of the network is used as the baseline metric for investigating radial structure. Common vertex-specific quantities are plotted against this metric to reveal distinctive characteristics of central and peripheral vertices. Two data sets are analyzed using these measures as well as two common generative models (Barabási-Albert and Inet). We find a clear distinction between the highly connected core and a sparse periphery. We also find that the periphery has a more complex structure than that predicted by degree distribution or the two generative models.

PACS numbers: 89.20.Hh, 89.75.Fb, 89.75.Hc

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the turn of the century there has been increasing interest in the statistical study of networks (1; 10; 23), stimulated in large part by the availability of large-scale network data sets. One network of great interest is the Internet (24). The Internet is intriguing because its complexity and size preclude comprehensive study. It is comprised of millions of individual end-nodes connected to tens of thousands of ISPs whose relationships are continually in flux and only partially observable. One way to cope with these complexities is by analyzing a single scale of Internet data, for example, a local office network of computers and their inter-connections; a network of email address book contacts; the network formed by URL links on the World Wide Web; or the interdomain (Autonomous System) level of the Internet. This paper is concerned with the last of these examples—the AS graph. The vertices in the graph are themselves computer networks; roughly speaking an AS is an independently operated network or set of networks owned by a single entity. Edges represent pairs of ASs that can directly communicate.

A major finding of earlier AS studies is that node degree (number of links to other ASs) has a power law distribution (13). The degree distribution is, however, not the only structure that affects Internet dynamics (11). In this paper we investigate higher-order (beyond the degree distribution) network structures that also impact network dynamics. We analyze the AS graph using methods that are appropriate for networks with a clear hierarchical organization (24; 29). In particular, we study network quantities as a function of the average distance to other vertices. This approach allows us to separate vertices of different hierarchical levels, in a radial fashion, ranging from central (in the sense of the closeness centrality (27)) to peripheral vertices. This is, furthermore, a way to dissolve how clearly separated the core and the periphery are. Most analysis methods developed by physicists (degree frequencies, correlations, etc.) are based on quantities averaged over the whole network and do not take a hierarchical partitioning into account (24). Studies by computer scientists, on the other hand, assume a division of the AS level In-

ternet into hierarchical levels (28). We will argue that the observed AS level networks do have pronounced core-periphery dichotomy but that the periphery has more structure than previously thought.

## II. NETWORKS

This section briefly reviews the organization of the AS-level Internet and describes how we obtained our data sets. We also describe the network models to which we compare our observed data. These models include one randomization scheme that samples random networks with the same set of degrees as the original networks, and the generative BA and Inet models. Technically all three models are null-models, but to contrast the randomized networks (having  $N$  degrees of freedom) with the generative models (having only a few degrees of freedom) we reserve the term null-model to the former.

The data are represented as a network  $G = (V, E)$  where  $V$  is a set of  $N$  vertices (ASs) and  $E$  is a set of  $M$  undirected edges (connections between ASs). The Internet is currently composed of roughly 22,000 individual networks known as Autonomous Systems. Each of these systems peer with a (usually small) set of ASs to form a connected network. The protocol used to establish peering sessions and discover routes to distant ASs is called the Border Gateway Protocol (BGP). Two typical peering relationships are: customer-provider in which the provider provides connectivity to the rest of the Internet for the customer; and peer-peer in which the peering ASs transfer traffic between their respective customers. The extreme core of the network, the Tier-1 ASs, have many peer-peer and customer links but no providers. Nodes closer to the periphery of the network have fewer customers and peers but more providers.

### A. AS networks

We analyze four real-world data sets (that is, data sets collected using observed network data rather than simu-

lated networks that are generated synthetically), of which two are original. The first two are well-known and well-studied (7) dating from 2002 and the second two data sets are recent, inferred from 2006 data. The first graph in each pair consists of edges learned solely from dumps of router state, known as Routing Information Bases (RIBs) (<http://www.routeviews.org/data.html>). RIBs are a standard source of AS connectivity data. The second graph in each pair contains RIB information augmented with edges derived from other sources (such as routing registries, looking glass servers, and update messages) which produces a more accurate representation of the real network. The additional sources are described below.

### 1. Obtaining RIBs from Route Views

BGP routers store the most recent AS path for each IP block (prefix) announced by its peers. These data are stored in the router's RIB, and periodic RIB dumps from a large number of voluntary sources are available from Route Views (<http://www.routeviews.org>). Each RIB represents a static snapshot of all routes available to the router from which it was obtained. Since BGP only disseminates each router's best path, and this value is dynamic as links go up and down, a sizable portion of the network is hidden from each router. In order to obtain a more complete topology, common practice is to take the union of the relationships found in a large number of RIB samples. From the samples, AS relationships are then inferred from the routing paths. A path is comprised of connected ASs and therefore each pair of adjacent ASs in a path corresponds to an edge in the graph.

The 2002 graph taken from a single RIB (RIB '02) was inferred from Route Views on May 15th of 2002. We constructed the 2006 RIB graph (RIB '06) from the Route Views RIB on May 16th of 2006. The RIB '02 graph has  $N = 13233$  and  $M = 27724$  while RIB '06 has  $N = 22403$  and  $M = 46343$ .

### 2. Extending the RIB Dataset

There are other sources of AS connectivity data besides Route Views. RIPE (<http://www.ripe.net>) has data collected from additional RIBs beyond those contained in the Route Views data. Peering information is directly available for a small number of ASs that are participating Looking Glass (<http://www.traceroute.org>) routers. Finally, some ASs register their peering relationships in regional registries such as RIPE. The extended 2002 AS graph (AS '02) was constructed using inferred topologies from all three of these sources, together with the original Route Views data.

RIB data represent a brief snapshot of routing state. There are many paths that a router sees only briefly, and the chances of capturing all of them from just a few RIB dumps is unlikely. In the extended AS-graph of 2006 (AS '06), we augmented the Route Views RIB data with all of the paths found in BGP update messages for the entire month of April 2006 from both

Route Views and RIPE. This gives a more complete picture over time, although it is still biased by the limited number of routers from which the data were collected.

The extended 2002 AS-graph (AS '02) has  $N = 13579$ ,  $M = 37448$  and the corresponding 2006 network (AS '06) has  $N = 22688$   $M = 62637$ . Thus the extended data sets have 35% (2002) and 67% (2006) more edges than their RIB counterparts.

## B. Null-model networks

We are interested in network structure beyond degree distribution, so we compare our AS network data against a null model with the same degree distribution. Our null model is a random network constrained to have the same set of degrees as the original network. By comparing results for the observed networks with the same quantities for the null model, we can observe additional network structure if it exists. The standard way to sample such networks is by randomizing the original network with stochastic rewiring of the edges (see Ref. (14) for an early example). In our implementation we create a new random network by enumerating the edges  $E$  of the original graph, and for each edge  $(i, j)$  we are:

1. Choosing another edge  $(i', j')$  randomly and replacing  $(i, j)$  and  $(i', j')$  with  $(i, j')$  and  $(i', j)$ . If this creates a multi- or self-edge, then we are reverting to the original edges  $(i, j)$  and  $(i', j')$ , and repeating with a new  $(i', j')$ .
2. Choosing two edges  $(i_1, j_1)$  and  $(i_2, j_2)$  and replacing them along with  $(i, j')$  by  $(i_1, j')$ ,  $(i, j_2)$  and  $(i_2, j_1)$ .

Step 2 guarantees ergodicity of the sampling (26), i.e. that one can go between any pair of graphs with a given set of degrees by successive edge-rewirings.

## C. Generative network models

In addition to the observed (inferred from data) and null-model networks described above, we also study networks produced according to two previously proposed network-generation schemes (5; 31). The first is the well-known the Barabási-Albert preferential attachment model (5). The second, known as the Inet model (version 3.0) (31), is more complex and designed specifically for creating networks with AS graph properties.

### 1. Barabási-Albert model

The Barabási-Albert (BA) model is a general growth model for producing networks with power-law degree distributions Ref. (5). Vertices and edges are iteratively added to the network according to a preferential attachment rule, which ensures that a power-law degree distribution emerges.

More precisely, the initial configuration consists of  $m$  isolated vertices. From this configuration the network is iteratively grown. At each time step one vertex is added together

with  $m$  edges leading out from the new vertex. The edges are attached to vertices in the graph such that:

1. The probability of attaching to a vertex  $i$  is proportional to  $k(i)$ .
2. No multiple edges, or self-edges, are formed.

This procedure produces a network which has, in the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limit, a degree distribution  $P(k) \sim k^{-3}$  for  $k \geq m$ , and  $P(k) = 0$  for  $k < m$ .

Because the BA model has only one integer parameter it is not very flexible at fitting data. We use  $m = 3$  to make the average degree as similar to the AS networks as possible. Other preferential attachment models (e.g., Ref. (25)), can model the average degree and slope of the degree distribution more closely. Such improvements, we believe, are unlikely to change the conclusions drawn from the original BA model.

## 2. Inet model

The Inet model (31) is less general than BA's. Its objective is to regenerate the AS graph as accurately as possible rather than to focus on a single mechanism to create and explain scale-free networks. The scheme is rather detailed and we only sketch its strategy here. Starting with  $N$  vertices, Inet first generates random numbers that represent the final degree of the vertices such that the degree distribution matches the observed distribution of the AS-graph as closely as possible. This means that the low-degree end of the distribution is more accurately modeled by Inet than the BA model because the BA model will not produce a vertex with degree less than  $m$ . In the real AS-graph there are a considerable fraction of degree-one vertices. After the degrees are assigned to the vertices, edges are added in such a way that the degree-degree correlation properties of the original AS-graph is matched as closely as possible.

A more detailed explanation of this procedure and its rationale are given in Ref. (31). We use Inet's default parameter settings, except  $N$  which we extracted from our datasets, producing an average degree that is approximately six.

## III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section we present the numerical results of our analysis. We first discuss the average distance metric we use for displaying network properties with a radial perspective. Then we define and present the results for each network structural measure as a function of the average distance to other vertices.

Let  $d(i, j)$  denote the graph distance between two vertices  $i$  and  $j$ —the number of edges in the shortest path between  $i$  and  $j$ . A simple measure for how peripheral a vertex is in the network is its *eccentricity*—the distance to the most distant vertex,  $\max_{j \in V} d(i, j)$  (6). Eccentricity is thus an extremal property of the network and is determined by a small fraction of vertices. To reflect the typical path length of a vertex we rank vertices according to an average property of the vertex.




FIG. 1 Normalized histograms of vertices with a specific average distance  $\bar{d}$  to the rest of the vertices. (a) shows curves for the Oregon Route Views data (RIB '02), extended data (AS '02), and values for random networks with the same degree sequences as AS '02. (b) displays curves for the Oregon Route Views data (RIB '06), extended data (AS '06), as well as randomized networks with the degree sequence of AS '06. (c) shows the same AS '06 curve as (b) along with the BA and Inet model results for parameter values as close as possible to those of the AS '06 network. 100 averages were used for the null-model curves in (a) and (b) as well as the model networks in (c). Lines are guides for the eyes. The error-bars represent standard error (the point symbols are often larger than the error bars).

The average property corresponding to eccentricity is the average distance from one vertex to all of the others:

$$\bar{d}(i) = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_j d(i, j), \quad (1)$$

where the sum is over all vertices, except  $i$ , in  $V$ . We note that the reciprocal value of  $\bar{d}(i)$ , the *closeness centrality*, is a common measure for centrality in social network studies (6; 27). Average distance is a more intuitive measure in this context— $\bar{d}(i) \approx 2$  means that  $i$  is on average two hops away from other vertices, whereas the closeness value 0.5 does not have such a direct interpretation.

Another way to study eccentricity is by iteratively removing vertices of low-degree to construct a sequence of  $k$ -cores (subgraphs in which all vertices have degree  $\geq k$ ) (3; 28). We

used the average distance metric instead because it measures separation of vertices—i.e. the values on the x-axis are not only integers as for the eccentricity. Further, because it is a global measure (in the sense that the entire network topology affects  $\bar{d}(i)$  for every  $i$ ) it is likely more robust to errors in the input data.

### A. Radial vertex density

We first plot the fraction of vertices as a function of  $\bar{d}$ . Fig. 1 shows the distribution of  $\bar{d}$  for our data sets and the model AS graphs. The observed networks produce graphs that are far from smooth, unimodal distributions. Instead they have one peak close to  $\bar{d} = 3$ , a smaller peak around  $\bar{d} = 4$ , and for the 2006 data, a third peak near  $\bar{d} = 5$ . The difference between the RIB-only and the extended datasets is small, except around the second peak in Fig. 1(b) which is higher in the RIB-only data. The null-model curves are much more unimodal, although they do not follow a simple, smooth functional form. Such a unimodal form could be a result of the averaging of many null-model curves, but the observation holds even if single realizations of the randomization are plotted (data not shown). Thus, the observed AS graph is less homogeneous than what we would predict by considering only vertex degree.

We interpret the two peaks as an effect of the hierarchical organization of the Internet. The core (Tier-1 providers and other large ISPs) is in the low- $\bar{d}$  tail, the  $\bar{d} = 3$  peak are vertices directly connected to the core, and the  $\bar{d} = 4$  peak are vertices whose closest neighbors are in the  $\bar{d} = 3$  peak. This explains the approximately integer distance between the peaks. Determining the edge relationship between the peaks (customer-provider or peer-peer) is a difficult problem (28) however we believe that they are likely to be from customers to providers as ASs generally only have peer-peer edges with networks of equal class. The Tier-1 ASs that do not have any providers and are thus most core (AS numbers 209, 701, 1239, 1668, 2914, 3356, 3549, 3561, 6461 and 7018 in our data sets) have an average  $\bar{d} = 2.35 \pm 0.03$  in the AS '02 data and  $\bar{d} = 2.41 \pm 0.03$  in the AS '06 data, and are thus in the center of the network (left of the most central peak). Thus, the Tier-1 ASs are in the extreme low end of the  $\bar{d}$ -spectrum.

Results for the BA and Inet model networks are shown in Fig. 1(c). The Inet model has a peak to the left of the middle of the range of distances, but no second or third peak. The BA model matches the observed network even less accurately—its peak is at a relatively high  $\bar{d}$  value.

### B. Degree

Degree distribution is now a classical quantity in the study of the Internet topology. Ref. (13) reports a highly skewed distribution of degree, fitting well to a power-law with an exponent around 2.2. Since this finding, the degree distribution has become a core component in models of the AS graph—both the BA and Inet models as well as others (4; 12; 20) create




FIG. 2 Degree  $k$  as a function of the average distance  $\bar{d}$ . The panels and symbols represent the same data sets as in Fig. 1.

networks with power-law degree distributions. One interpretation of degree is that it is a local centrality measure (6). Further, different measures of centrality are known to be highly correlated (15; 16; 21) so one can expect the average degree  $k$  to be a decreasing function of the average distance  $\bar{d}$ .

Figure 2 confirms this prediction for both the observed and model networks. In Fig. 2(a) and (b) we observe that the  $k(\bar{d})$ -curves decrease dramatically until the approximate location of the first peak in the distribution plots Fig. 1(a) and (b). Therefore,  $\bar{d}$  identifies a natural border between the core vertices of high-degree and low average distance, and the sparsely connected periphery. The observed graphs, however, have higher degree in the periphery compared to the null-model curves. This suggests that the network periphery may have more complex wiring topology than that is predicted by degree distribution alone. This pattern occurs in our other network measurements as well.

The Inet model (Fig. 2(c)) fails to capture the higher degree (implying additional complexity) in the periphery. Because the BA model has a minimal degree of three, it is difficult to compare to the observed networks. However, the decrease of the  $k(\bar{d})$ -curves at the largest  $\bar{d}$ -peak is not conspicuous in the BA model curves. Thus, there is no clear core-periphery dichotomy in the BA model. This too is not surprising, because the BA model was designed to produce “scale-free” networks




FIG. 3 Neighbor degree  $K$  as a function of the average distance  $\bar{d}$ . The panels and symbols represent the same data sets as in Fig. 1.

in the sense of fractals (if one zooms in on any part of system, it looks similar to the whole).

### C. Neighbor degree

Degree is a property of individual vertices, with no information about how they are interconnected. In this sense degree is a measure of local network structure. A common way to broaden the perspective to understand the network's non-local organization (17) is to measure the correlations of degrees between neighbors in the network. There are three common approaches. The first, known as *assortative mixing coefficient* (23), measures the Pearson correlation coefficient for each edge. This provides one number for the entire network and is thus appropriate for comparisons between networks. The second approach makes a density plot that displays the fraction of edges with degree  $(k_1, k_2)$ . This kind of two-dimensional plot is called a *correlation profile* (18; 19). Correlation profiles provide more detailed information than the assortative mixing coefficient, but they are less concise and more sensitive to noisy data. The third approach measures average neighbor degree

$$K(i) = \frac{1}{k(i)} \sum_{j \in \Gamma_i} k(j), \quad (2)$$

(where  $\Gamma_i$  is the neighborhood of  $i$ ) as a function of degree  $k(i)$  (25). All approaches must be compared to null models because skewed degree distributions are known to induce anti-correlations (19). The third approach produces a one-dimensional plot and thus forms a middle ground between the assortative mixing coefficient and the correlation profile. It is also a method that can be adapted to our radial-plot framework—by plotting  $K$  against  $\bar{d}$  we can monitor the correlation between centrality and neighbor degree. For the AS-level Internet it has been observed that the  $K(k)$ -curves decay (25). In other words, high-degree vertices are, on average, connected to vertices of low degree and vice versa. Then, since degree decreases with  $\bar{d}$ , one would then expect  $K$  to be an increasing function of  $\bar{d}$ .

As seen in Fig. 3, vertices at intermediate distances have neighbors of highest degree. The peak in  $K(\bar{d})$  coincides with the largest peak in the histograms found in Fig. 1, and the change of slope in Fig. 2. This suggests that the periphery is composed of two levels: the intermediate majority which is primarily connected to the core, and the extreme periphery that is connected to other periphery vertices.

It is also apparent in Fig. 3(a) and (b) that the null-model qualitatively has the same shape as the observed network; but, just as for  $k$ ;  $K$  are larger in the observed networks than the null-model. Also, the Inet model underestimates the average neighbor degree in the periphery. Finally, the BA model exhibits less correlation between  $K$  and  $\bar{d}$ .

### D. Deletion impact

If a vertex is not actively routing packets due to fault or attack, other vertices might be affected. We are interested in knowing how susceptible a given network structure is to random node failures. Assuming that the network is connected, let  $S_i$  be the number of vertices in the largest connected sub-graph after the deletion of  $i$ . We define the *deletion impact* as

$$\phi(i) = \frac{N - 1 - S_i}{N - 2}. \quad (3)$$

This measure can take values in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . A value of 0 means that the entire network, except  $i$ , is still connected after the deletion. A value of 1 means that all of the network's edges were attached to  $i$  and that all of the vertices are isolated after the deletion.

Fig. 4 plots deletion impact as a function of the average distance for the same data sets as the previous figures. All curves are roughly decreasing. This means that the network is more sensitive to the deletion of central, than peripheral, vertices. This observation is anticipated from earlier studies showing that the Internet is vulnerable to targeted attacks at the vertices of highest degree (2) but robust to random failures. This is because the majority of vertices have low  $\phi$ -values. However, the deletion impact measure can detect more subtle effects in the periphery.

The first peak in the  $\bar{d}$ -distribution is, as mentioned above, around  $\bar{d} = 3$ . At this distance  $\phi$  has decreased a thousand




FIG. 4 Deletion impact  $\phi$  as a function of the average distance  $\bar{d}$ . The panels and symbols represent the same data sets as in Fig. 1.

times from the core where  $\phi \sim 10^{-2}$ . In this quantity we see a substantial difference from the null-model; the peripheral vertices of the inferred networks have significantly lower deletion impact than the peripheral vertices of the null-model networks. This, we believe, is another effect of the high degree of peripheral vertices. The fact that the periphery is relatively highly connected suggests that there are alternate routes that could be used if a regular path is obstructed by a vertex failure. In the case of the Inet model, which has very few vertices of high  $\bar{d}$ , the peripheral  $\phi$  values are quite low because the periphery is well connected to the core. As expected,  $\phi = 0$  for all vertices in the BA model since all vertices have degree of at least three. The BA model thus produces network that are more robust to vertex deletion than the observed networks are.

### E. Clustering coefficient

The *clustering coefficient*  $C(i)$  (30) is another frequently studied network property:

$$C(i) = M(\Gamma_i) / \binom{k(i)}{2} \quad (4)$$




FIG. 5 Clustering coefficient  $C$  as a function of the average distance  $\bar{d}$ . The panels and symbols represent the same data sets as shown in Fig. 1.

$M(X)$  denotes the number of edges in a subgraph  $X$ . The clustering coefficient measures how interconnected the neighborhood of a vertex is. One interpretation is that  $C(i)$  is the number of connected neighbor pairs rescaled by the theoretical maximum.  $C(i)$  can also be seen as the fraction of triangles that  $i$  is a member of, normalized to the interval  $[0, 1]$ .

In Fig. 5 we display the clustering coefficient as a function of the average distance. The curves for the observed graph, null-model, and Inet model networks show a peak around the same point as the peak in the  $\bar{d}$ -distribution. However, the null-models do not exhibit as high a degree of clustering in the periphery as the inferred networks. In other words, there are more triangles in the periphery than can be expected from only the network's degree distribution. In fact, for 100 null-model networks based on the AS '06 network, no triangles existed for  $\bar{d} > 3.8$  with any vertex having  $\bar{d} > 3.8$ . This should be compared with 1124 triangles for the AS '06 network itself (there are even 83 triangles where all vertices have  $\bar{d} > 3.8$ ). This further suggests that the periphery of the observed AS graphs is complex. As triangles represent redundancy (the three vertices will still be connected if any one of the edges are cut) this could help to explain the increased robustness to deletion seen in Section III.D. As seen in Fig. 5(b), neither the




FIG. 6 Distance balance  $b$  as a function of the average distance  $\bar{d}$ . The panels and symbols represent the same data sets as shown in Fig. 1.

Inet, nor the BA model predict a significant number of peripheral triangles. The low deletion impact values for peripheral vertices in these models may be attributed to the presence of longer cycles.

#### F. Distance balance

In the context of scientific collaboration networks it has been shown (22) that the number of shortest paths leaving a vertex via a specific neighbor is skew distributed. In other words, most of the shortest paths from a vertex  $i$  to the rest of the network traverse a single neighbor of  $i$ . To rephrase this in terms of the average distance, central vertices are likely to have few neighbors with smaller  $\bar{d}$  values. This leads us to another view of centrality. Let the *distance balance* of  $b(i)$  be the fraction of  $i$ -neighbors  $j$  with  $\bar{d}(j) < \bar{d}(i)$ . Clearly one can expect this to be an increasing function of  $\bar{d}$ , but is it a linear increase?

In Fig. 6 we plot the distance balance as a function of  $\bar{d}$ . As expected, all of the curves generally increase but not linearly. Almost all the increase from 0 to 1 takes place around the highest peak in Fig. 1, which gives another characteriza-

tion of the core and periphery: in the core, the typical vertex has relatively few neighbors of higher centrality than itself (and vice versa in the periphery). The  $b(i)$  values in the peripheral region of all curves approach values close to 1. In Fig. 6(b) the curves of the observed data are somewhat lower. This supports the previous observation that—as seen previously in quantities such as degree, neighbor degree, and the clustering coefficient—the periphery is structurally less different from the core than what can be expected from random networks constrained to the degree sequence of the observed networks. As seen in Fig. 1(c), the Inet model behaves like the null-model—the same observation holds for the average neighbor degree (Fig. 3) and clustering coefficient (Fig. 5). Unlike the Inet model, the BA model’s curve increases more smoothly which suggests (in accordance with what has been observed above) a less pronounced core-periphery structure than the observed networks.

#### IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper investigated how vertex-specific network measures of the AS level Internet vary with the average distance from a vertex to the other vertices of the graph. This projection of vertices to the space of average distances gives a picture of how the network structure changes from the most central to the most peripheral vertices. Using the distance separation measure we find that there is a well-defined core-periphery dichotomy in the inferred networks. To some extent this can be explained as an effect of the set of degrees of the network—we notice that the average degree as a function of the average distance has the same qualitative form for the observed networks as our null-model networks. However, the periphery is more complex than what is predicted by degree alone. This is manifested in higher average degree, higher average neighbor degree, lower deletion impact, higher clustering coefficient, and lower distance balance than the observed networks. To summarize, the AS graph has a more clear split into a core and a periphery than can be anticipated by its degree distribution and simple models of scale-free networks. At the same time, the split is less dramatic and more nuanced than expected from a strict hierarchy. The additional network structure in the periphery may have consequences for spread of attacks and methods to defend against attack. Further, the two topology generators (Inet and BA model) that we tested could be extended to model the periphery more accurately.

We used two kinds of observed AS data—easily accessible router RIBs and more complete data sets where edges missing from the RIBs are added. The effect of the missing edges is clearly visible: the peripheries of the RIB-networks (with missing edges) have lower average degree, lower number of triangles, and other traits. On the other hand, the missing links do not change the network structure qualitatively. Our conclusions would be unchanged if we used only the RIB data.

Future modeling and measuring research needs to be undertaken to elucidate the detailed structure of the core and periphery of the AS graph. Furthermore, the structures should be related to the strategies of AS management (8; 9; 31).

## Acknowledgments

PH acknowledges financial support from the Wenner-Gren foundations. The authors acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation (grants CCR-0331580 and CCR-0311686), and the Santa Fe Institute.

## References

- [1] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 74:47–98, 2002.
- [2] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A.-L. Barabási. Attack and error tolerance of complex networks. *Nature*, 406:378–382, 2000.
- [3] J. I. Alvarez-Hamelin, L. Dall’Asta, A. Barrat, and A. Vespignani. k-core decomposition: a tool for the analysis of large scale Internet graphs. e-print cs/0511007.
- [4] J. I. Alvarez-Hamelin and N. Schabanel. An internet graph model based on trade-off optimization. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 38:231–237, 2004.
- [5] A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286:509–512, October 1999.
- [6] F. Buckley and F. Harary. *Distance in graphs*. Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1989.
- [7] H. Chang, R. Govindan, S. Jamin, S. J. Shenker, and W. Willinger. Towards capturing representative as-level internet topologies. Technical Report UM-CSE-TR-454-02, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, University of Michigan, 2002.
- [8] H. Chang, S. Jamin, and W. Willinger. To peer or not to peer: Modeling the evolution of the Internet’s AS-level topology. to appear in Proceedings of SIGCOMM06.
- [9] I. Daubechies, K. Drakakis, and T. Khovanova. A detailed study of the attachment strategies of new autonomous systems in the AS connectivity graph. *Internet Mathematics*, 2:185–246, 2006.
- [10] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes. *Evolution of Networks: From Biological Nets to the Internet and WWW*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
- [11] J. C. Doyle, D. L. Alderson, L. Li, S. Low, M. Roughan, S. Shalunov, R. Tanaka, and W. Willinger. The “robust yet fragile” nature of the Internet. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 102(41):14497–14502, 2005.
- [12] A. Fabrikant, E. Koutsoupias, and C. H. Papadimitriou. Heuristically optimized trade-offs: A new paradigm for power laws in the Internet. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, volume 2380 of *Lecture notes in Computer science*, pages 110–122, Heidelberg, 2002. Springer.
- [13] M. Faloutsos, P. Faloutsos, and C. Faloutsos. On power-law relationships of the Internet topology. *Comput. Commun. Rev.*, 29:251–262, 1999.
- [14] D. Gale. A theorem of flows in networks. *Pacific J. Math.*, 7:1073–1082, 1957.
- [15] P. Holme, B. J. Kim, C. N. Yoon, and S. K. Han. Attack vulnerability of complex networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 65:056109, 2002.
- [16] C.-Y. Lee. Correlations among centrality measures in complex networks. e-print physics/0605220.
- [17] P. Mahadevan, D. Krioukov, M. Fomenkov, B. Huffaker, X. Dimitropoulos, K. C. Claffy, and A. Vahdat. Lessons from three views of the Internet topology. tr-2005-02, Cooperative Association for Internet Data Analysis, 2005.
- [18] P. Mahadevan, D. Krioukov, M. Fomenkov, B. Huffaker, X. Dimitropoulos, K. C. Claffy, and A. Vahdat. The Internet AS-level topology: Three data sources and one definitive metric. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communications Review*, 36:17–26, 2006.
- [19] S. Maslov, K. Sneppen, and A. Zaliznyak. Detection of topological patterns in complex networks: Correlation profile of the Internet. *Physica A*, 333:529–540, 2004.
- [20] A. Medina, I. Matta, and J. Byers. On the origin of power laws in Internet topologies. *ACM Computer Communication Review*, 30(2):18–28, 2000.
- [21] K. Nakao. Distribution of measures of centrality: Enumerated distributions of freeman’s graph centrality measures. *Connections*, 13:10–22, 1990.
- [22] M. E. J. Newman. Scientific collaboration networks. II. Shortest paths, weighted networks, and centrality. *Phys. Rev. E*, 64:016132, 2001.
- [23] M. E. J. Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Review*, 45:167–256, 2003.
- [24] R. Pastor-Santorrás and A. Vespignani. *Evolution and structure of the Internet : a statistical physics approach*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [25] R. Pastor-Satorras, A. Vázquez, and A. Vespignani. Dynamical and correlation properties of the Internet. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 87:258701, 2001.
- [26] J. M. Roberts Jr. Simple methods for simulating sociomatrices with given marginal totals. *Social Networks*, 22:273–283, 2000.
- [27] G. Sabidussi. The centrality index of a graph. *Psychometrika*, 31:581–603, 1966.
- [28] L. Subramanian, S. Agarwal, J. Rexford, and R. H. Katz. Characterizing the internet hierarchy from multiple vantage point. In *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, pages 618–627, New York, 2002. IEEE.
- [29] A. Trusina, S. Maslov, P. Minnhagen, and K. Sneppen. Hierarchy measures in complex networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92:178702, 2004.
- [30] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks. *Nature*, 393:440–442, 1998.
- [31] J. Winick and S. Jamin. Inet-3.0: Internet topology generator. Technical Report UM-CSE-TR-456-02, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, University of Michigan, 2000.