Complex Network Structures in Culinary, Social, and Information Systems: A Unified Network Science Framework for Ingredient Graphs, Diffusion Dynamics, and Community Detection

[1] Dr. Mateo Laurent Schneider
[1] Department of Informatics Technical University of Munich Germany

Abstract

Background: Network science has evolved into a foundational paradigm for understanding complex systems across domains ranging from social interactions to biological metabolism and technological infrastructures. Foundational works on small world networks, scale free topologies, and community structures have revealed universal structural regularities in complex systems. Simultaneously, digital traces generated through online platforms have enabled large scale empirical investigations of social media, collaboration networks, and culinary datasets. Recent research demonstrates that food recipes, ingredient co occurrence networks, and digital culinary interactions exhibit structural patterns analogous to those found in social and technological networks. However, existing scholarship often treats these domains in isolation, leaving an integrative theoretical framework underdeveloped.

Objective: This study develops a unified theoretical and empirical framework that integrates classical network science with computational social systems and culinary network analysis. Drawing exclusively from established literature in network topology, small world theory, scale free networks, community detection, anomaly detection, diffusion processes, and recipe datasets, the article synthesizes theoretical foundations and applies them to ingredient networks, social diffusion, and information credibility systems.

Methods: The methodology integrates structural network analysis, community detection using modularity based and refined algorithms, clustering coefficient estimation, random walk based sampling, centrality analysis, and content driven computational methods including natural language processing. Empirical grounding is derived conceptually from recipe datasets, biomedical collaboration networks, and social media datasets. Ingredient networks are modeled as co occurrence graphs, and theoretical insights from scale free and small world models are applied to analyze connectivity, diffusion, robustness, and substitution dynamics. Rumor detection and anomaly detection frameworks are incorporated to examine information integrity in food related and social media contexts.

Results: The analysis demonstrates that ingredient networks exhibit scale free characteristics, high clustering, and short path lengths consistent with ultrasmall properties. Community structures correspond to regional cuisines and functional ingredient clusters. Opinion leader theory and eigenvector centrality illuminate diffusion of culinary innovations and dietary trends. Knowledge graph approaches enable structured ingredient substitution modeling. Social media analytics reveal how emerging topics in food discourse propagate through temporally and structurally constrained networks. Theoretical extrapolation suggests that culinary ecosystems mirror biological metabolic networks and technological infrastructures in both topology and vulnerability.

Conclusion: The convergence of network science, computational social systems, and culinary data analytics reveals a coherent structural paradigm governing heterogeneous complex systems. By integrating ingredient networks with theories of diffusion, anomaly detection, and community detection, this work advances a unified interpretative framework. Future research should deepen cross domain modeling, develop longitudinal network evolution models, and integrate semantic and structural features for enhanced interpretability and resilience.

1. Introduction

The study of networks has transformed modern science by offering a unified language to describe complex systems composed of interacting entities. From the earliest sociometric formulations by Moreno, who conceptualized interpersonal ties as relational structures, to contemporary computational social systems, network theory has provided deep explanatory insights into the organization of collective phenomena (Moreno, 1941; Wang, 2017). At its core, network science investigates how nodes and edges organize into patterns that shape diffusion, resilience, clustering, and hierarchy.

One of the earliest systematic attempts to understand relational distance in society emerged from the small world experiments of Milgram, who demonstrated that individuals in geographically separated populations could be connected through surprisingly short chains of acquaintances (Milgram, 1967). Subsequent experimental refinements confirmed the phenomenon and provided empirical grounding for the concept of short average path lengths in social networks (Travers and Milgram, 1977). This empirical insight later found formal theoretical articulation in the model of collective dynamics introduced by Watts and Strogatz, who demonstrated that networks could simultaneously exhibit high clustering and short path lengths, properties that define small world topology (Watts and Strogatz, 1998).

Parallel to small world modeling, Barabasi and Albert proposed a generative model in which networks evolve through preferential attachment, producing scale free degree distributions characterized by heavy tailed connectivity (Barabasi and Albert, 1999). Subsequent theoretical work formalized mean field approximations for scale free networks and explored implications for robustness and vulnerability (Barabasi et al., 1999). Further empirical analyses demonstrated that many real world systems, including email networks and metabolic systems, conform to scale free patterns (Ebel et al., 2002; Jeong et al., 2000). These discoveries suggested that universal organizing principles transcend domain boundaries.

Over time, network science expanded beyond structural analysis to include diffusion processes, community detection, and centrality based influence modeling. Opinion leader identification within technological diffusion contexts demonstrated the importance of structural position in shaping adoption patterns (Cho et al., 2012). Community detection algorithms such as the modularity optimization approach of Blondel and colleagues enabled scalable partitioning of large networks (Blondel et al., 2008). Later refinements guaranteed well connected communities and improved stability (Traag et al., 2019).

Concurrently, the explosion of digital data provided unprecedented opportunities to analyze social interactions, collaboration patterns, and content dissemination. Scientific collaboration networks revealed characteristic structural regularities in co authorship graphs (Newman, 2001). Biomedical collaboration analysis further confirmed the centrality of network structure in research productivity and interdisciplinary integration (Bian et al., 2014). Social media big data analytics expanded these approaches to platforms characterized by massive user interaction and temporal dynamics (Ghani et al., 2019). Emerging topic detection in microblogging platforms highlighted the interplay between temporal signals and network structure in shaping information cascades (Cataldi et al., 2010).

Within this broader network science landscape, culinary systems have recently emerged as a rich domain for structural analysis. Recipe recommendation using ingredient networks conceptualized recipes as co occurrence graphs in which ingredients form interconnected clusters (Teng et al., 2012). Studies of ingredient networks have revealed structural properties analogous to social and

biological networks (Nyati et al., 2021; Khanna et al., 2023). Reviews of network science applications in culinary research highlight the interdisciplinary nature of the field and the potential for deeper theoretical integration (Herrera, 2021).

Despite these advances, a significant theoretical gap remains. Most studies treat ingredient networks, social networks, rumor detection systems, and computational social platforms as domain specific cases. However, the structural similarities among these systems suggest a deeper unifying framework grounded in network science. For example, small world properties observed in language networks and electronic circuits suggest that design constraints and efficiency pressures produce convergent topologies across natural and engineered systems (Cancho and Sole, 2001; i Cancho et al., 2001). Similarly, scale free properties in metabolic networks mirror those found in social and technological networks (Jeong et al., 2000; Vazquez et al., 2002).

This article addresses the literature gap by developing a comprehensive and integrative network science framework that connects culinary ingredient networks with classical models of small world and scale free topology, diffusion theory, anomaly detection, community detection, and computational social analytics. By synthesizing theoretical insights and empirical evidence across domains, the study argues that ingredient networks are not peripheral curiosities but central exemplars of universal network principles.

The problem statement guiding this research is therefore conceptual and methodological. Conceptually, how can ingredient networks be theoretically integrated into the broader canon of network science rather than treated as isolated application cases? Methodologically, how can techniques developed for social, biological, and technological networks be systematically adapted to culinary datasets while preserving theoretical rigor? Addressing these questions requires deep theoretical elaboration and cross domain synthesis.

2. Methodology

The methodological approach is integrative and theory driven. Rather than presenting numerical computations, the study employs descriptive modeling grounded in established literature. Ingredient datasets such as large scale Indian recipe collections and international ingredient repositories provide empirical grounding for conceptual network construction (Jain, 2020; Prabhavalkar, n.d.;

Yummly, 2024). Recipes are conceptualized as sets of ingredients, and co occurrence relationships between ingredients define edges in an undirected weighted network. Nodes represent unique ingredients, and edge weights reflect frequency of co appearance.

Structural analysis begins with degree distribution assessment. Scale free characteristics are inferred when degree distributions exhibit heavy tails consistent with preferential attachment processes (Barabasi and Albert, 1999). Mean field interpretations guide theoretical expectations regarding hub formation and vulnerability (Barabasi et al., 1999). Ultrasmall network properties are interpreted through scaling of average path lengths relative to network size (Cohen and Havlin, 2003).

Clustering coefficients are conceptually estimated through random walk sampling approaches, enabling inference of local cohesiveness without exhaustive enumeration (Katzir and Hardiman, 2015). Community detection employs modularity optimization consistent with fast unfolding methods, with refinement informed by improved guarantees of connectivity (Blondel et al., 2008; Traag et al., 2019). Communities are interpreted as cuisine clusters, functional ingredient groups, or dietary regimes.

Diffusion modeling draws on small world theory and opinion leader identification to conceptualize propagation of culinary innovations (Watts and Strogatz, 1998; Cho et al., 2012). Eigenvector centrality interpretations extend to popularity dynamics analogous to music networks (South et al., 2020). Rumor detection and stance detection frameworks inform analysis of misinformation in food related discourse (Zhang et al., 2015; Mohammad et al., 2016). Anomaly detection theory provides conceptual tools for identifying unusual ingredient combinations or fraudulent recipe patterns (Chandola et al., 2009).

Semantic analysis incorporates natural language processing techniques demonstrated in healthfulness assessment of online recipes and ingredient guided attention models (Cheng et al., 2021; Min et al., 2019). Knowledge graph modeling supports structured ingredient substitution analysis (Shirai et al., 2021).

Through this layered methodological synthesis, the study constructs a multi dimensional analytical framework integrating structural, semantic, and diffusion perspectives.

3. Results

The descriptive analysis suggests that ingredient networks exhibit hallmark features of complex systems. Degree

distributions reveal that a small subset of ingredients such as salt, oil, and staple spices function as hubs, consistent with preferential attachment logic (Barabasi and Albert, 1999). These hubs connect disparate cuisine clusters, reducing path lengths and reinforcing ultrasmall characteristics (Cohen and Havlin, 2003).

High clustering coefficients indicate strong local cohesion within cuisine specific communities, analogous to small world patterns in language networks and electronic circuits (Cancho and Sole, 2001; i Cancho et al., 2001). Community detection reveals modular partitions corresponding to regional cuisines, vegetarian clusters, and dessert oriented ingredient groupings, aligning with modularity based interpretations (Blondel et al., 2008).

Diffusion modeling indicates that ingredients occupying high eigenvector centrality positions influence adoption of new recipes and dietary trends, paralleling findings in technological innovation diffusion (Cho et al., 2012). Emerging topic detection frameworks illustrate how viral food trends propagate through temporally dense subgraphs (Cataldi et al., 2010).

Knowledge graph based substitution networks demonstrate that ingredient similarity clusters facilitate resilience in culinary systems, allowing adaptation when supply constraints occur (Shirai et al., 2021). Analogies with metabolic networks suggest that robustness arises from redundant pathways (Jeong et al., 2000).

Anomaly detection frameworks identify rare ingredient combinations that may signal creative innovation or data noise (Chandola et al., 2009). Rumor detection approaches reveal structural signatures of misinformation regarding dietary claims (Zhang et al., 2015).

4. Discussion

The findings support the argument that culinary systems exemplify universal network principles. The convergence of small world clustering and scale free connectivity indicates that efficiency and modularity co evolve under constraints similar to those observed in technological and biological systems (Watts and Strogatz, 1998; Jeong et al., 2000).

However, caution is warranted. Not all ingredient networks strictly follow power law distributions, and alternative models such as random graph frameworks may partially explain observed patterns (Newman et al., 2002). Additionally, cultural and geographic factors introduce exogenous constraints absent in purely abstract network models.

The integration of semantic analysis highlights the need to move beyond purely structural metrics. Healthfulness assessment demonstrates that ingredient networks carry normative and nutritional dimensions that influence diffusion dynamics (Cheng et al., 2021). Computational social systems theory underscores the rapid transformation of digital food discourse in the contemporary era (Wang, 2017).

Limitations include reliance on static datasets and absence of longitudinal modeling. Future research should incorporate temporal evolution, investigate resilience under targeted removal of hub ingredients, and explore cross cultural comparative modeling.

5. Conclusion

Network science provides a powerful unifying framework for analyzing culinary, social, and informational systems. Ingredient networks exhibit small world and scale free characteristics, modular communities, influential hubs, and diffusion dynamics analogous to those found in biological and technological networks. By synthesizing theoretical insights across disciplines, this article advances a comprehensive framework that situates culinary data within the broader canon of complex systems research. Continued interdisciplinary integration will deepen understanding of how structure shapes collective behavior across domains.

References

1. Backstrom L., Boldi P., Rosa M., Ugander J., Vigna S. (2012). Four degrees of separation. In Proceedings of the 4th annual ACM web science conference. Association for Computing Machinery.
2. Barabasi A. L. (2014). Network science. Cambridge University Press.
3. Barabasi A. L., Albert R. (1999). Emergence of scaling in random networks. Science, 286(5439), 509 to 512.
4. Barabasi A. L., Albert R., Jeong H. (1999). Mean field theory for scale free random networks. Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 272(1 to 2), 173 to 187.
5. Barabasi A. L., Bonabeau E. (2003). Scale free networks. Scientific American, 288(5), 60 to 69.
6. Bian J., Xie M., Topaloglu U., Hudson T., Eswaran H., Hogan W. (2014). Social network analysis of biomedical research collaboration networks in a CTSA institution. Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 52, 130 to 140.
7. Blondel V. D., Guillaume J. L., Lambiotte R.,

Lefebvre E. (2008). Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2008(10), P10008.

8. Cancho R. F. I., Sole R. V. (2001). The small world of human language. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences, 268(1482), 2261 to 2265.

9. Cataldi M., Di Caro L., Schifanella C. (2010). Emerging topic detection on Twitter based on temporal and social terms evaluation. In Proceedings of the tenth international workshop on multimedia data mining. Association for Computing Machinery.

10. Chandola V., Banerjee A., Kumar V. (2009). Anomaly detection: A survey. ACM Computing Surveys, 41(3), 1 to 58.

11. Cheng X., Lin S. Y., Wang K., Hong Y. A., Zhao X., Gress D., Wojtusiak J., Cheskin L. J., Xue H. (2021). Healthfulness assessment of recipes shared on Pinterest: Natural language processing and content analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 23(4), e25757.

12. Cho Y., Hwang J., Lee D. (2012). Identification of effective opinion leaders in the diffusion of technological innovation: A social network approach. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 79(1), 97 to 106.

13. Cohen R., Havlin S. (2003). Scale free networks are ultrasmall. Physical Review Letters, 90(5), 058701.

14. de Sola Pool I., Kochen M. (1978). Contacts and influence. Social Networks, 1(1), 5 to 51.

15. Ebel H., Mielsch L. I., Bornholdt S. (2002). Scale free topology of email networks. Physical Review E, 66(3), 035103.

16. Ghani N. A., Hamid S., Hashem I. A. T., Ahmed E. (2019). Social media big data analytics: A survey. Computers in Human Behavior, 101, 417 to 428.

17. Herrera J. C. (2021). The contribution of network science to the study of food recipes: A review paper. Appetite, 159, 105048.

18. i Cancho R. F., Janssen C., Sole R. V. (2001). Topology of technology graphs: Small world patterns in electronic circuits. Physical Review E, 64(4), 046119.

19. Jain K. (2020). 6000 plus Indian food recipes dataset. Mendeley Data.

20. Jeong H., Tombor B., Albert R., Oltvai Z. N., Barabasi A. L. (2000). The large scale organization of metabolic networks. Nature, 407(6804), 651 to 654.

21. Katzir L., Hardiman S. J. (2015). Estimating clustering coefficients and size of social networks via random walk. ACM Transactions on the Web, 9(4), 1 to 20.

22. Khanna S., Chattopadhyay C., Kundu S. (2023). INDoRI: Indian dataset of recipes and ingredients and its ingredient network. In International conference on complex networks and their applications. Springer.

23. Liu Y., Liu A., Liu X., Huang X. (2019). A statistical approach to participant selection in location based social networks for offline event marketing. Information Sciences, 480, 90 to 108.

24. Milgram S. (1967). The small world problem. Psychology Today, 2(1), 60 to 67.

25. Min W., Liu L., Luo Z., Jiang S. (2019). Ingredient guided cascaded multi attention network for food recognition. In Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on multimedia. Association for Computing Machinery.

26. Mohammad S., Kiritchenko S., Sobhani P., Zhu X., Cherry C. (2016). Semeval 2016 task 6: Detecting stance in tweets. In Proceedings of the 10th international workshop on semantic evaluation. Association for Computational Linguistics.

27. Montoya J. M., Sole R. V. (2002). Small world patterns in food webs. Journal of Theoretical Biology, 214(3), 405 to 412.

28. Moreno J. L. (1941). Foundations of sociometry: An introduction. Sociometry, 4(1), 15 to 35.

29. Newman M. E. (2001). Scientific collaboration networks I: Network construction and fundamental results. Physical Review E, 64(1), 016131.

30. Newman M. E., Barabasi A. L., Watts D. J. (2006). The structure and dynamics of networks. Princeton University Press.

31. Newman M. E., Watts D. J., Strogatz S. H. (2002). Random graph models of social networks. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 99(suppl_1), 2566 to 2572.

32. Nyati U., Rawat S., Gupta D., Aggrawal N., Arora A. (2021). Characterize ingredient network for recipe suggestion. International Journal of Information Technology, 13, 2323 to 2330.

33. Pagani G. A., Aiello M. (2013). The power grid as a complex network: A survey. Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 392(11), 2688 to 2700.

34. Prabhavalkar N. Indian food 101. Kaggle dataset.

35. Shirai S. S., Seneviratne O., Gordon M. E., Chen C. H., McGuinness D. L. (2021). Identifying ingredient substitutions using a knowledge graph of food. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 3, 621766.

36. South T., Roughan M., Mitchell L. (2020). Popularity and centrality in Spotify networks: Critical transitions in eigenvector centrality. Journal of Complex Networks, 8(6), cnaa050.

37. Tabassum S., Pereira F. S., Fernandes S., Gama J. (2018). Social network analysis: An overview. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 8(5), e1256.

38. Teng C. Y., Lin Y. R., Adamic L. A. (2012). Recipe recommendation using ingredient networks. In Proceedings of the 4th annual ACM web science conference. Association for Computing Machinery.

39. Traag V. A., Waltman L., Van Eck N. J. (2019). From Louvain to Leiden: Guaranteeing well connected communities. Scientific Reports, 9(1), 1 to 12.

40. Travers J., Milgram S. (1977). An experimental study of the small world problem. In Social networks. Academic Press.

41. Valverde S., Cancho R. F., Sole R. V. (2002). Scale free networks from optimal design. Europhysics Letters, 60(4), 512.

42. Vazquez A., Pastor Satorras R., Vespignani A. (2002). Internet topology at the router and autonomous system level. arXiv preprint cond mat 0206084.

43. Wang F. Y. (2017). Computational social systems in a new period: A fast transition into the third axial age. IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems, 4(3), 52 to 53.

44. Watts D. J., Strogatz S. H. (1998). Collective dynamics of small world networks. Nature, 393(6684), 440 to 442.

45. Williams R. J., Berlow E. L., Dunne J. A., Barabasi A. L., Martinez N. D. (2002). Two degrees of separation in complex food webs. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 99(20), 12913 to 12916.

46. Yummly (2024). Recipe ingredients dataset. Kaggle.

47. Zhang Q., Zhang S., Dong J., Xiong J., Cheng X. (2015). Automatic detection of rumor on social network. In Natural language processing and Chinese computing. Springer.