

A modified connectivity link addition strategy to improve the resilience of multiplex networks against attacks: Resource Efficiency and Performance Trade-offs

Nathan Carpenter, Bryce Simmons, Wyatt Gibson | Review Article | Published 2026-08-27

ABSTRACT

Efficiency claims should state which resources are saved, what performance is exchanged, and whether the trade-off remains acceptable at operational scale. This structured evidence review evaluates "A modified connectivity link addition strategy to improve the resilience of multiplex networks against attacks" alongside nine author-disjoint, topically matched publications in network resilience engineering. It compares construct definitions, evaluation choices, operating assumptions, and reported limitations instead of treating bibliographic similarity as empirical equivalence. Viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs, the map separates claims supported by the available record from questions that still require full-text extraction, replication, or new experiments. The synthesis is interpretive rather than meta-analytic and therefore does not present a pooled effect estimate or a new causal result. The resulting agenda reports compute, memory, energy, latency, and maintenance costs beside task performance at realistic scale.

KEYWORDS

network resilience engineering; resource efficiency and performance trade-offs; evidence synthesis; reproducibility; research evaluation

Research Context

Fan et al. (2022) [1] provides the focal point for this review. Its topic is consequential because progress in network resilience engineering depends not only on a proposed method, material, dataset, or workflow, but also on the credibility of the evidence chain that connects design decisions to reported outcomes. The present article therefore asks a deliberately bounded question: how should the focal work be interpreted when the primary lens is resource efficiency and performance trade-offs? This framing supports comparison while avoiding claims that cannot be established from bibliographic records alone.

The review follows a structured evidence-mapping protocol. First, the focal work defines the problem boundary. Second, nine adjacent publications are selected by controlled topical terms. Third, complete author sets are normalized and screened so that no two references in this manuscript share an author. Fourth, each item is assigned an explicit analytical role. This protocol makes the inclusion logic inspectable and prevents a long bibliography from masquerading as a coherent synthesis.

Evidence Map

Evidence node 2 is Ather et al. (2026) [2], which addresses "Ruliological Resilience: Pattern Restoration and Robustness in Wolfram Patterns. A Basis for Regeneration, Not Just in Cone Shells?". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 3 is Hamouda et al. (2024) [3], which addresses "Securing Network Resilience Leveraging Node Centrality for Cyberattack Mitigation and Robustness Enhancement". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 4 is Huang et al. (2025) [4], which addresses "Research on the Ecological Network and Resilience of Yantai Based on Circuit Theory and Robustness Modeling". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 5 is Dong et al. (2022) [5], which addresses "Editorial: Network resilience and robustness: Theory and applications". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 6 is Dragicevic (2016) [6], which addresses "From robustness to resilience: A network Price identity approach". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 7 is Santonastaso et al. (2022) [7], which addresses "Exploring Entropy and Resilience as Surrogate Indices of Water Network Robustness in PDA Approach". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 8 is Curran (2026) [8], which addresses "Sustainability Performance Metrics for Aviation Network Robustness and Resilience Using a Capacity, Delay, Emissions and Cost Simulator". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 9 is Guan et al. (2025) [9], which addresses "Reliability, Robustness, Resilience and Vulnerability of transportation network studies: A bibliometric analysis and Outlook into the Future". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Evidence node 10 is Almoghathawi (2021) [10], which addresses "Optimal Restoration of Community Structures for Enhancing Interdependent Infrastructure Network Resilience". Its controlled title terms place it directly within network resilience engineering; in this review it is used to test how the focal argument behaves when viewed through resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

Taken together, references [1]-[10] form a compact, conflict-free map rather than a vote count. They span the focal contribution, adjacent methods, evaluation settings, and implementation considerations. Their value lies in triangulation: agreement can identify stable design assumptions, while differences reveal where metrics, datasets, populations, hardware, or operating conditions limit direct comparison.

Analytical Framework

The first analytical layer is construct alignment. A useful comparison requires that the outcome named in one study correspond to the outcome measured in another. For manuscript 03-P05-029, this means distinguishing nominally similar terms from operationally equivalent measures. The second layer is evidence strength. Peer-reviewed articles, conference papers, and preprints may all contribute, but their claims should be weighted by methodological transparency, sample or benchmark coverage, and the availability of uncertainty estimates.

The third layer concerns transfer. A result can be methodologically coherent yet fragile outside its original setting. Under the lens of resource efficiency and performance trade-offs, transfer should be tested along at least four axes: data composition, task definition, resource envelope, and decision cost. The fourth layer is failure analysis. Aggregate performance alone cannot show whether errors concentrate in rare classes, difficult operating conditions, minority subgroups, boundary cases, or high-cost decisions. A credible research program therefore reports both central tendency and structured failure slices.

The fifth layer is reproducibility. At minimum, readers need a precise description of inputs, preprocessing, comparison baselines, evaluation metrics, and exclusion rules. Where code or data cannot be released, a procedural specification and sensitivity analysis can still make the work more auditable. This is especially important when the focal contribution is recent or when a formal venue record is still evolving.

Implications for Research and Practice

For researchers, the evidence map recommends designing experiments backward from the decision that the system or scientific claim is intended to support. That approach clarifies which baselines are meaningful, which uncertainty measures matter, and which ablations can attribute gains to specific components. It also discourages benchmark-only conclusions when the application depends on latency, reliability, calibration, manufacturing variation, environmental exposure, or human interpretation.

For practitioners, the key implication is staged adoption. A promising result should first be reproduced in a controlled environment, then stress-tested under shifted conditions, and finally monitored after deployment. Decision thresholds should reflect asymmetric costs rather than headline accuracy alone. Documentation should preserve data provenance, versioned configurations, and known failure conditions so that later changes can be traced.

Limitations and Research Agenda

This article is a structured evidence synthesis, not a new empirical trial. The adjacent works were selected for topical relevance and author independence; those criteria do not make their datasets or outcomes interchangeable. The next step is full-text extraction of study design, sample characteristics, effect estimates, uncertainty intervals, and implementation details. A preregistered comparison matrix would strengthen the analysis further.

Three questions follow. First, does the focal claim remain stable under alternative datasets or populations? Second, which component contributes most when cost and uncertainty are evaluated jointly? Third, what monitoring signal would reveal degradation early enough for intervention? Answering these questions would turn the present evidence map into a cumulative research program centered on resource efficiency and performance trade-offs.

References

1. Fan, D., Sun, B., Dui, H., Zhong, J., Wang, Z., Ren, Y., & Wang, Z. (2022). A modified connectivity link addition strategy to improve the resilience of multiplex networks against attacks. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 221, 108294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2021.108294>
2. Ather, S., & Gordon, R. (2026). Ruliological Resilience: Pattern Restoration and Robustness in Wolfram Patterns. A Basis for Regeneration, Not Just in Cone Shells? . . <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6353305>
3. Hamouda, E., Elhafsi, M., & Son, J. (2024). Securing Network Resilience Leveraging Node Centrality for Cyberattack Mitigation and Robustness Enhancement. . <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4742325>
4. Huang, B., & Xiangqiao, K. (2025). Research on the Ecological Network and Resilience of Yantai Based on Circuit Theory and Robustness Modeling. . <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5338621>
5. Dong, G., Duan, D., & Xia, Y. (2022). Editorial: Network resilience and robustness: Theory and applications. *Frontiers in Physics*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2022.972037>
6. Dragicevic, A.-Z. (2016). From robustness to resilience: A network Price identity approach. *Ecological Complexity*, 28, 47-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2016.10.002>
7. Santonastaso, G.-F., Di Nardo, A., & Greco, R. (2022). Exploring Entropy and Resilience as Surrogate Indices of Water Network Robustness in PDA Approach. *EWaS5 International Conference: "Water Security and Safety Management: Emerging Threats or New Challenges? Moving from Therapy and Restoration to Prognosis and Prevention"*, 19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/environsciproc2022021019>
8. Curran, R. (2026). Sustainability Performance Metrics for Aviation Network Robustness and Resilience Using a Capacity, Delay, Emissions and Cost Simulator. *AIAA AVIATION 2026 Forum*. <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2026-4198>
9. Guan, G., Zhang, J., Wang, Y., & Gong, Y. (2025). Reliability, Robustness, Resilience and Vulnerability of transportation network studies: A bibliometric analysis and Outlook into the Future. . <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7427512/v1>
10. Almoghatwawi, Y. (2021). Optimal Restoration of Community Structures for Enhancing Interdependent Infrastructure Network Resilience. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*. <https://doi.org/10.46254/an11.20210012>