Epidemics on networks: the risky and the at-risk

#### **Tim Rogers**

Department of Mathematical Sciences University of Bath

# Vulnerability

Consider the SIR model on a network:



Consider the SIR model on a network:



Start with one initial infected individual.

Consider the SIR model on a network:



The infection may be passed along the edges of the network with a probability  $\beta dt$  of infection in a small tilmestep dt.

Consider the SIR model on a network:



Infected nodes can recover; suppose the time to recovery is randomly distributed with pdf  $\gamma(t).$ 

Consider the SIR model on a network:



Another infection takes place...

Consider the SIR model on a network:



...and another recovery, now the disease cannot progress further...

Consider the SIR model on a network:



...and must die out. This is the final state.

What is the probability I catch the disease from my neighbour? Define the *transmissibility* 

$$T = \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) \left( 1 - e^{-\beta t} \right) dt \,.$$

This is probability that the infection is passed from a node to its neighbour before it recovers.

If T is small, the disease is sure to die out quickly. If T is large, a major outbreak is possible.

What is the probability I catch the disease from my neighbour? Define the *transmissibility* 

$$T = \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) \left( 1 - e^{-\beta t} \right) dt \,.$$

This is probability that the infection is passed from a node to its neighbour before it recovers.

If T is small, the disease is sure to die out quickly. If T is large, a major outbreak is possible.

Q: Which nodes are most likely to get infected?

### Example



### Example



### Example



















Transmission probability: 90%



Which node is more vulnerable to the infection, A or B?

Transmission probability: 90%



**B** is more vulnerable — it is closer (in the network) to the source.





Which node is more vulnerable to the infection, A or B?





**B** is more vulnerable — it has more neighbours, who are likely to get sick themselves.























Which node is more vulnerable to the infection, A or B?





A is more vulnerable — it has more paths between it and the source for the infection to travel down.

### Cavity Method

Write  $v_i$  for the probability node i is infected eventually, then

$$v_i = 1 - \prod_{j \in \partial i} (1 - Tv_j^{(i)}),$$

where,  $v_j^{(i)}$  is the probability that node j is infected by the disease in the network *with node i removed*.

Write  $v_i$  for the probability node i is infected eventually, then

$$v_i = 1 - \prod_{j \in \partial i} (1 - Tv_j^{(i)}),$$

where,  $v_j^{(i)}$  is the probability that node j is infected by the disease in the network *with node i removed*. Assuming a locally tree-like structure (e.g. configuration model) we do the same trick one more time to find:
Write  $v_i$  for the probability node i is infected eventually, then

$$v_i = 1 - \prod_{j \in \partial i} (1 - Tv_j^{(i)}),$$

where,  $v_j^{(i)}$  is the probability that node j is infected by the disease in the network *with node i removed*. Assuming a locally tree-like structure (e.g. configuration model) we do the same trick one more time to find:

$$v_j^{(i)} = 1 - \prod_{l \in \partial j \backslash i} (1 - T v_l^{(j)}) \,.$$

These are the cavity equations.

Procedure for vulnerability analysis:

- 1) Compute the transmissibility  $T = \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) \left(1 e^{-\beta t}\right) dt$
- 2) Solve the cavity equations  $v_j^{(i)} = 1 \prod_{l \in \partial j \setminus i} (1 T v_l^{(j)})$
- 3) Deduce node vulnerability via  $v_i = 1 \prod_{j \in \partial i} (1 Tv_j^{(i)})$

The cavity equations are a system of 2|E| non-linear simultaneous equations. Numerical solution is usually the only option.

# Non-Backtracking (Hashimoto) Graph

It will be useful to draw a graph of relationships between cavity variables. If G = (V, E) is the original graph, define a new directed graph H with

**Nodes:** ordered pairs (i, j) for  $j \in V$ ,  $i \in \partial j$ 

**Edges:**  $(i, j) \rightarrow (k, l)$  if k = j and  $l \neq i$ 

# Non-Backtracking (Hashimoto) Graph

It will be useful to draw a graph of relationships between cavity variables. If G = (V, E) is the original graph, define a new directed graph H with

**Nodes:** ordered pairs (i, j) for  $j \in V$ ,  $i \in \partial j$ 

**Edges:**  $(i, j) \rightarrow (k, l)$  if k = j and  $l \neq i$ 



# Non-Backtracking (Hashimoto) Graph

It will be useful to draw a graph of relationships between cavity variables. If G = (V, E) is the original graph, define a new directed graph H with

**Nodes:** ordered pairs (i, j) for  $j \in V$ ,  $i \in \partial j$ 

**Edges:**  $(i, j) \rightarrow (k, l)$  if k = j and  $l \neq i$ 



Define the map  $D: \mathbb{R}^{2|E|} \to \mathbb{R}^{2|E|}$ 

$$D_e(\boldsymbol{v}) = 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tv_{e'}).$$

Then solving the cavity equations means finding a fixed point  $m{v}=D(m{v}).$ 

Define the map  $D: \mathbb{R}^{2|E|} \to \mathbb{R}^{2|E|}$ 

$$D_e(\boldsymbol{v}) = 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tv_{e'}).$$

Then solving the cavity equations means finding a fixed point  $oldsymbol{v}=D(oldsymbol{v}).$ 

Simple iteration works.  $D_{(i,j)}^n(1)$  describes the probability of j eventually being infected in a network with i removed and at nodes of distance n or greater initially infected. As  $n \to \infty$  we obtain a solution to the cavity equations.

# Vulnerability Ranking



Node vulnerability in a configuration model network with degrees three and five (in 50/50 mix).

For what value of T is a major outbreak possible?

For what value of T is a major outbreak possible? That is, when is v = 0 a stable solution of v = D(v)? For what value of T is a major outbreak possible? That is, when is v = 0 a stable solution of v = D(v)?

$$D_e = 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tv_{e'})$$

$$\Rightarrow \qquad \frac{\partial D_e}{\partial v_{e'}} = T \mathbb{I}_{\{e' \in \partial e\}} \prod_{e'' \in \partial e \setminus e'} (1 - T v_{e''})$$

For what value of T is a major outbreak possible? That is, when is v = 0 a stable solution of v = D(v)?

$$D_e = 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tv_{e'})$$

$$\Rightarrow \qquad \frac{\partial D_e}{\partial v_{e'}} = T \mathbb{I}_{\{e' \in \partial e\}} \prod_{e'' \in \partial e \setminus e'} (1 - T v_{e''})$$

So

$$\left. \frac{\partial D_e}{\partial v_{e'}} \right|_{\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{0}} = TB_{e,e'} \,,$$

where B is the adjacency matrix of the Hashimoto graph. Thus a major outbreak is possible only if  $T > T_c = 1/\lambda_{\max}(B)$ .

How does the solution v of the cavity equations vary with T?

 $\sim$ 

How does the solution v of the cavity equations vary with T?

$$v_e = 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tv_{e'})$$

$$\Rightarrow \qquad \frac{\partial v_e}{\partial T} =: \partial v_e = \sum_{e' \in \partial e} (v_{e'} + T \partial v_{e'}) \prod_{e'' \in \partial e \setminus e'} (1 - T v_{e''})$$

How does the solution v of the cavity equations vary with T?

$$v_e = 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tv_{e'})$$

$$\Rightarrow \qquad \frac{\partial v_e}{\partial T} =: \partial v_e = \sum_{e' \in \partial e} (v_{e'} + T \partial v_{e'}) \prod_{e'' \in \partial e \setminus e'} (1 - T v_{e''})$$

Around  $T \approx T_c$  we have  $\boldsymbol{v} \approx \boldsymbol{0}$  so

 $\sim$ 

$$\partial v_e \approx \sum_{e' \in \partial e} T_c \partial v_{e'} \,,$$

that is,  $\partial v$  is the eigenvector of B corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\max}(B) = 1/T_c$ .

How does the solution v of the cavity equations vary with T?

$$v_e = 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tv_{e'})$$

$$\Rightarrow \qquad \frac{\partial v_e}{\partial T} =: \partial v_e = \sum_{e' \in \partial e} (v_{e'} + T \partial v_{e'}) \prod_{e'' \in \partial e \setminus e'} (1 - T v_{e''})$$

Around  $T \approx T_c$  we have  $oldsymbol{v} pprox oldsymbol{0}$  so

$$\partial v_e \approx \sum_{e' \in \partial e} T_c \partial v_{e'} \,,$$

that is,  $\partial v$  is the eigenvector of B corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\max}(B) = 1/T_c$ .

Thus, near  $T_c$ , the vulnerability is  $v_i \approx (T - T_c)T_c \sum_{j \in \partial i} v_j^{(i)}$ .

Going further, the curvature near  $T_c$  can be found by weakly non-linear analysis:



Near  $T \approx 1$  we have  $\boldsymbol{v} \approx \mathbf{1}$ 

Near  $T \approx 1$  we have  $\boldsymbol{v} \approx \boldsymbol{1}$  so

$$\partial v_e = \sum_{e' \in \partial e} (v_{e'} + T \partial v_{e'}) \prod_{e'' \in \partial e \setminus e'} (1 - T v_{e''})$$
$$\approx \delta_{|\partial_e|, 1} \sum_{e' \in \partial e} (1 + \partial v_{e'})$$

Near  $T \approx 1$  we have  $\boldsymbol{v} \approx \boldsymbol{1}$  so

$$\partial v_e = \sum_{e' \in \partial e} (v_{e'} + T \partial v_{e'}) \prod_{e'' \in \partial e \setminus e'} (1 - T v_{e''})$$
$$\approx \delta_{|\partial_e|, 1} \sum_{e' \in \partial e} (1 + \partial v_{e'})$$

Generally, the first non-zero derivative  $\partial^n v_e$  at T = 1 is at  $n = |\partial e|$ .

So node vulnerability ranking for strongly infections diseases depends entirely on degree.

# Vulnerability Ranking



#### Summarising:

- The epidemic threshold is determined by  $T_c = 1/\lambda_{\max}(B)$ .
- The rank order near  $T = T_c$  depends on the corresponding eigenvector of B.
- The rank order near T = 1 depends only on degree.

# $\mathsf{Risk}$

Suppose we want to compute the probability that a major outbreak happens if a given node is "patient zero".



Suppose we want to compute the probability that a major outbreak happens if a given node is "patient zero".



Suppose we want to compute the probability that a major outbreak happens if a given node is "patient zero".



**Complication:** The fates of the two susceptible nodes here are not independent — they are both exposed to the random lifetime distribution of their infectious neighbour.

First we need to know the probability that i infects some subset J of it's neighbours (and no-one else):

$$\mathbb{P}(i \to J) = \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) \prod_{j \in J} (1 - e^{\beta t}) \prod_{j \in \partial i \setminus J} e^{-\beta t} dt$$
$$= \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) (1 - e^{\beta t})^{|J|} e^{-\beta t (|\partial i| - |J|)} dt.$$

First we need to know the probability that i infects some subset J of it's neighbours (and no-one else):

$$\mathbb{P}(i \to J) = \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) \prod_{j \in J} (1 - e^{\beta t}) \prod_{j \in \partial i \setminus J} e^{-\beta t} dt$$
$$= \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) (1 - e^{\beta t})^{|J|} e^{-\beta t (|\partial i| - |J|)} dt \,.$$

Then we can compute the risk posed by i as:

$$r_i = 1 - \sum_{J \subset \partial i} \mathbb{P}(i \to J)(1 - r_J^{(i)}),$$

where  $r_J^{(i)}$  is the probability of a major outbreak in a network with i removed and all of J initially infected.

# Cavity Method

Clearly,

$$1 - r_J^{(i)} \le \prod_{j \in J} (1 - r_j^{(i)}).$$

Clearly,

$$1 - r_J^{(i)} \le \prod_{j \in J} (1 - r_j^{(i)}).$$

In tree-like networks this bound is very good, so we assume equality and can write

$$r_{i} = 1 - \sum_{J \subset \partial i} \mathbb{P}(i \to J)(1 - r_{J}^{(i)})$$
  
= ... = 1 -  $\sum_{J \subset \partial i} (-1)^{|J|} T_{|J|} \prod_{j \in J} r_{j}^{(i)}$ ,

where  $T_n = \int_0^\infty \gamma(t) (1 - e^{-\beta t})^n dt$ .

Repeating the calculation for j with i removed we obtain the cavity equations

$$r_j^{(i)} = 1 - \sum_{L \subset \partial j \setminus i} (-1)^{|L|} T_{|L|} \prod_{l \in L} r_l^{(j)} \,.$$

Unlike the node vulnerability, risk depends on the full details of the disease lifetime distribution  $\gamma(t)$ 

### Another Guessing Game

Which disease lifetime distribution is most deadly?



### Another Guessing Game

Which disease lifetime distribution is most deadly?



Recalling 
$$T_n=\int_0^\infty \gamma(t)(1-e^{-\beta t})^n\,dt,$$
 we have 
$$T^n\leq T_n\leq T$$

thus

$$1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - Tr_{e'}) \ge r_e \ge T \left( 1 - \prod_{e' \in \partial e} (1 - r_{e'}) \right) \,.$$

### **Risk Bounds**



Risk (purple) and vulnerability (green) in a 4-regular graph with Weibull distributed lifetimes

$$\gamma(t) = \kappa e^{-t^{\kappa}} t^{(\kappa-1)}$$

Interpolating between heavy tailed ( $\kappa \ll 1$ ), memoryless ( $\kappa = 1$ ) and delta-function ( $\kappa \gg 1$ ).

# **Risk Ranking**

# **Risk Ranking**



**Left:** Node risk as a function of  $\kappa$ , lines shaded according to degree. The dashed green line is the average risk  $\bar{r} = \sum_i r_i$ . **Right:** Close up of relative risk  $r_i/\bar{r}$  for several nodes.


- Epidemics on networks are confusing
- The cavity method can used to compute node risk and vulnerability to good approximation



Upstream: Risk of causing an oubreak

**Downstream:** Vulnerability to ongoing outbreaks

• Lots more to do...