

The graphical structure of respondent-driven sampling

Forrest W. Crawford

Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health
60 College St. New Haven, CT, USA 06510
phone: (203) 785-6125; fax: (203) 785-6912
email: forrest.crawford@yale.edu
url: <http://crawford.research.yale.edu>

March 1, 2022

Abstract

Respondent-driven sampling (RDS) is a chain-referral method for sampling members of a hidden or hard-to-reach population such as sex workers, homeless people, or drug users via their social network. Most methodological work on RDS has focused on inference of population means under the assumption that subjects' network degree determines their probability of being sampled. Criticism of existing estimators is usually focused on missing data: the underlying network is only partially observed, so it is difficult to determine correct sampling probabilities. In this paper, we show that data collected in ordinary RDS studies contain information about the structure of the respondents' social network. We construct a continuous-time model of RDS recruitment that incorporates the time series of recruitment events, the pattern of coupon use, and the network degrees of sampled subjects. Together, the observed data and the recruitment model place a well-defined probability distribution on the recruitment-induced subgraph of respondents. We show that this distribution can be interpreted as an exponential random graph model and develop a computationally efficient method for estimating the hidden graph. We validate the method using simulated data and apply the technique to an RDS study of injection drug users in St. Petersburg, Russia.

Keywords: hidden population, link-tracing, missing data, network inference, respondent-driven sampling, social network

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by NIH Grant KL2 TR000140, NIMH grant P30 MH062294, the Yale Center for Clinical Investigation, and the Yale Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS. I am especially indebted to Edward H. Kaplan, Robert Heimer, Peter M. Aronow, and Leonid Chindelevitch for providing detailed comments on the manuscript. I also thank Yakir Berchenko, Russel Barbour, Alexander Bazazi, Lin Chen, Krista Gile, Mark Handcock, Olga Levina, Aleksandr Sirotkin, Edward White, Jiacheng Wu, Alexei Zelenev, and Li Zeng for valuable suggestions and discussion. The Project 90 data were obtained from the Office of Population Research at Princeton University (<http://opr.princeton.edu/archive/P90>). The RDS data presented in the application are from the "Influences on HIV Prevalence and Service Access among IDUs in Russia and Estonia" study, funded by NIH/NIDA grant 1R01DA029888 to Robert Heimer and Anneli Uuskuila (Co-PIs). I made use of the Yale University Biomedical High Performance Computing Center, funded by NIH RR029676-01.

1 Introduction

Hidden populations such as drug users, men who have sex with men, sex workers, or homeless people are often subject to social stigma or criminalization. Learning about these populations can be challenging for sociologists, epidemiologists, and public health researchers because potential subjects may fear exposure or prosecution. Several survey techniques have been developed for sampling from hidden populations, including social link tracing and snowball designs (Goodman, 1961; Thompson and Frank, 2000). Respondent-driven sampling (RDS) is a common survey method for hidden or hard-to-reach populations for which no convenient sampling frame exists (Heckathorn, 1997; Broadhead et al., 1998). In RDS, study participants recruit members of their social network who are also members of the hidden population. Starting with a set of “seeds”, participants are given a fixed number of coupons tagged with a unique code. Participants then recruit members of their social network by giving them a coupon. The recipient of the coupon redeems it at the study site (or over the phone, online, etc.), is interviewed, and receives coupons to recruit others. A dual incentive encourages recruitment: subjects receive a small reward for participating in the study, and for each new subject they recruit. Subjects cannot be recruited more than once, and only a small number of coupons are given to new participants to prevent the local network from being saturated with coupons or emergence of a secondary market for coupons. To safeguard the privacy of subjects not participating in the study, subjects do not reveal the identities of their social contacts to researchers. The only network information typically reported by subjects is their *network degree*, the number of social contacts who are also members of the study population.

While RDS is an effective procedure for recruiting members of a hidden population, estimation of population characteristics from data obtained by RDS is controversial. Most methodological work on RDS assumes that the recruitment process takes place on a hidden social network connecting members of the study population. With the understanding that the structure of this hidden network likely affects individual subjects’ likelihood of being recruited, many researchers have sought to determine sampling probabilities for design-based estimation of population means (e.g. HIV prevalence). Salganik and Heckathorn (2004) construct a model of the recruitment process in which subjects receive only one coupon and can be recruited infinitely many times. They model the recruitment as a random walk *with replacement* on the hidden population social network. When this walk is at “equilibrium”, they argue that the probability that a given subject is sampled is proportional to their network degree. Salganik and Heckathorn (2004) and Volz and Heckathorn (2008) propose a Horvitz-Thompson type estimator for the population mean, where observations are weighted by the inverse of the subject’s degree. Gile (2011) derives a related estimator where sampling is without replacement.

Unfortunately, the characterization of the RDS recruitment process as a sampling design, where sampling probability is a function of network degree alone, suffers from some fundamental flaws. First, RDS recruitment is always *without replacement*, since subjects cannot be recruited more than once (Heckathorn, 1997); second, a without-replacement random walk on a network is never at equilibrium with respect to its probability of sampling particular subjects – once a subject is recruited, he or she can never be visited by the recruitment process again; and third, if the recruitment process operates on the social network connecting the sampled individuals and seeds are not chosen at random, the network structure itself determines the probability that a given person will be reached by the recruitment chain. Indeed, for a given sample size n on a fixed population network, any potential subject whose minimum path length to a seed is greater than n has sampling probability 0, *regardless of their network degree*. The random walk characterization of RDS also neglects the fundamental role of coupon depletion in the dynamics of recruitment. Depletion of certain recruiters’ coupons can block paths to isolated parts of the network, providing

no way for the recruitment chain to reach some members of the population. Researchers have raised serious concerns about the empirical properties of population estimates from data obtained by RDS and the Volz and Heckathorn (2008) estimator in particular (Goel and Salganik, 2010; Johnston et al., 2010; Gile and Handcock, 2010; Salganik, 2012; White et al., 2012; Mills et al., 2014). Studies comparing RDS with traditional sampling or census of the same population have highlighted serious bias in estimates (McCreesh et al., 2012) or problems with variance estimation (Wejnert, 2009).

It is difficult to determine the correct sampling probabilities for recruited subjects under RDS because the underlying social network is only partially observed (Gile and Handcock, 2010, 2015). The unobserved links between recruited subjects, and between recruited and unrecruited population members constitute *missing data* in RDS studies. Characterization of the network upon which the sampling process takes place is therefore a major methodological frontier in research on estimation from RDS (Handcock and Gile, 2010). Perhaps surprisingly, a typical RDS study reveals a great deal of information about the network of respondents: the observed degrees, recruitment chain, and patterns of coupon allocation and depletion are all readily available and provide valuable information about the local structure of the population network. Insight into the information content of data from RDS studies would clarify exactly which network and population properties researchers can hope to estimate – and which they cannot – in real-world studies. In particular, a better understanding of the network on which RDS recruitment operates could facilitate computation of marginal sampling probabilities similar those calculated by Gile and Handcock (2015) for use in Horvitz-Thompson type estimators for population means (e.g. Volz and Heckathorn, 2008). Alternatively, specification of a probability model for dependence between trait values of vertices that share an edge in G may allow regression approaches to population estimation and adjustment for dependence in outcomes induced by the network structure (e.g. Bastos et al., 2012). An estimate of the sub-network of respondents in an RDS study could also be used to estimate the size of the target population in a manner analogous to the “network scale-up” population size estimator (Killworth et al., 1998; Bernard et al., 2010; Feehan and Salganik, 2014).

In addition to its statistical uses for population-level inference, the sub-network of respondents is of inherent sociological and epidemiological interest. The network connecting sampled subjects reveals social links between participants and possible avenues for transmission of ideas, behaviors, practices, or infectious agents. Comprehensive sociometric mapping can be difficult and costly in hidden populations, and many researchers have attempted to estimate epidemiological properties of recruited individuals’ networks from recruitment data obtained by RDS (e.g. Liu et al., 2009; Cepeda et al., 2011; Li et al., 2011; Stein et al., 2014a,b). The ability to estimate features of the subgraph of respondents in an RDS study would place sociological and epidemiological inquiries about the local network onto firmer theoretical and methodological ground.

In other areas of network theory, researchers have made progress in reconstructing networks from partial observation. When links are missing, some techniques assume that similar subjects are likely to be connected (Leskovec et al., 2010; Lü and Zhou, 2011; Atchade, 2011; Koskinen et al., 2013). When vertices, edges, or egocentric networks are sampled, several authors have proposed ways of estimating global network properties (Smith, 2012; Bliss et al., 2014; Goyal et al., 2014), or when vertices can be observed more than once (Yan and Gregory, 2013; Frank and Snijders, 1994). Sometimes dynamic or random processes can reveal structural information about networks (Kramer et al., 2009; Shandilya and Timme, 2011; Linderman and Adams, 2014). Gile (2011) and Gile and Handcock (2015) present methods for random graph model-assisted inference of the degree distribution from RDS, but still assume sampling probability is a function of network degree alone.

In this paper, we show how to use data from RDS studies to probabilistically reconstruct the social network of respondents. We first define the observed data under RDS and construct a realistic

continuous-time model of the RDS recruitment process on a graph. The model is a simple and natural formalization of the RDS recruitment procedure initially defined by Heckathorn (1997). Inter-recruitment waiting times carry information about the network edges linking recruiters to unsampled individuals at each moment in time. We combine this timing information, knowledge of who recruited whom, who had coupons at which times, and the network degrees of recruited subjects to place a well-defined probability distribution on the structure of the recruitment-induced subgraph. A fundamental result of this paper is that under simple and realistic assumptions, the likelihood of the recruitment process on a hidden graph can be interpreted as exponential random graph model. We describe a technique for jointly estimating the recruitment-induced subgraph and recruitment rate. An important feature of the algorithm is a computationally efficient method to calculate the likelihood of the recruitment-induced subgraph. We validate the proposed technique using simulated and real networks and apply it to an RDS study of injection drug users in St. Petersburg, Russia. We conclude with a new perspective on the information content of data from RDS studies and ideas for future work.

2 Preliminaries

We begin by stating some definitions and assumptions to ensure that the graph inference problem is well-posed (we use the terms “graph” and “network” interchangeably). The first is implicit in the foundational work on RDS and guarantees that the objects under study exist (Heckathorn, 1997; Salganik and Heckathorn, 2004; Volz and Heckathorn, 2008).

Assumption 1. *The hidden population exists and has finite size N . The social network connecting members of the hidden population is an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with $|V| = N$ and no parallel edges or self-loops.*

Members of the hidden population are *vertices* in V . A vertex is *recruited* if it is known to the study. A vertex is a *recruiter* if it has at least one coupon and at least one unrecruited neighbor; a *susceptible vertex* is unrecruited and has at least one neighbor who is a recruiter. A *susceptible edge* connects a recruiter and a susceptible vertex, and recruitments can only take place across susceptible edges. A recruited vertex cannot be recruited again. At the moment it is recruited, a vertex is endowed with a non-negative number of coupons that it may use to recruit its susceptible neighbors. Every recruitment reduces the number of coupons held by the recruiter by one. When all the coupons belonging to a recruiter vertex are depleted, the vertex is no longer a recruiter, and any edges incident to it are no longer susceptible. *Seeds* are recruited vertices chosen from the entire population of vertices by some mechanism, not necessarily random, usually at the beginning of the study. Seeds are not considered to have been recruited by any other vertex.

Definition 1 (Recruitment-induced subgraph). *The recruitment-induced subgraph is $G_S = (V_S, E_S)$, where $V_S \subseteq V$ consists of $n = |V_S|$ sampled vertices (including seeds); and $\{i, j\} \in E_S$ if and only if $i \in V_S$, $j \in V_S$, and $\{i, j\} \in E$.*

Definition 2 (Recruitment graph). *The directed recruitment graph is $G_R = (V_R, E_R)$, where $V_R = V_S$ is the set of n sampled vertices and a directed edge from i to j indicates that i recruited j .*

Since subjects cannot be recruited more than once, G_R is acyclic. Assumption 1 does not require that G be connected, nor that the RDS sample take place in the largest connected component, or even a single component. Therefore the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S may not be connected. Let \mathbf{d} be the $n \times 1$ vector of recruited subjects’ degrees (in the order of their recruitment into the study) and let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ be the $n \times 1$ vector of recruitment times, where $t_1 < \dots < t_n$.




Figure 1: Example of unobserved and observed data in RDS. The true hidden population network is G , shown at top left. One seed is chosen (the vertex marked 1), and the RDS recruitment proceeds with each recruited vertex receiving 2 coupons. The directed recruitment graph G_R is shown superimposed on G . The recruitment-induced subgraph G_S is the subgraph of the recruited vertices. The degrees $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_8)$ of each recruited vertex are observed, along with the recruitment times $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_8)$. Finally, the coupon matrix \mathbf{C} shows which recruited vertices had at least one coupon just before each recruitment event. In RDS, researchers observe neither G nor G_S ; the observed data consist of $\mathbf{Y} = (G_R, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{C})$.

Definition 3 (Coupon matrix). *Let \mathbf{C} be the $n \times n$ coupon matrix whose element \mathbf{C}_{ij} is 1 if subject i has at least one coupon just before the j th recruitment event, and zero otherwise. The rows and columns of \mathbf{C} are ordered by subjects' recruitment time.*

The RDS recruitment process reveals only some of this information to researchers.

Assumption 2. *The observed data from an RDS recruitment process consist of $\mathbf{Y} = (G_R, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{C})$.*

In particular, researchers do not observe the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S of the sampled vertices. Assumption 2 is taken from the description of the RDS recruitment procedure given by Heckathorn (1997). The coupon matrix \mathbf{C} is a deterministic function of G_R and the number of coupons given to subjects. Figure 1 shows an example graph G and a realization of the RDS recruitment process on G . The recruitment graph G_R , recruitment-induced subgraph G_S , degree vector \mathbf{d} , recruitment times \mathbf{t} , and coupon matrix \mathbf{C} are also shown.

We now state three assumptions about the behavior of recruiters and their knowledge of the recruitment status of their neighbors.

Assumption 3. *Vertices become recruiters immediately upon entering the study and receiving one or more coupons. They remain recruiters until their coupons or susceptible neighbors are depleted, whichever happens first.*

Assumption 4. *When a susceptible neighbor j of a recruiter i is recruited by any recruiter, the edge connecting i and j is immediately no longer susceptible.*

By Assumption 4, recruitment is *competitive*: the first recruiter to recruit a given susceptible vertex immediately removes it from the pool of susceptibles. Finally, we specify a parametric waiting time distribution for the time it takes for a recruiter to recruit a susceptible neighbor.

Assumption 5. *The time to recruitment along an edge connecting a recruiter to a susceptible neighbor has exponential distribution with rate λ , independent of the identity of the recruiter, neighbor, and all other waiting times.*

By Assumption 5, waiting times to recruitment along susceptible edges are independent and elapse concurrently in continuous time, so recruitment is *simultaneous*. Together, Assumptions 3, 4, and 5 place a well-defined probability distribution on the recruitment-induced subgraph of respondents.

2.1 Consequences of the waiting time assumption

The following results follow directly from Assumption 5. Let R be the set of recruiters with coupons and let S be the set of susceptible vertices at a certain moment in the recruitment process. Let S_u be the set of susceptible vertices that are neighbors of the recruiter $u \in R$. Likewise, let R_v be the set of possible recruiters of a susceptible vertex $v \in S$. Clearly, $v \in S_u$ if and only if $u \in R_v$.

Proposition 1. *Given that the recruiter u recruits one of its susceptible neighbors $v \in S_u$ before any other recruiter, the waiting time to this recruitment event is distributed as $\text{Exponential}(\lambda|S_u|)$. The probability that the susceptible vertex $v \in S_u$ is the next recruit is uniform $1/|S_u|$, independent of the waiting time to the recruitment event.*

Proposition 2. *The waiting time to the next recruitment of any susceptible vertex is distributed as $\text{Exponential}(\lambda \sum_{u \in R} |S_u|)$. The probability that the susceptible vertex $v \in S$ is the next recruit is*

$$\frac{|R_v|}{\sum_{k \in S} |R_k|}, \quad (1)$$

independent of the waiting time.

Proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 are given in the Appendix. Intuitively, Proposition 2 means that the new recruited vertex is chosen with probability proportional to the number of edges along which it can be recruited. These results formalize the consequences of simultaneous and competitive recruitment in continuous time.

Interestingly, Assumptions 3-5 and the resulting recruitment probability (1) differ starkly from the recruitment dynamics used in simulations by other researchers to test the performance of estimators for RDS. Gile and Handcock (2010) simulate the RDS recruitment process by first choosing seeds, after which “[s]ubsequent sample waves were selected without-replacement by sampling up to two nodes at random from among the unsampled alters of each sampled node”. This leads us to a brief Corollary establishing the difference between these approaches.

Corollary 1. *Assumptions 3-5 (simultaneous and competitive recruitment) result in different recruitment probabilities than the RDS recruitment implementation of Gile and Handcock (2010).*

A proof is given in the Appendix. Figure 2 shows an example in which the probability of the next recruited vertex under the model developed in this paper is different from that proposed by Gile and Handcock (2010). The process defined by Gile and Handcock (2010) requires that recruiters “take turns”. This approach implicitly requires that recruiters have knowledge about the behavior of other recruiters – even those to whom they are not connected in the network. This process induces a different distribution on the susceptible degree, and hence overall degree, of the new recruit than the model described in Assumptions 3-5 of this paper. Most existing methods for population inference from RDS data depend intimately on the degree distribution of recruited vertices (e.g. Salganik and Heckathorn, 2004; Volz and Heckathorn, 2008; Gile, 2011), so it is important to highlight scenarios when methods for simulation of recruitment dynamics differ.




Figure 2: Probability of the next recruited vertex. Consider a set $R = \{r_1, r_2\}$ of two recruiters and a set $S = \{u, v\}$ of two susceptible vertices r_1 is connected to both u and v and r_2 is connected only to v . Under simultaneous and competitive recruitment (Assumption 5), the probability that a given susceptible vertex is recruited next is proportional to the number of susceptible edges incident to it. Then u is the next recruit with probability $1/3$ and v with probability $2/3$. Gile and Handcock (2010) simulate the RDS recruitment process with $u \in R$ chosen first with probability $1/2$, followed by $v \in S_u$. This procedure results in recruitment probabilities $1/4$ and $3/4$ for u and v respectively.

3 Likelihood of the recruitment time series

Proposition 2 shows that under Assumptions 3-5, the rate of recruitment is proportional to the number of susceptible edges. Given a realization of the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S , it is not immediately obvious how to quickly determine the number of susceptible edges just before each recruitment. When a given susceptible vertex is recruited, all susceptible edges incident to it disappear from the set of susceptible edges (Assumption 4). Furthermore, the newly recruited vertex now has coupons, so there may be new susceptible edges connected to it. Finally, if the new vertex is not a seed, its recruiter has used one coupon; if its coupons are now depleted, any other susceptible edges incident to the recruiter are no longer susceptible. Clearly the number of susceptible edges can increase, decrease, or stay the same from one recruitment to the next. In this Section, we derive a computationally efficient representation of the likelihood of the recruitment time series using matrix algebra. This approach obviates costly enumeration of all $|E_S|$ edges to determine whether they are susceptible at each step in the recruitment process. A preliminary definition will assist us in this task. Let $\mathbb{1}\{X\}$ be the indicator of an event X , which takes value 1 when X is true, and zero otherwise.

Definition 4 (Compatibility). *An estimated subgraph $\hat{G}_S = (\hat{V}_S, \hat{E}_S)$ is compatible with the observed data if the following conditions are met:*

1. *the vertices in the estimated subgraph are identical to the set of recruited vertices: $v \in \hat{V}_S$ if and only if $v \in V_R$;*
2. *all directed recruitment edges are represented as undirected edges: if $(i, j) \in E_R$ then $\{i, j\} \in \hat{E}_S$;*
3. *the number of edges in G_S belonging to each sampled vertex does not exceed the vertex's degree: for all $v \in V_R$, $\sum_{u \in V_R \setminus v} \mathbb{1}\{\{u, v\} \in \hat{E}_S\} \leq d_v$, where d_v is the degree of vertex v .*

These compatibility conditions provide topological constraints on the structure of G_S . Combining these with the likelihood of the recruitment time series places a probability distribution on the topology of G_S .

Let \mathbf{A} be the $n \times n$ adjacency matrix (sociomatrix) of a compatible estimate G_S , where the rows and columns of \mathbf{A} correspond to subjects in the order of their recruitment. The product of \mathbf{A} and the coupon matrix \mathbf{C} gives an $n \times n$ matrix whose elements describe the number of recruiters




Figure 3: Examples of matrices used to calculate the recruitment time series likelihood. At top left is the recruitment graph G_R overlaid on the population graph G , with recruited vertices numbered and other vertices and edges in gray. The true recruitment-induced subgraph G_S is not directly observed. We estimate G_S by \hat{G}_S and let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of \hat{G}_S . The coupon matrix \mathbf{C} and the number of pendant edges attached to each recruited vertex \mathbf{u} are shown. Pendant edges connect recruited vertices to unknown/unsampled vertices. The i, j th element of $\text{lt}(\mathbf{AC})$ is the number of recruiters connected to i just before the j th recruitment event.

connected to each vertex in G_S over time. Let $\mathbf{w} = (0, t_2 - t_1, \dots, t_n - t_{n-1})$ be the $n \times 1$ vector of waiting times between recruitments. Let \mathbf{u} be the $n \times 1$ vector of the number of edge ends belonging to each vertex (in the order of recruitment) that are not connected to any other sampled vertex. With this notation, we see that vertex degree is *conserved*, $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{d}_i - \sum_j \mathbf{A}_{ij}$. When $j \leq i$, $\{\mathbf{AC}\}_{ij}$ is the number of recruiters connected to i just before the time t_j of the j th recruitment. Then $\text{lt}(\mathbf{AC})$, the lower triangle of \mathbf{AC} , is the number of recruiters connected to each vertex at each time before recruitment of that vertex. Likewise, the j th element of $\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{u}$ is the number of susceptible edges connecting sampled vertices to unsampled vertices at time t_j . Figure 3 shows examples of these matrices. Finally, let M be the set of seeds. The following Proposition gives the likelihood of the recruitment time series.

Proposition 3. *Under Assumptions 1-5, the likelihood of the recruitment time series is*

$$L(\mathbf{w}|G_S, \lambda) = \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \lambda s_k \right) \exp[-\lambda \mathbf{s}'\mathbf{w}] \quad (2)$$

where

$$\mathbf{s} = \text{lt}(\mathbf{AC})'\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{C}'\mathbf{u} \quad (3)$$

is a vector whose elements are the number of susceptible edges just before each recruitment event.

A proof is given in the Appendix. As before, the rate of recruitment is proportional to the number of susceptible edges, and Proposition 3 generalizes Proposition 2 by providing an explicit expression for the number of susceptible edges at each step, and allowing for seeds to be added at any time.

3.1 The likelihood is an exponential random graph model

While (2) is the likelihood of the recruitment time series \mathbf{w} , we can also view it as a function of the recruitment-induced subgraph adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} with \mathbf{w} held fixed. Consider the statistic

$T(\mathbf{A}) = -\lambda \mathbf{s}$, where \mathbf{s} is defined by (3), $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{w}$, and $B(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{k \notin M} \log(\lambda \mathbf{s}_k)$. Then we can re-normalize the likelihood (2) to form the probability

$$\Pr(\mathbf{A}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\exp[T(\mathbf{A})'\boldsymbol{\theta} + B(\mathbf{A})]}{\kappa(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \quad (4)$$

where $\kappa(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a normalizing constant that does not depend on \mathbf{A} . It is clear from (4) that $\Pr(\mathbf{A}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a member of the exponential family of distributions. In particular, it is an exponential random graph model (ERGM), also known as a p^* graph (Frank and Strauss, 1986; Wasserman and Pattison, 1996).

Regardless of whether we view (2) as the likelihood of the random waiting times \mathbf{w} or as the probability of the random graph G_S , the inference procedure we develop below benefits from Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms developed for sampling edges in ERGMs (see Snijders and Van Duijn, 2002, for example). One of the most important properties of ERGMs is that it is easy to sample \mathbf{A} for a given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. To illustrate, consider the adjacency matrices of two compatible graphs, \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 . The ratio of probabilities, used below in formulation of the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance probability, is

$$\frac{\Pr(\mathbf{A}_1|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\Pr(\mathbf{A}_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \exp \left[(T(\mathbf{A}_1) - T(\mathbf{A}_2))'\boldsymbol{\theta} + B(\mathbf{A}_1) - B(\mathbf{A}_2) \right]. \quad (5)$$

As we show below, the *change statistic* in the exponential term is straightforward to calculate without the matrix multiplication seemingly required by (3).

4 Estimating G_S and λ

Together, the compatibility conditions (Definition 4) and Proposition 3 make possible simultaneous estimation of the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S and the waiting time parameter λ under the recruitment model. We define the joint posterior distribution as

$$p(G_S, \lambda | \mathbf{Y}) \propto L(\mathbf{w} | G_S, \lambda) \Pr(G_S) \pi(\lambda) \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = (G_R, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t})$ is the observed data, and $\Pr(G_S)$ and $\pi(\lambda)$ are prior distributions. In the rest of this paper, we take the uniform distribution over compatible graphs, $\Pr(G_S) \propto 1$, but in principle $\Pr(G_S)$ could be any distribution over $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$.

4.1 Adding and removing edges

To estimate G_S , it is helpful to have a recipe for generating compatible subgraphs. Let $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$ denote the set of all recruitment-induced subgraphs that are compatible with the observed data G_R and \mathbf{d} . To obtain a new compatible subgraph \hat{G}_S from a current compatible subgraph $G_S = (V_S, E_S)$, we randomly choose two vertices i and j , where $i \neq j$. If $\{i, j\} \notin E_S$, $\mathbf{u}_i > 0$, and $\mathbf{u}_j > 0$, then we propose to add the edge $\{i, j\}$ to E_S . Alternatively, if $\{i, j\} \in E_S$ and $\{i, j\} \notin E_R$, then we propose to remove the edge $\{i, j\}$ from E_S . If neither of these conditions hold, we pick another pair $\{i, j\}$ and try again. This procedure is described formally in the following algorithm.

- 1: **loop**
- 2: Choose two vertices i and j at random, with $i < j$.
- 3: **if** $\{i, j\} \notin E_S$ and $\mathbf{u}_i \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{u}_j \geq 1$ **then**
- 4: let $E_S^+ = \{i, j\} \cup E_S$ and $G_S^+ = (V_S, E_S^+)$
- 5: let $\mathbf{u}_k^+ = \mathbf{u}_k$ for all $k \neq i, j$ and $\mathbf{u}_i^+ = \mathbf{u}_i - 1$, $\mathbf{u}_j^+ = \mathbf{u}_j - 1$.

```

6:   return  $G_S^+$  and  $\mathbf{u}^+$ 
7: else if  $\{i, j\} \in E_S$  and  $\{i, j\} \notin E_R$  then
8:   let  $E_S^- = E_S \setminus \{i, j\}$  and  $G_S^- = (V_S, E_S^-)$ 
9:    $\mathbf{u}_i^- = \mathbf{u}_i + 1$  and  $\mathbf{u}_j^- = \mathbf{u}_j + 1$ 
10:  return  $G_S^-$  and  $\mathbf{u}^-$ 
11: end if
12: end loop

```

This procedure chooses a vertex pair $\{i, j\}$ uniformly at random from all pairs whose change (addition or removal of the edge between i and j) would result in a compatible graph. The space of compatible subgraphs $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$ is connected via proposals of this type. To see why this is so, consider two compatible graphs G_S^1 and G_S^2 in $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$. Let $G_R^r = (V_S, E_R^r)$ be the undirected recruitment graph obtained by making each edge in the directed recruitment graph G_R reciprocal. By definition, G_R^r is a subgraph of every graph in $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$. From G_S^1 , we can obtain G_R^r by successively removing non-recruitment edges, one at a time and each of these steps occurs with positive probability. From G_R^r we can obtain G_S^2 by adding non-recruitment edges, one at a time. Since we can reach G_S^2 from G_S^1 in a similar manner, $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$ is connected via the given proposal algorithm.

4.2 Monte Carlo sampling

To draw samples (G_S, λ) from the posterior distribution $p(G_S, \lambda | \mathbf{Y})$, we describe a Metropolis-within-Gibbs sampling scheme. This involves first sampling G_S conditional on λ , then sampling λ conditional on G_S . By alternating these steps, we define a reversible Markov chain whose equilibrium distribution is the given by (6). To sample G_S conditional on λ , suppose λ is fixed and we have a compatible subgraph G_S . We generate a new compatible subgraph $G_S^* = (V_S, E_S^*)$ using the algorithm given above. We take the uniform prior distribution over the recruitment-induced subgraph: $\Pr(G_S) = 1/|\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})|$ for every $G_S \in \mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$. To decide whether to accept a proposal G_S^* as a sample from the conditional distribution $p(G_S | \lambda, \mathbf{Y})$, we form the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance probability

$$\rho = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{L(\mathbf{w} | G_S^*, \lambda)}{L(\mathbf{w} | G_S, \lambda)} \cdot \frac{\Pr(G_S | G_S^*)}{\Pr(G_S^* | G_S)} \right\}, \quad (7)$$

and we accept the proposed graph G_S^* with probability ρ . Section 4.3 gives a simple and computationally efficient expression for the likelihood ratio, and Section 4.3.1 gives a derivation of the proposal ratio $\Pr(G_S | G_S^*) / \Pr(G_S^* | G_S)$.

To sample λ conditional on G_S , we employ a Metropolis-Hastings step based on an approximation to the conditional distribution of λ . From (2), we can easily find the maximum likelihood estimator of λ ,

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{n - |M|}{\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{w}} \quad (8)$$

with asymptotic variance $\sigma^2 = \lambda^2 / (n - |M|)$. Let

$$g(\lambda | G_S) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp[-(\lambda - \hat{\lambda})^2 / \sigma^2] \quad (9)$$

be a normal approximation to the conditional distribution of λ given G_S . Suppose λ is the current value and we propose a new value λ^* from $g(\lambda | G_S)$. We accept the proposal with probability

$$\rho = \min \left\{ \frac{L(\mathbf{w} | G_S, \lambda^*)}{L(\mathbf{w} | G_S, \lambda)} \cdot \frac{\pi(\lambda^*)}{\pi(\lambda)} \cdot \frac{g(\lambda | G_S)}{g(\lambda^* | G_S)} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

4.3 Computing the likelihood ratio

The ratio of likelihoods in (7) can be computed very efficiently. Since by definition vertex i was recruited before j , we have $t_i < t_j$. Let t_i^* be the minimum of the time that vertex i used its last coupon and t_n , the end of the study. Let \mathbf{s} be given by (3) for a particular realization of G_S and let \mathbf{s}^+ be the susceptible vector after addition of an edge between i and j , where $i < j$. Likewise let \mathbf{s}^- be the susceptible vector after removal of an edge between i and j . The following result will be useful in computing the likelihood ratio in a simple way.

Lemma 1. *Given \mathbf{s} , i , and j , where $t_i < t_j$, the vectors \mathbf{s}^+ and \mathbf{s}^- are given by*

$$\mathbf{s}_k^+ = \mathbf{s}_k - \mathbb{1}\{k > j\}C_{ik} - C_{jk} \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_k^- = \mathbf{s}_k + \mathbb{1}\{k > j\}C_{ik} + C_{jk} \quad (12)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n$.

A proof of Lemma 1 is given in the Appendix. The following Proposition establishes likelihood ratios for addition and removal of edges in G_S .

Proposition 4. *Suppose $G_S = (V_S, E_S)$ has $\{i, j\} \notin E_S$, $\mathbf{u}_i \geq 1$, and $\mathbf{u}_j \geq 1$. For a proposal $G_S^+ = (V_S, E_S^+)$ identical to G_S except that $\{i, j\} \in E_S^+$, the likelihood ratio is*

$$\frac{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S^+, \lambda)}{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S, \lambda)} = \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^+}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) e^{\lambda(t_i^* - \min\{t_j, t_i^*\} + t_j^* - t_j)}. \quad (13)$$

Now suppose $G_S = (V_S, E_S)$ has $\{i, j\} \in E_S$ and $\{i, j\} \notin E_R$. For a proposal $G_S^- = (V_S, E_S^-)$ identical to G_S except that $\{i, j\} \notin E_S^-$, the likelihood ratio is

$$\frac{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S^-, \lambda)}{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S, \lambda)} = \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^-}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) e^{-\lambda(t_i^* - \min\{t_j, t_i^*\} + t_j^* - t_j)}. \quad (14)$$

A proof of Proposition 4 is given in the Appendix. These expressions depend only on a simple *change statistic* and do not require evaluation of the matrix products required by the likelihood (2) for the proposal. Indeed, the change in susceptible edge time, $t_i^* - \min\{t_j, t_i^*\} + t_j^* - t_j$, does not depend on any unknown parameters and can be computed in advance for every i and $j > i$. Likewise, \mathbf{s}_k can be updated at each step using (11) and (12) without computing the matrix product in (3). More generally, the computational burden of the procedure scales with the sample size n , and is not affected by the total size $N = |V|$ of the target population.

4.3.1 Proposal ratio

To define the subgraph proposal ratio in (7), consider a given subgraph G_S . The number of possible vertex pairs between which an edge can be added is

$$\text{Add}(G_S) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \mathbb{1}\{\{i, j\} \notin E_S \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_i \geq 1 \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_j \geq 1\}. \quad (15)$$

Likewise, for a proposed removal of an edge, the number of possible vertex pairs is

$$\text{Remove}(G_S) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \mathbf{1}\{\{i, j\} \in E_S \text{ and } \{i, j\} \notin E_R\}. \quad (16)$$

Then the proposal probability for obtaining G_S^* from G_S is

$$\Pr(G_S^*|G_S) = 1/(\text{Add}(G_S) + \text{Remove}(G_S)). \quad (17)$$

and the ratio of backward and forward proposal probabilities for an addition is

$$\frac{\Pr(G_S|G_S^*)}{\Pr(G_S^*|G_S)} = \frac{1/(\text{Add}(G_S^*) + \text{Remove}(G_S^*))}{1/(\text{Add}(G_S) + \text{Remove}(G_S))} = \frac{\text{Add}(G_S) + \text{Remove}(G_S)}{\text{Add}(G_S^*) + \text{Remove}(G_S^*)} \quad (18)$$

4.4 Maximum likelihood estimation

In Section 4.2 we described a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm for drawing from the posterior distribution of G_S . However, this approach can be time consuming, and may be unnecessary if only a single “most-likely” subgraph G_S is desired. The same routine can be used to find a maximum likelihood (or maximum *a posteriori*) estimate of G_S and λ . This Monte Carlo optimization approach is called “simulated annealing” (see, e.g. Robert and Casella, 2004, for details). Let $\gamma > 0$ be a scale factor and let

$$L_\gamma(\mathbf{w}|G_S, \lambda) = \exp \left[- \left(\lambda \mathbf{s}'\mathbf{w} + \sum_{k \notin M} \log(\lambda \mathbf{s}_k) \right) / \gamma \right] \quad (19)$$

Define a sequence $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_i = 0$. At each iteration i , we propose G_S^* and compute (7) with $L_{\gamma_i}(\mathbf{w}|G_S^*, \lambda)$ to accept the proposal with probability ρ . Once G_S is sampled, the most likely λ is obtained by (8). The joint sequence of sampled subgraphs and λ 's tends toward the maximum likelihood estimates very rapidly.

5 Validation using simulations

In simulation studies, reasonably accurate reconstruction of the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S can be achieved using the proposed recruitment model (2). We analyze the performance of reconstruction in simulated networks and a real-world social network. Conditional on the population network, we simulate the RDS recruitment process with n subjects, $|M|$ seeds, and recruitment rate λ , under Assumptions 3-5. From the simulated recruitment data, we extract the observed data $\mathbf{Y} = (G_R, t, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{C})$ in accordance with Assumption 2. We place a Gamma prior distribution on the waiting time parameter, $\pi(\lambda) \propto \lambda^{\eta-1} e^{-\xi\lambda}$ where $\eta > 0$ and $\xi > 0$. We assess the accuracy of reconstruction over 100 repetitions of simulated RDS recruitment over different networks, and for each simulated dataset we find the joint maximum *a posteriori* (MAP) estimate of G_S and λ using the procedure outlined in Section 4.4. MAP estimates represent the mode of the posterior distribution over (G_S, λ) and provide a convenient point estimate for comparing results over many repetitions of the simulation. We analyze the performance of reconstruction on simulated Erdős-Rényi networks and a real-world network derived from a network study heterosexuals at high risk of contracting HIV in Colorado Springs, CO, USA from 1988-1990 called Project 90 (Woodhouse et al., 1994; Klov Dahl et al., 1994; Rothenberg et al., 1995; Potterat et al., 2004). We also evaluate reconstruction under mis-specification of the waiting time model, in which Assumption 5 is

violated. Reconstruction remains robust, with corresponding bias in estimates of λ . We present detailed simulation results in the online Appendix.

A simple illustrative example of MAP estimation with $\lambda = 1$, $n = 50$, $|M| = 1$ seed, and three coupons per subject is shown in Figure 4. The prior distribution of λ has mean 1 and SD 0.1. The population network is derived from the Project 90 network data, described in detail below. The top row shows the true subgraph G_S with the recruitment graph G_R overlaid (arrows indicate recruitment edges), adjacency matrices of G_R , G_S , and an estimate \hat{G}_S . The bottom row shows the number of edges $|\hat{E}_S|$ in the estimated subgraph at each iteration, the trace of λ , log posterior values, and accuracy.

6 Application

The HIV epidemic in St. Petersburg, Russia is concentrated in people who inject drugs (PWID). At least 12,000 people are registered as drug users, but the number of current PWID is likely much higher (Heimer and White, 2010). Injection drug use is highly stigmatized in the Russian Federation, and criminal penalties for drug possession can be severe. PWID suffer from high rates of HIV infection and may lack access to treatment and health-related educational resources (Niccolai et al., 2010, 2011).

6.1 Study description

As part of a study to assess perceived barriers to use of HIV prevention and treatment services, $n = 813$ PWID were recruited using RDS in St. Petersburg during 2012-2013. Outreach workers identified 17 seed subjects using venue-based sampling in six city districts. Interviews collected demographic information, injection practices, sex practices, mental health measures, and knowledge of HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis resources, but we focus solely on network structure in this analysis. Figure 5 shows the raw RDS data: the recruitment trees, number of new recruits per day, cumulative number of recruits, and reported network degrees.

Participation in the study was limited to current injection drug users over the age of 21 who had injected within the previous four weeks. Subjects' status as PWID was verified either by inspection of arms for injection marks or explanation of drug preparation. Subjects received a voucher with a value of about US\$20 for being interviewed, and a secondary reward with value about US\$10 for recruiting another eligible subject. Following their interview, each subject received 3 coupons, and no subject could be recruited more than once. Informed consent was obtained from all participants and the study was approved by Yale University and Stelit (St. Petersburg) institutional review boards.

6.2 Data

Figure 6 shows the observed data $\mathbf{Y} = (G_R, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{C})$ from this study. The recruitment graph G_R was constructed by matching participants' coupon ID with the IDs of coupons given to their recruiter. The coupon matrix \mathbf{C} was constructed by calculating the number of coupons held by each subject just before each recruitment event. Interviews assessed network degree by asking

“How many people do you know (you know one another’s names) who you have seen within the last 4 weeks who inject drugs?”

Define a subject’s *minimum degree* as the number of undirected edges incident to that subject in the recruitment graph G_R . We assumed subject’s network degree was accurately reported,




Figure 4: Example maximum *a posteriori* reconstruction of G_S and estimation of λ from the Project 90 network and simulated RDS with $\lambda = 1$, $n = 50$, $|M| = 1$ seed, and three coupons per subject. The Gamma prior for λ has mean 1 and SD 0.1. The top row shows the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S with the directed recruitment graph G_R overlaid, and the adjacency matrices of G_R , G_S , and a sample reconstruction \hat{G}_S of G_S . The bottom row shows the traces of the estimated number of edges $|E_S|$, λ , the unnormalized log-posterior value, and the accuracy of \hat{G}_S as a predictor of G_S at each iteration. Accuracy is defined as the number of correct entries in the adjacency matrix of G_S divided by the total number of entries. The true number of edges is $|E_S| = 174$ and the number of edges in the estimated graph is 169. The estimated λ is 1.15.




Figure 5: Raw data from an RDS sample of $n = 813$ people who inject drugs in St. Petersburg, Russia. In the top left panel, fourteen RDS recruitment chains originating from different seeds are shown. Recruited subjects are organized into “waves” along the vertical axis. The top right panel shows the number of subjects interviewed on each day of the study, with seeds indicated by gray bars. The bottom left panel shows the cumulative number of recruits over the course of the study, and the bottom right panel shows a histogram of the reported degrees of subjects, with bin size one.




Figure 6: Raw RDS data $\mathbf{Y} = (G_R, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{C})$ extracted from study recruitment information.

except when a subject’s reported degree was less than their minimum degree. In these cases, we replaced the reported degree by the minimum degree. The average reported degree of subjects was 10.3. Interview dates and times were recorded for each subject; the elapsed time between a subject’s interview and the next interview (in days) was treated as the inter-recruitment waiting time. To more reliably estimate the edge-wise recruitment rate λ , we removed weekends and other breaks during which no interviews were scheduled. This slightly changes the units of λ but allows better estimation of the true waiting time distribution. The online appendix describes the prior specification for λ . In a few cases, the interview times for a subject and their recruit were the same, presumably because both individuals came to the interview site together. In these cases, we resolved the tie by jittering the recruiter’s interview time to be slightly earlier than the recruitee’s interview time.

Construction of G_R and \mathbf{C} revealed a minor violation of the RDS recruitment specification that merits mention: we found seven recruits whose coupon ID matched the ID of an already-redeemed coupon. The financial reward for recruiting another eligible subject may provide a strong incentive for participants to fraudulently inflate the number of coupons they hold by creating a facsimile of the original coupon and giving it to another potential subject to redeem. This appears to be what happened: the recruiter photocopied the original coupon, this reproduction was not detected by the interviewer, and both the new recruit and recruiter received their corresponding rewards. Rather than breaking the recruitment chain by omitting data from the seven subjects with duplicated coupon IDs, we instead artificially increase the number of coupons held by the apparent recruiter to be equal to the number of subjects who redeemed coupons bearing the ID of the recruiter.

6.3 Results

Overall recruitment of participants in this study was rapid: the mean time between interviews was 0.28 ± 0.74 days. However, the mean time between a particular subject’s interview and their recruiter’s interview was 23.4 ± 18.0 days, indicating that the per-edge waiting times for recruited subjects were substantially longer (the maximum waiting time from interview to recruitment was 112 days). Indeed, this calculation is conditional on the subject actually being recruited within the study time frame, so any longer waiting times are censored by the end of the study. We evaluated the posterior mode with η ranging from 0.1 to 10, and in every case the estimate ranged from 0.0050 to 0.0053. The rate of recruitment across susceptible edges is estimated to be approximately $1/\lambda = 199$ days with posterior quantiles (186, 215), nearly as long as the study duration of 223 days. The apparent discrepancy between the high frequency of interviews and very slow recruitment across susceptible edges is explained by the fact that researchers observe the *minimum* waiting time to recruitment across all susceptible edges at each step in the recruitment process.

Figure 7 shows the MAP estimate of the adjacency matrix for all 813 sampled subjects (left) and inset detail (right). Recruitment edges appear in gray. The apparent bands in the adjacency matrix represent high-degree individuals with many non-recruitment edges. Probabilistic assignment of these edge ends to other recruited individuals depends on the timing of recruitments of other subjects. The block-like structure evident in this adjacency matrix may indicate sub-networks of highly connected individuals. Subjects recruited nearby in time may be more likely to know one another, even if they are not linked by a recruitment edge.




Figure 7: Maximum *a posteriori* estimate of G_S for the St. Petersburg RDS study. The left panel shows the MAP estimate of the adjacency matrix of G_S , and the right panel shows the inset sub-matrix in detail. Edges in the recruitment graph are shown in gray.

7 Discussion

7.1 RDS as a network sampling method

Nearly every paper on statistical methods for RDS data states or assumes a version of Assumption 1: the social network connecting members of the hidden population exists and determines the sampling probabilities. But because this network is only partially observed in real-world RDS studies, Assumption 1 is usually disregarded in the formulation of statistical estimators. Instead, researchers usually make the simplifying assumption that sampling probability is proportional to degree and does not otherwise depend on subjects' location in the network. This simplification is justified by a thought-experiment in which the rules of the game are altered: subjects can be recruited infinitely many times, each subject receives only one coupon, and this process continues for an infinitely long time (Salganik and Heckathorn, 2004; Volz and Heckathorn, 2008; Goel and Salganik, 2009).

In this paper, we have embraced Assumption 1 and its natural consequence: RDS recruitment happens across edges in the network connecting members of the hidden population. This point of view emphasizes that RDS is more like a stochastic spreading process on a hidden network than a survey sampling method. We define a simple continuous-time model for RDS recruitment on a hidden population graph using the kind of data obtained by every RDS study. The model results in sensible non-uniform recruitment probabilities: the next subject is recruited with probability proportional to the number of edges they share with recruiters (Proposition 2), *not their total network degree*. Combining this model with the observed data from an RDS study allows joint estimation of the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S and the waiting time parameter λ . Most importantly, the model directly connects the observed data to the recruitment process on the underlying network.

This approach yields two computational benefits. First, the time required to evaluate the likelihood via Proposition 3 is a function of the sample size n alone, and does not depend on the population size N , which is likely to be much larger. In particular, we never simulate unobserved portions of the population network G ; the ERGM (2) specifies a probability model for the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S only. In contrast, some researchers dealing with partially

observed network data marginalize over the entire unsampled portion of the graph, which may be burdensome or impossible for large N (Gile and Handcock, 2015). Second, the likelihood ratios in Proposition 4 do not require computation of the matrix products in (3). Instead, (13) and (14) only depend on a *change statistic* that can be efficiently updated.

Our approach is unique because it uses all the available data $\mathbf{Y} = (G_R, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{C})$ from real-world RDS studies. Several researchers have attempted to estimate the population degree distribution, but use only G_R and \mathbf{d} (and sometimes \mathbf{d} alone), ignoring \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{C} (Salganik and Heckathorn, 2004; Volz and Heckathorn, 2008; Gile, 2011; Handcock et al., 2015; Gile and Handcock, 2015). Berchenko et al. (2013) give a formulation of recruitment event intensity similar to Assumption 2 by employing a multi-type epidemic model in which active recruiters correspond to infective individuals. In their model, the rate of recruitment of a new subject with degree k is proportional to the product of the number of active recruiters and the number of susceptible subjects with degree k . However, they use only \mathbf{d} , \mathbf{t} , and \mathbf{C} , but do not take advantage of the topological information contained in G_R .

7.2 RDS and missing data

Historically, there have been two major statistical objections to RDS as a survey design for inference of population quantities. First, sampling probabilities cannot be computed directly from the observed data, without additional assumptions (Gile and Handcock, 2010; Gile, 2011). Second, there may be statistical dependence between the traits of a given subject and their neighbors (particularly their recruiter) in the network (Heckathorn, 1997, 2002; Tomas and Gile, 2011; Fisher and Merli, 2014). This dependency might be due to homophily – the tendency for people to form social ties with others similar to them – or preferential recruitment of certain types of people, conditional on existing social ties. Clearly, the network structure local to the seeds and recruitment chain encodes the sampling probabilities and the statistical dependencies between subjects’ attributes. This leads us to the conclusion that a fundamental obstacle to principled statistical inference for RDS is *missing data*: in RDS not all network neighbors of a vertex i are observed, either because they remain unsampled, or because the recruitment graph G_R does not reveal a tie between i and the sampled vertices to which it is connected. Objections to RDS typically understate the information about this network contained in the recruitment graph G_R and the time series of interviews. Our results – revealing the graphical structure of data obtained by RDS – raise the possibility that researchers can account for both of these sources of missing data without imposing a prior parametric graph model for the hidden network.

Although the network may be of interest for sociological reasons, it can also be viewed as a nuisance parameter when population attributes are of primary interest. Our simulation results and the St. Petersburg application show that the data from RDS studies contain information about the topology of G_S . Marginalizing (integrating) over the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S can be understood as multiple imputation, repeatedly filling in the missing data in accordance with its distribution under the model (Little and Rubin, 1986; Huisman, 2009; Koskinen et al., 2010, 2013). In the absence of any other information, we could marginalize over compatible graphs in $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$ with respect to the uniform distribution. However, the reconstructed graph would be subject to two types of reconstruction inaccuracy. First, for three sampled vertices i , j , and k with at least one pendant edge each, the uniform distribution provides no basis to distinguish an edge $\{i, j\}$ from an edge $\{i, k\}$ unless a recruitment event took place along one of those edges. For any given pendant edge, there are usually many more incorrect ways to connect it to sampled vertices than there are correct ways. Second, marginalization with respect to the uniform distribution usually results in inclusion of too many or too few edges overall in G_S . To illustrate, note that the compatibility conditions in Definition 4 provide the bounds $n - |M| \leq |E_S| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$. But the

uniform distribution over subgraphs in the set $\mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$ does not result in the uniform distribution over the set $\{n - |M|, \dots, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i\}$. Usually there are many more graphs $\hat{G}_S \in \mathcal{C}(G_R, \mathbf{d})$ with $|\hat{E}_S| > |E_S|$. The waiting time model developed in this paper provides a coherent basis for adding edges to the recruitment subgraph G_R , and helps ensure that estimates of G_S have approximately the same number of edges as the true underlying graph.

In conclusion, we offer a mixed message about the prospect for statistically rigorous analysis of data from real-world RDS studies. First, current estimators for population characteristics depend on assumptions that bear little similarity to RDS recruitment processes on social networks, and do not use all the available data. This may account for their poor performance in empirical studies. Second, and more optimistically, data from RDS studies contain far more information about the social network connecting respondents than has been acknowledged. Estimation of population-level characteristics should therefore proceed from knowledge about the network of sampled subjects; extrapolation to the population network requires stronger assumptions than those given in this paper. By introducing a simple technique for probabilistic reconstruction of the recruitment-induced subgraph, we hope to offer researchers a new tool for sociological inquiry: a social network sampling method that delivers the network.

A Proof of Proposition 1

Let $u \in R$ be a particular recruiter and let S_u be the set of susceptible vertices that are neighbors of u at a given time in the recruitment process. Let W_{ux} be the waiting time for u to recruit its susceptible neighbor $x \in S_u$. By Assumption 5, $W_{ux} \sim \text{Exponential}(\lambda)$ independently for each $x \in S_u$. Given that u recruits a random vertex X in S_u before any other recruiter, define the first recruited vertex to be

$$X = \underset{x \in S_u}{\operatorname{argmin}} W_{ux}. \quad (20)$$

We follow the competing risks perspective of Lange (2010, page 188) and consider the joint probability

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X = x, W_{ux} \geq t) &= \Pr(W_{ux} \geq t, W_{uk} > W_{ux} \text{ for all } k \neq x) \\ &= \int_t^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda s} \Pr(W_{uk} > s \text{ for all } k \neq x) \, ds \\ &= \int_t^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda s} \prod_{\substack{k \in S_u \\ k \neq x}} e^{-\lambda s} \, ds \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_u|} e^{-\lambda |S_u| t}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Therefore X is recruited uniformly at random from S_u , the waiting time to this recruitment has distribution $\text{Exponential}(\lambda |S_u|)$, and X and W_{uX} are independent. \square

B Proof of Proposition 2

Let $W_u = \min_{x \in S_u} W_{ux}$ be the waiting time to the first recruitment by recruiter $u \in R$ and let $W = \min_{u \in R} \min_{x \in S_u} W_{ux}$ be the waiting time to the first recruitment by any recruiter. The first recruiter is $U = \underset{u \in R}{\operatorname{argmin}} W_u$ and the first recruited vertex is $X = \underset{x \in S_U}{\operatorname{argmin}} W_{UX}$. We again

consider the joint probability of the recruited vertex $X = x$ and the waiting time W_{ux} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(X = x, W_{UX} \geq t) &= \sum_{u \in R} \Pr(W_{ux} \geq t, W_{jk} > W_{ux} \text{ for all } k \in R, j \in S, \{u, x\} \neq \{j, k\}) \mathbf{1}\{u \in R_x\} \\
&= \sum_{u \in R_x} \int_t^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda s} \Pr(W_{jk} > s \text{ for all } k \in R, j \in S, \{u, x\} \neq \{j, k\}) \, ds \\
&= \sum_{u \in R_x} \int_t^\infty \lambda e^{-\lambda s} \prod_{j \in R} \prod_{\substack{k \in S_j \\ \{j, k\} \neq \{u, x\}}} e^{-\lambda s} \, ds \\
&= \sum_{u \in R_x} \frac{1}{\sum_{j \in R} |S_j|} \exp \left[-\lambda t \sum_{j \in R} |S_j| \right] \\
&= \frac{|R_x|}{\sum_{k \in S} |R_k|} \exp \left[-\lambda t \sum_{j \in R} |S_j| \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the last line is obtained because $\sum_{j \in R} |S_j| = \sum_{k \in S} |R_k|$. Therefore $X \in S$ is the first recruit with probability proportional to the number of recruiters it has (equivalently, the number of susceptible edges incident to it), the waiting time W_{UX} to the first recruitment is $\text{Exponential}(\lambda \sum_{j \in R} |S_j|)$, and X and W_{UX} are independent. \square

C Proof of Corollary 1

Equation (1) gives the probability that a given vertex $x \in S$ is recruited at the next step in the sampling process under the model described in this paper. Gile and Handcock (2010) describe a recruitment process in which the recruiter u is chosen first, without regard to the number of susceptible vertices linked to it. Then, conditional on the identity of the chosen u , a susceptible neighbors $x \in S_u$ is recruited with uniform probability $1/|S_u|$. Marginalizing over the recruiter u , we find that the probability of recruiting vertex $x \in S$ in the model of Gile and Handcock (2010) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(x \in S \text{ is recruited}) &= \sum_{u \in R} \Pr(u \text{ is recruiter}) \Pr(x \text{ is recruited} | u \text{ is recruiter}) \\
&= \sum_{u \in R} \frac{1}{|R|} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{x \in S_u\}}{|S_u|} \\
&= \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{u \in R_x} \frac{1}{|S_u|}
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the last line is obtained because $x \in S_u$ if and only if $u \in R_x$. In general, this probability distribution is not equal to (1). \square

D Proof of Proposition 3

We first give a rigorous definition of the coupon matrix \mathbf{C} . Define the function $C_i(t)$ to be 1 if subject i has at least one coupon just before time t , and zero otherwise. The function $C_i(t)$ is

left-continuous. Let t_j be the time of the j th recruitment event. Then define the i, j th element of \mathbf{C} as

$$\mathbf{C}_{ij} = \lim_{t \rightarrow t_j^-} C_i(t). \quad (24)$$

where $t \rightarrow t_j^-$ means that t approaches t_j from the left. Recall that \mathbf{A} is the adjacency matrix of the recruitment-induced subgraph, with rows and columns in the order of vertices' recruitment into the study. The i, j th element of the matrix product \mathbf{AC} is the number of recruiters connected to i just before the time t_j of the j th recruitment. Then

$$\{\mathbf{AC}\}_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{A}_{ik} \mathbf{C}_{kj} \quad (25)$$

is the number of possible recruiters of subject i at time t_j^- , and

$$\sum_{i=j}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{A}_{ik} \mathbf{C}_{kj} \quad (26)$$

is the number of susceptible edges at time t_j^- connecting recruiters to vertices that will eventually be sampled. Recruiters may also have connections to vertices that are never recruited into the study. The i th element of the $n \times 1$ vector \mathbf{u} is the number of pendant edges connecting vertex i to unknown/unsampled vertices. Each of these pendant edges is susceptible while i is a recruiter, so the number of susceptible pendant edges just before time t_j is

$$\sum_{i=j}^n \mathbf{C}_{ij} \mathbf{u}_i. \quad (27)$$

Finally, the total number of susceptible edges just before time t_j is the sum of (26) and (27),

$$\mathbf{s}_j = \sum_{i=j}^n \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{A}_{ik} \mathbf{C}_{kj} \right) + \mathbf{C}_{ij} \mathbf{u}_i. \quad (28)$$

and in vector form, $\mathbf{s} = \text{lt}(\mathbf{AC})' \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{C}' \mathbf{u}$. Now let $\mathbf{w} = (0, t_2 - t_1, \dots, t_n - t_{n-1})$ be the $n \times 1$ vector of waiting times between recruitments. By Proposition 2, the random waiting time between recruitment of subject $j - 1$ and j has distribution $\text{Exponential}(\lambda \mathbf{s}_j)$. For recruited vertices j , this waiting time \mathbf{w}_j is fully observed and has density $\lambda \mathbf{s}_j \exp[-\lambda \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{w}_j]$ where $j \notin M$, where M is the set of seeds. In contrast, seeds are recruited not by other vertices, but by another mechanism. If a seed j shares edges with any recruiters before it is chosen as a seed, we observe that the actual waiting time to its recruitment must be greater than the waiting time actually observed, so the density of the waiting time \mathbf{w}_j of a seed is $\exp[-\lambda \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{w}_j]$. Therefore, the full likelihood of the recruitment time series is

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathbf{w} | G_S, \lambda) &= \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda \mathbf{s}_i)^{\mathbb{1}_{\{i \notin M\}}} \exp[-\lambda \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{w}_i] \\ &= \left(\prod_{i \notin M} \lambda \mathbf{s}_i \right) \exp[-\lambda \mathbf{s}' \mathbf{w}], \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where M is the set of seeds, as claimed. \square

E Proof of Lemma 1

Consider the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} of the current estimate of the recruitment-induced subgraph G_S and suppose we would like to add an edge between i and j , where $t_i < t_j$, $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \mathbf{A}_{ji} = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_i \geq 1$, and $\mathbf{u}_j \geq 1$. Define the proposal graph as G_S^+ with adjacency matrix \mathbf{A}^+ to be a matrix identical to \mathbf{A} , except that $\mathbf{A}_{ij}^+ = \mathbf{A}_{ji}^+ = 1$, with \mathbf{u}^+ identical to \mathbf{u} except $\mathbf{u}_i^+ = \mathbf{u}_i - 1$ and $\mathbf{u}_j^+ = \mathbf{u}_j - 1$. By (28),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{s}_k^+ &= \sum_{x=k}^n \left(\sum_{y=1}^n \mathbf{A}_{xy}^+ \mathbf{C}_{yk} \right) + \mathbf{C}_{xk} \mathbf{u}_x^+ \\
&= \sum_{x=k}^n \left(\sum_{y=1}^n (\mathbf{A}_{xy} + \mathbb{1}\{x=i, y=j\} + \mathbb{1}\{x=j, y=i\}) \mathbf{C}_{yk} \right) + \mathbf{C}_{xk} \mathbf{u}_x \\
&\quad - \mathbf{C}_{xk} (\mathbb{1}\{x=i\} + \mathbb{1}\{x=j\}) \\
&= \mathbf{s}_k + \mathbb{1}\{i \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{jk} + \mathbb{1}\{j \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{ik} - \mathbb{1}\{i \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{ik} - \mathbb{1}\{j \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{jk} \\
&= \mathbf{s}_k + 0 + (1 - \mathbb{1}\{j < k\}) \mathbf{C}_{ik} - (1 - \mathbb{1}\{i < k\}) \mathbf{C}_{ik} - (1 - \mathbb{1}\{j < k\}) \mathbf{C}_{jk} \\
&= \mathbf{s}_k - \mathbf{C}_{ik} \mathbb{1}\{k > j\} - \mathbf{C}_{jk}
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where the last line is obtained because $\mathbf{C}_{jk} = 0$ for $k < j$. This establishes (11).

Now we consider removing an edge between i and j , where $t_i < t_j$. Suppose the current estimate of the recruitment-induced subgraph is \mathbf{A} with $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \mathbf{A}_{ji} = 1$ with no recruitment taking place across this edge, $\{i, j\} \notin E_R$. Define the proposal graph as G_S^- with adjacency matrix \mathbf{A}^- to be a matrix identical to \mathbf{A} , except that $\mathbf{A}_{ij}^- = \mathbf{A}_{ji}^- = 0$, with \mathbf{u}^- identical to \mathbf{u} except $\mathbf{u}_i^- = \mathbf{u}_i + 1$ and $\mathbf{u}_j^- = \mathbf{u}_j + 1$. Then the number of susceptible edges just before the time t_k of the k th recruitment is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{s}_k^- &= \sum_{x=k}^n \left(\sum_{y=1}^n \mathbf{A}_{xy}^- \mathbf{C}_{yk} \right) + \mathbf{C}_{xk} \mathbf{u}_x^- \\
&= \sum_{x=k}^n \left(\sum_{y=1}^n (\mathbf{A}_{xy} - \mathbb{1}\{x=i, y=j\} - \mathbb{1}\{x=j, y=i\}) \mathbf{C}_{yk} \right) + \mathbf{C}_{xk} \mathbf{u}_x \\
&\quad + \mathbf{C}_{xk} (\mathbb{1}\{x=i\} + \mathbb{1}\{x=j\}) \\
&= \mathbf{s}_k - \mathbb{1}\{i \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{jk} - \mathbb{1}\{j \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{ik} + \mathbb{1}\{i \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{ik} + \mathbb{1}\{j \geq k\} \mathbf{C}_{jk} \\
&= \mathbf{s}_k + \mathbb{1}\{k > j\} \mathbf{C}_{ik} + \mathbf{C}_{jk}.
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

This gives the update formula (12). □

F Proof of Proposition 4

For the addition of an edge between i and j , the likelihood ratio is

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S^+, \lambda)}{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S, \lambda)} &= \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^+}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) \exp \left[-\lambda (\mathbf{s}^+ - \mathbf{s})' \mathbf{w} \right] \\
&= \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^+}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) \exp \left[\lambda \sum_{k=1}^n (\mathbf{C}_{ik} \mathbb{1}\{k > j\} + \mathbf{C}_{jk}) \mathbf{w}_k \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

We have

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{C}_{ik} \mathbb{1}\{k > j\} \mathbf{w}_k = t_i^* - \min\{t_i^*, t_j\} \quad (33)$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{C}_{jk} \mathbf{w}_k = t_j^* - t_j. \quad (34)$$

Then the ratio becomes

$$\frac{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S^+, \lambda)}{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S, \lambda)} = \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^+}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) \exp [\lambda(t_i^* - \min\{t_j, t_i^*\} + t_j^* - t_j)]. \quad (35)$$

For the removal of an edge between i and j , the same arguments apply. The likelihood ratio is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S^-, \lambda)}{L(\mathbf{w}|G_S, \lambda)} &= \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^-}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) \exp [-\lambda(\mathbf{s}^- - \mathbf{s})' \mathbf{w}] \\ &= \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^-}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) \exp \left[-\lambda \sum_{k=1}^n (\mathbf{C}_{ik} \mathbb{1}\{k > j\} + \mathbf{C}_{jk}) \mathbf{w}_k \right] \\ &= \left(\prod_{k \notin M} \frac{\mathbf{s}_k^-}{\mathbf{s}_k} \right) \exp [-\lambda(t_i^* - \min\{t_j, t_i^*\} + t_j^* - t_j)], \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

as claimed. \square

G Simulation results

Let $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ be the adjacency matrix of the estimated subgraph \hat{G}_S and let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of the true subgraph G_S . We measure the accuracy, true positive rate (TPR), and true negative rate (TNR) of each estimated subgraph. These measures are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Accuracy}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}) &= \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{ij} = \mathbf{A}_{ij}\} / \binom{n}{2} \\ \text{TPR}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}) &= \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{ij} = 1 \text{ and } \mathbf{A}_{ij} = 1\} / \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{A}_{ij} = 1\} \\ \text{TNR}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}) &= \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{ij} = 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{A}_{ij} = 0\} / \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{A}_{ij} = 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

In every simulation, we generate an RDS sample of $n = 500$ subjects, starting from $|M| = 10$ seeds with three coupons per recruit. Since the choice of time scale is arbitrary, we set $\lambda = 1$ for every simulation. We first evaluate reconstruction accuracy by simulating RDS on random undirected networks $G = (V, E)$ generated according to the Erdős-Rényi random graph model with total population size $N = 1000, 5000$, and 10000 vertices and densities $p = 5/N, 10/N$, and $15/N$. In addition, we evaluate the performance of reconstruction on a real-world network: Project 90 surveyed networks of heterosexuals at high risk of contracting HIV in Colorado Springs, CO, USA from 1988-1990 (Woodhouse et al., 1994; Klov Dahl et al., 1994; Rothenberg et al., 1995; Potterat

et al., 2004). The network data G in the Project 90 data consist of $|V| = 5492$ individuals and $|E| = 43288$ edges. Network edges represent social, sexual, or drug use links between individuals. The Project 90 data have been used in other simulation studies to evaluate the performance of RDS estimators (Goel and Salganik, 2010).

Table 1 shows estimate summaries; each row aggregates the results of 100 simulations on distinct networks. Conditional on each simulated network, we simulate the recruitment process and report the mean and SD of estimated quantities over the 100 repetitions. We report the parameters N and p used in the network simulation, the prior standard deviation (SD) of λ , the mean and standard deviation (SD) of accuracy, TPR, and TNR for reconstruction of G_S , and the mean and SD of estimates of λ . Accuracy and TNR are generally very high, with lower values of TPR. The high values of accuracy and TNR indicate that the reconstruction method recovers the true density of G_S fairly well on average. Assignment of the non-recruitment edges is more difficult, and TPR is lower. Figure 4 shows an example in which the general structure of the adjacency matrix are recovered, but individual edges (shown as black entries in the adjacency matrix) may not always be correctly placed. The overall accuracy of edge inference depends on the pattern of coupon use and the structure of the recruitment graph. Accuracy is strongly affected by the proportion of recruitment edges in G_S : G_R is always a subgraph of G_S , so these edges are always present in estimates of G_S . Therefore simulated datasets with low edge density contain very few non-recruitment edges in G_S and hence reconstructions of G_S enjoys very high accuracy and high TNR, while TPR is lower. More dense subgraphs generally have higher TPR. Some estimates of λ exhibit small upward bias, which is alleviated by more a informative prior for λ .

In real-world RDS studies, Assumption 5 may be violated. It is therefore important to assess the performance of subgraph reconstruction and estimation of λ when the waiting time distribution is mis-specified and Assumption 5 does not hold. To this end, we draw random edge-wise waiting times T_{ij} from the Gamma distribution with density $f(t) = \lambda^\delta t^{\delta-1} e^{-\delta t} / \Gamma(\delta)$ with shape and rate parameters $\delta > 0$. Setting $\delta = 1$ recovers the Exponential($\lambda = 1$) distribution. When $0 < \delta < 1$, the Gamma density decays monotonically with the waiting time. When $\delta > 1$, the density has a nonzero mode. In simulations under this waiting time distribution, we fix the mean waiting time at $\mathbb{E}[T_{ij}] = 1$ and vary δ . In this way, δ provides a convenient continuous parameter to change the magnitude of mis-specification of the waiting time model.

Table 2 gives the results for Gamma-distributed waiting times, where δ is specified. The prior SD of λ , accuracy, TPR, TNR, and the mean and SD of estimates of λ are given. In general, accuracy, TPR, and TNR are roughly the same as in the Exponential($\lambda = 1$) case. But as expected, estimates of λ under a mis-specified waiting time distribution appear to be subject to bias. When $\delta < 1$, λ is typically over-estimated; when $\delta > 1$, λ is usually under-estimated. We can explain the relative robustness of reconstruction by recalling two features of the proposed framework. First, the compatibility conditions (Definition 4) impose strong constraints on the topology of G_S when G_R and \mathbf{d} are observed. These constraints are in effect regardless of whether the waiting time model is correctly specified, and serve to ensure that all edges in G_R are correctly estimated. Second, under any model in which the recruitment times across edges are independent, the rate of new recruitments is positively associated with the number of susceptible edges. Under the exponential model this relationship is linear, and under other waiting time models the relationship may be non-linear (and in general depends on time waited along each susceptible edge up to the current time).

Simulated		Prior SD $_{\lambda}$	Accuracy		TPR		TNR		λ		
Network			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
N	Np										
1000	5	1.00	0.994	2.9E-4	0.574	1.3E-2	0.997	2.1E-4	1.292	9.8E-2	
		0.10	0.994	3.1E-4	0.589	1.5E-2	0.997	2.4E-4	1.093	2.6E-2	
		0.01	0.994	2.8E-4	0.600	1.7E-2	0.997	2.1E-4	1.001	4.1E-4	
	10	1.00	0.985	5.4E-4	0.429	1.4E-2	0.994	5.7E-4	1.401	1.0E-1	
		0.10	0.986	4.9E-4	0.455	1.2E-2	0.994	4.8E-4	1.103	2.3E-2	
		0.01	0.986	5.5E-4	0.468	1.5E-2	0.994	3.9E-4	1.001	3.8E-4	
	15	1.00	0.977	7.2E-4	0.374	1.6E-2	0.991	8.2E-4	1.409	1.1E-1	
		0.10	0.979	7.0E-4	0.403	1.4E-2	0.990	7.5E-4	1.104	2.6E-2	
		0.01	0.980	8.3E-4	0.421	1.7E-2	0.990	6.3E-4	1.001	4.3E-4	
	5000	5	1.00	0.996	4.7E-4	0.542	3.2E-2	0.999	7.7E-5	1.401	9.7E-2
			0.10	0.997	5.0E-4	0.617	4.8E-2	0.999	8.2E-5	1.141	2.6E-2
			0.01	0.998	5.7E-4	0.717	7.3E-2	0.999	6.7E-5	1.002	7.4E-4
		10	1.00	0.990	1.0E-3	0.339	2.6E-2	0.999	1.3E-4	1.540	1.1E-1
			0.10	0.993	1.1E-3	0.440	4.8E-2	0.999	1.3E-4	1.149	2.3E-2
			0.01	0.995	1.1E-3	0.537	8.2E-2	0.999	1.1E-4	1.003	6.1E-4
15		1.00	0.984	1.5E-3	0.258	2.0E-2	0.998	1.7E-4	1.576	1.4E-1	
		0.10	0.989	1.7E-3	0.355	4.5E-2	0.998	1.7E-4	1.150	2.5E-2	
		0.01	0.992	1.9E-3	0.472	9.0E-2	0.998	1.5E-4	1.003	8.0E-4	
10000	5	1.00	0.996	4.4E-4	0.546	3.2E-2	1.000	5.5E-5	1.434	1.1E-1	
		0.10	0.997	5.2E-4	0.635	5.0E-2	1.000	5.4E-5	1.146	2.9E-2	
		0.01	0.998	5.9E-4	0.727	7.7E-2	1.000	5.7E-5	1.003	6.7E-4	
	10	1.00	0.991	1.2E-3	0.337	3.8E-2	0.999	7.7E-5	1.541	1.4E-1	
		0.10	0.994	1.0E-3	0.441	4.7E-2	0.999	7.9E-5	1.158	2.6E-2	
		0.01	0.996	1.2E-3	0.569	9.4E-2	0.999	7.8E-5	1.003	7.3E-4	
	15	1.00	0.986	1.6E-3	0.246	2.3E-2	0.999	1.1E-4	1.578	1.1E-1	
		0.10	0.991	1.8E-3	0.354	5.7E-2	0.999	1.0E-4	1.161	2.7E-2	
		0.01	0.994	1.8E-3	0.481	1.1E-1	0.999	9.0E-5	1.003	7.4E-4	
Project 90	1.00	0.973	1.6E-3	0.376	2.6E-2	0.989	1.1E-3	1.263	1.0E-1		
	0.10	0.974	1.3E-3	0.370	2.5E-2	0.988	9.5E-4	1.085	3.6E-2		
	0.01	0.974	1.5E-3	0.374	2.3E-2	0.987	9.3E-4	1.001	4.1E-4		

Table 1: Simulation results for RDS on Erdős-Rényi random networks and the Project 90 network. The recruitment rate λ in every simulation is 1. Each row summarizes 100 simulations of RDS on different random networks under the given network parameters N and p . The prior SD of λ is given in the next column. The mean and SD of accuracy, TPR, and TNR for reconstruction of G_S and the mean MAP estimate and SD of λ are in the last three columns. Below, simulation results for RDS on the Project 90 network are given.

δ	Prior	Accuracy		TPR		TNR		λ	
	SD_λ	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
0.5	1.00	0.974	1.6E-3	0.394	2.9E-2	0.990	1.0E-3	19.816	3.4E-0
	0.10	0.986	1.1E-3	0.969	6.0E-2	0.986	9.1E-4	3.872	2.3E-1
	0.01	0.986	9.3E-4	1.000	3.3E-4	0.986	9.4E-4	1.043	8.8E-4
0.6	1.00	0.974	1.5E-3	0.387	3.0E-2	0.990	1.0E-3	8.748	1.4E-0
	0.10	0.985	1.9E-3	0.814	1.2E-1	0.986	9.2E-4	2.698	1.7E-1
	0.01	0.986	9.6E-4	0.998	8.2E-3	0.986	9.6E-4	1.037	1.3E-3
0.7	1.00	0.973	1.5E-3	0.385	2.6E-2	0.989	1.0E-3	4.390	5.9E-1
	0.10	0.981	2.2E-3	0.596	9.1E-2	0.986	1.0E-3	1.885	9.4E-2
	0.01	0.986	1.1E-3	0.977	4.6E-2	0.986	1.0E-3	1.026	2.4E-3
0.8	1.00	0.973	1.4E-3	0.383	2.5E-2	0.989	9.4E-4	2.710	2.6E-1
	0.10	0.978	2.0E-3	0.464	4.3E-2	0.987	1.0E-3	1.441	7.7E-2
	0.01	0.984	2.3E-3	0.794	1.4E-1	0.986	1.1E-3	1.013	2.6E-3
0.9	1.00	0.974	1.6E-3	0.380	2.5E-2	0.989	1.0E-3	1.736	1.6E-1
	0.10	0.975	1.6E-3	0.399	2.3E-2	0.987	9.3E-4	1.197	3.9E-2
	0.01	0.978	2.3E-3	0.458	6.2E-2	0.987	1.0E-3	1.004	1.1E-3
1.1	1.00	0.974	1.7E-3	0.379	2.7E-2	0.989	1.1E-3	0.929	7.2E-2
	0.10	0.973	1.5E-3	0.380	2.7E-2	0.989	1.0E-3	0.970	3.6E-2
	0.01	0.973	1.6E-3	0.374	2.5E-2	0.989	1.0E-3	0.999	8.2E-4
1.2	1.00	0.973	1.5E-3	0.373	2.4E-2	0.988	1.0E-3	0.731	5.3E-2
	0.10	0.974	1.7E-3	0.394	2.8E-2	0.990	9.4E-4	0.834	3.3E-2
	0.01	0.974	2.0E-3	0.405	3.3E-2	0.991	1.0E-3	0.995	1.6E-3
1.3	1.00	0.973	1.5E-3	0.370	2.3E-2	0.988	1.2E-3	0.587	4.4E-2
	0.10	0.974	1.9E-3	0.401	3.2E-2	0.990	1.0E-3	0.724	3.0E-2
	0.01	0.976	2.1E-3	0.436	3.4E-2	0.993	1.0E-3	0.987	2.4E-3
1.4	1.00	0.973	1.5E-3	0.366	2.4E-2	0.988	1.1E-3	0.488	3.6E-2
	0.10	0.974	1.8E-3	0.404	2.9E-2	0.990	1.0E-3	0.626	2.4E-2
	0.01	0.977	1.9E-3	0.460	3.3E-2	0.994	9.8E-4	0.978	3.1E-3
1.5	1.00	0.973	1.6E-3	0.352	2.2E-2	0.988	1.1E-3	0.412	3.0E-2
	0.10	0.974	2.1E-3	0.400	3.4E-2	0.990	1.0E-3	0.542	2.1E-2
	0.01	0.978	2.1E-3	0.481	3.6E-2	0.995	9.1E-4	0.968	3.4E-3

Table 2: Simulation results for RDS on the Project 90 data under mis-specification of the waiting time distribution. The mean waiting time to recruitment is distributed as $\text{Gamma}(\delta, \delta)$, for the given values of δ . When $\delta = 1$, the waiting time distribution is correctly specified; these results are given in the last three lines of Table 1.

H Prior for λ in the St. Petersburg application

To obtain a sensible prior distribution for the edge-wise recruitment rate λ , we adopt an empirical Bayesian approach based on bounding the maximum likelihood estimate of λ given by (8). First, observe that the maximum number of susceptible edges that can be added by a vertex i with degree d_i is d_i minus one if i was recruited by another subject, $d_i - \mathbb{1}\{i \notin M\}$. Then the maximum number of susceptible edges at step k in the recruitment process is $\mathbf{s}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} d_i - \mathbb{1}\{i \notin M\}$. Therefore a minimum estimate of λ is

$$\lambda_{\text{lo}} = \frac{n - |M|}{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{w}_i \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (d_i - \mathbb{1}\{i \notin M\})}.$$

Now let n_i be the number of subjects recruited by subject i . The minimum number of susceptible edges at step k is $\mathbf{s}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} n_i - \mathbb{1}\{i \notin M\}$, and the maximum estimate of λ is

$$\lambda_{\text{hi}} = \frac{n - |M|}{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{w}_i \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (n_i - \mathbb{1}\{i \notin M\})}.$$

Applying these bounds to the St. Petersburg data yields $\lambda_{\text{lo}} = 9.8 \times 10^{-4}$ and $\lambda_{\text{hi}} = 4.2 \times 10^{-2}$. We therefore specify a prior distribution for λ that takes most of its mass in the interval $[\lambda_{\text{lo}}, \lambda_{\text{hi}}]$. Let $\lambda_{\text{mean}} = (\lambda_{\text{lo}} + \lambda_{\text{hi}})/2 = 0.022$. Suppose $\eta > 0$ is given and let $\xi = \eta/\lambda_{\text{mean}}$. Now by varying η , we obtain a family of Gamma prior distributions with mean λ_{mean} .

References

- Atchade, Yves F. 2011. “Estimation of Network structures from partially observed Markov random fields.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1108.2835* .
- Bastos, Leonardo S, Adriana A Pinho, Claudia Codeço, and Francisco I Bastos. 2012. “Binary regression analysis with network structure of respondent-driven sampling data.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.5681* .
- Berchenko, Yakir, Jonathan Rosenblatt, and Simon DW Frost. 2013. “Modeling and Analysing Respondent Driven Sampling as a Counting Process.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1304.3505* .
- Bernard, H Russell, Tim Hallett, Alexandrina Iovita, Eugene C Johnsen, Rob Lyster, Christopher McCarty, Mary Mahy, Matthew J Salganik, Tetiana Saliuk, Otilia Scutelnicu, et al. 2010. “Counting hard-to-count populations: the network scale-up method for public health.” *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 86:ii11–ii15.
- Bliss, Catherine A, Christopher M Danforth, and Peter Sheridan Dodds. 2014. “Estimation of global network statistics from incomplete data.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1548* .
- Broadhead, Robert S, Douglas D Heckathorn, David L Weakliem, Denise L Anthony, Heather Madray, Robert J Mills, and James Hughes. 1998. “Harnessing peer networks as an instrument for AIDS prevention: results from a peer-driven intervention.” *Public Health Reports* 113:42.
- Cepeda, Javier A, Veronika A Odionokova, Robert Heimer, Lauretta E Grau, Alexandra Lyubimova, Liliya Safiullina, Olga S Levina, and Linda M Niccolai. 2011. “Drug network characteristics and HIV risk among injection drug users in Russia: the roles of trust, size, and stability.” *AIDS and Behavior* 15:1003–1010.

- Feehan, Dennis M and Matthew J Salganik. 2014. “Generalizing the Network Scale-Up Method: A New Estimator for the Size of Hidden Populations.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.4009* .
- Fisher, Jacob C and M Giovanna Merli. 2014. “Stickiness of respondent-driven sampling recruitment chains.” *Network Science* 2:298–301.
- Frank, Ove and Tom Snijders. 1994. “Estimating the size of hidden populations using snowball sampling.” *Journal of Official Statistics* 10:53–53.
- Frank, Ove and David Strauss. 1986. “Markov graphs.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81:832–842.
- Gile, Krista J. 2011. “Improved Inference for Respondent-Driven Sampling Data With Application to HIV Prevalence Estimation.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106:135–146.
- Gile, Krista J and Mark S Handcock. 2010. “Respondent-driven sampling: an assessment of current methodology.” *Sociological Methodology* 40:285–327.
- Gile, Krista J and Mark S Handcock. 2015. “Network model-assisted inference from respondent-driven sampling data.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 178:619–639.
- Goel, Sharad and Matthew J Salganik. 2009. “Respondent-driven sampling as Markov chain Monte Carlo.” *Statistics in Medicine* 28:2202–2229.
- Goel, Sharad and Matthew J Salganik. 2010. “Assessing respondent-driven sampling.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:6743–6747.
- Goodman, Leo A. 1961. “Snowball sampling.” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 32:148–170.
- Goyal, Ravi, Joseph Blitzstein, and Victor de Gruttola. 2014. “Sampling networks from their posterior predictive distribution.” *Network Science* 2:107–131.
- Handcock, Mark S and Krista J Gile. 2010. “Modeling social networks from sampled data.” *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 4:5–25.
- Handcock, Mark S, Krista J Gile, and Corinne M Mar. 2015. “Estimating the size of populations at high risk for HIV using respondent-driven sampling data.” *Biometrics* 71:258–266.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D. 1997. “Respondent-driven sampling: a new approach to the study of hidden populations.” *Social Problems* 44:174–199.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D. 2002. “Respondent-driven sampling II: deriving valid population estimates from chain-referral samples of hidden populations.” *Social problems* 49:11–34.
- Heimer, Robert and Edward White. 2010. “Estimation of the number of injection drug users in St. Petersburg, Russia.” *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 109:79–83.
- Huisman, Mark. 2009. “Imputation of missing network data: Some simple procedures.” *Journal of Social Structure* 10:1–29.
- Johnston, Lisa Grazina, Sara Whitehead, Milena Simic-Lawson, and Carl Kendall. 2010. “Formative research to optimize respondent-driven sampling surveys among hard-to-reach populations in HIV behavioral and biological surveillance: lessons learned from four case studies.” *AIDS Care* 22:784–792.

- Killworth, Peter D, Christopher McCarty, H Russell Bernard, Gene Ann Shelley, and Eugene C Johnsen. 1998. “Estimation of seroprevalence, rape, and homelessness in the United States using a social network approach.” *Evaluation Review* 22:289–308.
- Klov Dahl, Alden S, John J Potterat, Donald E Woodhouse, John B Muth, Stephen Q Muth, and William W Darrow. 1994. “Social networks and infectious disease: The Colorado Springs study.” *Social Science & Medicine* 38:79–88.
- Koskinen, Johan H., Garry L. Robins, and Philippa E. Pattison. 2010. “Analysing exponential random graph (p-star) models with missing data using Bayesian data augmentation.” *Statistical Methodology* 7:366 – 384.
- Koskinen, Johan H, Garry L Robins, Peng Wang, and Philippa E Pattison. 2013. “Bayesian analysis for partially observed network data, missing ties, attributes and actors.” *Social Networks* 35:514–527.
- Kramer, Mark A, Uri T Eden, Sydney S Cash, and Eric D Kolaczyk. 2009. “Network inference with confidence from multivariate time series.” *Physical Review E* 79:061916.
- Lange, Kenneth. 2010. *Applied Probability*. Springer texts in statistics. Springer New York, 2nd edition.
- Leskovec, Jure, Daniel Huttenlocher, and Jon Kleinberg. 2010. “Predicting positive and negative links in online social networks.” In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pp. 641–650. ACM.
- Li, Jian, Hongjie Liu, Jianhua Li, Jian Luo, Nana Koram, and Roger Detels. 2011. “Sexual transmissibility of HIV among opiate users with concurrent sexual partnerships: an egocentric network study in Yunnan, China.” *Addiction* 106:1780–1787.
- Linderman, Scott W and Ryan P Adams. 2014. “Discovering Latent Network Structure in Point Process Data.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.0914* .
- Little, Roderick JA and Donald B Rubin. 1986. *Statistical Analysis With Missing Data*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Liu, Hongjie, Tiejian Feng, Hui Liu, Hucang Feng, Yumao Cai, Anne G Rhodes, and Oscar Grusky. 2009. “Egocentric networks of Chinese men who have sex with men: Network components, condom use norms, and safer sex.” *AIDS Patient Care and STDs* 23:885–893.
- Lü, Linyuan and Tao Zhou. 2011. “Link prediction in complex networks: A survey.” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 390:1150–1170.
- McCreesh, Nicky, Simon Frost, Janet Seeley, Joseph Katongole, Matilda Ndagire Tarsh, Richard Ndunguse, Fatima Jichi, Natasha L Lunel, Dermot Maher, Lisa G Johnston, et al. 2012. “Evaluation of respondent-driven sampling.” *Epidemiology* 23:138.
- Mills, Harriet L, Samuel Johnson, Matthew Hickman, Nick S Jones, and Caroline Colijn. 2014. “Errors in reported degrees and respondent driven sampling: Implications for bias.” *Drug and alcohol dependence* 142:120–126.

- Niccolai, Linda M, Olga V Toussova, Sergei V Verevchkin, Russell Barbour, Robert Heimer, and Andrei P Kozlov. 2010. "High HIV prevalence, suboptimal HIV testing, and low knowledge of HIV-positive serostatus among injection drug users in St. Petersburg, Russia." *AIDS and Behavior* 14:932–941.
- Niccolai, Linda M, Sergei V Verevchkin, Olga V Toussova, Edward White, Russell Barbour, Andrei P Kozlov, and Robert Heimer. 2011. "Estimates of HIV incidence among drug users in St. Petersburg, Russia: continued growth of a rapidly expanding epidemic." *The European Journal of Public Health* 21:613–619.
- Potterat, JJ, DE Woodhouse, SQ Muth, R Rothenberg, WW Darrow, AS Klov Dahl, and JB Muth. 2004. "Network Dynamism: History and Lessons of the Colorado Springs Study." In *Network epidemiology: A handbook for survey design and data collection*, edited by Martina Morris, pp. 87–114. Oxford University Press.
- Robert, Christian and George Casella. 2004. *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2 edition.
- Rothenberg, Richard B, Donald E Woodhouse, John J Potterat, Stephen Q Muth, William W Darrow, and Alden S Klov Dahl. 1995. "Social Networks in Disease Transmission: the Colorado Springs Study." In *Social Networks, Drug Abuse, and HIV Transmission*, edited by Richard Needle, Sander G Genser, and Robert T Trotter. US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Salganik, Matthew J. 2012. "Commentary: respondent-driven sampling in the real world." *Epidemiology* 23:148–150.
- Salganik, Matthew J and Douglas D Heckathorn. 2004. "Sampling and estimation in hidden populations using respondent-driven sampling." *Sociological Methodology* 34:193–240.
- Shandilya, Srinivas Gorur and Marc Timme. 2011. "Inferring network topology from complex dynamics." *New Journal of Physics* 13:013004.
- Smith, Jeffrey A. 2012. "Macrostructure from Microstructure Generating Whole Systems from Ego Networks." *Sociological Methodology* 42:155–205.
- Snijders, Tom AB and Marijtje AJ Van Duijn. 2002. "Conditional maximum likelihood estimation under various specifications of exponential random graph models." In *Contributions to social network analysis, information theory, and other topics in statistics: A Festschrift in honour of Ove Frank*, edited by Jan Hagberg, pp. 117–134, Stockholm, Sweden. University of Stockholm, Department of Statistics.
- Stein, Mart L, Jim E van Steenbergen, Vincent Buskens, Peter GM van der Heijden, Charnchudhi Chanyasanha, Mathuros Tipayamongkholgul, Anna E Thorson, Linus Bengtsson, Xin Lu, and Mirjam EE Kretzschmar. 2014a. "Comparison of Contact Patterns Relevant for Transmission of Respiratory Pathogens in Thailand and the Netherlands Using Respondent-Driven Sampling." *PloS one* 9:e113711.
- Stein, Mart L, Jim E van Steenbergen, Charnchudhi Chanyasanha, Mathuros Tipayamongkholgul, Vincent Buskens, Peter GM van der Heijden, Wasamon Sabaiwan, Linus Bengtsson, Xin Lu, Anna E Thorson, and Mirjam E. E. Kretzschmar. 2014b. "Online Respondent-Driven Sampling for Studying Contact Patterns Relevant for the Spread of Close-Contact Pathogens: A Pilot Study in Thailand." *PloS one* 9:e85256.

- Thompson, Steven K and Ove Frank. 2000. "Model-based estimation with link-tracing sampling designs." *Survey Methodology* 26:87–98.
- Tomas, Amber and Krista J Gile. 2011. "The effect of differential recruitment, non-response and non-recruitment on estimators for respondent-driven sampling." *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 5:899–934.
- Volz, Erik and Douglas D Heckathorn. 2008. "Probability based estimation theory for respondent driven sampling." *Journal of Official Statistics* 24:79–97.
- Wasserman, Stanley and Philippa Pattison. 1996. "Logit models and logistic regressions for social networks: I. An introduction to Markov graphs and p^* ." *Psychometrika* 61:401–425.
- Wejnert, Cyprian. 2009. "An empirical test of respondent-driven sampling: point estimates, variance, degree measures, and out-of-equilibrium data." *Sociological Methodology* 39:73–116.
- White, Richard G, Amy Lansky, Sharad Goel, David Wilson, Wolfgang Hladik, Avi Hakim, and Simon DW Frost. 2012. "Respondent driven sampling where we are and where should we be going?" *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 88:397–399.
- Woodhouse, Donald E, Richard B Rothenberg, John J Potterat, William W Darrow, Stephen Q Muth, Alden S Klovdahl, Helen P Zimmerman, Helen L Rogers, Tammy S Maldonado, John B Muth, et al. 1994. "Mapping a social network of heterosexuals at high risk for HIV infection." *AIDS* 8:1331–1336.
- Yan, Bowen and Steve Gregory. 2013. "Identifying communities and key vertices by reconstructing networks from samples." *PloS One* 8:e61006.