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Epidemic containment is a major concern when confronting large-scale infections in complex networks. Many works have been devoted to analytically understand how to restructure the network to minimize the impact of major outbreaks of infections at large scale. In many cases, the strategies consist in the isolation of certain nodes, while less attention has been paid to the intervention on links. In epidemic spreading, links inform about the probability of carrying the contagion of the disease from infected to susceptible individuals. Note that these states depend on the full structure of the network, and its determination is not straightforward from the knowledge of nodes’ states. Here, we confront this challenge and propose a set of discrete-time governing equations that can be closed and analyzed, assessing the contribution of links to spreading processes in complex networks. Our approach allows an scheme for the contention of epidemics, based on deactivating the most important links in transmitting the disease, which outperforms previous proposals. The model is validated in synthetic and real networks, obtaining an accurate determination of the epidemic incidence and the critical thresholds. Epidemic containment based on links’ deactivation promises to be an efficient tool to maintain functionality on networks while controlling the spread of diseases, as for example in air transportation networks.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of modeling the spread of a disease among individuals has been studied in deep over many years [1–4]. The development of compartmental models, models that divide the individuals among a set of possible states, has given rise to a new collection of techniques that enables, for instance, the analysis of the onset of epidemics [5–15] or the study of the impact of a vaccination campaign [16–20]. All previous works heavily rely on the mathematical approach to the study of epidemic spreading [21] and here we follow the same spirit.

The design of effective containment strategies constitutes a major challenge. Measures like vaccination, health care, cattle sacrifice, or education to prevent contagions, operate on the biological aspects of the disease. On the other hand, isolation or mobility restrictions act on the physical spreading channels, which may transform a local event into a pandemic. Here, we concentrate on the role of the links of the spreading network. For example, if we identify the edges which are more involved in the propagation of a disease, it is possible to design targeted countermeasures which affect just specific links instead of whole nodes, while being more effective. This can be illustrated by a hypothetical pandemic disease propagated using the air transportation network: the isolation of one airport is a dramatic measure that is socially and politically difficult to accept and put into practice, but the suspension of just a few connections between selected airports could be more easily assumed, and at the same time achieving a better contention of the disease.

Previous works have directed their attention mostly towards schemes based on the action on single nodes, either randomly or according to node properties such as their degree, betweenness, PageRank or eigenvector centrality [22–23]. Following the same idea, some authors have introduced link removal using properties of the adjacent nodes (degrees or centralities) or of the link itself (edge betweenness) [22–27]. A model of coevolution of epidemics with permanent and temporal link removals was proposed in [28]. Currently, it is considered that the optimal approach consists in finding the minimum set of edges whose removal leads to a maximum decrease of the spectral radius of the network, i.e., the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix [28, 30, 31]. Since the epidemic threshold is, at first order approximation of a susceptible-infected-susceptible (SIS) epidemic dynamics, inverse to the spectral radius, it seems the best and more mathematically grounded option. Unfortunately, it turns out to be an NP-complete problem, thus only heuristics are available for large networks [28].

It must be emphasized that all the previous approaches make use only of the structural characteristics of the network to decide which nodes or edges have to be removed; the characteristics or parameters of the epidemic process are ignored. Even the spectral radius, which is closely related to the epidemic threshold, does not depend on the infection or recovery rates, the expected number of infected neighbors around a certain node, or any other local or global information of the spreading process.

Our proposal concentrates on the role of the links in the spreading of the epidemics, quantifying which is the importance of each link [32], thus enabling containment strategies based on their removal. To this end, we first define the epidemic importance of a link as its capacity to infect other individuals once this link has been used to propagate the disease. The determination of this link epidemic importance requires the development of a mathematical model able to cope with the infection propaga-
FIG. 1. Representation of spreading processes in networks. Left, state of the epidemic spreading at node level, where the size and the color of the nodes is proportional to the probability of being in an infected state. Right, quantification of the role of the links in the dynamics: the length of the arrow represents probability $\Phi$, i.e. the probability that the link is in a state that enables the spreading of the disease, and the blue space between the arrows is proportional to the probability that a given link stays in a non-transmittable state ($\Theta^I + \Theta^S$). Both representations are complementary and help to understand the spreading processes in complex networks.

RESULTS

Link Epidemic Importance

Let us consider a discrete time SIS dynamics that runs on top of a complex network of $N$ nodes and $L$ edges, with adjacency matrix $A$, and where each node $i$ can be in one of two different states $\sigma_i$, either susceptible ($S$) or infected ($I$), i.e. $\sigma_i \in \{S, I\}$. The parameters of the SIS dynamics are the infection and recovery probabilities, $\beta$ and $\mu$, respectively.

Based on the idea of edge importance introduced in [32], our objective is to find the optimal strategy to contain an SIS epidemic process through bond percolation. To determine which link should be removed first, we need a measure of the importance of each link in the spreading of the epidemics. It is clear that links with high probability of being in a state that enables the transmission of the disease, i.e. those with a high value of the joint probability $P(\sigma_j = S, \sigma_i = I)$, should be among the first candidates. However, this measure does not consider the effect that the transmission may have in the next time step, thus it is better to rely on the expected number of infections triggered after the link is used to propagate the disease. This measure is what we call the link epidemic importance, $I_{ij}$, which can be expressed as

$$I_{ij} = \beta P(\sigma_j = S, \sigma_i = I) \sum_{r=1}^{N} A_{jr} \beta P(\sigma_r = S|\sigma_j = I).$$

Now, the problem reduces to finding the joint and conditional probabilities for each link, and this is accomplished using our Epidemic Link Equations (ELE). It can be shown that this definition of link epidemic importance has the property of preserving the connectivity of the network (see Supplementary Note 1 and Supplementary Fig. 1), unlike other options such as edge betweenness, which quickly tend to produce a large number of disconnected components, thus hindering the functionality of the network.

Epidemic Link Equations

To simplify the notation, we first denote the previous joint probability as $\Phi_{ij} = P(\sigma_i = S, \sigma_j = I)$; the higher the $\Phi_{ij}$, the larger the likelihood that the disease propagates from node $j$ to node $i$. It is worth mentioning that this feature is in general asymmetrical, meaning that the propagation of the illness can be more probable from $j$
to $i$ than the other way around. In the same way, the epidemic is restrained by edges where the nodes are in the same state, thus it is convenient to define the probabilities $\Theta_{ij}^S = P(\sigma_i = \sigma_j = S)$ and $\Theta_{ij}^I = P(\sigma_i = \sigma_j = I)$ for all pairs of neighboring nodes, Fig. 1.

The evolution of the joint probability $\Phi_{ij}$ of one link depends on $\Phi$, $\Theta^f$ and $\Theta^S$ to the rest of the neighboring links, and the infection rules of the SIS dynamics. Thus, we can write the following equation for each link:

$$\Phi_{ij}(t + 1) = \Theta_{ij}^S(t) q_{ij}(t) (1 - q_{ji}(t))$$

$$+ \Phi_{ij}(t) ((1 - \beta) q_{ji}(t)) (1 - \mu)$$

$$+ \Phi_{ji}(t) \mu (1 - (1 - \beta) q_{ji}(t))$$

$$+ \Theta_{ij}^I(t) \mu (1 - \mu)$$

(2)

where we have taken into account all the possible changes of state of the nodes $i$ and $j$. The first term considers the probability that both nodes are in a susceptible state, and then node $i$ remaining susceptible while node $j$ is infected by any of its other neighbors. The second term accounts for both nodes remaining in the same state, node $i$ is not infected by any of its neighbors and node $j$ is not recovered from the infection. Then, the third term represents the transition in which node $i$ is infected and recovers while node $j$ is susceptible and it is infected by any of its other neighbors. Finally, in the fourth term both nodes are infected but node $i$ recovers while node $j$ does not. The asymmetry of probability $\Phi_{ij}$ multiplies the number of equations by two, since for each link between nodes $i$ and $j$ we need an equation for $\Phi_{ij}(t + 1)$ and another for $\Phi_{ji}(t + 1)$.

Similarly we can obtain an expression for probability $\Theta_{ij}^f$:

$$\Theta_{ij}^f(t + 1) = \Theta_{ij}^S(t) (1 - q_{ij}(t)) (1 - q_{ji}(t))$$

$$+ \Phi_{ij}(t) (1 - (1 - \beta) q_{ji}(t)) (1 - \mu)$$

$$+ \Phi_{ji}(t) (1 - \mu) (1 - (1 - \beta) q_{ji}(t))$$

$$+ \Theta_{ij}^I(t) (1 - \mu)^2$$

(3)

In this case we have only $L$ equations, one per link, due to its symmetry. There is no need of extra equations for probability $\Theta_{ij}^S$ since the normalization leads to $\Theta_{ij}^S = 1 - \Phi_{ij} - \Phi_{ji} - \Theta_{ij}^f$.

The $q_{ij}(t)$ in equations (2) and (3) stands for the probability that a susceptible node $i$ is not infected by any of its neighbors (excluding node $j$):

$$q_{ij}(t) = \prod_{r \neq j}^{N} (1 - \beta A_{ir} h_{ir})$$

(4)

where $h_{ij}$ defines the hostility of $j$ against $i$, i.e. the probability that node $j$ is infected when node $i$ is susceptible, $h_{ij} = P(\sigma_j = I | \sigma_i = S)$. The hostility can be obtained in terms of $\Theta_{ij}^S$ and $\Phi_{ij}$ as:

$$h_{ij} = \frac{\Phi_{ij}}{\Phi_{ij} + \Theta_{ij}^S}$$

(5)
FIG. 3. Targeted bond percolation. We show the incidence of the epidemics, ρ, and the number of connected components as function of the occupation probability, $L_r/L$, where $L_r$ is the current number of removed edges in the bond percolation process. We compare five different epidemic containment strategies: removing the edges of the node with highest probability of being infected, $P(\sigma_i = I)$ (orange dash-dash line); a random edge removal (yellow dash-dot line); removing the edge with highest edge-betweenness (light orange dotted line); targeting the edge with highest EigenScore (red dashed line); and finally, removing the edge that has the largest total importance (blue solid line). We apply these processes to the same networks as in Fig. 2 (see Methods). We have set the recovery rate to $\mu = 0.5$ and chosen the infection probability $\beta$ such that the initial incidence of the epidemics is about $\rho \approx 0.2$ for all the networks, i.e. $\beta = 0.1$ for both power-law networks, $\beta = 0.06$ for air transportation network, and $\beta = 0.11$ for the collaboration network.

Note that the denominator in equation (5) is a property of node $i$ given that $\Phi_{ij} + \Theta_{ij}^S = P(\sigma_i = S)$ for all neighboring nodes $j$ of vertex $i$.

We call this system of $3L$ equations and unknowns our Epidemic Link Equations (ELE) model. It can be solved by iteration, starting from any meaningful initial condition, e.g. $\Theta_{ij}^I(0) = \rho_0^I$ and $\Phi_{ij}(0) = \Phi_{ji}(0) = \rho_0(1 - \rho_0)$ (for any $0 < \rho_0 \leq 1$), until fixed values are found. Apart from the solution where all nodes are susceptible, $\Theta_j^S = 1$ for all the links, a non-trivial one appears when the system is above the critical value of the epidemic spreading (see Methods for the analytic derivation of the epidemic threshold from ELE model). Finally, the incidence of the epidemic process, the average number of infected nodes in the whole system, can be computed as:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ji}(\Phi_{ji} + \Theta_{ij}^I)$$

(6)

To test the agreement between our approach and empirical simulations we have analyzed the incidence of the epidemics, $\rho$, in different synthetic and real network structures, covering the full range of infection probabilities, $\beta$, see Fig. 3. The results show a perfect agreement between our ELE model and the Monte Carlo simulations, and a good prediction of the epidemic threshold for all synthetic and real networks, pointing out the validity of our model to describe the global impact of the epidemics. Note that all network, except the first one, have a large clustering coefficient, making the determination of the incidence difficult for standard mean field methods, due to the effect of dynamical correlations.
FIG. 4. **Epidemic Containment on the air transportation network.** We show the networks after 33.3% of the links have been removed using link epidemic importance (top) and edge betweenness (bottom). Nodes and edges with the same color belong to the same connected component. The area of the nodes is proportional to their probability of being infected \( P(\sigma_i = 1) \) from 0.0 to 0.6. We have set the epidemic probabilities to \( \mu = 0.5 \) and \( \beta = 0.06 \).

### Epidemic Containment

Our approach for optimal epidemic containment consists in the use of the *link epidemic importance* to select which link we have to remove first. Since we have two link epidemic importances per edge, i.e., \( I_{ij} \) and \( I_{ji} \), which cannot be dissociated, we choose to remove the link with highest total importance, \( \tilde{I}_{ij} = I_{ij} + I_{ji} \). This is possible once we have solved the ELE model, computing the \( I_{ij} \) for all the links in the network using equation 1. Since the structure of the network changes after each link removal, it is convenient to recalculate the solution of the ELE model to ensure that we really remove the current link with largest total importance, \( \tilde{I}_{ij} \).

We show the results of our approach for epidemic containment in Fig. 3. For comparison purposes, we also test four additional containment strategies. First, two strategies that just consider the structure of the network: removal based on maximal edge betweenness [22], and targeting the link with highest EigenScore, i.e., the product...
of the eigenvector centralities of the nodes connected by the link [28]. Then, we consider a measure based on the epidemic process at the level of nodes, the removal of all the links of the node that has maximal probability of being infected. Finally, a simple random edge removal. As in the case of our strategy, we recalculate all the measures after each removal (see Methods for further details).

We observe in Fig. 3 that link importance leads to the fastest extinction of the epidemics for the four considered networks, and it is the only method that preserves their connectivity (thus, functionality). Note that the strategy based on node infectivity performs poorly for all the networks despite having information about the epidemic process, although better than the random removal. This means that the use of information at the level of links is crucial to contain the epidemics.

For the power-law network, our approach using link importance leads to the best performance, but the results are very similar to the ones obtained using EigenScore and edge betweenness strategies (equivalent results hold for Erdős-Rényi networks, see Supplementary Fig. 6). However, when the transitivity of the network is increased, we can clearly see the benefits of using link importance, both in epidemic containment and on preservation of the connectivity of the network (see Supplementary Figs. 2 and 3 for more details on the containment process for each method).

The effect of the clustering coefficient is also present when we look to the epidemic containment results for the two empirical networks in Fig. 3. Moreover, as in most real networks, the air transportation and the scientific collaborations networks have a significant modular structure. This plays an important role on the epidemic containment process. Here, we can see how the strategy based on edge betweenness apparently performs better when few links are removed, due to the fact that links with higher edge betweenness are those connecting different modules [28]. When the bond percolation process isolates modules, each module may sustain its own epidemic process, and thus it may happen that some of the modules are subcritical for the given infection probability \( \beta \). That will lead to a decrease of the global prevalence of the epidemics at expenses of loosing the connectivity of the network. Furthermore, if we look at the prevalence on the giant connected component, an important increase above the initial average number of infected individuals is revealed (see Supplementary Figs. 4 and 5). A consequence of this fragmentation process is the appearance of multiple isolated supercritical components, for which the removal of a link in one of them does not affect the incidence on the other components. As a result, the edge betweenness procedure needs to remove more links to arrive to the total epidemic extinction than any of the other methods, even the random one. For the sake of completeness we have analyzed two benchmark networks with community structure, obtaining similar results (see Supplementary Figs. 7 and 8).

In Fig. 4 (top) we illustrate the survival links in the air transportation network after 33.3% of the edges have been removed according to our epidemic containment strategy proposal (see Supplementary Fig. 9 for the original network before the containment process). As it is observed, the global connectivity, and thus functionality, of the worldwide connections is preserved (links of the same color are part of the same connected component). In Fig. 4 (bottom) we plot the network after deactivating the same fraction of links (33.3%) using the recursive deactivation of links according to edge betweenness. The edge betweenness containment method, in contrast with our proposal, generates two main kinds of components: small or sparsely connected subcritical modules like the ones in Australia, Africa or South America, where the epidemics vanishes; and large supercritical communities in Europe, North America and Easter Asia, with a large prevalence of the epidemics. This means that, for instance, there is no path to go from London to New York, or from Tokyo to Los Angeles, thus disconnecting the world by air transportation.

DISCUSSION

We have presented a methodology for assessing epidemic spreading based on links instead of nodes. The model, named Epidemic Link Equations (ELE), allows the determination of the importance of each link in transmitting the disease. The method accounts for the first order correlations between links, although it could be extended to higher orders assuming a larger analytical and computational cost. The results are used to develop an epidemic containment strategy consisting in deactivating recursively the largest epidemic importance links while preserving the connectivity of the full network, i.e. avoiding fragmentation. We have validated our proposal in synthetic and empirical networks, comparing with other alternative containment strategies, and showing its better performance. In the empirical case of the worldwide air transportation network, we identify the most important connections between airports for the spreading of epidemics and evaluate the epidemic incidence after its deactivation, considering an SIS epidemic spreading dynamics. Our results open the door to new approaches in the analysis of dynamical diffusive-like models on complex networks at the level of links instead of nodes.

METHODS

Epidemic Threshold

The determination of the epidemic threshold is performed by considering a state of the system in which the epidemic incidence is very small \( (\Phi_{ij}, \Theta_{ij}, \Omega_{ij} \ll 1, \text{for all links}) \), thus the system of equations can be linearized,
resulting in:

$$\Theta_{ij}^f = \beta(1 - \mu) \Phi_{ij} + \beta(1 - \mu) \Phi_{ji} + (1 - \mu)^2 \Theta_{ij}^f$$  
$$\Phi_{ij} = \beta \sum_r (A_{rj} - (1 - \mu) \delta_{ri}) \Phi_{jr} + (1 - \beta)(1 - \mu) \Phi_{ij} + \mu(1 - \mu) \Theta_{ij}^f$$

Here we have removed the dependence on time, to emphasize we are considering the steady state. From equation (7) we can write

$$\Theta_{ij}^f = \frac{\beta(1 - \mu)}{\mu(2 - \mu)}(\Phi_{ij} + \Phi_{ji})$$

Now, calling $\epsilon_i = \Phi_{ji} + \Theta_{ij}^f \ll 1$, which does not depend on node $j$ since $P(\sigma_i = I, \sigma_j = S) + P(\sigma_i = I, \sigma_j = I) = P(\sigma_i = I)$, we make the following ansatz:

$$\Theta_{ij}^f = \Upsilon(\epsilon_i + \epsilon_j)$$
$$\Phi_{ij} = X\epsilon_i + Z\epsilon_j$$

where $\Upsilon$, $X$, and $Z$ are constants independent of the link. These ansatz include the assumption of symmetry $\Theta_{ij}^f$ and asymmetry of $\Phi_{ij}$, respectively. We can determine the constants by substituting in equation (9) and using the definition of $\epsilon_i$, which leads to

$$\Upsilon = \frac{\beta(1 - \mu)}{\mu(2 - \mu) + 2\beta(1 - \mu)}$$
$$X = -\Upsilon$$
$$Z = 1 - \Upsilon$$

Finally, we build equations for the $\epsilon_i$ by substituting equations (7) and (9) in $\epsilon_i = \Phi_{ji} + \Theta_{ij}^f$, and using the ansatz. The result is

$$\frac{\mu}{\beta} \epsilon_i = \sum_j B_{ji} \epsilon_j$$

where $B$ is a matrix whose elements depend on the adjacency matrix of the network, on $\Upsilon$ and on the degrees $k_i$ of the nodes:

$$B_{ij} = (1 - \Upsilon) A_{ij} - \Upsilon k_i \delta_{ij}$$

The $\delta_{ij}$ stands for the Kronecker delta function, which is 1 if $i = j$, and 0 otherwise. If $\mu/\beta$ is an eigenvalue of matrix $B$, equation (15) has a non-trivial solutions. Hence, the onset of the epidemics $\beta_c$, the lowest value of $\beta$ that yields non-trivial solutions of equation (15), is given by

$$\beta_c = \frac{\mu}{\Lambda_{\text{max}}(B)}$$

where $\Lambda_{\text{max}}(B)$ is the largest eigenvalue of matrix $B$. Note that matrix $B$ depends on $\beta$ and $\mu$, thus equation (17) is implicit for $\beta_c$, which can be solved by iteration.

**Estimation of the incidence of the epidemic from numerical simulations**

To compute the incidence of the epidemics, $\rho$, using numerical simulations we have made use of the quasistationary approach (QS) [37, 38] to avoid the effect that large number of realizations end up in the absorbing state with no infected individuals in the system. Basically, the QS method focus the simulation on active configurations, i.e. with one or more infected individuals. Every time the system reaches the absorbing state, this state is replaced by one of the previously stored active states of the system. We keep 50 active configurations with an update probability of 0.20. We give the systems a transient time of $10^5$ time steps and then, we calculate the $\rho$ as an average over a relaxation time of $2 \times 10^4$ time steps.

**Networks**

In this work, we evaluate our methodology on synthetic and empirical networks. We have built a network with power-law degree distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ with exponent $\gamma = 3$ and $\langle k \rangle = 6$ using the configuration model. To evaluate the impact of transitivity we have also built another network with the same characteristics of the previous one but with a clustering coefficient of 0.6 using the algorithm by Holme et al. [39] with a parameter $p = 0.8$.

We consider also two empirical networks: the air transportation network, and the network of scientific collaborations in the field of general relativity. The air transportation network has been constructed using data from website openflights.org which has information about the traffic between airports updated to 2012. This network accounts for the largest connected component, with 3154 nodes and 18592 edges (see Supplementary Data 1). The network of scientific collaborations has been obtained from [40]; it is composed by 5242 nodes linked by 14496 edges.

**Containment process**

To perform the deactivation of links, we impose an adiabatic process: after each removal step we let the system converge to the meta-stable equilibrium before removing any other link. For a fair comparison between different containment strategies, we remove on each deactivation step as many edges as we have removed using the node infectivity strategy.
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also call $\rho^A$ and $\rho^B$ their respective incidence of the epidemics. The link epidemic importance of a link between nodes $i$ and $j$ has been defined in Eq. (1) as

$$I_{ij} = \beta P(\sigma_j = S, \sigma_i = I) \sum_{r=1}^{N} A_{jr} \beta P(\sigma_r = S|\sigma_j = I),$$

which, supposing independence of the states of the nodes, can be approximated as

$$I_{ij} \approx \beta P(\sigma_j = S) P(\sigma_i = I) \sum_{r=1}^{N} A_{jr} \beta P(\sigma_r = S).$$

In a homogeneous mean field approximation we may substitute $k_j = \langle k \rangle, P(\sigma_i = I) \approx \rho$, and $P(\sigma_j = S) \approx 1 - \rho$, which lead to the following expressions for the total importance of a link, $I_{ij} = I_{ij} + I_{ji}$:

$$\tilde{I}^A \approx 2\beta^2 \rho^A (1 - \rho^A)^2 \langle k \rangle_A,$$

$$\tilde{I}^B \approx 2\beta^2 \rho^B (1 - \rho^B)^2 \langle k \rangle_B,$$

$$\tilde{I}^{AB} \approx 2\beta [\rho^A (1 - \rho^B)^2 \langle k \rangle_B + \rho^B (1 - \rho^A)^2 \langle k \rangle_A].$$

Here, $\tilde{I}^A$ and $\tilde{I}^B$ denote the total epidemic importance of links inside $A$ and $B$, respectively, and $\tilde{I}^{AB}$ the total importance of the link connecting subnetworks $A$ and $B$.

We need an expression relating the average degree $\langle k \rangle$ and the incidence of the epidemics $\rho$ to be able to calculate the approximate values of the total importances in Eqs. (20) to (22). It can be obtained using the nonperturbative heterogeneous mean field (npHMF) equations in [11]. In particular, the npHMF equations for the SIS model without one-step reinfections (WOR) read as

$$0 = -\mu \rho_k + (1 - \rho_k) (1 - q_k),$$

$$q_k = \prod_{k'} (1 - \beta \rho_k'^{C_{kk'}}),$$

where $\rho_k$ represents the fraction of infected nodes of degree $k$, $q_k$ the probability that nodes of degree $k$ are not infected by nodes of any other degree $k'$, and $C_{kk'} = kP(k'|k)$ the expected number of links from a node of degree $k$ to nodes of degree $k'$. In the nonperturbative homogeneous mean field (npHoMF) approximation, this reduces to

$$0 = -\mu \rho + (1 - \rho)(1 - q),$$

$$q = (1 - \beta \rho)^k.$$

Thus, after some algebra we get

$$\langle k \rangle = \frac{\log \left( \frac{1 - \mu \rho}{1 - \beta \rho} \right)}{\log(1 - \beta \rho)}.$$

An immediate consequence of Eq. (27) is that $0 \leq \rho \leq 1/(1 + \mu)$. We can see a plot of the npHoMF relationship between $\rho$ and $\langle k \rangle$ in the inset of Supplementary Fig. 1. Note that $\rho$ is an increasing function of $\langle k \rangle$, thus the
Supplementary Figure 1. Ratio between the total importance $\tilde{I}^A$ of a link in a subnetwork $A$ and the total importance $\tilde{I}^{AB}$ of a link which acts as the only bridge between subnetworks $A$ and $B$. First, we fix the average degree $\langle k \rangle_B$ of subnetwork $B$ (or equivalently, we fix its incidence $\rho^B$, the red circles), and then we consider subnetworks $A$ with average degree (and epidemic incidence) larger than that of $B$, i.e. $\langle k \rangle_A \geq \langle k \rangle_B$ (thus, $\rho^A \geq \rho^B$). We can see that, in all cases, $\tilde{I}^A \geq \tilde{I}^{AB}$, meaning that the ranking by epidemic importance will not be leaded by the bridges. The vertical dotted line highlights the asymptote at $\rho = 1/(1 + \mu)$. The inset shows the relationship between the incidence and the average degree. We have set the epidemic parameters to $\mu = 0.5$ and $\beta = 0.1$, and the calculations rely on a nonperturbative homogeneous mean field approximation (npHoMF). See Supplementary Note for further details.

larger the average degree, the greater the incidence of the epidemics.

Now, we can substitute Eq. (27) for $\langle k \rangle_A$ and $\langle k \rangle_B$ into Eqs. (20) to (22) to obtain approximations of the three different link epidemic importances. The results are presented in Supplementary Fig. 1. Fixing a certain average degree $\langle k \rangle_B$ for subnetwork $B$, we consider subnetworks $A$ with $\langle k \rangle_A \geq \langle k \rangle_B$. Since $\rho$ increases with $\langle k \rangle$, this is equivalent to fixing $\rho^B$ and consider subnetworks $A$ with $\rho^A \geq \rho^B$. We observe that, in all cases, the importance $\tilde{I}^A$ of links in subnetwork $A$ is larger than the importance $\tilde{I}^{AB}$ of the bridge link between subnetworks $A$ and $B$ ($\tilde{I}^A \geq \tilde{I}^{AB}$), thus confirming that our epidemic containment strategy driven by link importance does not disconnect the network.
Supplementary Figure 2. Epidemic containment for a network with 5000 nodes, power-law degree distribution of exponent 3, and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 6$. Five containment strategies are compared: maximum probability of being infected (Node Infectivity), random link selection (Random), maximum edge betweenness (Betweenness), maximum EigenScore (EigenScore), and maximum link importance (Link Importance). In the horizontal axis we represent the fraction of removed links during the containment process ($L_r/L$). We show, from top to bottom: incidence of the epidemics on the network; incidence of the epidemics on the Giant Connected Component (GCC); number of connected components; size of the GCC; size of the Second Largest Connected Component (SLCC).
Supplementary Figure 3. Epidemic containment for a network with 5000 nodes, power-law degree distribution of exponent 3, high clustering coefficient, and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 6$ (see Methods in main text for more details). Five containment strategies are compared: maximum probability of being infected (Node Infectivity), random link selection (Random), maximum edge betweenness (Betweenness), maximum EigenScore (EigenScore), and maximum link importance (Link Importance). In the horizontal axis we represent the fraction of removed links during the containment process ($L_r/L$). We show, from top to bottom: incidence of the epidemics on the network; incidence of the epidemics on the Giant Connected Component (GCC); number of connected components; size of the GCC; size of the Second Largest Connected Component (SLCC).
Supplementary Figure 4. Epidemic containment for the air transportation network (see Methods in main text for more details). Five containment strategies are compared: maximum probability of being infected, random link selection, maximum edge betweenness, maximum EigenScore, and maximum link importance. In the horizontal axis we represent the fraction of removed links during the containment process. We show, from top to bottom: incidence of the epidemics on the network; incidence of the epidemics on the Giant Connected Component (GCC); number of connected components; size of the GCC; size of the Second Largest Connected Component (SLCC).
Supplementary Figure 5. Epidemic containment for the general relativity collaborations network (see Methods in main text for more details). Five containment strategies are compared: maximum probability of being infected, random link selection, maximum edge betweenness, maximum EigenScore, and maximum link importance. In the horizontal axis we represent the fraction of removed links during the containment process. We show, from top to bottom: incidence of the epidemics on the network; incidence of the epidemics on the Giant Connected Component (GCC); number of connected components; size of the GCC; size of the Second Largest Connected Component (SLCC).
**Supplementary Figure 6.** Epidemic containment for an Erdős-Rényi network with 5000 nodes and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 6$. Five containment strategies are compared: maximum probability of being infected, random link selection, maximum edge betweenness, maximum EigenScore, and maximum link importance. In the horizontal axis we represent the fraction of removed links during the containment process. We show, from top to bottom: incidence of the epidemics on the network; incidence of the epidemics on the Giant Connected Component (GCC); number of connected components; size of the GCC; size of the Second Largest Connected Component (SLCC). We observe that the containment is similar to the one in the power-law network in Supplementary Fig. 2 due to the absence of transitivity and modular structure.
**Supplementary Figure 7.** Epidemic containment for a network with 5000 nodes generated with a Stochastic Block Model, with 4 blocks of 250 nodes, 2 blocks of 1000 nodes, and 1 block of 2000 nodes, average degree 5 and mixing probability 0.3. Five containment strategies are compared: maximum probability of being infected, random link selection, maximum edge betweenness, maximum EigenScore, and maximum link importance. In the horizontal axis we represent the fraction of removed links during the containment process. We show, from top to bottom: incidence of the epidemics on the network; incidence of the epidemics on the Giant Connected Component (GCC); number of connected components; size of the GCC; size of the Second Largest Connected Component (SLCC). We observe that our containment strategy based on link importance outperforms all other methods except EigenScore, with similar results, and the large fragmentation induced by the other strategies.
Supplementary Figure 8. Epidemic containment for a network with 5000 nodes generated using the LFR algorithm [41], with average degree 6, exponent 3, and mixing probability 0.1. Five containment strategies are compared: maximum probability of being infected, random link selection, maximum edge betweenness, maximum EigenScore, and maximum link importance. In the horizontal axis we represent the fraction of removed links during the containment process. We show, from top to bottom: incidence of the epidemics on the network; incidence of the epidemics on the Giant Connected Component (GCC); number of connected components; size of the GCC; size of the Second Largest Connected Component (SLCC). We observe that our containment strategy based on link importance outperforms all other methods except EigenScore, with similar results, and the large fragmentation induced by the other approaches.
Supplementary Figure 9. Original air transportation network (top) and the results after a removal of 33.3% of the links using link importance (middle) and edge betweenness (bottom). Nodes and edges with the same color belong to the same connected component. The area of the nodes is proportional to their probability of being infected. We have set the epidemic parameters to $\mu = 0.5$ and $\beta = 0.06$. 