

Joint Cyber Risk Assessment of Network Systems with Heterogeneous Components

Gaofeng Da, Maochao Xu, Jingshi Zhang, and Peng Zhao

Abstract—Cyber risks are the most common risks encountered by a modern network system. However, it is significantly difficult to assess the joint cyber risk owing to the network topology, risk propagation, and heterogeneities of components. In this paper, we propose a novel backward elimination approach for computing the joint cyber risk encountered by different types of components in a network system; moreover, explicit formulas are also presented. Certain specific network topologies including complete, star, and complete bi-partite topologies are studied. The effects of propagation depth and compromise probabilities on the joint cyber risk are analyzed using stochastic comparisons. The variances and correlations of cyber risks are examined by a simulation experiment. It was discovered that both variances and correlations change rapidly when the propagation depth increases from its initial value. Further, numerical examples are also presented.

Index Terms—Backward elimination; Correlation; Network system; Scoring; Propagation model.

1 INTRODUCTION

NETWORK systems have become an indispensable component in modern society. They are important owing to the rapid evolution of cyber infrastructure, which typically consists of different processors, eStorage devices, sensors, and computers. For example, a key component for operating the cyber infrastructure is the supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system, which performs monitoring, analyzing, and controlling tasks by using computers and networked data communications [5]. Another example is the rapid development of the internet of things, which relies on the cyber network system to connect and exchange data. The network system consists of sensors, computers, e-devices, and other objects to gather and share the information. While the network systems are essential and beneficial to society, they encounter significant cyber risks [20], [21]. According to the Repository of Industrial Security Incidents (<http://www.risidata.com/>), 242 security incidents related to critical infrastructure and industrial control systems have occurred from 1982 to 2014 [12]. Therefore, there is an urgent demand for the methodologies to assess the cyber risks of network systems, which is challenging owing to the dependence among risks and heterogeneous nature of the network system (i.e., different types of components).

In the literature, there are extensive studies on the risk assessment of network systems [2], [26], [27], [28]. For instance, Cherdantseva et al. [2] reviewed twenty-four risk assessment methods pertaining to a SCADA system, and various approaches were discussed. A comprehensive review of the studies on the epidemic spreading over complex networks was presented in [13]. Although there are extensive models for studying the cyber risks

of networked systems, the dependence among the risks were not thoroughly understood despite its natural existence among the cyber risks of network systems. For example, for a smart grid with a SCADA system, the risks encountered by the computers and phasor measurement units (PMUs) are highly correlated as the attacks can propagate through the communication network. The challenge existing in the dependence study is primarily caused by the technique barrier as the network system typically involves different types of components. There are only a few works that analyze joint/dependent risks. Xu and Xu [25] proposed a stochastic model to assess the risks of a network system, where the stochastic renewal process was utilized to handle the joint risk. Xu et al. [24] introduced the tool of copulas to accommodate the dependencies among the cyber risks over a complex network, where the copula is a statistical tool that can handle the nonlinear dependence and is widely used in several different areas [6]. Qu and Wang [16] developed a correlated heterogeneous susceptible-infectious-susceptible (SIS) model over a network, where the infection rates were assumed to be correlated to nodal degrees. Laszka et al. [9] studied a correlated risk model over a network system from the cyber insurance perspective, where the probability distribution of the total number of compromised nodes within a network was provided. To the best of our knowledge, none of the existing studies have discussed the joint risk over a network system with heterogeneous nodes, which is the main purpose of this work.

To further understand the motivations for our study, consider the synchrophasor data system of a smart grid, as illustrated in Figure 1, which has three different types of components [15]: (i) a PMU monitors the working status of a power grid by recording the measurement data including voltage, current, frequency, and phase angle; (ii) a phasor data concentrator (PDC) converts the phasor data obtained from multiple PMUs, which is outputted to the data stream; further, the data can be transmitted to other PDCs or to workstations; (iii) a workstation, where decisions are made and operations performed based on the data from PDCs. As those components are networked and the attacks can propagate over the network, it is particularly important to study the joint risk of the

- Gaofeng Da and Jingshi Zhang are with the College of Economics and Management, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China. Email: dagfvc@gmail.com.
- Maochao Xu is with the Department of Mathematics, Illinois State University, USA. E-mail: mxu2@ilstu.edu.
- Peng Zhao is with School of Mathematics and Statistics, Jiangsu Normal University, China. Corresponding author. E-mail: zhaop@jnsu.edu.cn.




Fig. 1. Illustration of synchrophasor control system

different components. Specifically, the system defender is required to know the information on the numbers of PMUs, PDCs, and computers in the workstation that are compromised to assess the risk of the entire system. For example, the risk level of the smart grid in Figure 1 can be scored from zero to five based on the joint risk levels listed in Table 1. The risk score is the highest (five) if any of the computers in the workstation is compromised, all the PMUs are compromised, or four PMUs and at least one PDC is compromised. To develop a similar risk scoring system, the joint distribution of risks is required, which is also the motivation for the current work. Such a scoring system can be used by an insurance company for the purpose of pricing.

TABLE 1

Sample risk scoring approach for the synchrophasor data system, where X_1 represents the number of compromised PMUs, X_2 represents the number of compromised PDCs, and X_3 denotes the number of compromised computers in the workstation

Risk score	(X_1, X_2, X_3)
0	(0, 0, 0)
1	(1, 0, 0)
2	(2, 0, 0)
3	(3, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 2, 0)
4	(1, ≥ 1 , 0), (2, ≥ 1 , 0), (3, ≥ 1 , 0), (4, 0, 0)
5	(0, 0, ≥ 1), (4, ≥ 1 , 0), (5, 0, 0)

In this paper, we present an analysis of the joint cyber risk in a network system with heterogenous components. The main contributions are summarized as follows.

- The explicit formulas of joint cyber risks are provided for network systems with heterogenous components. Those explicit solutions are particularly important for assessing the joint risk of critical cyber components in a small size network system. A novel *backward elimination* approach for computing the joint risk of a network system is developed for this purpose. For a large-scale network with heterogenous components, the proposed backward elimination approach can be used to effectively simulate the joint risks.
- A new cyber index (namely, propagation depth L) is introduced. This new index L allows us to describe the power of risk propagation or the defensive power of a network. Specifically, the network defender can use this index to determine the propagation power of a new risk (e.g., a new malware). If L is large, the new risk is considered to have more power for propagating over the network. This index can also be used for assessing the defense

level of a company network. If a less contagious malware can propagate more hops over a company network, the defense level of the network can be marked as low. This also helps the insurance company to determine the risk score of the company who wants to purchase the cyber insurance policy.

- We rigorously prove the effects of propagation parameters on the cyber risk of a network with heterogenous components via stochastic comparisons. The simulation study is also presented to confirm the theoretical results and provide new insights.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the L -hop risk propagation model, and discuss the new concept of propagation depth. Section 3 presents the joint cyber risk of different types of nodes and the explicit formulas for computing the joint distribution of varying numbers of multi-type compromised nodes by using a novel backward elimination approach. Certain special cases are also presented in this section. In Section 4, we study the effects of propagation depth and compromise probabilities on the joint cyber risk via stochastic ordering. We perform a simulation study in Section 5 to assess the joint cyber risk of a network system and obtain certain new insights. In the last Section, we conclude our main results and present some discussions.

2 L -HOP RISK PROPAGATION MODEL

2.1 Existing risk propagation models

There exists several risk propagation models in the literature, which aim to understand the propagation dynamics. For example, the well-known SIS and susceptible-infectious-recovered (SIR) epidemic models [14] and their variations were widely studied in the areas of biology, epidemiology, and cyber security [3], [4], [23]. These models are used to describe the asymptotic steady status of an epidemic in a population or a virus over a computer network by employing certain stochastic process theories [22]. For comprehensive reviews of SIS, SIR, and their variations, please refer to recent surveys [14], [23]. Another popular risk propagation model was originally proposed from the perspective of game theory [8] and generalized to a probabilistic model [7]. The generalized model is named as the one-hop model and is further extended to the multi-hop model [9]. Specifically, the one-hop model describes two types of risks encountered by a network. First is the direct attack, i.e., risk from outside the network, where a node is directly compromised by attacks, which includes the drive-by-download attacks (i.e., a node is compromised because its user visits a malicious website), or outside hacker attack (i.e., a node is directly compromised by the hacker). The second is the indirect attack, i.e., risk from within the network, where a node is compromised by attacks from its compromised neighbors. These two types of risks are also called the pull- and push-based risks, respectively, in the literature [24]. In a one-hop model, the risk within the network only propagates one hop. Thus, a node only encounters risks from the outside or its immediate neighbors. Specifically, if a node i is directly compromised by the risk from outside, it has the ability to propagate the risk to its healthy neighbor j once with a probability q_{ij} . However, if the node is indirectly compromised, it cannot propagate the risk. The multi-hop model introduced in [9] allows a compromised node i to propagate the risks irrespective of the node i being directly or

indirectly compromised. Therefore, a compromised node i can compromise its healthy neighbor j once with probability q_{ij} , irrespective of how the node i is compromised.

2.2 Proposed L -hop risk propagation model

In this section, we introduce the L -hop risk propagation model, i.e., the risk from a direct attack, is allowed to propagate L hops within the network. For the purpose of illustration, a 2-hop risk propagation over a network is displayed in Figure 2. Nodes 1, 5, and 8 are directly compromised by the risks from outside the network. Those nodes propagate the risks to their neighbors, and compromise nodes 2, 4, and 9. The compromised nodes 2, 4, 9 further propagate the risks to their neighbors, and compromise nodes 7 and 12.




Fig. 2. A 2-hop risk propagation over a network. Blue color represents the healthy nodes. Red color represents the nodes (1, 5, and 8) that are compromised directly by the risk from outside the network. Gold color represents the nodes (2, 4, and 9) that are compromised by the directly-compromised nodes. Grey color represents the nodes (7 and 12) that are compromised by their infected neighbors.

The following reasons motivate us to introduce the L -hop risk propagation model.

- The propagation cannot be unlimited for most of cyber networks. Theoretically, the propagation depth is at most the length of the longest path between two nodes in the network. Hence, the L -hop model is a natural extension of the multi-hop model, with L equal to the length of the longest path between two nodes in a network. Practically, the propagation will be stopped by the network defender after the compromise is detected on the network.
- The propagation depth L provides a new index for assessing the cyber risk of network system. Specifically, the network defender can use this index to determine the propagation power of a new risk (e.g., a new malware). If L is large, the new risk is considered to have more power for propagating over the network. From the other hand, this index can also be used for assessing the defense level of a company network. That is, if a less contagious malware can propagate more hops over a company network, the defense level of the network can be marked as low. This would be particularly useful for the insurance company to perform the risk scoring.
- It should be noted that the L -hop risk propagation model is a nontrivial extension to the one-hop model as the propagation depth L can significantly affect the dynamics of risk propagation. In [9], it was argued that the L -hop model can be regarded as a certain one-hop model

with a power matrix of indirect compromise probabilities between nodes. Unfortunately, this perspective is incorrect. This is simply because that the matrix of indirect compromise probabilities with certain power may not be a probability matrix (see Section 3 for a specific example).

It is interesting to see that the L -hop model can be connected to the L -hop percolation model in the literature of cyber security [18], [19]. The L -hop percolation model can characterize the scenario of a network under attack by a computer malware and under the control of a bot master. The network defender can directly detect and delete certain bots (i.e., compromised nodes) and can trace the risk from the bots within their L -hop neighborhood and remove them [18]. Although both L -hop risk propagation and percolation models consider the risk propagation over L hops, the proposed risk propagation focuses on the propagation dynamics from the perspective of risk management while the percolation model focuses on the strategies for removing the risk, i.e., from the perspective of network defense.

3 JOINT CYBER RISK OF A NETWORK SYSTEM

In this section, we analyze the joint cyber risk of heterogeneous nodes under the L -hop risk propagation model, namely, the multivariate distribution of numbers of multi-type compromised nodes.

We consider an undirected finite network graph $G(V, E)$, where $V = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ is the set of nodes with size $N = |V|$, and $E = \{e_{ij} : i, j \in V\}$ is the set of edges. We assume that G has M different types of nodes, such as abstract computers, e-devices, and e-components. Let \mathcal{S}_i be the set of all type i nodes with $|\mathcal{S}_i| = N_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, M$, $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{i=1}^M \mathcal{S}_i$, and $\sum_{i=1}^M N_i = N$.

Let \mathbf{p} be the direct compromise probability vector

$$\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_N),$$

where p_i represents the probability that node i is compromised by the direct attack, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Let Q be the indirect compromise probability matrix, i.e.,

$$Q = (q_{ij}) \in [0, 1]^{N \times N},$$

where element q_{ij} denotes the probability that node j is compromised by the indirect attack from node i , where $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, with $q_{ij} = 0$ for $i = j$.

In the subsequent discussion, we assume that all random compromise events are statistically independent. We denote $\bar{a} = 1 - a$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$; \bar{A} is the complement of any set A ; further, $A \setminus B$ is the difference set of A and B . The following conventional notations are also used throughout the paper.

$$0^0 = 1, \sum_{\emptyset} = 0, \prod_{\emptyset} = 1, \binom{n}{m} = 0 \text{ for } m < 0 \text{ or } m > n.$$

3.1 Backward elimination approach for a general case

Let X_i be the number of compromised nodes in \mathcal{S}_i for $i = 1, \dots, M$. Subsequently, we discuss the procedure to compute the joint probability of varying numbers of compromised nodes. To facilitate the discussion, we denote

$$E_U = \{e_{ij} \in E : i, j \in U\}, \quad U \subset V.$$

Let $R_{G(U)}(C, D; L)$ denote the conditional probability that only all nodes of C are compromised provided that all nodes of D are compromised directly over the network $G(U, E_U)$, where $D \subset C \subset U$.

Theorem 3.1. For $L \geq 1$, the joint probability mass function of random vector (X_1, \dots, X_M) is,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x_1, \dots, x_M) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{C_1 \subset \mathcal{S}_1 \\ |C_1|=x_1}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{C_M \subset \mathcal{S}_M \\ |C_M|=x_M}} \sum_{D_0 \subset \mathcal{C}} \\ & \left\{ \prod_{j \in D_0} p_j \cdot \prod_{i \in \overline{D_0}} \bar{p}_i \cdot R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; L) \right\}, \quad (3.1) \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq x_i \leq N_i$, $\mathcal{C} = \cup_{i=1}^M C_i$, and

a) for $L = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; 1) \\ &= \prod_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus D_0} \left(1 - \prod_{j \in D_0} \bar{q}_{ji} \right) \prod_{v \in D_0, l \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{q}_{vl}; \quad (3.2) \end{aligned}$$

b) for $L \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; L) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{D_j \subset \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{j-1} \\ j=1, \dots, L-1}} \prod_{i=0}^{L-2} R_{G(V \setminus \mathcal{D}_{i-1})}(D_i \cup D_{i+1}, D_i; 1) \\ & \cdot R_{G(V \setminus \mathcal{D}_{L-2})}(\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{L-2}, D_{L-1}; 1) \quad (3.3) \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{D}_k = \cup_{l=0}^k D_l$ for $k = 0, \dots, L-1$, and $\mathcal{D}_{-1} = \emptyset$.

Proof We define the events as:

$B_C = \{\text{Only nodes in } C \text{ are compromised for } L\text{-hop propagation}\}$

and

$A_D = \{\text{Only nodes in } D \text{ are directly compromised}\}$

for $C, D \subset V$.

When $0 \leq x_i \leq N_i, i = 1, \dots, M$,

$$P(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_M = x_M) = \sum_{\substack{C_1 \subset \mathcal{S}_1 \\ |C_1|=x_1}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{C_M \subset \mathcal{S}_M \\ |C_M|=x_M}} P(B_C),$$

where C_i represents the set of type i nodes with the cardinality x_i , and $\mathcal{C} = \cup_{i=1}^M C_i$. Now, we consider whether the nodes are directly compromised. Considering the condition on the directly compromised nodes,

$$P(B_C) = \sum_{D_0 \subset \mathcal{C}} P(B_C | A_{D_0}) P(A_{D_0}),$$

where

$$P(A_{D_0}) = \prod_{j \in D_0} p_j \cdot \prod_{i \in \overline{D_0}} \bar{p}_i.$$

It is to be noted that

$$P(B_C | A_{D_0}) = R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; L).$$

For $L = 1$, only the propagation from the directly compromised nodes to their neighbors is permitted. Therefore, the probability that the nodes in $\mathcal{C} \setminus D_0$ are compromised indirectly by D_0 is

$$\prod_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus D_0} \left(1 - \prod_{j \in D_0} \bar{q}_{ji} \right),$$

and the probability that the nodes in $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ are not compromised by D_0 is $\prod_{v \in D_0, l \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{q}_{vl}$. Thus,

$$R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; 1) = \prod_{l \in \mathcal{C} \setminus D_0} \left(1 - \prod_{j \in D_0} \bar{q}_{jl} \right) \prod_{i \in D_0, h \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} \bar{q}_{ih}. \quad (3.4)$$

For $L \geq 2$, the computation of the key component $P(B_C | A_D)$ is significantly complex. To overcome the computational complexity, we introduce the following novel *backward elimination* approach for computing the joint probability mass function.

The idea of backward elimination is motivated from the perspective of dynamic propagation. Thus, we consider the L -hop propagation as L rounds of propagation. We define $B_C^{(m)}$ as the event that only the nodes of C are compromised after m rounds of propagations for $1 \leq m \leq L$ and $C \subset V$. Note that $B_C^{(L)} \equiv B_C$.

Let us consider the first round of propagation. By conditioning on the exact number of compromised nodes in $\mathcal{C} \setminus D_0$ after the first round of propagation, by the law of total probability, the following is satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; L) \\ &= P(B_C^{(L)} | A_{D_0}) \\ &= \sum_{D_1 \subset \mathcal{C} \setminus D_0} P(B_C^{(L)} | B_{D_1}^{(1)}, A_{D_0}) P(B_{D_1}^{(1)} | A_{D_0}), \quad (3.5) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P(B_{D_1}^{(1)} | A_{D_0}) = R_{G(V)}(D_1 \cup D_0, D_0; 1). \quad (3.6)$$

The conditional probability

$$P(B_C^{(L)} | B_{D_1}^{(1)}, A_{D_0})$$

can be efficiently computed by using the backward elimination approach as follows. After the first round of propagation, nodes in D_0 and all the edges from D_0 to $V \setminus D_0$ are eliminated as those elements do not play a role in the second round of propagation. Therefore, the network $G(V)$ reduces to a subnetwork $G(V \setminus D_0)$. Given $B_{D_1}^{(1)}$ (i.e., only the nodes in $D_1 \in \mathcal{C} \setminus D_0$ are compromised in the first round), the event that the nodes in \mathcal{C} are compromised owing to A_{D_0} after L rounds of propagations is equivalent to that of the nodes in $\mathcal{C} \setminus D_0$ being compromised by the nodes in D_1 over the network $G(V \setminus D_0)$ after $L-1$ rounds of propagations (namely, $B_{\mathcal{C} \setminus D_0}^{(L-1)} | A_{D_1}$). Thus,

$$P(B_C^{(L)} | B_{D_1}^{(1)}, A_{D_0}) = R_{G(V \setminus D_0)}(\mathcal{C} \setminus D_0, D_1; L-1). \quad (3.7)$$

Substituting (3.6) and (3.7) into (3.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; L) \\ &= \sum_{D_1 \subset \mathcal{C} \setminus D_0} R_{G(V)}(D_1 \cup D_0, D_0; 1) \\ & \cdot R_{G(V \setminus D_0)}(\mathcal{C} \setminus D_0, D_1; L-1). \quad (3.8) \end{aligned}$$

After $L-1$ iterations of (3.8), the explicit expression can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_{G(V)}(\mathcal{C}, D_0; L) \\
&= \sum_{D_1 \subset \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{D}_0} \sum_{D_2 \subset \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{D}_1} \cdots \sum_{D_{L-1} \subset \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{L-2}} \\
&\quad \prod_{i=0}^{L-2} R_{G(V \setminus \mathcal{D}_{i-1})}(D_i \cup D_{i+1}, D_i; 1) \\
&\quad \cdot R_{G(V \setminus \mathcal{D}_{L-2})}(\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{L-2}, D_{L-1}; 1),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_k = \cup_{l=0}^k D_l$ for $k = 0, \dots, L-1$, and $\mathcal{D}_{-1} = \emptyset$.

The required result is presented subsequently. ■

Theorem 3.1 provides explicit formulas for computing the joint probability for the varying numbers of multi-type compromised nodes with a propagation depth L . It should be emphasized that the primary expression in Eq. (3.3) only considers the case of $L = 1$, which is readily satisfied in Eq. (3.2). Hence, the joint probability can be effectively computed from Eq. (3.1). In particular, Theorem 3.1 provides an explicit formula for a special case of a multi-hop model (i.e., L is the length of the largest path of a network).

The key idea for deriving the explicit expressions for the joint probability is the proposed backward elimination approach. To further explain the idea of the backward elimination approach, we consider the two-hop risk propagation illustrated in Figure 2. At the initial stage (i.e., stage 0), we assume that the network only includes the directly compromised nodes (i.e., 1, 5, 8), as illustrated in Figure 3(a). Let us assume that these compromised nodes indirectly compromise nodes 2, 4, 9 successfully at stage 1. The idea of backward elimination is to remove nodes 1, 5, 8, and the edges $\{e_{12}, e_{54}, e_{56}, e_{82}, e_{89}, e_{810}\}$ as those nodes and edges do not play a role in the subsequent propagation. Then, we obtain a smaller network, as shown in Figure 3(b). As the propagation depth is $L = 2$, nodes 2, 4, and 9 further compromise nodes 7 and 12 at stage 2. Now, we can remove nodes 2, 4, 9, and the edges $\{e_{27}, e_{23}, e_{43}, e_{96}, e_{912}, e_{911}\}$, which results in a much smaller network, as illustrated in Figure 3(c).

In [9], it was stated that the L -hop model with indirect compromise probability matrix Q can be regarded as the one-hop model with indirect compromise probability matrix Q^L . Unfortunately, this statement is incorrect as Q^L may not even be a probability matrix. For example, consider the homogeneous model with $N = 4$, $L = 2$, $q_{ij} = 0.8$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$, and $q_{ii} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. It can be seen that all of off-diagonal components of Q^2 are 1.28, which means that Q^2 can not be a matrix of indirect compromise probabilities.

3.2 Special cases

In this section, we discuss certain specific network topologies for which the multivariate distributions of varying numbers of compromised nodes have simpler forms.

3.2.1 Complete network

Consider a complete graph network consisting of M types of nodes with $\sum_{i=1}^M N_i = N$. We further assume that the compromise probabilities are homogeneous; therefore,

$$p_l = p, \quad q_{ij} = q, \quad (3.9)$$

for $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Note that the conditional probability $R_{G(U)}(C, D; L)$ now only depends on $|C|$ and $|D|$ for this case. To simplify the

notations, we define $R_{K_u}(c, d; L)$ as the conditional probability that only certain $c-d$ nodes are compromised indirectly, provided that certain d nodes are compromised directly over a complete network K_u with u nodes, where $d \leq c \leq u$. Owing to the symmetry, Eqs. (3.2), (3.8), and (3.3) can be simplified as

$$R_{K_u}(c, d; 1) = (1 - \bar{q}^d)^{c-d} \bar{q}^{d(u-c)}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{K_u}(c, d; L) &= \sum_{i=0}^{c-d} \binom{c-d}{i} R_{K_u}(d+i, d; 1) \\
&\quad \cdot R_{K_{u-d}}(c-d, i; L-1),
\end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_{K_u}(c, d; L) \\
&= \sum_{d_1=0}^{c-d} \sum_{d_2=0}^{c-d_1} \cdots \sum_{d_{L-1}=0}^{c-d_{L-2}} \prod_{j=0}^{L-2} \binom{c-\delta_j}{d_{j+1}} (1 - \bar{q}^{d_j})^{d_{j+1}} \\
&\quad \cdot \bar{q}^{d_j(u-\delta_{j+1})} (1 - \bar{q}^{d_{L-1}})^{c-\delta_{L-1}} \bar{q}^{d_{L-1}(u-c)}
\end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

with $\delta_k = d + \sum_{i=1}^k d_i$ for $k = 0, \dots, L-1$ and $\delta_{-1} = 0$.

Then, we derive the following result for a network with complete topology and homogeneous compromise probabilities.

Proposition 3.2. Under the assumption (3.9), for a given $L \geq 1$, the following equation is satisfied:

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_M) = \prod_{i=1}^M \binom{N_i}{x_i} \sum_{d=0}^{\chi} \binom{\chi}{d} \left[p^d \bar{p}^{N-d} R_{K_N}(\chi, d; L) \right]$$

with $\chi = \sum_{i=1}^M x_i$, where $R_{K_N}(\chi, d; L)$ can be computed by (3.10) and (3.12) for $L = 1$ and $L \geq 2$, respectively.

3.2.2 Star network

Consider a star network with one hub and $N-1$ leaves. The nodes can be divided into two categories: hub (type I) and leaves (type II), i.e., $M = 2$. We define the compromise probability as follows. Let $p_I(p_{II})$ denote the probability of direct compromise of the hub (a leaf), and $q_{I,II}(q_{II,I})$ denote the probability that a leaf (the hub) is compromised by the hub (a leaf). Note that for a star network, the propagation depth L is at most two. From Theorem 3.1, we have the following closed forms of the joint mass functions for the joint risk.

Proposition 3.3. For a star network with the aforementioned two types of nodes, we have:

- a) for $L = 1$, the joint mass function of (X_1, X_2) is given by

$$f(0, m) = \binom{N-1}{m} p_{II}^m \bar{p}_I \bar{p}_{II}^{N-1-m} \bar{q}_{II,I}^m$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(1, m) \\
&= \binom{N-1}{m} p_{II}^m \bar{p}_I \bar{p}_{II}^{N-1-m} (1 - \bar{q}_{II,I}^m) \\
&\quad + \binom{N-1}{m} \sum_{d=0}^m \binom{m}{d} p_I p_{II}^d \bar{p}_{II}^{N-1-d} q_{I,II}^{m-d} \bar{q}_{II,I}^{N-1-m};
\end{aligned}$$

- b) for $L = 2$, the joint mass function of (X_1, X_2) is given by

$$f(0, m) = \binom{N-1}{m} \bar{p}_I p_{II}^m \bar{p}_{II}^{N-1-m} \bar{q}_{II,I}^m;$$




Fig. 3. Illustration of the backward elimination approach

moreover, for $0 \leq m \leq N - 1$,

$$f(1, m) = \binom{N-1}{m} \cdot \left(\sum_{d=1}^m \binom{m}{d} \bar{p}_I p_{II}^d \bar{p}_{II}^{N-1-d} (1 - \bar{q}_{II,I}^d) \bar{q}_{II,I}^{N-1-m} q_{II,I}^{m-d} + \sum_{d=0}^m \binom{m}{d} p_I p_{II}^d \bar{p}_{II}^{N-1-d} \bar{q}_{II,I}^{N-1-m} q_{II,I}^{m-d} \right).$$

3.2.3 Complete bi-partite network

A complete bi-partite graph K_{N_1, N_2} consists of two disjoint sets \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 containing corresponding N_1 and N_2 nodes, such that all nodes in \mathcal{S}_1 are connected to all nodes in \mathcal{S}_2 , while within each set there are no connections.

We assume that the direct compromise probabilities of nodes in each set are the same, i.e., $p_i \equiv p_I$ and $p_j \equiv p_{II}$, for all $i \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $j \in \mathcal{S}_2$, and the propagation probability from any node in \mathcal{S}_1 (\mathcal{S}_2) to any node in \mathcal{S}_2 (\mathcal{S}_1) is the same, denoted by $q_{I,II}$ ($q_{II,I}$). Then, for the one-hop propagation, we derive the subsequent result.

Proposition 3.4. Assume a complete bi-partite network with disjoint sets \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 . For propagation depth $L = 1$, the

joint probability mass function of (X_1, X_2) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(m_1, m_2) &= \binom{N_1}{m_1} \binom{N_2}{m_2} \sum_{d_1=0}^{m_1} \sum_{d_2=0}^{m_2} \left\{ \binom{m_1}{d_1} \binom{m_2}{d_2} p_I^{d_1} p_{II}^{d_2} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot (1 - p_I)^{N_1-d_1} (1 - p_{II})^{N_2-d_2} \\ &\quad \cdot [1 - (1 - q_{I,II})^{d_1}]^{m_2-d_2} \cdot [1 - (1 - q_{II,I})^{d_2}]^{m_1-d_1} \\ &\quad \cdot (1 - q_{I,II})^{d_1(N_2-m_2)} \cdot (1 - q_{II,I})^{d_2(N_1-m_1)} \left. \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq m_1 \leq N_1$ and $0 \leq m_2 \leq N_2$.

To conclude this section, we present an example illustrating the backward elimination approach. For simplicity, we consider the case of a complete network with homogeneous compromise probabilities.

Example 3.5. Consider a complete graph network with $N = 5$ nodes. Assume that there are two types of nodes: $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{1, 2\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{3, 4, 5\}$; further, the propagation depth is $L = 2$. We assume that for $1 \leq i, j \leq 5$,

$$p_i = p, \quad q_{ij} = q.$$

Subsequently, we compute the joint mass function of (X_1, X_2) . First, it is easy to see that

$$f(0, 0) = \bar{p}^5.$$

Further, by Proposition 3.2, we derive

$$f(1, 0) = 2 \times [\bar{p}^5 R_{K_5}(1, 0; L) + p \bar{p}^4 R_{K_5}(1, 1; L)].$$

Note that the indirect compromise probability is homogeneous; thus, we obtain

$$R_{K_5}(1, 0; 2) = 0, \quad R_{K_5}(1, 1; 2) = \bar{q}^4.$$

Then, we calculate that

$$f(1, 0) = 2p\bar{p}^4\bar{q}^4.$$

Similarly, we have

$$f(0, 1) = 3p\bar{p}^4\bar{q}^4.$$

To maintain conciseness, we only compute the expression of $f(1, 1)$ for the illustration. Using Proposition 3.2, we derive the following expression

$$f(1, 1) = 6 \times [2p\bar{p}^4 R_{K_5}(2, 1; 2) + p^2\bar{p}^3 R_{K_5}(2, 2; 2)] \quad (3.13)$$

Applying Eq. (3.12), it follows that

$$R_{K_5}(2, 1; 2) = q\bar{q}^4 R_{K_4}(1, 0; 1) + q\bar{q}^3 R_{K_4}(1, 1; 1)$$

and

$$R_{K_5}(2, 2; 2) = \bar{q}^6 R_{K_3}(0, 0; 1).$$

Using Eq. (3.10), we also calculate:

$$R_{K_4}(1, 0; 1) = 0, \quad R_{K_4}(1, 1; 1) = \bar{q}^3,$$

and

$$R_{K_3}(0, 0; 1) = 1.$$

Therefore,

$$R_{K_5}(2, 1; 2) = q\bar{q}^6, \quad (3.14)$$

$$R_{K_5}(2, 2; 2) = \bar{q}^6. \quad (3.15)$$

Substituting (3.14) and (3.15) into (3.13) yields

$$f(1, 1) = 6 \times (2p\bar{p}^4 q\bar{q}^6 + p^2\bar{p}^3 \bar{q}^6).$$

The other cases can be computed similarly.

Table 2 lists the joint probabilities of (X_1, X_2) for $p = 0.2$ and $q = 0.1$ with $L = 2, 3, 4$ (note that $L = 4$ demonstrates a multi-hop model). It can be observed that when L

TABLE 2
Joint probability for $p = 0.2, q = 0.1$, and $L = 2, 3, 4$.

$X_1 \backslash X_2$	0	1	2	3	Total
$L = 2$					
0	0.3277	0.1612	0.0588	0.0131	0.5608
1	0.1075	0.1175	0.0788	0.0245	0.3283
2	0.0196	0.0394	0.0367	0.0152	0.1109
Total	0.4548	0.3181	0.1743	0.0528	
$L = 3$					
0	0.3277	0.1612	0.0588	0.0126	0.5603
1	0.1075	0.1175	0.0755	0.0255	0.326
2	0.0196	0.0377	0.0383	0.0181	0.1137
Total	0.4548	0.3164	0.1726	0.0562	
$L = 4$					
0	0.3277	0.1612	0.0588	0.0126	0.5603
1	0.1075	0.1175	0.0755	0.0253	0.3258
2	0.0196	0.0377	0.0380	0.0186	0.1139
Total	0.4548	0.3164	0.1723	0.0565	

increases, the joint probability of compromising more nodes demonstrates an overall increasing trend. For example, when $L = 2$, we observe $P(X_1 = 2, X_2 = 3) = 0.0152$, which increases to 0.0181 for $L = 3$, and to 0.0186 for $L = 4$.

In particular, the probability of $P(X_1 = 2)$ increases from 0.1109 for $L = 2$ to 0.1139 for $L = 4$, and the probability of $P(X_2 = 3)$ increases from 0.0528 for $L = 2$ to 0.0565 for $L = 4$. This observation is confirmed by the theoretical results obtained in Section 4.

4 EFFECTS OF PROPAGATION PARAMETERS

In this section, we discuss how the propagation depth L , direct infection probability vector \mathbf{p} , and indirect compromise probability matrix \mathbf{Q} affect the joint distribution of the number of compromised nodes. Intuitively, the joint risk of nodes over the network should increase with increasing values of L , \mathbf{p} , and \mathbf{Q} . In the following, we provide rigorous mathematical proofs to verify those intuitions via the tool of stochastic orders, which has been widely used in statistics, operation research, risk management, and several other areas [11], [17].

We first recall the following multivariate stochastic order [17].

Definition 4.1. Suppose $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ are two random vectors. Then, random vector \mathbf{X} is said to be smaller than \mathbf{Y} in the usual multivariate stochastic order (denoted by $\mathbf{X} \leq_{\text{st}} \mathbf{Y}$) if $\mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathbf{X})] \leq \mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathbf{Y})]$ for all nondecreasing functions ϕ .

It should be noted that [17]:

$$\mathbf{X} \leq_{\text{st}} \mathbf{Y} \Rightarrow P(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_n \leq x_n) \geq P(Y_1 \leq x_1, \dots, Y_n \leq x_n)$$

and

$$\mathbf{X} \leq_{\text{st}} \mathbf{Y} \Rightarrow P(X_1 > x_1, \dots, X_n > x_n) \leq P(Y_1 > x_1, \dots, Y_n > x_n).$$

Let $(X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q})$ be the number vector of the compromised nodes for the given parameters L , \mathbf{p} , and \mathbf{Q} . The following result shows that if the propagation depth L is larger, there are more compromised nodes in the sense of the multivariate stochastic order.

Theorem 4.2. We assume a network has M types of nodes, with a propagation depth L , direct compromise probability vector \mathbf{p} , and indirect compromise probability matrix \mathbf{Q} . Then, the random vector (X_1, \dots, X_M) increases with increasing values of L in the sense of multivariate stochastic order, i.e., for $L \leq L'$,

$$(X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q}) \leq_{\text{st}} (X_1, \dots, X_M | L', \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q});$$

and hence,

$$[X_i | L, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q}] \leq_{\text{st}} [X_i | L', \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q}], \quad i = 1, \dots, M,$$

and

$$\left[\sum_{i=1}^M X_i \middle| L, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q} \right] \leq_{\text{st}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^M X_i \middle| L', \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q} \right].$$

Proof Note that for the network under cyber threats, the set of compromised nodes in the L -hop model is always a subset of that in the $(L+1)$ -hop model. This is because the propagation is allowed to propagate one more step. Therefore,

$$(X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q}) \leq_{\text{a.s.}} (X_1, \dots, X_M | L+1, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q}),$$

where a.s. represents “almost surely”. According to Theorem 6.B.1 in [17],

$$(X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q}) \leq_{\text{st}} (X_1, \dots, X_M | L+1, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{Q}),$$

which further implies

$$[X_i|L, \mathbf{p}, Q] \leq_{\text{st}} [X_i|L', \mathbf{p}, Q], \quad i = 1, \dots, M,$$

and

$$\left[\sum_{i=1}^M X_i | L, \mathbf{p}, Q \right] \leq_{\text{st}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^M X_i | L', \mathbf{p}, Q \right].$$

Theorem 4.2 verifies the intuition that if the risk has more power to propagate, i.e., the propagation depth L is larger, then more nodes over the network will be compromised. It further shows that the number of compromised nodes is always larger when L is larger for each type. In particular, for $L \leq L'$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_M \leq x_m | L, \mathbf{p}, Q) \\ & \geq P(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_M \leq x_m | L', \mathbf{p}, Q). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the joint distribution function of the number of compromised nodes decreases when the propagation depth increases. Similarly, for $L \leq L'$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P(X_1 > x_1, \dots, X_M > x_m | L, \mathbf{p}, Q) \\ & \geq P(X_1 > x_1, \dots, X_M > x_m | L', \mathbf{p}, Q). \end{aligned}$$

This indicates that the joint survival function of the number of compromised nodes increases (i.e., a more severe network environment) when the propagation depth increases. These results coincide with the findings listed in Table 2.

Subsequently, we analyze how the direct and indirect probabilities affect the number of compromised nodes.

Theorem 4.3. We assume a network has M types of nodes, with a propagation depth L , direct compromise probability vector \mathbf{p} , and indirect compromise probability matrix Q . Then, the random vector (X_1, \dots, X_M) increases when:

- a) \mathbf{p} increases in the sense of the multivariate stochastic order, i.e., for $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{p}'$,

$$(X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}, Q) \leq_{\text{st}} (X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}', Q);$$

- b) Q increases in the sense of the multivariate stochastic order, i.e., for $Q \leq Q'$,

$$(X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}, Q) \leq_{\text{st}} (X_1, \dots, X_M | L, \mathbf{p}, Q').$$

Proof The proof is determined by using the coupling method in probability theory [10].

a) Considering a network A , let I_j be a Bernoulli random variable with $I_{j,A} = 1$, which represents that node j is compromised successfully by a direct attack; then,

$$P(I_{j,A} = 1) = p_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, N.$$

Now, we construct a new network B with the same types of nodes, a propagation depth L , and indirect compromise probability matrix Q . We assume that the new network B has a different direct compromise probability vector $\mathbf{p}' \geq \mathbf{p}$. The vector \mathbf{p}' is constructed as follows. Let $I_{j,B}$ represent a node j that is successfully compromised by a direct attack over network B . We define that if $I_{j,A} = 1$, then $I_{j,B} = 1$; if $I_{j,A} = 0$, then $I_{j,B} = 1$ with probability $(p'_j - p_j)/(1 - p_j)$. Then,

$$P(I_{j,B} = 1) = p'_j.$$

Therefore,

$$(X_1^A, \dots, X_M^A) \leq_{a.s.} (X_1^B, \dots, X_M^B),$$

which implies that

$$(X_1^A, \dots, X_M^A) \leq_{\text{st}} (X_1^B, \dots, X_M^B),$$

where $X_i^{A(B)}$ represents the number of type i compromised nodes in network $A(B)$, $i = 1, \dots, M$. Therefore, this is proved.

b) Similar to the proof of a), we use $I_{l,j,A} = 1$ to represent the node j , which is compromised by node l in network A . Then,

$$P(I_{l,j,A} = 1) = q_{lj}.$$

Then, we construct a new network C with the same types of nodes, a propagation depth L , and direct compromise probability vector \mathbf{p} . We assume that the new network C has a different indirect compromise probability matrix $Q' \geq Q$. The matrix Q' is constructed as follows. Let $I_{l,j,C}$ represent a node j , which is successfully compromised by an indirect attack from node j in network C . We define that if $I_{l,j,A} = 1$, then $I_{l,j,C} = 1$; if $I_{l,j,A} = 0$, then $I_{l,j,C} = 1$, with probability $(q'_{lj} - q_{lj})/(1 - q_{lj})$. Then,

$$P(I_{l,j,C} = 1) = q'_{lj}.$$

Therefore,

$$(X_1^A, \dots, X_M^A) \leq_{a.s.} (X_1^C, \dots, X_M^C),$$

which implies that

$$(X_1^A, \dots, X_M^A) \leq_{\text{st}} (X_1^C, \dots, X_M^C).$$

Thus, the required proof is obtained. \blacksquare

Theorem 4.3 implies that when the direct compromise probability increases (e.g., the hacker launches attacks towards newly discovered vulnerabilities of a software or an operating system), more nodes over the network will be compromised. Theorem 4.3 further indicates that all types of nodes have a joint larger probability of being compromised, namely, for $\mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{p}'$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P(X_1 > x_1, \dots, X_M > x_m | L, \mathbf{p}, Q) \\ & \leq P(X_1 > x_1, \dots, X_M > x_m | L, \mathbf{p}', Q). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, when the indirect compromise probability increases (e.g., the malware is very contagious or the network defense is very weak), more nodes will be compromised. Particularly, all types of nodes have a joint larger probability of being compromised.

To sum, we rigorously show that both propagation depth and compromise probabilities (direct or indirect) demonstrate significant effects on the joint cyber risk of a network in the sense of the multivariate stochastic order. When the propagation depth is larger, all types of nodes have larger probabilities of being compromised. Either direct or indirect compromise probability can increase the joint cyber risk of a network.

5 SIMULATION STUDY

In this section, we perform a simulation study to assess the joint cyber risk of a network system with heterogeneous nodes. There are three main purposes: (i) The first is to validate the theoretical results in Section 4. (ii) The second is to provide some new insights on the correlation among risks which are

measured via popular dependence measures including Pearson correlation (Pearson), Kendall's tau (Kendall), and Spearman's rho (Spearman) [6]. (iii) The third is to study the joint cyber risk of a large-scale network via the proposed backward elimination simulation when the explicit computing is infeasible.

We generate a scale-free network with 200 nodes according to Barabasi-Albert model [1]. We first set five initial nodes, and then each new node is randomly connected to two existing nodes with probabilities proportional to the degrees of the existing nodes. The generated graph is shown in Figure 4. We choose 20 nodes with the top highest degrees as the type I nodes, and others as the type II nodes. The degrees of the type I nodes are: 49, 38, 37, 35, 35, 33, 32, 30, 28, 24, 24, 21, 19, 18, 17, 16, 16, 15, 15, 15.




Fig. 4. Scale-free network with 200 nodes, where the red color nodes represent the type I nodes, and the others are type II nodes

Let X_i denote the varying numbers of compromised nodes of type i , $i = 1, 2$, and $X = X_1 + X_2$. For simplicity, we assume that the direct compromise probabilities are the same for each type, i.e., p_I and p_{II} for type I and type II nodes, respectively. Similarly, we assume that the indirect compromise probabilities are the same for each type, i.e., q_I and q_{II} for type I and type II nodes, respectively.

Algorithm 1 is used to simulate the number of compromised nodes. The simulation algorithm is primarily based on the proposed backward elimination approach. In Algorithm 1, for a given L , all the compromised nodes for every depth $1 \leq l \leq L$ are recorded (lines 14 and 16); thus, obtaining all the different results for l . The experiment is performed based on 100,000 Monte Carlo simulations.

5.1 Propagation depth

Figure 5 shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations of proportions of compromised nodes under different scenarios. It is seen from Figures 5(a), 5(d), and 5(g) that the means of proportions of compromised nodes increase with the propagation depth L for both type I and type II nodes. In particular, we observe that the means of proportions of compromised nodes increases dramatically from $L = 1$ to $L = 2$ (around 25% to 40%). However, when L increases from 4 to 20 or more, the mean of proportions of compromised nodes only varies marginally. This

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for simulating compromised nodes via the back elimination approach.

INPUT: network graph $G(V, E)$; number of nodes N ; propagation depth L ; directly compromise probability vector \mathbf{p} ; propagation probability matrix Q ; number of iterations K

OUTPUT: Simulated number of compromised nodes of all types

```

1: for  $k \in 1 : K$  do
2:   Determine the nodes that are directly compromised, i.e.,
   generate Bernoulli random vector  $(I_1, \dots, I_N)$  with prob-
   ability  $\mathbf{p}$ , and let  $U_0 = \{i : I_i = 1\}$  denote the set of
   compromised nodes;
3:   for  $h \in 1 : L$  do
4:     for  $j \in V \setminus U_0$  do
5:       Determine whether node  $j$  is compromised by the
       nodes in  $U_0$  with propagation probability matrix  $Q$ ,
       i.e., generate independent Bernoulli random variables
        $I_{l,j}$  with probabilities  $q_{lj}$ ,  $l \in U_0$ ;
6:       if Node  $j$  is compromised, i.e.,  $\max_{l \in U_0} \{I_{lj}\} = 1$ ;
       then
7:         Record the new compromised nodes into set  $U_h$ ;
8:       end if
9:     end for
10:    Count the number of compromised nodes for each type
    in  $U_h$ , denoted by  $(u_{h,1}^{(k)}, \dots, u_{h,M}^{(k)})$ ;
11:    Update  $V \leftarrow V \setminus U_0$ , i.e., by removing the nodes  $U_0$ 
    from  $V$ , and all the edges connecting  $U_0$ ;
12:    Update  $U_0 \leftarrow U_h$ ;
13:  end for
14:  Compute the number of compromised nodes for
  each round and type as  $(x_{l,1}^{(k)}, \dots, x_{l,M}^{(k)}) =$ 
   $(\sum_{h=0}^l u_{h,1}^{(k)}, \dots, \sum_{h=0}^l u_{h,M}^{(k)})$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ ;
15: end for
16: return  $(x_{l,1}^{(k)}, \dots, x_{l,M}^{(k)})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ .

```

is primarily because the dynamic of compromise has attained a relatively steady state. For type I nodes, almost all nodes are compromised, while for type II nodes, there are still a few healthy nodes. This suggests that the propagation depth L has a significant effect on the number of compromised nodes.

While considering the standard deviation from Figures 5(b), 5(e), and 5(h), it is observed that for a smaller L (namely, 1 and 2), the standard deviations of the proportions of compromised nodes are larger for both types. This is because, when L is small, the varying numbers of compromised nodes could be quite different. However, when L is larger (say, greater or equal to 4), the standard deviation is smaller, owing to the fact that the dynamic of compromise has become a relatively steady state, i.e., the proportions of compromised nodes are nearly the same. We conclude that the propagation depth L has a significant effect on the standard deviations of proportions of compromised nodes.

For the correlations between the proportions of compromised nodes of both types, it is observed from Figures 5(c), 5(f), and 5(i) that the correlation is larger when L is small as measured by the three dependence measures. When L is larger, the correlation becomes smaller. This observations can be explained as follows: when L is smaller, a larger proportion of compromised type I nodes should be associated with a larger proportion of










(a) Mean, $\zeta = (0.05, 0.15, 0.2, 0.3)$ (b) SD, $\zeta = (0.05, 0.15, 0.2, 0.3)$ (c) Corr., $\zeta = (0.05, 0.15, 0.2, 0.3)$ (d) Mean, $\zeta = (0.05, 0.15, 0.4, 0.5)$ (e) SD, $\zeta = (0.05, 0.15, 0.4, 0.5)$ (f) Corr., $\zeta = (0.05, 0.15, 0.4, 0.5)$ (g) Mean, $\zeta = (0.1, 0.2, 0.2, 0.3)$ (h) SD, $\zeta = (0.1, 0.2, 0.2, 0.3)$ (i) Corr., $\zeta = (0.1, 0.2, 0.2, 0.3)$

Fig. 5. Means, standard deviations (SD), and correlations (Corr.) of proportions of compromised nodes for different parameters $\zeta = (p_I, p_{II}, q_I, q_{II})$.

compromised type II nodes; when L is large, the proportions of compromised nodes for both types are relatively stable, which results in a smaller correlation.

5.2 Compromise probabilities

From Figure 6, it is seen that all the probability curves are unimodal and they shift to the right when L is large. In particular, we observe that the probability curves have the largest peak values for $L = 10$. Comparing the Figures 6(a), 6(b) and 6(c) to those corresponding ones in the second row of Figure 6, it is observed that the larger indirect compromise probabilities cause the probability curves shifting to the right. This implies that when the indirect compromise probabilities increase, more nodes are compromised. Comparing the Figures 6(a), 6(b) and 6(c) to

those corresponding ones in the third row of Figure 6, the similar conclusion can be drawn for the direct compromise probabilities. These observations validate the theoretical results of Theorem 4.3.

5.3 Joint cyber risks

To assess the joint cyber risks of type I and type II nodes, we display the contour plots of the joint probabilities of compromised nodes in Figure 7 with

$$(p_I, p_{II}, q_I, q_{II}) = (0.05, 0.15, 0.2, 0.3).$$

Figure 7(a) shows the contour plot for the case of $L = 1$. It is observed that the proportions of compromised nodes of different types demonstrate a clear positive correlation. Thus, when the proportion of type I compromised nodes increases, the proportion




Fig. 6. Probability plots of proportions of compromised nodes for different $\zeta = (p_I, p_{II}, q_I, q_{II})$ and $L = 1, 2, 10$

of type II compromised nodes also increases. By comparing Figure 7(a) and Figure 7(b), we observe that there also exists a positive dependence between the compromised proportions. It is very clear that the joint risk significantly increases when $L = 2$. Figure 7(c) shows the contour plot for the case of $L = 10$. It is observed that the joint risk is the highest among all the cases. However, it does not show any clear positive dependence pattern between two types of nodes, which coincides with the previous correlation analysis.

6 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Assessing the joint cyber risk of network systems is an important but challenging task. The challenge is primarily owing to three components: network topology, attack propagation, and heterogeneities of components. These integrated components result in

interdependent cyber risks over the network. We propose a novel backward elimination approach to efficiently computing the joint distribution of the number of compromised components over the network. The developed backward elimination approach not only can provide explicit formulas for assessing the joint cyber risk of a small network but also can be used to efficiently simulate the joint cyber risk of a large-scale network when the explicit computing is infeasible.

We specifically introduce a new concept of propagation depth L , which describes the power of risk propagation or the defensive power of a network. It is rigorously shown that when the propagation depth L is larger, more nodes of all types over the network are compromised in the sense of the multivariate stochastic order. In particular, the number of compromised nodes is always stochastically larger when L is larger for each type.




Fig. 7. Contour plots of proportions of compromised nodes with $(p_I, p_{II}, q_I, q_{II}) = (0.05, 0.15, 0.2, 0.3)$. The x -axis presents the proportion of type I compromised nodes, and y -axis represents the proportion of type II compromised nodes.

We further demonstrate that when the compromise probabilities (direct or indirect) are larger, more nodes are compromised. The simulation study demonstrates that the number of compromised nodes increases significantly when L increases from one to two. The correlation between the proportions of compromised nodes was positive, as shown by the simulation study.

The results developed in this work can be used to score a cyber infrastructure with heterogeneous components, which can be further used for the purpose of risk management or cyber insurance. The current work can be extended in several directions. For example, independence is assumed among all the propagation events in the current work. It would be interesting to study how the dependence among the propagation events would affect the risk propagation over the network. Our preliminary study shows that the dependence has a significant effect on the risk propagation. The other direction is to consider the propagation depth L as a random variable because L is indiscernible in certain practical situations. The theory of mixture models may be utilized to develop certain statistical inferences. Another possible study is the exploration of other propagation models (e.g., SIS or SIR) as the L -hop propagation model may not be suitable for certain networks/scenarios. Then, the joint cyber risk could be assessed based on the new propagation models, which would be different from the current work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Albert-Laszlo Barabasi and Reka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(1):509–512, 1999.
- [2] Yulia Cherdantseva, Pete Burnap, Andrew Blyth, Peter Eden, Kevin Jones, Hugh Soulsby, and Kristan Stoddart. A review of cyber security risk assessment methods for scada systems. *Computers & security*, 56:1–27, 2016.
- [3] Gaofeng Da, Maochao Xu, and Shouhuai Xu. On the quasi-stationary distribution of sis models. *Probability in the Engineering and Information Sciences*, 30(4):622–639, 2016.
- [4] Gaofeng Da, Maochao Xu, and Peng Zhao. Modeling network systems under simultaneous cyber-attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, 68(3):971–984, 2019.
- [5] Vinay M Ijure, Sean A Laughter, and Ronald D Williams. Security issues in scada networks. *computers & security*, 25(7):498–506, 2006.
- [6] Harry Joe. *Dependence modeling with copulas*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2014.
- [7] Benjamin Johnson, Jens Grossklags, Nicolas Christin, and John Chuang. Uncertainty in interdependent security games. *Decision and Game Theory for Security*, pages 234–244, 2010.
- [8] Howard Kunreuther and Geoffrey Heal. Interdependent security. *Journal of risk and uncertainty*, 26(2-3):231–249, 2003.
- [9] Aron Laszka, Benjamin Johnson, and Jens Grossklags. On the assessment of systematic risk in networked systems. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)*, 18(4):48, 2018.
- [10] Torgny Lindvall. *Lectures on the coupling method*. Courier Corporation, 2002.
- [11] Jorge Navarro, Franco Pellerey, and Antonio Di Crescenzo. Orderings of coherent systems with randomized dependent components. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 240(1):127–139, 2015.
- [12] Robert Ighodaro Ogie. Cyber security incidents on critical infrastructure and industrial networks. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer and Automation Engineering*, pages 254–258. ACM, 2017.
- [13] Romualdo Pastor-Satorras, Claudio Castellano, Piet Van Mieghem, and Alessandro Vespignani. Epidemic processes in complex networks. *Reviews of modern physics*, 87(3):925, 2015.
- [14] Romualdo Pastor-Satorras and Alessandro Vespignani. Epidemic dynamics and endemic states in complex networks. *Physical Review E*, 63(6):066117, 2001.
- [15] Arun G Phadke and John Samuel Thorp. *Synchronized phasor measurements and their applications*, volume 1. Springer, 2008.
- [16] Bo Qu and Huijuan Wang. Sis epidemic spreading with correlated heterogeneous infection rates. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 472:13–24, 2017.
- [17] Moshe Shaked and J George Shanthikumar. *Stochastic orders*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [18] Yilun Shang, Weiliang Luo, and Shouhuai Xu. L-hop percolation on networks with arbitrary degree distributions and its applications. *Physical Review E*, 84(3):031113, 2011.
- [19] Shuai Shao, Xuqing Huang, H Eugene Stanley, and Shlomo Havlin. Percolation of localized attack on complex networks. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(2):023049, 2015.
- [20] Hui Suo, Jiafu Wan, Caifeng Zou, and Jianqi Liu. Security in the internet of things: a review. In *2012 international conference on computer science and electronics engineering*, volume 3, pages 648–651. IEEE, 2012.
- [21] Chee-Wooi Ten, Chen-Ching Liu, and Govindarasu Manimaran. Vulnerability assessment of cybersecurity for scada systems. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 23(4):1836–1846, 2008.
- [22] Piet Van Mieghem, Jasmina Omic, and Robert Kooij. Virus spread in networks. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 17(1):1–14, February 2009.
- [23] Yini Wang, Sheng Wen, Yang Xiang, and Wanlei Zhou. Modeling the propagation of worms in networks: A survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 16(2):942–960, 2014.
- [24] Maochao Xu, Gaofeng Da, and Shouhuai Xu. Cyber epidemic models with dependences. *Internet Mathematics*, 11(1):62–92, 2015.
- [25] Maochao Xu and Shouhuai Xu. An extended stochastic model for quantitative security analysis of networked systems. *Internet Mathematics*, 8(3):288–320, 2012.
- [26] Shouhuai Xu, Wenlian Lu, and Zhenxin Zhan. A stochastic model of multivirus dynamics. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 9(1):30–45, 2011.

- [27] Lu-Xing Yang, Pengdeng Li, Xiaofan Yang, and Yuan Yan Tang. A risk management approach to defending against the advanced persistent threat. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2018.
- [28] Cliff C Zou, Don Towsley, and Weibo Gong. Modeling and simulation study of the propagation and defense of internet e-mail worms. *IEEE Transactions on dependable and secure computing*, 4(2):105–118, 2007.