

A Central Limit Theorem for Diffusion in Sparse Random Graphs

Hamed Amini*

Erhan Bayraktar[†]

Suman Chakraborty[‡]

February 2021

Abstract

We consider bootstrap percolation and diffusion in sparse random graphs with fixed degrees, constructed by configuration model. Every node has two states: it is either active or inactive. We assume that to each node is assigned a nonnegative (integer) threshold. The diffusion process is initiated by a subset of nodes with threshold zero which consists of initially activated nodes, whereas every other node is inactive. Subsequently, in each round, if an inactive node with threshold θ has at least θ of its neighbours activated, then it also becomes active and remains so forever. This is repeated until no more nodes become activated. The main result of this paper provides a central limit theorem for the final size of activated nodes. Namely, under suitable assumptions on the degree and threshold distributions, we show that the final size of activated nodes has asymptotically Gaussian fluctuations.

Keywords: Contagion, bootstrap percolation, central limit theorem, sparse random graphs.

1 Introduction

Threshold models of contagion have been used to describe many complex phenomena in diverse areas including epidemiology [8, 29–31], neuronal activity [4, 34], viral marketing [22, 23, 25] and spread of defaults in economic networks [1, 5].

Consider a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ with n nodes $V = [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Given two nodes $i, j \in [n]$, we write $i \sim j$ if $\{i, j\} \in E$. Every node has two states: it is either active or inactive (sometimes also referred to as infected or uninfected). We assume that to each node is assigned a nonnegative (integer) threshold. Let θ_i be the threshold of node i . The diffusion is then initiated by the (deterministic) subset of nodes with threshold zero which consists of initially activated nodes $\mathcal{A}_0 := \{i \in V : \theta_i = 0\}$. Subsequently, in each round, if an inactive node with threshold θ has at least θ of its neighbours activated, then it also becomes active and remains so forever. Namely, at time $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the (deterministic) set of active nodes is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_t = \{i \in V : \sum_{j:j \sim i} \mathbf{1}\{j \in \mathcal{A}_{t-1}\} \geq \theta_i\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}$ denotes the indicator of an event \mathcal{E} , i.e., this is 1 if \mathcal{E} holds and 0 otherwise.

*Department of Risk Management and Insurance, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303, USA, email: hamini@gsu.edu.

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, email: erhan@umich.edu

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Eindhoven University of Technology, email: s.chakraborty1@tue.nl

We study above threshold driven contagion model in sparse random graphs with fixed degrees, constructed by configuration model. The interest in this random graph model stems from its ability to mimic some of the empirical properties of real networks, while allowing for tractability (see e.g., [14, 28, 35]). We describe this random graph model next.

1.1 Configuration model

For each integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider a system of n nodes $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ endowed with a sequence of initial nonnegative integer thresholds $(\theta_{n,i})_{i=1}^n$. We are also given a sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_{n,i})_{i=1}^n$ of nonnegative integers $d_{n,1}, \dots, d_{n,n}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n d_{n,i}$ is even. By means of the configuration model we define a random multigraph with given degree sequence, denoted by $\mathcal{G}(n, \mathbf{d}_n)$. It starts with n nodes and $d_{n,i}$ many half edges corresponding to the i -th node. Then at each step two edges are selected uniformly at random, and a full edge is completed by joining them. The multigraph is constructed when there is no more half edges left. Although self-loops and multiple edges may occur, these become rare (under our regularity conditions below) as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It is easy to see conditional on the multigraph being simple graph, we obtain a uniformly distributed random graph with these given degree sequences; see e.g. [35].

Let $u_n(d, \theta)$ be the number of nodes with degree d and threshold θ :

$$u_n(d, \theta) := \#\{i \in [n] : d_{n,i} = d, \theta_{n,i} = \theta\}.$$

We assume the following regularity conditions on the degree sequence and thresholds.

Condition 1.1. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_{n,i})_{i=1}^n$ and $(\theta_{n,i})_{i=1}^n$ are sequence of non-negative integers such that $\sum_{i=1}^n d_{n,i}$ is even and, for some probability distribution $p : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ independent of n , with $u_n(d, \theta)$ as defined above:

(C₁) as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n} := \frac{\#\{i \in [n] : d_{n,i} = d, \theta_{n,i} = \theta\}}{n} \rightarrow p(d, \theta)$$

for every non-negative integers d and θ . We further assume $\sum_{\theta=0}^{\infty} p(0, \theta) < 1$.

(C₂) for every $A > 1$, we have

$$\sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=0}^{\infty} u_n(d, \theta) A^d = \sum_{i=1}^n A^{d_{n,i}} = O(n).$$

Remark 1.2. Let (D_n, Θ_n) be random variables with joint distribution $\mathbb{P}(D_n = d, \Theta_n = \theta) = u_n(d, \theta)/n$, which is the distribution of degree and threshold of a random node in $\mathcal{G}(n, \mathbf{d}_n)$. Moreover, let (D, Θ) be random variables (over nonnegative integers) with joint distribution $\mathbb{P}(D = d, \Theta = \theta) = p(d, \theta)$. Let

$$\lambda := \mathbb{E}[D] = \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=0}^{\infty} dp(d, \theta).$$

Then Condition 1.1 can be rewritten as $(D_n, \Theta_n) \xrightarrow{d} (D, \Theta)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[A^{D_n}] = O(1)$ for each $A > 1$, which in particular implies the uniform integrability of D_n , so

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_{n,i}}{n} = \mathbb{E}[D_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[D] = \lambda \in (0, \infty).$$

Similarly, all higher moments converge.

1.2 Diffusion process in $\mathcal{G}(n, \mathbf{d}_n)$

We start with the graph $\mathcal{G}(n, \mathbf{d}_n)$, and then remove the initially activated nodes with threshold zero, say \mathcal{A}_0 . Now the degree of each nodes in the graph induced by $[n] \setminus \mathcal{A}_0$ is less than or equal to the degree of that vertex in $\mathcal{G}(n, \mathbf{d}_n)$. We denote the degree of vertex i at time t in the evolving graph by d_i^B . In this process we remove the vertex i when $d_i^B < d_i - \theta_i$. At the end of this procedure all the vertices that are removed will be the set of infected vertices, and the rest will remain non-infected. Instead of removing vertices we can also remove edges to obtain the infected set of vertices. We delete an edge if one end point of the edge satisfies $d_i^B < d_i - \theta_i$, and when no such deletion is possible we remove all isolated vertices and these isolated vertices are the set of infected vertices.

Let us describe the process by assigning a type A (active) or B (inactive) to each of these nodes. To begin with the initially activated nodes (with threshold zero) are of type A , and say that a vertex is type A if $d_i^B < d_i - \theta_i$. Otherwise, we call it of type B . In particular at the beginning of the diffusion process, all nodes in initially activated nodes are of type A since $d_i^B = d_i$ and all nodes not in the initially activated nodes are by definition of type B . As we proceed with the algorithm, d_i^B might decrease and a type B nodes may become of type A . In terms of edges, a half-edge is of type A or B when its endpoint is. As long as there is any half-edge of type A , we choose one such half-edge uniformly at random and remove the edge it belongs to. Note that it may result in changing the other endpoint from B to A (by decreasing d_i^B) and thus create new half-edges of type A . When there are no half-edges of type A left, we stop. Then the final set of activated nodes is the set of nodes of type A (which are all isolated).

Next step is to turn this into a balls, and bins problem. In this step we simultaneously run the exploration process described in Section 3 and construct the configuration model. We call a type A (or B) node as type A (or B) bins and similarly consider the half-edges as balls of type A (or B) if its end point is type A (or B). At each step, we remove first one random ball from the set of balls in A -bins and then a random ball without restriction. We stop when there are no non-empty A -bins. Therefore we alternately remove a random A -ball and a random ball. We may just as well say that we first remove a random A -ball. We then remove balls in pairs, first a random ball without restriction, and then a random A -ball, and stop with the random ball, leaving no A -ball to remove. We now change the description a little by introducing colors. Initially all balls are white, and we begin again by removing one random A -ball. Subsequently, in each deletion step we first remove a random white ball and then recolor a random white A -ball red. This is repeated until no more white A -balls remain.

The next step is to run the above deletion process in continuous time. Each ball has an exponentially distributed random lifetime with mean 1, independent of the other balls. In other words balls die and are removed at rate 1, independent of each other. Also when a white ball dies we color a random white A ball red (in terms of configuration model these two half-edges form an edge). We stop when we should recolor a A ball to red but there is no such ball. Let $H_A(t)$ and $H_B(t)$ denote the number of white A balls and B balls respectively, at time t . Note that these parameters depend on n , but we will omit the subscript as it is clear from the context. We also let $A_n(t)$ and $B_n(t)$ be the number of A bins and B bins at time t .

Let τ_n be the stopping time of the above diffusion process. Note that there are no white A balls left at τ_n . However we pretend that we delete a (nonexistent) A ball at τ_n -th step and denote $H_A(\tau) = -1$. Therefore the stopping time τ_n may be characterized by $H_A(\tau) = -1$, and $H_A(t) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq t < \tau_n$. Finally note that all the B balls left at time τ_n are white and they constitute the set of all non-infected nodes. Denoting by \mathcal{A}_n^* the final set of activated nodes, we observe that $|\mathcal{A}_n^*| = n - B_n(\tau_n)$. Next we consider the white balls only. The total number of white balls at time t is $H_A(t) + H_B(t)$. In the evolution of this process each ball dies with rate 1 and another ball is colored red upon its death. Therefore, $H_A(t) + H_B(t)$ is a death process with rate 2.

1.3 Main theorems

The main result of this paper provides a central limit theorem for the final size of activated nodes. Namely, when the degree and threshold sequences satisfy Condition 1.1, we show that the final size of activated nodes $|\mathcal{A}_n^*|$ has asymptotically Gaussian fluctuations.

For the following theorem, we will use the notation

$$\widehat{a}_n(t) := 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=0}^d u_n(d, \theta) \beta(d, 1 - e^{-t}, \theta),$$

where $u_n(d, \theta)$ is the number of nodes with degree d and threshold θ . Also, let

$$b(d, z, \ell) := \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(d, z) = \ell) = \binom{d}{\ell} z^\ell (1-z)^{d-\ell},$$

$$\beta(d, z, \ell) := \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(d, z) \geq \ell) = \sum_{r=\ell}^d \binom{d}{r} z^r (1-z)^{d-r},$$

and $\text{Bin}(d, z)$ denotes the binomial distribution with parameters d and z .

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\tau'_n \leq \tau_n$ be a stopping time such that $\tau'_n \rightarrow t_0$ for some $t_0 \geq 0$. Then in $\mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$n^{-1/2} (A_n(t \wedge \tau'_n) - n\widehat{a}_n(t \wedge \tau'_n)) \xrightarrow{d} Z_A(t \wedge t_0),$$

for all $t \leq t_0$, where Z_A is a continuous Gaussian process on $[0, t_0]$ with mean 0 and variance

$$\sigma_A^2(t) := \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \left(\Delta_{d, \theta, d-\theta}(t) + \sum_{\ell=d-\theta+1}^{\infty} (d-\theta) \binom{\ell-1}{d-\theta} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{\ell-(d-\theta)-1} e^{-s} \Delta_{d, \theta, \ell}(s) ds \right),$$

where

$$\Delta_{d, \theta, \ell}(t) = p(d, \theta) \left(1 - e^{2\ell t} \beta(d, e^{-t}, \ell) + 2\ell \int_0^t e^{2\ell s} \beta(d, e^{-s}, \ell) ds \right).$$

The proof of above theorem is provided in Section 3.

Let us write

$$h_B(z) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \ell p(d, \theta) \beta(d, z, d-\theta),$$

which also gives us the plausible candidate for the limit of our stopping time

$$\widehat{z} := \sup\{z \in [0, 1] : \lambda z^2 - h_B(z) = 0\}.$$

Note that the solution \widehat{z} always exists since $h_B(0) = 0$. Also, $h_B(z)$ is continuous in z . We will further assume that if \widehat{z} is a non-zero then it is not a local minimum of $\lambda z^2 - h_B(z)$.

Lemma 1.4. *Let τ_n be the stopping time of the diffusion process such that $H_A(\tau_n) = -1$ for the first time. Then $\tau_n \xrightarrow{P} -\ln \widehat{z}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where \xrightarrow{P} denotes the convergence in probability.*

The proof of lemma is provided in Section 3.3.

We are interested in the number of activated nodes (bins) which is given by $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} A_n(t \wedge \tau_n)$. In the following theorem we show that in fact for $t \geq -\ln \widehat{z}$, the number of activated nodes $A_n(t \wedge \tau_n)$ has an asymptotic normal distribution, where the limit is independent of t .

Theorem 1.5. For $t \geq -\ln \hat{z}$ we have

$$n^{-1/2} (A_n(t \wedge \tau_n) - n\hat{a}(t \wedge \tau_n)) \xrightarrow{d} Z_A(-\ln \hat{z}),$$

Proof. We will use the Theorem 1.3 with the stopping time τ_n (as in Lemma 1.4). Since $\tau_n \xrightarrow{p} -\ln \hat{z}$, we have from Lemma 1.3

$$n^{-1/2} (A_n(t \wedge \tau_n) - n\hat{a}_n(t \wedge \tau_n)) \rightarrow Z_A(t \wedge -\ln \hat{z}).$$

Therefore for $t \geq \ln \hat{z}$,

$$n^{-1/2} (A_n(t \wedge \tau_n) - n\hat{a}_n(t \wedge \tau_n)) \xrightarrow{d} Z_A(-\ln \hat{z}),$$

proving the theorem. □

1.4 Relation to bootstrap percolation and k -core

We now discuss our results with respect to related literature.

The diffusion model we consider in this paper can be seen as a generalization of bootstrap percolation and k -core in any graph $G = (V, E)$.

In the case of equal thresholds ($\theta_i = \theta$ over all nodes), our model is equivalent to bootstrap percolation (with deterministic initial activation). This process was introduced by Chalupa, Leath and Reich [12] in 1979 as a simplified model of some magnetic disordered systems. A short survey regarding applications of bootstrap percolation processes can be found in Bootstrap percolation in random graphs [2]. Recently, bootstrap percolation has been studied on varieties of random graphs models, see e.g., [20] for random graph $G_{n,p}$, [6, 7, 16] for inhomogeneous random graphs and [3, 9, 24] for the configuration model.

The k -core of a graph G is the largest induced subgraph of G with minimum vertex degree at least k . The k -core of an arbitrary finite graph can be found by removing vertices of degree less than k , in an arbitrary order, until no such vertices exist. By setting the threshold of node i as $\theta_i = (d_i - k)_+ = \max\{d_i - k, 0\}$, we find that $B_n(\tau_n)$ will be the size of k -core in the random graph $G(n, \mathbf{d}_n)$.

The questions concerning the existence, size and structure of the k -core in random graphs, have attracted a lot of attention over the recent years, see e.g., [26, 32] for random graph $G_{n,p}$, [10, 33] for inhomogeneous random graphs and [13, 15, 18, 19, 27] for the configuration model.

In particular, more closely related to our paper, [19] analyze the asymptotic normality of the k -core for sparse random graph $G_{n,p}$ and for configuration model. We continue on the same line as [19] and generalize partly their results by allowing different threshold levels to each of nodes. Our proof technique is also inspired by [19]. In particular, we look at the spread of activation (or infection) and constructing the configuration model simultaneously. Then we express the number of inactive vertices at a particular time point in terms of a martingale. After that we appeal to a martingale limit theorem from [17] to derive the limiting distribution.

Notation. We let \mathbb{N} be the set of nonnegative integers. Let $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of real-valued random variables on a probability space (Ω, \mathbb{P}) . If $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant, we write $X_n \xrightarrow{p} c$ to denote that X_n converges in probability to c . That is, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}(|X_n - c| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We write $X_n = o_p(a_n)$, if $|X_n|/a_n$ converges to 0 in probability. We use \xrightarrow{d} for convergence in distribution. If \mathcal{E}_n is a measurable subset of Ω , for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that the sequence $\{\mathcal{E}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ occurs with high probability (**w.h.p.**) if $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n) = 1 - o(1)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Also, we denote by $\text{Bin}(k, p)$ a binomial distribution corresponding to the number of

successes of a sequence of k independent Bernoulli trials each having probability of success p . We will suppress the dependence of parameters on the size of the network n , if it is clear from the context. We use the notation $\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}$ for the indicator of an event \mathcal{E} which is 1 if \mathcal{E} holds and 0 otherwise. We let $\mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$ be the standard space of right-continuous functions with left limits on $[0, \infty)$ equipped with the Skorohod topology (see e.g. [17, 21])

2 Preliminaries

In this section we provide some preliminary lemmas that will be used in our proofs.

2.1 Some death process lemmas

Consider a pure death process with rate 1. This process starts with some number of balls whose lifetimes are i.i.d. rate 1 exponentials.

Lemma 2.1 (Death Process Lemma). *Let $N_n(t)$ be the number of balls alive at time t in a rate 1 death process with $N_n(0) = n$. Then*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} |N_n(t)/n - e^{-t}| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. $1 - N_n(t)/n$ is the empirical distribution function of the n lifetimes, which are i.i.d. random variables with the distribution function $1 - e^{-t}$. Therefore the result follows using Glivenko-Cantelli theorem (see e.g. [21, Proposition 4.24]). \square

Lemma 2.2 (White Balls Centrality Lemma). *The number of white balls $H_A(t) + H_B(t)$ follow a pure death process, and*

$$\sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |H_A(t) + H_B(t) - n\lambda e^{-2t}| = o_p(n).$$

Proof. In the evolution of this process each ball dies with rate 1 and another ball is colored red upon its death. Therefore $A(t) + B(t)$ is a death process with rate 2. Therefore the lemma follows using Lemma 2.1. \square

2.2 Martingale limit theorems

We recall some martingale theory that are going to be useful in proving Theorem 1.3. Let X be a martingale defined on $[0, \infty)$, we denote its quadratic variation of X by $[X, X]_t$, and the bilinear extension of quadratic variation to two martingales X and Y by $[X, Y]_t$. If X and Y be two martingales with path-wise finite variation, then

$$[X, Y]_t := \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \Delta X(s) \Delta Y(s), \tag{2}$$

where $\Delta X(s) := X(s) - X(s-)$ is the jump of X at s . Similarly, $\Delta Y(s) := Y(s) - Y(s-)$. In our context there will only be countable number of jumps for the martingales under consideration, and the sum in Equation (2) will be finite. We will assume $[X, Y]_0 = 0$. For vector-valued martingales $X = (X_i)_{i=1}^m$ and $Y = (Y_j)_{j=1}^n$, $[X, Y]$ will denote the matrix, we define the square bracket $[X, Y]$ to be the matrix $([X_i, Y_j])_{i,j}$. A real-valued martingale $X(s)$ on $[0, t]$ is an L^2 if and only if $\mathbb{E}[X, X]_t < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}|X(0)|^2 < \infty$, and then $\mathbb{E}|X(t)|^2 = \mathbb{E}[X, X]_t + \mathbb{E}|X(0)|^2$. We will use the following martingale limit theorem from [17], see also [19, Proposition 4.1].

Proposition 2.3. For each $n \geq 1$, let $M_n(t) = (M_{ni}(t))_{i=0}^q$ be a q -dimensional martingale on $[0, \infty)$ and $M_n(0) = 0$. Also $\Sigma(t)$ be a continuous positive semi-definite function such that

$$\begin{aligned} [M_n, M_n]_t &\xrightarrow{p} \Sigma(t) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \\ \sup_n \mathbb{E}[M_{ni}, M_{ni}]_t &< \infty, \quad i = 1, \dots, q. \end{aligned}$$

Then $M_n \xrightarrow{d} M$, in $\mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$ where M is continuous q -dimensional Gaussian martingale with $\mathbb{E}M(t) = 0$ and covariances $\text{Cov}(M(t)) = \Sigma(t)$.

In the next section, we will apply Proposition 2.3 to stopped processes.

3 Proofs

In this section we present the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Lemma 1.4.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.3

We denote the number of white balls at time t by $W_n(t)$ and clearly $W_n(t) = H_A(t) + H_B(t)$. Let $m_n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{n,i}$ denotes the total number of edges in $\mathcal{G}(n, \mathbf{d}_n)$. In our construction $W_n(0) = 2m_n - 1$, and W_n decreases by 2 each time a white ball dies. The death happens with rate 1, and therefore $W_n(t) + \int_0^t 2W_n(s) ds$ is a martingale on $[0, \tau_n]$. In differential form

$$dW_n(t) = -2W_n(t) dt + d\mathcal{M}(t), \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{M} is a martingale. Now by Ito's lemma and (3),

$$d(e^{2t} W_n(t)) = e^{2t} dW_n(t) + 2e^{2t} W_n(t) dt = e^{2t} d\mathcal{M}(t),$$

which implies $\widehat{W}_n(t) := e^{2t} W_n(t)$ is another martingale. Note that distinct balls die at distinct time with probability one, also all jumps in $W_n(t)$ equals -2 . The quadratic variation of $\widehat{W}_n(t)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} [\widehat{W}_n, \widehat{W}_n]_t &= \sum_{0 < s \leq t} |\Delta \widehat{W}_n(s)|^2 = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} e^{2s} |\Delta W_n(s)|^2 \\ &= \sum_{0 < s \leq t} e^{4s} (W_n(s-) - W_n(s))(W_n(s-) - W_n(s)) \\ &= \sum_{0 < s \leq t} 2e^{4s} (W_n(s-) - W_n(s)) = \int_0^t 2e^{4s} d(-W_n(s)) \\ &= -2e^{4t} W_n(t) + 2W_n(0) + \int_0^t 8e^{4s} W_n(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Using the fact that $W_n(t)$ is a decreasing function in t and $W_n(0) = 2m_n - 1$ we get

$$[\widehat{W}_n, \widehat{W}_n]_t \leq 2e^{4t} \int_0^t d(-W_n(s)) \leq 4m_n e^{4t}.$$

Let the stopped martingale on $[0, \infty)$ to be $W_n^*(t) := \frac{1}{n} \widehat{W}_n(t \wedge \tau_n)$. Then W_n^* is a martingale on $[0, \infty)$ and, for every $T < \infty$, the quadratic variation of this martingale is

$$[W_n^*, W_n^*]_T = \frac{1}{n^2} [W_n, W_n]_{T \wedge \tau_n} \leq \frac{4e^{4T} m_n}{n^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad (5)$$

as n goes to infinity. Also $0 \leq W_n^*(t) \leq 2m_n/n = O(1)$. Therefore by Proposition 2.3 on $\mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$, $W_n^*(t) - W_n^*(0) \rightarrow 0$ in probability uniformly on $[0, T]$, and as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n^{-1} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |W_n(t) - W_n(0)e^{-2t}| \rightarrow 0. \quad (6)$$

Now using (4) and (5) we get for every $t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\widehat{W}_n, \widehat{W}_n]_t &= -2e^{4t}W_n(0)e^{-2t} + 2W_n(0) + \int_0^t 8e^{4s}W_n(0)e^{-2s} ds + o_p(n) \\ &= 2W_n(0)(e^{2t} - 1) + o_p(n) = 2(2m_n - 1)(e^{2t} - 1) + o_p(n) \\ &= 2\lambda n(e^{2t} - 1) + o_p(n). \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote by (for $d, \theta, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$)

$$\mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = \{i \in [n] : d_i = d, \theta_i = \theta, W_i(t) = \ell\},$$

the set of nodes (bins) with degree d , threshold θ and ℓ white balls at time t . Let $B_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = |\mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)|$. Therefore, the total number of (uninfected) B bins at time t is given by

$$B_n(t) = \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=d-\theta}^d B_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,d-\theta},$$

where $\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell} = \sum_{r=\ell}^d B_{d,\theta,r}(t)$ denotes the number of (initially uninfected) B bins at time t with initial degree d and threshold θ with at least ℓ white balls. In the rest of the proof we will derive a central limit theorem for the quantity $B_n(t)$, which is the number of uninfected vertices at time t . This will immediately give us our desired result since $A_n(t) + B_n(t) = n$.

Note that $\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}$ decreases by one only when a ball dies in an uninfected bin with initially d balls and threshold θ that has exactly ℓ balls, and there are precisely $\ell B_{d,\theta,\ell}$ many such balls, therefore

$$d\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = -\ell B_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) dt + d\mathcal{M}(t), \quad (7)$$

where \mathcal{M} is a martingale.

Let us now define the following quantity

$$\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) := e^{\ell t} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t), \quad (8)$$

which gives

$$d\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = \ell e^{\ell t} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) dt + e^{\ell t} d\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t).$$

Plugging in (7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) &= \ell e^{\ell t} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) dt - \ell e^{\ell t} B_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) dt + e^{\ell t} d\mathcal{M}(t) \\ &= \ell e^{\ell t} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell+1}(t) dt + e^{\ell t} d\mathcal{M}(t) \\ &= \ell e^{-t} \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell+1}(t) dt + d\mathcal{M}'(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $d\mathcal{M}'(t) = e^{\ell t} d\mathcal{M}(t)$. Since this is yet another martingale differential, we can define the following martingale for every fixed $d \geq \ell \geq 0$

$$M_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) := \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - \ell \int_0^t e^{-s} \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell+1}(s) ds. \quad (9)$$

The quadratic variation will be same as that of $\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} [M_{d,\theta,\ell}, M_{d,\theta,\ell}]_t &= \sum_{0 < s \leq t} |\Delta M_{d,\theta,\ell}(s)|^2 = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} |\Delta \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(s)|^2 \\ &= \sum_{0 < s \leq t} e^{2\ell s} |\Delta \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(s)|^2 = \int_0^t e^{2\ell s} d(-\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(s)) \\ &= \int_0^t e^{2\ell s} d(-\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(s)). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Let us now define the centered version of $M_{d,\theta,\ell}$ as follows

$$\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) := n^{-1/2}(M_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - M_{d,\theta,\ell}(0)). \quad (11)$$

This is of course the centered martingale where for $\ell \leq d$,

$$M_{d,\theta,\ell}(0) = \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(0) = \sum_{r=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{i \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,r}(0)\} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{i \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,d}(0)\}.$$

The quadratic variation of $\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$ can be calculated using integration by parts as follows

$$\begin{aligned} [\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}]_t &= \frac{1}{n} [M_{d,\theta,\ell}, M_{d,\theta,\ell}]_t \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left(\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(0) - e^{2\ell t} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) + 2\ell \int_0^t e^{2\ell s} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(s) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now note that (for $\theta \geq 1$)

$$\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(0) = u_n(d, \theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)] = u_n(d, \theta) \beta(d, e^{-t}, \ell).$$

Hence, by using Condition 1.1 and above equations, the quadratic variation of $\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$ satisfies (for $\theta \geq 1$) (see also Equation 26)

$$\begin{aligned} [\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}]_t &:= p(d, \theta) \left(1 - e^{2\ell t} \beta(d, e^{-t}, \ell) + 2\ell \int_0^t e^{2\ell s} \beta(d, e^{-s}, \ell) ds \right) + o_p(1) \\ &= \Delta_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

We will also use the following crude estimate. Using (10) we get that

$$[\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}]_t = \frac{1}{n} [M_{d,\theta,\ell}, M_{d,\theta,\ell}]_t \leq \frac{1}{n} e^{2\ell t} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(0) = \frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n} e^{2\ell t}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore we can apply Proposition 2.3 to the stopped process at τ_n

$$\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t \wedge \tau_n) \rightarrow Z_{d,\theta,\ell}(t \wedge t_0) \text{ in } D[0, \infty), \quad (13)$$

where $Z_{d,\theta,\ell}$ is a Gaussian process with $\mathbb{E}Z_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = 0$ and covariance $\Delta_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$.

Also note that $\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$ and $\widetilde{B}_{d',\theta',\ell'}(t)$ can not change together almost surely for $(d, \theta, \ell) \neq (d', \theta', \ell')$, therefore $[\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d',\theta',\ell'}] = 0$. Thus for a finite set S , $(\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell})_{(d,\theta,\ell) \in S}$ converges to $(Z_{d,\theta,\ell})_{(d,\theta,\ell) \in S}$ in distribution, and $(Z_{d,\theta,\ell})$ are independent.

Let us now express $\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}$ in terms of $M_{d,\theta,\ell}$ so that we can apply the limit theorems for $\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}$'s to get limit theorems for $\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}$.

Using (9) one can write

$$\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = M_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) + \sum_{r=\ell+1}^d \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-\ell-1} e^{-s} M_{d,\theta,r}(s) ds. \quad (14)$$

Since $M_{d,\theta,\ell}$ is a martingale $\mathbb{E}[M_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)] = M_{d,\theta,\ell}(0)$, and using (14) we get $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)] = \widehat{b}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$, where we define for $t \geq 0$,

$$\widehat{b}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = M_{d,\theta,\ell}(0) + \sum_{r=\ell+1}^d \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-\ell-1} e^{-s} M_{d,\theta,r}(0) ds. \quad (15)$$

Recall from (8) that $\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) := e^{\ell t} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$, where $\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$ is the number of (uninfected) B bins with at least ℓ balls at time t with initial number of balls (degree) d and threshold θ . Therefore the sum in the right hand side of the above equation is number of bins with at least ℓ balls at time t . Also recall that balls die independently with rate 1. Let us denote

$$\mathcal{U}_n(d, \theta) = \{i \in [n] : d_{n,i} = d, \theta_{n,i} = \theta\},$$

so that $u_n(d, \theta) = |\mathcal{U}_n(d, \theta)|$. This gives also $u_n(d, \theta) = \sum_{\ell} B_{d,\theta,\ell}(0)$.

Recall that $B_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = |\mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)|$ where $\mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = \{i \in [n] : d_i = d, \theta_i = \theta, W_i(t) = \ell\}$. Since each ball dies with rate one independent of each other and survival probability of a ball after time t is equal to e^{-t} . A bin from $\mathcal{U}_n(d, \theta)$ has at least ℓ balls at time t with probability

$$\beta(d, e^{-t}, \ell) = \sum_{r=\ell}^d \binom{d}{r} (e^{-t})^r (1 - e^{-t})^{d-r}.$$

Hence we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)] = e^{\ell t} \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)] = e^{\ell t} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{U}_n(d, \theta)} \mathbb{P}(\text{out of } d \text{ at least } \ell \text{ balls survive}),$$

which gives

$$\widehat{b}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)] = e^{\ell t} u_n(d, \ell) \beta(d, e^{-t}, \ell).$$

Using (14), (15) and (11), it turns out that the centered version of $\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - \widehat{b}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(M_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - M_{d,\theta,\ell}(0) + \sum_{r=\ell+1}^{\infty} \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-\ell-1} e^{-s} (M_{d,\theta,r}(s) - M_{d,\theta,r}(0)) ds \right) \\ &= \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) + \sum_{r=\ell+1}^{\infty} \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-\ell-1} e^{-s} \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,r}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now using (12) we get (for $\ell \leq d$ and for any $T \geq 0$):

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell} \right]_T \leq e^{2\ell T} \frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n} e^{2\ell T} \sum_{d \geq \ell} \sum_{\theta} u_n(d, \theta).$$

Then using Condition 1.1 and the simple fact that for $A > 1$,

$$A^\ell \sum_{d \geq \ell} \sum_{\theta} u_n(d, \theta) \leq \sum_{d \geq \ell} \sum_{\theta} u_n(d, \theta) A^d \leq \sum_d \sum_{\theta} u_n(d, \theta) A^d,$$

we get for any $T \geq 0$, by setting $A = e^{2T+2}$, there is a constant C_A such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell} \right]_T \leq e^{2rT} C_A A^{-\ell} = C_A e^{-2\ell}.$$

Now using Doob's L^2 -inequality we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}^2(t) \right) \leq 4\mathbb{E} \left[\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell} \right]_T \leq C' e^{-2\ell}.$$

Therefore using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)| \right) \leq C' e^{-\ell}. \quad (16)$$

Therefore by (13) and Fatou's lemma we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} |Z_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)| \right) \leq C' e^{-\ell}. \quad (17)$$

Let us define

$$R_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) := \sum_{r=\ell+1}^{\infty} \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-\ell-1} e^{-s} M_{d,\theta,r}(s) ds.$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |R_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)| \right] \leq \sum_{r=\ell+1}^{\infty} \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-\ell-1} e^{-s} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_{d,\theta,r}(s)| \right] ds.$$

Therefore (16) yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |R_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)| \right) \leq C' \sum_{r=\ell+1}^{\infty} \ell e^{-r} \binom{r-1}{\ell} (1 - e^{-T})^{r-\ell}. \quad (18)$$

Clearly, for fixed ℓ and T , (18) converges to zero uniformly in n , as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Now using (15), (18) and applying [11, Theorem 4.2] we get

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - \widehat{b}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \widetilde{Z}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t \wedge t_0),$$

in $\mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$ for each ℓ , where

$$\widetilde{Z}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) := Z_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) + \sum_{r=\ell+1}^{\infty} \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-\ell-1} e^{-s} Z_{d,\theta,r}(s) ds. \quad (19)$$

Again using (17) we obtain that the sum in (19) almost surely uniformly converges for $t \leq t_0$, and this gives $\widetilde{Z}_{d,\theta,\ell}$ is continuous for each (d, θ, ℓ) . Now recall that we are interested in the case $\ell = d - \theta$. More particularly, we will derive a central limit theorem of the following quantity

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \left(\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t) - \widehat{b}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t) \right) \\ &= \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t) + \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{r=d-\theta+1}^{\infty} (d-\theta) \binom{r-1}{d-\theta} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-(d-\theta)-1} e^{-s} \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,r}(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Note that from (13) we know the limiting distribution of $\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t)$, and therefore it will be sufficient to show that the contribution from the tail of (19) is negligible. To be precise let us define two terms

$$\widetilde{R}_\ell(t) := \sum_{d=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t),$$

and

$$\widehat{R}_\ell(t) := \sum_{d=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{r=d-\theta+1}^d (d-\theta) \binom{r-1}{d-\theta} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-(d-\theta)-1} e^{-s} \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,r}(s) ds.$$

In the following lemma we show that $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\widetilde{R}_\ell(t)| \right]$, and $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\widehat{R}_\ell(t)| \right]$ converges to zero as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n .

Lemma 3.1. *We have $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\widetilde{R}_\ell(t)| \right] \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\widehat{R}_\ell(t)| \right] \rightarrow 0$, as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in n .*

For the sake of readability, we postpone the proof of the lemma to the end of this section. By using Lemma 3.1, (20) and [11, Theorem 4.2] we get

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \left(\widehat{B}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t) - \widehat{b}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \widetilde{Z}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t).$$

Using (23) we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) \right| \right] \leq 2e^{sT} \sqrt{\frac{u_n(d,\theta)}{n}} + 2 \sum_{r=\ell+1}^{\infty} \ell \binom{r-1}{\ell} (1-e^{-t})^{r-\ell} e^{sT} \sqrt{\frac{u_n(d,\theta)}{n}}$$

Again using $u_n(d,\theta) \leq C_A A^{-d} n$ and writing the second term in terms of negative binomial distribution we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - \widehat{b}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) \right| \right) \leq C_A e^{dT} A^{-d/2} + C_A e^{dT} A^{-d/2} e^{\ell T + T} (1 - e^{-T}) \ell.$$

Since $\ell \leq d$, by choosing $A = e^{4T+2}$, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \widehat{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - \widehat{b}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) \right| \right] \leq C_A d e^{-d}. \quad (21)$$

Using (21) and Fatou's lemma we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \left| \widetilde{Z}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t) \right| \right] \leq C_A d e^{-d}.$$

This in turn implies that $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \widetilde{Z}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t)$, almost surely converges uniformly in $t \leq t_0$ and therefore $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \widetilde{Z}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t)$ is continuous. Finally, we finish the proof by proving the tail bound in (20). We end this section by presenting the proof of Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Using Condition 1.1 and the fact that for all $A > 1$, $A^d u_n(d, \theta) \leq \sum_{d \geq \ell} u_n(d, \theta) A^d$ we find that for any $A > 1$ there is a constant C_A such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell} \right]_T \leq e^{2\ell T} \frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n}.$$

Using Doob's L^2 -inequality we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}^2(t) \right] \leq 4 \mathbb{E} \left[\widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell}, \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,\ell} \right]_T \leq 4e^{2rT} \frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n}. \quad (22)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widetilde{R}_\ell(t) \right| \right] \leq \sum_{d=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,d-\theta}(t) \right| \right).$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (22)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widetilde{R}_{N,n}(t) \right| \right] \leq 2 \sum_{d=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d e^{(d-\theta)T} \sqrt{\frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n}} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{d \geq \ell} e^{dT} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sqrt{u_n(d, \theta)}.$$

Using Condition 1.1, for all $A > 1$, $A^d u_n(d, \theta) = O(n)$. Therefore for any $A > 1$ there is a constant C_A such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widetilde{R}_\ell(t) \right| \right] \leq C_A \sum_{d \geq \ell} d e^{dT} A^{-d/2}.$$

In particular, choosing $A = e^{4T}$, we see that $\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widetilde{R}_\ell(t) \right| \right]$ converges to zero as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n .

Now let us define

$$\widehat{R}_\ell(t) := \sum_{d=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{r=d-\theta+1}^d (d-\theta) \binom{r-1}{d-\theta} \int_0^t (e^{-s} - e^{-t})^{r-(d-\theta)-1} e^{-s} \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,r}(s) ds.$$

Observe that the index r is at most d , and therefore using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (22)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widetilde{M}_{d,\theta,r}(s) \right| \right] \leq 2e^{sT} \sqrt{\frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n}}. \quad (23)$$

We can now compute the following tail bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widehat{R}_\ell(t) \right| \right) \leq \sum_{d=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{r=d-\theta+1}^d (d-\theta) \binom{r-1}{d-\theta} (1 - e^{-t})^{r-(d-\theta)} 2e^{sT} \sqrt{\frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n}}$$

Again we have $u_n(d, \theta) \leq C_A A^{-d} n$ for some constant $C_A > 0$. Plugging in $A = e^{8T}$ we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widehat{R}_\ell(t) \right| \right] \leq C_A \sum_{d=\ell}^{\infty} e^{-3dT} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{r=d-\theta+1}^{\infty} (d-\theta) \binom{r-1}{d-\theta} (1 - e^{-T})^{r-(d-\theta)}. \quad (24)$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=d-\theta+1}^{\infty} (d-\theta) \binom{r-1}{d-\theta} (1 - e^{-t})^{r-(d-\theta)} &= \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} r \binom{r+d-\theta-1}{r} (1 - e^{-T})^r \\ &= (d-\theta) e^{(d-\theta+1)T} (1 - e^{-T}), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where in the second equality we used the expectation of negative binomial distribution. Now plugging this in (24) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \widehat{R}_\ell(t) \right| \right] \leq C_A \sum_{d \geq \ell} d^2 e^{-2dT},$$

which again goes to zero uniformly in n as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

3.2 The stopping time

Note that we can write

$$H_B(t) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{\ell=d-\theta}^d \ell B_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{\ell \geq d-\theta}^d \ell \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{v \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)\}.$$

First let us consider the term $\sum_{\ell \geq d-\theta} \ell \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{v \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)\}$. It is precisely the number of balls that were not infected initially, and remain non-infected at time t . Now consider those $u_n(d, \theta)$ bins with degree d and threshold $\theta \geq 1$ (not initially infected). For $k = 1, 2, \dots, u_n(d, \theta)$, let T_k be the time ℓ -th ball is removed from the k -th such bin. Then

$$|\{k : T_k \leq t\}| = \sum_{r=0}^{d-\ell} \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{v \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)\}.$$

For the k -th bin we get

$$\mathbb{P}(T_k \leq t) = \sum_{r=0}^{d-\ell} \binom{d}{r} (e^{-t})^r (1 - e^{-t})^{d-r} := \sum_{r=0}^{d-\ell} \beta(d, e^{-t}, r),$$

out of the $u_n(d, \theta)$ bins. Since each bins are independent, using Glivenko-Cantelli lemma we get that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=0}^{d-\ell} \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{v \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)\} - \frac{u_n(d, \theta)}{n} \sum_{r=0}^{d-\ell} \beta(d, e^{-t}, r) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Condition 1.1, $u_n(d, \theta) = p(d, \theta)n + o(n)$, therefore we get

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=0}^{d-\ell} \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{v \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)\} - p(d, \theta) \sum_{r=0}^{d-\ell} \beta(d, e^{-t}, r) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (26)$$

in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since (26) is true for all $0 \leq \ell \leq d$, taking difference of two consecutive terms we get for each $0 \leq r \leq d$,

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{v \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)\} - p(d, \theta) \beta(d, e^{-t}, r) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

and therefore taking a sum over r , and using Condition 1.1,

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{1}{n} \widetilde{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t) - p(d, \theta) \beta(d, e^{-t}, r) \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Also combining Condition 1.1 and (26) we get

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{1}\{v \in \mathcal{B}_{d,\theta,\ell}(t)\} - p(d,\theta)\beta(d, e^{-t}, r) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

and therefore

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{H_B(t)}{n} - \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{\ell \geq d-\theta} \ell p(d,\theta)\beta(d, e^{-t}, \ell) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (27)$$

in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that the stopping time τ was defined as $H_A(\tau) = -1$. Also note that from (27) and (6) we get that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \frac{H_B(t)}{n} - \lambda e^{-2t} + \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{\ell \geq d-\theta} \ell p(d,\theta)\beta(d, e^{-t}, \ell) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (28)$$

in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We can then write $h_B(z) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\theta=1}^d \sum_{\ell \geq d-\theta} \ell p(d,\theta)\beta(d, z, \ell)$. Also (28), gives us the plausible candidate for the limit of our stopping time

$$\hat{z} := \sup\{z \in [0, 1] : \lambda z^2 - h_B(z) = 0\}.$$

We further assume that if \hat{z} is a non-zero then it is not a local minimum of $\lambda z^2 - h_B(z)$.

3.3 Proof of Lemma 1.4

To show this let us take a constant $t_1 > 0$ such that $t_1 < -\ln \hat{z}$. This means $\hat{z} < 1$, and hence $\lambda > h_B(1)$. Therefore using the fact that $\lambda z^2 - h_B(z)$ is continuous we get $h_B(z) < \lambda z^2$ for $z \in (\hat{z}, 1]$. This again gives $h_B(e^{-t}) < \lambda e^{-2t}$ for all $t \leq t_1$. Since $[0, t_1]$ is compact again using the continuity of $h_B(z)$ we get $h_B(e^{-t}) - \lambda e^{-2t} < -c$ for some $c > 0$. Therefore on the set $\tau < t_1$ we will have $h_B(e^{-\tau}) - \lambda e^{-2\tau} < -c$. On the other hand, since $H_A(\tau) = -1$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (28) $H_A(\tau)/n \rightarrow 0$, which gives a contradiction, and thus $\mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t_1) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now let us choose $t_2 < \tau$ where $t_2 \in (-\ln \hat{z}, -\ln(\hat{z} - \varepsilon))$. By our assumption \hat{z} is not a local minimum of $\lambda z^2 - h_B(z)$, therefore there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\lambda e^{-2t_2} - h_B(e^{-t_2}) = -c$ for some $c > 0$. Now by definition if $\tau > t_2$, then $H_B(t_2) \geq 0$. Plugging these in (28) we get $\frac{H_B(t_2)}{n} - \lambda e^{-2t_2} + h_B(t_2) \geq c$. This gives $\mathbb{P}(\tau \geq t_2) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since t_1 and t_2 can be arbitrary close to $-\ln \hat{z}$, the proof of the claim is complete.

References

- [1] ACEMOGLU, D., OZDAGLAR, A., AND TAHBAZ-SALEHI, A. Systemic risk and stability in financial networks. *American Economic Review* 105, 2 (2015), 564–608.
- [2] ADLER, J., AND LEV, U. Bootstrap percolation: visualizations and applications. *Brazilian Journal of Physics* 33, 3 (2003), 641–644.
- [3] AMINI, H. Bootstrap percolation and diffusion in random graphs with given vertex degrees. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 17: R25 (2010).
- [4] AMINI, H. Bootstrap percolation in living neural networks. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 141 (2010), 459–475.

- [5] AMINI, H., CONT, R., AND MINCA, A. Resilience to contagion in financial networks. *Mathematical Finance* 26, 2 (2016), 329–365.
- [6] AMINI, H., AND FOUNTOULAKIS, N. Bootstrap percolation in power-law random graphs. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 155, 1 (2014), 72–92.
- [7] AMINI, H., FOUNTOULAKIS, N., AND PANAGIOTOU, K. Bootstrap percolation in inhomogeneous random graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.2815* (2014).
- [8] AMINI, H., AND MINCA, A. Epidemic spreading and equilibrium social distancing in heterogeneous networks, 2020.
- [9] BALOGH, J., AND PITTEL, B. G. Bootstrap percolation on the random regular graph. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 30, 1-2 (2007), 257–286.
- [10] BAYRAKTAR, E., CHAKRABORTY, S., AND ZHANG, X. k -core in percolated dense graph sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09730* (2020).
- [11] BILLINGSLEY, P. Convergence of probability measures john wiley & sons. *New York* 157 (1968).
- [12] CHALUPA, J., LEATH, P. L., AND REICH, G. R. Bootstrap percolation on a Bethe lattice. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* 12 (1979), L31–L35.
- [13] COOPER, C. The cores of random hypergraphs with a given degree sequence. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 25, 4 (2004), 353–375.
- [14] DURRETT, R. *Random graph dynamics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [15] FERNHOLZ, D., AND RAMACHANDRAN, V. Cores and connectivity in sparse random graphs. *The University of Texas at Austin, Department of Computer Sciences, technical report TR-04-13* (2004).
- [16] FOUNTOULAKIS, N., KANG, M., KOCH, C., MAKAI, T., ET AL. A phase transition regarding the evolution of bootstrap processes in inhomogeneous random graphs. *The annals of applied probability* 28, 2 (2018), 990–1051.
- [17] JACOD, J., AND SHIRYAEV, A. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, vol. 288. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [18] JANSON, S., AND LUCZAK, M. J. A simple solution to the k -core problem. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 30, 1-2 (2007), 50–62.
- [19] JANSON, S., AND LUCZAK, M. J. Asymptotic normality of the k -core in random graphs. *The annals of applied probability* 18, 3 (2008), 1085–1137.
- [20] JANSON, S., LUCZAK, T., TUROVA, T., AND VALLIER, T. Bootstrap percolation on the random graph $G_{n,p}$. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 22, 5 (2012), 1989–2047.
- [21] KALLENBERG, O., AND KALLENBERG, O. *Foundations of modern probability*, vol. 2. Springer, 1997.
- [22] KEMPE, D., KLEINBERG, J., AND TARDOS, E. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining* (2003), pp. 137–146.

- [23] KLEINBERG, J. Cascading behavior in networks: algorithmic and economic issues. In *Algorithmic game theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 613–632.
- [24] LELARGE, M. Diffusion and cascading behavior in random networks. *Games and Economic Behavior* 75, 2 (2012), 752–775.
- [25] LESKOVEC, J., ADAMIC, L. A., AND HUBERMAN, B. A. The dynamics of viral marketing. *ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB)* 1, 1 (2007), 5–es.
- [26] ŁUCZAK, T. Size and connectivity of the k-core of a random graph. *Discrete Mathematics* 91, 1 (1991), 61–68.
- [27] MOLLOY, M. Cores in random hypergraphs and boolean formulas. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 27, 1 (2005), 124–135.
- [28] MOLLOY, M., AND REED, B. A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Random Structures Algorithms* 6, 2-3 (1995), 161–179.
- [29] MORRIS, S. Contagion. *Review of Economic Studies* 67, 1 (January 2000), 57–78.
- [30] NEWMAN, M. E. J. Spread of epidemic disease on networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 66, 1 (Jul 2002), 016128.
- [31] PASTOR-SATORRAS, R., CASTELLANO, C., VAN MIEGHEM, P., AND VESPIGNANI, A. Epidemic processes in complex networks. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 87 (Aug 2015), 925–979.
- [32] PITTEL, B., SPENCER, J., AND WORMALD, N. Sudden emergence of a giant k-core in a random graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 67, 1 (1996), 111–151.
- [33] RIORDAN, O. The k-core and branching processes. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 17, 1 (2008), 111–136.
- [34] TLUSTY, T., AND ECKMANN, J.-P. Remarks on bootstrap percolation in metric networks. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 42, 20 (2009), 205004.
- [35] VAN DER HOFSTAD, R. *Random graphs and complex networks*, vol. 1. Cambridge university press, 2016.