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Abstract

We study the spread of information on multi-type directed random graphs. In such graphs the vertices are partitioned into distinct types (communities) that have different transmission rates between themselves and with other types. We construct multivariate generating functions and use multi-type branching processes to derive an equation for the size of the large out-components in multi-type random graphs with a general class of degree distributions. We use our methods to analyse the spread of epidemics and verify the results with population based simulations.

1 Introduction

Random graphs \cite{1,2} provide a framework for studying the spread of information in networks; it has been successfully applied to a wide range of dynamical systems such as social networks, epidemic spread and the internet \cite{3,4,5,6}. In many applications, one typically considers a complete graph where any two vertices are connected by a link with a prescribed probability $p$, independently for each pair of vertices. We will refer to such a link between two vertices as "transmission", which means that some information passed between the two vertices, and one often studies the fraction of the graph nodes to which information originating from some vertex is expected to reach. In the language of epidemic spread, which we will be using, such nodes are called "infected". Above a certain threshold value $p = p_c$ one has a giant connected component (GCC) or a large out-component of infected nodes in the case of a directed graph.

We will say that such graphs have a single-type structure, that is, all the vertices are equivalent. While being a good approximation in diverse cases, many real life networks are not complete graphs and take a multi-type structure, that is, the vertices are partitioned to different types (communities) that have a different interaction between themselves and with other types. Some examples of types can be age groups when analysing the spread of the pandemics, municipalities when studying social interactions, and fields of research when viewing the graph of scientific collaborations (see the reviews and books cited above).
A powerful mathematical tool using generating functions has been introduced and applied to single-type graphs in [7]. This tool has since been generalised to various other graphs in the study of percolations [8], and more recently, multi-type graphs with a Poisson degree distribution have been analysed and applied to the study of the pandemic spread in [9]. In [10], a slightly more complex model was considered. In this model, on top of partitioning the population into types corresponding to age cohorts, it was assumed that the different individuals have an activity level that increases their average in and out degrees by a certain factor. However, lacking a powerful analytical tool to find the size of the large out-components of such graphs, the authors assumed a simple distribution where each individual has one of 3 possible activity levels. In [11] the authors consider a slightly more general class of distributions in 2-type graphs to model the spread of sexually transmitted diseases. However, their model does not scale to the case where there are more than 2 types.

The aim of this paper is to generalize the works of [7, 9] by introducing a tool to model and calculate the size of the large out-components of a more general class of multi-type graphs, including Poisson graphs with an arbitrary activity level distribution. In our work we focus on directed graphs as they are more relevant for most of our use-cases. For such graphs one needs to refine the definition of the GCC. One possible approach, as taken in [7], is to look at greatest strongly connected component, i.e. the bow-tie model. However, keeping for instance with the example of the spread of a disease, one is interested in the percentage of the population infected when the disease starts from a small fraction of the population (i.e. in the out-component of those initially infected). We formalise the concept for general graphs and apply our framework in several settings, including a comparison of different activity levels in the multi-type setting considered in [10], and discuss its limitations.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we define the main concepts of our framework and discuss the limitations and assumptions of our model. In section 3, we show how these can be combined to find the size of the large out-components. In section 4, we consider in our framework several examples of multi-type graphs. In section 5, we apply our results to modeling the spread of epidemics. Section 6 is dedicated to a discussion of the results and their implication. In the appendices we outline in detail some technical aspects.

2 The Model and Generating Functions

In this section we lay the ground for the construction of the generating functions of multi-type directed random graphs. We consider \( r \) types of communities, where community \( i \) has size (number of vertices) \( n_i, i = 1, \ldots, r \). We specify the assumptions of our model and explain the rationale behind them. In particular, we assume a "sufficiently independent" distribution of in-out-degree pairs, where both the in and the out degrees are vectors in \( \mathbb{N}^r \), corresponding to the number of incoming/outgoing edges to/from each type. We define large out-components and show a method for computing their size.

2.1 Large Out-Components

We would like the large out-component of our graph to model the spread of an information such as a disease or some other transmission, assuming that it starts from a small fraction of the graph. In other words, we require this component to include those vertices that are likely to be reached when spanning from a small fraction of the vertices when chosen at random.
Definition 1. We say that a vertex $v$ is a member of the large out-component of a graph $G$ if the set of vertices spanned by $v$ on the reversed graph (which we call its in-component) is very large.

As we will see in the next sections, in random graphs, a constant fraction of the vertices would have bounded in-components, while the rest would have very large in-components. If we look at the set spanned by a small fraction of the vertices in the graph, any vertex with a bounded in-component is unlikely to be a member of this spanned set, while a vertex with an unbounded in-component, is unlikely not to have at least one of these starting vertices in its in-component. Therefore, in order to understand the fraction of the graph "easily" spanned, we will need to consider the fraction of the vertices in the graph with large in-degrees.

2.2 Sufficient Independence

A major step in the analysis of [7] is to consider the distribution of the in-degrees of vertices when weighted by their out-degrees, i.e. giving vertices with higher out-degrees a larger weight when averaging. Generalizing this to the multi-type case is not straightforward, since it is not clear how one should take into account the $r$-dimensional multi-type weight. One possible approach is to take the total out-degree, but this can be unreliable. Consider, for instance, the case where one of the types has only incoming edges, and no outgoing ones. Clearly, edges to this type are "dead ends" and should not be taken into account. However weighting vertices by their total out-degree does take such type into account, and can lead us to falsely consider an incorrect distribution on the vertices.

In order to avoid this issue, we will restrict the analysis to cases where it does not matter by which dimension of the out-degree we weigh a vertex. It is possible to generalize this analysis by considering graphs for which this is not the case. This results, however, in a rather complex model that is likely to be irrelevant for most real world use cases where one does not have a sufficiently detailed distribution to begin with. Formally, we will say that a distribution of in/out-degrees, i.e. a distribution of pairs of vectors in $\mathbb{N}^r$, is sufficiently independent if the distributions of the out-degree of a vertex is the same when weighted by any coordinate of its in-degree. Similarly, the in-degrees can be weighted by any of the out-degrees.

Consider a random vertex $v$ of type $i$. Denote by $I_{i,j}$ the distribution of its $j$th in-degree, i.e. the number of edges from vertices of type $j$ to $v$, and by $O_{i,j}$ the distribution of the $j$th out-degree of $v$, i.e. the number of edges going from $v$ to vertices of type $j$. We denote $\bar{I}_i = (I_{i,1}, ..., I_{i,r}), \bar{O}_i = (O_{i,1}, ..., O_{i,r})$. Keeping in mind that $\bar{I}_i$ and $\bar{O}_i$ can be correlated as they are the in and out degrees of the same vertex, our condition for sufficient independence is that for all $i, k, l$ and $\bar{x}$:

$$
\sum_y \frac{y}{\langle O_{i,k} \rangle} \Pr \left[ \bar{I}_i = \bar{x} \land O_{i,k} = y \right] = \sum_z \frac{z}{\langle I_{i,l} \rangle} \Pr \left[ \bar{I}_i = \bar{x} \land O_{i,l} = z \right],
$$

$$
\sum_y \frac{y}{\langle I_{i,k} \rangle} \Pr \left[ \bar{O}_i = \bar{x} \land I_{i,k} = y \right] = \sum_z \frac{z}{\langle I_{i,l} \rangle} \Pr \left[ \bar{O}_i = \bar{x} \land I_{i,l} = z \right],
$$

where $\langle ... \rangle$ is the mean value of the distribution.

Under this assumption, we can define the in/out degree distribution weighted by the out/in degree distribution.
Definition 2. Let $G$ be a sufficiently independent multi-type random graph with in and out degree distributions $I_{i,j}, O_{i,j}$, respectively. We define its biased in/out degree distributions as:

$$\Pr[B\vec{I}_i = \vec{x}] = \sum_y \frac{y}{\langle O_{i,k} \rangle} \Pr \left[ I_i = \vec{x} \land O_{i,k} = y \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

$$\Pr[B\vec{O}_i = \vec{x}] = \sum_y \frac{y}{\langle I_{i,k} \rangle} \Pr \left[ O_i = \vec{x} \land I_{i,k} = y \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

These are well defined even though we did not specify $k$ because of our independence assumption (2.1) and (2.2).

2.3 Multivariate Generating Functions

In order to generalize the results of [7] to the multi-type setting, we will first generalize their analysis of single variable generating functions to the multivariate regime. Working with multivariate generating functions instead of high dimensional probability distributions will allow us to complete our analysis with a greater deal of elegance.

Consider first a random graph with a large number $N$ of single type of vertices. Let $A$ be a random variable that corresponds to the distribution of the degrees of these vertices. Define a generating function by [7]:

$$G_A(z) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} p_{\alpha} z^{\alpha},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

where $p_{\alpha} = \Pr[A = \alpha]$ is the probability that a vertex chosen at random will have a degree $\alpha$. The normalization of the sum of the probabilities to one gives $G_A(1) = 1$. For this reason as well (2.5) is well defined in the range $|z| \leq 1$.

The generating function encodes the information of the probability distribution. The probabilities $p_{\alpha}$ are obtained by appropriate derivatives of (2.5) with respect to $z$ at $z = 0$:

$$p_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\alpha!} \frac{d^\alpha G_A(z)}{dz^\alpha} \bigg|_{z=0},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

while the moments of the distribution are obtained by the derivatives of (2.5) at $z = 1$:

$$\langle \alpha^n \rangle = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} \alpha^n p_{\alpha} = \left( z \frac{d}{dz} \right)^\alpha G_A(z) \bigg|_{z=1}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

In the following we generalize (2.5) in two ways, first by having multi-type vertices making $z$ a vector and second by allowing multiple random variables by making $A$ a vector.

Definition 3 (Multivariate Generating Functions). Let $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^r$ be a random variable whose values are non-negative integer values vectors of dimension $r$ (where $r$ is the number of types in our graph). Its multivariate generating function is:

$$G_A(\vec{z}) = G_A(z_1, \ldots, z_r) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} p_{\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_r} z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_r^{\alpha_r},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)
where \( p_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} = \Pr[A = \vec{\alpha}] \) is the probability that \( A \) has the value \( \vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r) \). Let \( \vec{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_m) \) be a vector of such random variables, \( A_i : \Omega \to \mathbb{N}^r \). We define their \( r \to m \) multivariate generating function as:

\[
G_{\vec{A}}(\vec{z}) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \left( G_{A_1}(\vec{z}), \ldots, G_{A_m}(\vec{z}) \right),
\]

where

\[
G_{A_i}(\vec{z}) = G_{A_i}(z_1, \ldots, z_r) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} p_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_r^{\alpha_r},
\]

with \( p_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} = \Pr[A_i = \vec{\alpha}] \).

The next ingredient in the analysis is the product of the generating functions of independent variables. Consider the products of the generating function in the single-type case \[7\]:

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k} G_{A_i}(z) = \sum_{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k = n, n=0}^{\infty} p_{\alpha_1}^{(1)} \cdots p_{\alpha_k}^{(k)} z^{(\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k)},
\]

where \( p_{\alpha_i}^{(i)} = \Pr[A_i = \alpha_i] \) and the summation is over all the \( k \) partitions of \( n \). We generalize this in the multi-type case as follows.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \( \vec{A}, \vec{B} \) be independent vectors of random variables, i.e. \( A_i \) and \( B_i \) are independent for all \( i \), with \( r \to m \) multivariate generating functions \( G_{\vec{A}}, G_{\vec{B}} \). Let \( \vec{C} = \vec{A} + \vec{B} \) be their sum, \( C_i = A_i + B_i \). Then \( G_{\vec{C}} = G_{\vec{A}} \odot G_{\vec{B}} \), where the \( \odot \) denotes point-wise multiplication.

**Proof.** As in the single-type case \[2.11\] this lemma can be shown by writing the coefficients of \( G_{\vec{A}} \odot G_{\vec{B}} \) directly and seeing that they correspond to a convolution of the coefficients of \( G_{\vec{A}} \) and \( G_{\vec{B}} \).

Consider next the composition of generating functions. In the single type case one has \[7\]:

\[
G_{A}(G_{B}(z)) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} p_{\alpha}(G_{B}(z))^{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} p_{\alpha}(G_{B_1+\ldots+B_n}(z)) . \tag{2.12}
\]

Equation \[2.12\] means that applying the generating function of \( A \) to the generating function of \( B \) is equivalent to producing \( A \) independent copies of the distribution \( B \) and summing over them. This can be generalised to the multivariate case in the following manner.

**Definition 4.** Let \( \vec{A}, \vec{B} \) be vectors of random variables with \( n \to m \) and \( m \to k \) multivariate generating functions \( G_{\vec{A}}, G_{\vec{B}} \) respectively. We define their composition:

\[
G_{\vec{B}}(G_{\vec{A}}(z)) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (G_{B_1}(G_{A}(z)), \ldots, G_{B_k}(G_{A}(z))) . \tag{2.13}
\]

**Lemma 2.2 (Composition Lemma).** Let \( \vec{A}, \vec{B} \) be independent vectors of random variables (i.e. \( A_i \) and \( B_i \) are independent for all \( i \)), with \( r \to m \) and \( m \to k \) multivariate generating functions \( G_{\vec{A}}, G_{\vec{B}} \) respectively. For each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, r\} \), we define the random variable \( C_i \) to be the result of the following random process:
• A vector $\vec{b} \in \mathbb{N}^m$ is chosen according to the distribution $B_i$.
• For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $b_j$ vectors $\vec{a}_1^j, \ldots, \vec{a}_{b_j}^j \in \mathbb{N}^r$ are chosen i.i.d according to the distribution $A_j$.
• The result $C_i$ is the sum over all of these $C_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{\beta=1}^{b_j} a_{\beta}^j$

Then,
\[
G_{C_i}(\vec{z}) = G_{\vec{B}_i}(G_{\vec{A}_i}(\vec{z})) .
\]
Equation (2.14) is a generalization of (2.12).

Proof. For each value of $\vec{b}$ the generating function of the conditional distribution is
\[
G_{C_i|B_i=\vec{b}}(\vec{z}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} (G_{A_j}(\vec{z}))^{b_j},
\]
and the final generating function of $C_i$ is
\[
G_{C_i|B_i=\vec{b}}(\vec{z}) = \sum_{\vec{b} \in \mathbb{N}^m} \Pr[B_i = \vec{b}] G_{C_i|B_i=\vec{b}}(\vec{z}) =
= \sum_{\vec{b} \in \mathbb{N}^m} \Pr[B_i = \vec{b}] \prod_{j=1}^{m} (G_{A_j}(\vec{z}))^{b_j} = G_{\vec{B}_i}(G_{\vec{A}_i}(\vec{z})).
\]

3 Multi-Type Branching Process

In this section we generalize the analysis of [7] from single-type random graphs to multi-type random graphs [9]. We use the multi-type Galton-Watson branching process and derive the equations for the sizes of the large out-components. We show that this is indeed well defined, since a certain fraction of the vertices in the graph will have a large in-component, meaning that any large enough set will span them with high probability.

3.1 Multi-Type Galton-Watson Analysis

Consider an infection originating from a single individual. If, on average, an infected individual tends to infect less than one new individual, it is clearly unlikely that this infection would reach a significant portion of the graph (for instance, since the expectancy of infected individuals is less than 1 allowing us to bound this probability Markov’s inequality).

Even if on average an infected individual tends to infect more than one new individual, the infection can still peter out early on (for instance if the patient zero happens not to be very infectious even though the average patient is infectious). However, once sufficiently many individuals are infected, it becomes extremely unlikely for the disease not to grow (due to the law of large numbers).

This growth will not go completely unchecked, and will end once a large enough percentage of the population was infected and herd immunity is reached. For bounded degree distributions (and degree distributions with a sufficiently small tail) this happens only once at least some constant fraction of the population was infected.
Our goal in what we call a "Galton-Watson analysis" is to find the probability that a randomly chosen vertex will be among those who span a large portion of the graph. Analysing this probability will help us find the portion of the population expected to be in each of these large out-components.

Naturally, this analysis depends on the distribution of the out-degrees of the vertices, but it can also depend on the joint in and out degree distribution. As we will show, when the in and out degree distributions are sufficiently independent, it suffices to know the out-degree distribution and the weighted out-degree distribution in order to find this probability.

Let \( O_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r} O_{i,j} \) denote the distribution of the out-degree of an individual of type \( i \) when chosen uniformly at random. Let \( BO_i \), the biased out-degree distribution, be the out-degree distribution of an individual of type \( i \) when the individual is chosen weighted by his in-degree (see definition 2). Denote \( \vec{O} = (O_1, ..., O_r) \), \( B\vec{O} = (BO_1, ..., BO_r) \) and the corresponding multivariate generating functions by \( G_{\vec{O}} \) and \( G_{B\vec{O}} \).

3.1.1 Neighbors Distribution and the Rate of Expansion

Consider the random variables \( N(d)_{i,j} \) and \( B\vec{N}(d)_{i,j} \) that denote the number of \( d \)th neighbors of a random vertex of type \( i \), that is vertices of distance \( d \) from the it when weighted or not weighted by its in-degree, respectively. We have:

\[
N(1)_{i,j} = O_{i,j}, \quad B\vec{N}(1)_{i,j} = BO_{i,j}.
\] (3.1)

Consider next the \( d = 2 \) case. Neglecting vertices that can be reached from our starting vertex in more than one way, the distribution of the number of second neighbors is the distribution of the sum of the number of first neighbors of each of the first neighbors of our starting vertex. Since the neighbors are independent of each other, we can apply the composition lemma (2.2). We get that the generating function of the distribution of the number of second degree neighbors of a random vertex reads:

\[
G_{\vec{N}(2)}(\vec{z}) = G_{\vec{O}} (G_{B\vec{O}}(\vec{z})) .
\] (3.2)

In the general \( d \)th neighbors case, we have:

\[
G_{B\vec{N}(d)}(\vec{z}) = G_{B\vec{O}} \left( G_{B\vec{N}(d-1)}(\vec{z}) \right),
\] (3.3)

and:

\[
G_{\vec{N}(d)}(\vec{z}) = G_{\vec{O}} \left( G_{B\vec{N}(d-1)}(\vec{z}) \right) = G_{\vec{O}} \left( G^{d-1}_{B\vec{O}}(\vec{z}) \right).
\] (3.4)

These allow us to generalise the definition of \( R_0 \) from SIR models [12] to general graph: When measuring the reproductive index of a disease, a commonly used technique (see e.g. [13 14 15 16]) is to fit the number of infected over time to the closest exponential growth \( I(t) \approx cR_0^d(t), \) where \( d(t) \approx \frac{1}{\tau} \) is the approximate depth of the infection tree at time \( t \) and \( \tau \) is the time it takes a newly infected individual to infect others.

We model the output of such a model using a parameter of the graph we call the rate of expansion. We define the value of this parameter to be the closest fit when comparing the number of neighbors after \( d \) steps to an exponent:

\[
R_0 \overset{def}{=} \lim_{d \to \infty} \left( \mathbb{E} \sum_{i,j} n_i n_j N(d)_{i,j} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} .
\] (3.5)
By its definition, in the case of infectious diseases, this rate defines the speed of the exponential growth of the number of infected individuals.

We can use equation (3.4) to find the value of $R_0$. Let $\bar{\varepsilon}$ be a short vector, then the Taylor expansion reads:

$$G_{\bar{N}(d)} \left( \bar{I} - \bar{\varepsilon} \right) = \bar{I} - M(d)\bar{\varepsilon} \pm O \left( \|\bar{\varepsilon}\|^2 \right) ,$$

where

$$M(d)_{i,j} = \frac{\partial G_{\bar{N}(d)}(\bar{z})}{\partial z_j} \bigg|_{\bar{z}=\bar{I}} .$$

Consider next the Taylor expansion:

$$G_{\bar{N}(d)} \left( \bar{I} - \bar{\varepsilon} \right) = G_{\bar{O}} \left( G_{\bar{B}\bar{O}}^{d-1} \left( \bar{I} - \bar{\varepsilon} \right) \right) = \bar{I} - M_{\bar{O}} M_{\bar{B}\bar{O}}^{d-1} \bar{\varepsilon} \pm O \left( \|\bar{\varepsilon}\|^2 \right) =$$

$$= \bar{I} - \sum_{\lambda \in \text{eig}(M_{\bar{B}\bar{O}})} \lambda^{d-1} M_{\bar{O}} \bar{v}_\lambda \langle \bar{v}_\lambda, \bar{\varepsilon} \rangle ,$$

where:

$$(M_{\bar{O}})_{i,j} = \frac{\partial (G_{\bar{O}})_{i,j}(\bar{z})}{\partial z_j} \bigg|_{\bar{z}=\bar{I}}, \quad (M_{\bar{B}\bar{O}})_{i,j} = \frac{\partial (G_{\bar{B}\bar{O}})_{i,j}(\bar{z})}{\partial z_j} \bigg|_{\bar{z}=\bar{I}} ,$$

and $\bar{v}_\lambda$ is the eigen-vector of $M_{\bar{B}\bar{O}}$ with eigenvalue $\lambda$.

We get:

$$R_0 = \lim_{d \to \infty} \left( \mathbb{E} \sum_{i,j} n_i n_j N(d)_{i,j} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} = \lim_{d \to \infty} \left( \sum_{\lambda \in \text{eig}(M_{\bar{B}\bar{O}})} c(\lambda) \lambda^d \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} = \max_{\lambda \in \text{eig}(M_{\bar{B}\bar{O}})} \{ |\lambda| \} ,$$

where $c(\lambda) = \frac{\langle v_\lambda, \bar{v}_\lambda \rangle}{\lambda \sum_i n_i} = \theta(1)$ as a function of $d$. In section 4 we will derive $G_{\bar{O}}$ and $G_{\bar{B}\bar{O}}$ for Poisson distributions. In this case:

$$G_{\bar{O}}(\bar{z}) = G_{\bar{B}\bar{O}}(\bar{z}) = \exp \left( M (\bar{z} - 1) \right) .$$

This gives us $M_{\bar{B}\bar{O}} = M$, and $R_0 = \max_{\lambda \in \text{eig}(M)} \{ |\lambda| \}$, and this is consistent with the results of [9].

Another commonly used notion of $R_0$ is as a threshold indicator for the spread of a disease: when $R_0 \leq 1$, the large out-component should be negligible and when $R_0 > 1$ the large out-component should be a set fraction of the vertices. This aspect of the reproductive index was considered for multi-type graphs in [9]. In Figure 1 we consider a set of multi-type graphs with values of $R_0$ near 1. It is clear that in the example computed for this figure, our definition of $R_0$ also acts as a threshold indicator. We will comment on this in the discussion section.

### 3.1.2 Spanned Sets

Returning to our main problem, we are interested in the distribution of the sizes of spanned sets in the graph. Let $S_i$ and $BS_i$ be the distributions of the sizes of the sets spanned from uniformly random and weighted vertices of type $i$, respectively. $BS_i$ is well defined, since the distribution of the size of the set spanned from any vertex depends only on its out-degree, and we know how to weight the out-degree distribution by the in-degree due to the sufficient independence of the graph.
Consider the generating functions $G_{\vec{S}}$ and $G_{B\vec{S}}$, analogous to $H_0$ and $H_1$ in [7]. If the connected component originating from a vertex $v$ is far smaller than the size of the graph $N$, then it is unlikely that it will contain any cycles. Therefore, in these cases, the size of the connected component of a vertex is almost always the sum of the sizes of the connected components of its neighbors. Applying the composition lemma once more, we obtain:

\[
G_{\vec{S}}(\vec{z}) = G_{\vec{O}}(G_{B\vec{S}}(\vec{z})),
\]

\[
G_{B\vec{S}}(\vec{z}) = G_{B\vec{O}}(G_{B\vec{S}}(\vec{z})).
\] (3.12)

Given $G_{\vec{O}}$ and $G_{B\vec{O}}$ we could in principle solve \ref{eq:3.12}, first for $G_{B\vec{S}}$ using the second equation and then for $G_{\vec{S}}$ using the first equation. However, this is a complicated task and we will follow and generalize the procedure taken in [7]. From \ref{eq:3.12} we have:

\[
\vec{u} \overset{def}{=} G_{B\vec{S}}(\vec{1}) = G_{B\vec{O}}(G_{B\vec{S}}(\vec{1})) = G_{B\vec{O}}(\vec{u}),
\] (3.13)

and the probability that the connected component originating from a random vertex of type $i$ is not small reads:

\[
p_i = 1 - G_{S_i}(\vec{1}) = 1 - G_{A_i}(G_{B\vec{C}}(\vec{1})) = 1 - G_{A_i}(\vec{u}).
\] (3.14)

### 3.2 Largest Out-Components

In the previous subsection we derived an equation that relates the probability that the connected component originating from a random vertex is large to the parameters of the random graph. This is similar to the question of whether or not a Galton-Watson process will terminate. However, we will be interested in a slightly different question, namely: “what is the size of the largest connected component?” That is, “what is the probability that a random vertex can be reached by a large portion of the graph?”. The difference between these two questions is not important when dealing with undirected graphs where a vertex can be reached by the giant connected component (GCC) if and only if the GCC can be reached by it. When the graph is directed, these questions are interchangeable by reversing the edges of the graph.

Define $I_i$ and $BI_i$ to be the distributions of the in-degrees of a random vertex of type $i$ and the in-degrees weighted by its out-degree, respectively (these are the equivalents of $O$ and $BO$ in the reversed graph). Since our definition of sufficient independence was symmetric, the reversed graph is also sufficiently independent and these are well defined. Similarly, we will define $C_i$ and $BC_i$ to be the distributions of the size of the component that spans a uniformly random and a weighted vertex. These are the equivalent of $S_i$ and $BS_i$ of the reversed graph, and as in the Galton-Watson analysis we may use their generating functions to find the probabilities that they are finite:

\[
\vec{p} = 1 - G_{\vec{I}}(\vec{u}),
\] (3.15)

where

\[
\vec{u} = G_{B\vec{C}}(\vec{1}) = G_{B\vec{I}}(\vec{u}).
\] (3.16)

### 4 Analytical Generating Functions

In this section we will consider various degree distributions, show that they are sufficiently independent, and analytically construct the above generating functions.
4.1 Poisson Distribution

Perhaps the simplest and most commonly studied distribution of degrees of random graphs is the Poisson distribution \[17\]. This has also been the case with multi-type graphs \[20\,18\,10\,9\] and it is therefore a case well worth considering. In \[20\] this model for the spread of a pandemic was proposed and the size of the large out-components was derived, in \[18\], this formula was simplified and made clearer. In \[10\] it has been applied to epidemiological data from the current COVID-19 pandemic and considered a slightly more general distribution. In \[9\] a simple condition for the existence of a giant connected component was proven.

In the case of a multi-variate Poisson degree distribution, each vertex \(u\) of type \(i\) has an edge to each vertex \(v\) of type \(j\) w.p. \(p_{i,j}\). There are \(n_j\) vertices of type \(j\) and \(p_{i,j}\) scales as the inverse of the total population size, thus the distribution of the number of \(j\) neighbors of any \(i\) vertex is close to a Poisson(\(n_j p_{i,j}\)). In the reversed case, the distribution of the number of \(j\) vertices of whom \(u\) is a neighbor is distributed according to a Poisson(\(n_j p_{j,i}\)). Altogether this gives us the generating functions:

\[
G_{Oi}(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq r} G_{O_{i,j}}(z_j) = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq r} G_{\text{Pois}(\lambda = p_j n_j)}(z_j) = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq r} \exp \left( p_{i,j} n_j (z_j - 1) \right) = \exp \left( \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} p_{i,j} n_j (z_j - 1) \right),
\]

and similarly:

\[
G_{I_i}(\mathbf{z}) = \exp \left( \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} p_{j,i} n_j (z_j - 1) \right).
\]

Furthermore, since the in / out degrees are independent, we have \(G_{B\mathbf{I}} = G_{\mathbf{F}}\). Therefore:

\[
G_{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{z}) = G_{B\mathbf{I}}(\mathbf{z}) = \exp \left( P^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{n}) \left( \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{I} \right) \right) = \exp \left( M^T \left( \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{1} \right) \right). \tag{4.3}
\]

From here, we can apply our main theorem to conclude that at the end of the pandemic, the fractions of the different types of the infected population are \(\mathbf{u}\) where

\[
\mathbf{u} = \exp \left( P^T \text{diag}(\mathbf{n}) \left( \mathbf{z} - 1 \right) \right), \tag{4.4}
\]

similar to equation (2.2) of \[20\].

4.2 Graphs with Independent Degree Distributions

In general, if the in-out degree distributions to each type are independent, then the generating function is a product of generating functions:

\[
G_{I_{ij}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} p_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_r^{\alpha_r} = \sum_{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r} p_{\alpha_1} \cdots p_{\alpha_r} z_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots z_r^{\alpha_r} = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} \sum_{\alpha_i} p_{\alpha_i} z_i^{\alpha_i} = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} G_{I_{i,j}}(z_i). \tag{4.5}
\]

Thus for instance, if we consider a 3 type graph whose first type has in-degrees that are distributed according to a Poisson distribution with mean \(\lambda\), a binomial distribution with parameters
\( n, p, \) and an exponential distribution with parameter \( \kappa \), then the multivariate generating function reads:

\[
G_{I_1}(\vec{z}) = G_{Poiss(\lambda)}(z_1) G_{Bin(n,p)}(z_2) G_{Exp(\kappa)}(z_3) = e^{\lambda(z_1-1)} (1 + p z_2 - p)^n \frac{1 - e^{-1/k}}{1 - z_3 e^{-1/k}}. \quad (4.6)
\]

### 4.3 Poisson Matrix with a General Activity Level Distribution

Another type of generalisation of the Poisson matrix distribution was introduced in [10]. In this paper the authors partition the population into 6 age cohorts and model the transfer of a disease between these cohorts by using the multi-type Poisson distribution, with a certain interaction matrix \( M \). Furthermore, they assume each age cohort is in itself partitioned into 3 sub-categories based upon their levels of interaction with others. This leads to a multi-type problem with \( r = 3 \times 6 = 18 \) types, thus requiring to solve an equation in 18 variables.

An easier approach is to consider each age cohort as a single type with a non-Poisson degree distribution. Specifically, we assume as in [10] that each age cohort is made up of three activity levels: 50% of each age cohort have a normal activity level, 25% have a higher activity level (doubling both their probability of being infected and the expected number of secondary infections they will cause) and 25% have a lower activity level (decreasing both their susceptibility and their infectiousness to half that of a normal activity level). Considering each age cohort as a single type, it is easy to see that:

\[
G_{I}(\vec{z}) = \frac{1}{4} \exp \left( \frac{1}{2} M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{4} \exp \left( M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{4} \exp \left( 2 M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right). \quad (4.7)
\]

Each activity level also increases the out-degrees of the vertices, causing a bias proportional to the activity level. Therefore:

\[
G_{BI}(\vec{z}) = \left( \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \right) \left( \frac{1}{8} \exp \left( \frac{1}{2} M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \exp \left( M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{4} \exp \left( 2 M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) \right) = \\
= \frac{1}{9} \exp \left( \frac{1}{2} M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) + \frac{4}{9} \exp \left( M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) + \frac{4}{9} \exp \left( 2 M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right). \quad (4.8)
\]

In the case considered by [10], which was chosen as a simple example that can be easily computed, it is still possible to use the naive approach. However, in larger settings this is likely to prove more difficult. On the other hand, even in the more general case where the activity level of an individual of each type is distributed according to some distribution \( \rho(x) \), one can still use our method to solve for the end of the disease without requiring an optimization over a large number of inputs using the identities:

\[
G_I(\vec{z}) = \int_x \rho(x) \exp \left( x M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) dx, \quad (4.9)
\]

and

\[
G_{BI}(\vec{z}) = \frac{\int_x x \rho(x) \exp \left( x M^T \left( \vec{z} - \vec{1} \right) \right) dx}{\int_x x \rho(x) dx}. \quad (4.10)
\]
Such graphs are sufficiently independent, since the only dependence between the in-degrees and the out-degrees is through the activity levels which are linearly proportional to any single in / out degree.

5 Epidemic Spread

In this section we will use our results to improve and generalise the model proposed in [10] of a pandemic whose spread can be temporarily slowed down. We will first provide a brief description of this model and the numerical methods originally taken to simulate it. We will then simulate a simpler example, showcasing some of our tools. Next, we will use our developed tools to reproduce their results more efficiently and and consider more general degree distributions. Finally, we will compare the results of this model with other models when extended to the multi-type setting.

5.1 A Multi-Type Model

The multi-type model of [10] received much attention and in this subsection we will explore its subtleties. A standard analysis of the spread of a pandemic in a single-type graph might follow one of two approaches. Either the model attempts to find the point at which an uncontrolled pandemic will end its spread by finding the expected size of the GCC or the large out-components of the pandemic’s graph [19], or it attempts to find the herd immunity point at which $R_0 = 1$ [23, 24, 25]. As was shown in [22], finding the point at which $R_0 = 1$ is akin to the outcome of a pandemic with limited intervention.

The model proposed in [10] generalizes this approach to multi-type graphs. It is assumed that some temporary counter-measures are taken that reduce the infectiousness by a multiplicative factor of $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. However, when the counter-measures are lifted, the infectiousness returns to its previous state. The goal of this type of counter-measures is to reach herd immunity with only a small infected population.

If the value of $\alpha$ were to be set to 1, the pandemic would go on as usual and while we would reach herd immunity in the first outbreak, we would still see a great many cases even after $R_0 < 1$. If the value of $\alpha$ were set extremely low, then during the first lockdown we would see no outbreak, but that would not prepare us for the lifting of the restrictions.

By choosing the value of $\alpha$ somewhere in the middle, one can reduce the total infected population, since the first wave will be greatly diminished by the counter-measures and the second wave will be diminished by the resistant population from the first wave. For single type graphs it can be easily shown that the optimal value of $\alpha$ is such that after lifting the restrictions, the value of $R_0$ is exactly 1 and that the resulting total infected population is equal to the forecast of the "$R_0$ model". The authors of [10] assume this also holds for the multi-type scenario and search for this value of $\alpha$ in several different scenarios.

5.2 Large Out-Components of Multi-Type Epidemic Spread

In this section we will model the spread of a pandemic in a multi-type society. Details of the computations are provided in Appendix A. We will first apply the tools to a toy model with 2 types and then we will work with the 6 age cohorts considered in [10], and consider different activity level distributions.
In order to find a solution to equations (3.16), we need to solve a system of nonlinear equations. While in general this may be a difficult problem, in our case we found that continuous optimization techniques tend to converge to the solution. In particular, we use a variant of the gradient descent algorithm detailed in appendix A. In Figure 1 we test our gradient descent on a set of multi-type graphs. We set the basic interaction matrix:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.15 \\ 0.05 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$  

(5.1)

and the distribution of activation levels from [10], and multiplied the interaction matrix by a different factor each time to obtain different values of $R_0$ per equation (3.10). This figure shows both the accuracy of our gradient descent, and the threshold phenomena where $R_0 \leq 1$ corresponds to $\vec{u} = \vec{1}$ being the only root (meaning that there are no large out-components) and $R_0 > 1$ corresponds to a second root moving further from $\vec{1}$ the higher $R_0$ becomes (which translates to larger out-components).

Figure 1: We use the gradient descent algorithm detailed in appendix A to search for the solution to equation (3.16) with the interaction matrix (5.1). We plot a heat-map of $1 + \frac{a}{\|\vec{u} - G_B I(\vec{u})\|}$ where $a,b$ were chosen so that the zeros of $\vec{u} - G_B I(\vec{u})$ would be more visible. The axes correspond to the coordinates of $\vec{u}$, where the closer $\vec{u}$ is to $\vec{1}$, the smaller the large out-component is. The cyan stars indicate the path taken by the gradient descent and the orange circle indicates the output of the optimisation.

In Figure 2 we compare the total infected for these age cohorts with several different activity level distributions. Using equations (3.16), (4.9), (4.10), we compute the expected fractional size of the large out-components of an infectious disease using the population sizes and the interaction matrix from [10], with varying activity level distributions (the dashed lines). We then ran population based simulations for each of these parameter sets (the dots). We performed these computations for the case where the activity level distribution is: uniform over the segment $(0,1)$, a half-Gaussian, a Gamma distribution with parameter $\kappa = 0.1$ and a generalised Pareto distribution with parameter
\( \xi = 0.25 \). In each case we fixed the value of \( R_0 \) to several values in the range \((1, 5)\) (normalising the interaction matrix to produce any specific \( R_0 \)). As we can see, the generalised Pareto and the Gamma distribution which are characterised by their higher variance produce a significantly smaller largest out-component than the uniform and half-Gaussian activity level distributions. This fits with the previous results of [22, 23, 24, 25, 19, 10]. Furthermore, the results of the population based simulations fit the predictions of the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Infected Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half-Gaussian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma Distribution ( (\kappa = 0.1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Pareto ( (\xi = 0.25) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: The expected fractional size of the large out-components of an infectious disease using the population sizes and the interaction matrix from [10], with varying activity level distributions (the dashed lines) compared to population based simulations for each of these parameter sets (the dots). The generalised Pareto and the Gamma distribution which are characterised by their higher variance produce a significantly smaller largest out-component than the uniform and half-Gaussian activity level distributions. The results of the population based simulations fit the predictions of the model.

6 Discussion

Previous results have modeled the spread of information in graphs and diseases in populations for either single-type graphs with general degree distributions [7, 19, 23, 21, 22], or for multi-type graphs limited to Poisson [9, 20, 18] or Poisson-like [10] degree distributions. In this work we derived a method for computing the size of the large out-component of multi-type graphs with a more complex degree distribution and presented an example of its application to the case of epidemiological research.

In [22], the authors compare two types of models for the spread of a disease. The first and more commonly known model is the \( R_0 \) type model which estimates the total infected in the spread of a disease by asking when \( R_0 \) goes below 1. This model best represents the case where the spread of the disease is mitigated by reactive countermeasures that limit the peak infected population. However, if no countermeasures are taken whatsoever, then at the precise moment when \( R_0 \) reaches 1 there
will be many infected individuals. While new infection chains are not expected to grow rapidly, those already infected will continue to infect fewer others resulting in a slowly diminishing after-burn effect which can almost double the total infected population. The second type of models is the GCC type model, which takes into account the after-burn effect. While both models can be resolved for single-type graphs using the methods shown in [22], and for Poisson multi-type graphs as shown in [10], our solution for the general multi-type scenario resolves only the GCC type model. We expect that methods similar to those shown in [10] can be used to generalise our results to solve this class of problems as well and leave it for future work.

Another interesting problem is the role of $R_0$: In our analysis we showed a method by which the concept of a reproductive index (in the sense of the rate by which a disease expands at its onset) can be generalised to classes of random graphs. Furthermore, we gave a formula for $R_0$ and showed that for Poisson multi-type graphs it is equivalent to the formula given by [9]. However, in single-type graphs, the same $R_0$ also plays another role in the study of diseases, it is a predictor of whether an outbreak will occur or not (there should be an outbreak if and only if $R_0 > 1$). It can be easily shown that with our definition of $R_0$ for multi-type graphs, $R_0 > 1$ is a necessary condition for an outbreak. For instance, we can use the convexity of $G_{BI}$ to obtain the following inequality:

$$
\sum_{\lambda \in \text{eig}(M_{BO}^T)} |a_{\lambda}|^2 = \langle \bar{I} - \bar{u}, \bar{I} - \bar{u} \rangle = \langle \bar{I} - \bar{u}, \bar{I} - G_{BI}(\bar{u}) \rangle \leq \langle \bar{I} - \bar{u}, \bar{I} - G_{BI}(\bar{I}) + M_{BI}(\bar{I} - \bar{u}) \rangle = \\
\sum_{\lambda \in \text{eig}(M_{BO}^T)} |a_{\lambda}|^2 \lambda ,
$$

(6.1)

where

$$
\bar{I} - \bar{u} = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{eig}(M_{BO}^T)} a_{\lambda} \bar{v}_{\lambda}
$$

(6.2)

is the spectral decomposition of $\bar{I} - \bar{u}$ to the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $M_{BO}$. For this inequality to hold, we must have $Re(\lambda) > 1$ for at least one of the eigenvalues of $M_{BO}$. However, it still remains to be proven that it is impossible for $R_0$ to be larger than 1 without having an outbreak. So far, this has been proven only for the Poisson distribution in [9].
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In this appendix we detail the numerical algorithms used to produce the results for Figures 1 and 2. These included a continuous optimization technique used for finding the solutions to equation (3.16), and a population based simulation whose results were then compared with the output of the model.

A.1 Gradient Descent

Gradient descent is a technique used for minimizing functions. Its base premise is that by moving against the direction of the gradient of the function, one can most rapidly reduce its value. We utilized this base premise but changed the heuristic by which the distance travelled along this gradient was chosen. Our goal in this choice was to advance as far as possible against the gradient, without running the risk of overshooting the root.

Our strategy was to frame our root finding problem as the minimization of a function which could be approximated by a quadratic form near its roots. We did this by choosing to minimise the function:

$$f(\vec{u}) = \|\vec{u} - G_{B\vec{I}}(\vec{u})\|_2^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.1)

Let $\vec{r}$ be the correct solution and define $\vec{\varepsilon} = \vec{u} - \vec{r}$. Assuming that the Jacobian matrix $J$ of $G_{B\vec{I}}$ at the root is not equal to the identity, our first order approximation for $f$ when $\varepsilon$ is sufficiently small would be:

$$f(\vec{u}) = \|\vec{r} + \vec{\varepsilon} - G_{B\vec{I}}(\vec{r} + \vec{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 \approx \|\vec{r} + \vec{\varepsilon} - G_{B\vec{I}}(\vec{r}) - J\vec{\varepsilon}\|_2^2 = \vec{\varepsilon}^T(I - J)^T(I - J)\vec{\varepsilon}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.2)
We followed these steps to determine how far we went along the gradient at each iteration of the descent. Let \( \vec{u}_n \) be the \( n^{th} \) step of the gradient descent. We define the direction of the step:

\[
\hat{d}_n = \frac{\nabla f(u_n)}{\|\nabla f(u_n)\|}.
\] (A.3)

We then consider the simpler function \( g_n(x) = f(\vec{u}_n + x\hat{d}_n) \). Assuming that \( f \) is indeed close to a quadratic form at \( u_n \), \( g_n \) will also be close to a quadratic form \( g_n(x) \approx ax^2 + bx + c \) (for some \( a, b, c \)). We use the first and second order derivatives of \( g \) at 0 to estimate its minimum \( x_n = -\frac{g_n'(0)}{g_n''(0)} \). However, to be on the safe side we cut the length of the step in half. Putting it all together, this gives us the following formula for the each step of the gradient descent:

\[
\vec{u}_{n+1} = \vec{u}_n + \frac{1}{2}x_n\hat{d}_n.
\] (A.4)

### A.2 Population Based Simulation

We performed population based simulations similar to the ones in [22]. In these simulations we modeled a population of size \( N = 1E6 \) individuals with a certain activity level specified for each experiment. These were then normalised to give the desired \( R_0 \) using equation (3.10). Each individual also carried a state which could be either SUSCEPTIBLE, INFECTED or RECOVERED, and a cohort corresponding to an age group (similar to the age cohorts in [10]). The percentage of the population in each age cohort and the interaction between age cohorts were set according to the data in [10]. A small percentage of the population (100 individuals chosen at random, weighted according to their activity levels) was then set to INFECTED.

From there we set an iterative process where at each step an INFECTED individual \( A \) would set any SUSCEPTIBLE individual \( B \) to INFECTED with probability \( p = A.infectiousness \times B.susceptibility \times InteractionMatrix[A.cohort, B.cohort] \). At the end of the iteration we would set \( A \) to RECOVERED. We repeated this process until the entire population was either SUSCEPTIBLE or RECOVERED, and then counted the SUSCEPTIBLE and RECOVERED individuals.

### A.3 Details of the Models

In all of our models we used the interaction matrix and the relative cohort sizes from [10]. In particular, these age cohorts which correspond to the age groups 0-5, 6-12, 13-19, 20-39, 40-59 and 60+ were assumed to represent 7.25%, 8.66%, 11.24%, 33.23%, 22.67% and 16.95% of the population respectively.

The basic interaction matrix used was:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
2.2257 & 0.4136 & 0.2342 & 0.4539 & 0.2085 & 0.1506 \\
0.4139 & 3.614 & 0.4251 & 0.4587 & 0.2712 & 0.1514 \\
0.2342 & 0.4257 & 2.9514 & 0.6682 & 0.4936 & 0.1972 \\
0.4539 & 0.4592 & 0.6676 & 0.9958 & 0.651 & 0.33 \\
0.2088 & 0.2706 & 0.4942 & 0.6508 & 0.8066 & 0.4341 \\
0.1507 & 0.152 & 0.1968 & 0.3303 & 0.4344 & 0.7136
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

We considered 4 basic distributions of activity levels:
• **Gamma Distribution** with the PDF \( f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(k)\theta^k} x^{k-1} e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}}, \) where \( k \) was set to 0.1 (as in [22]) and \( \theta \) was scaled for the desired \( R_0 \).

• **Generalised Pareto Distribution** with the PDF \( f(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma} (1 + \zeta \frac{x-\mu}{\sigma})^{-(1/\zeta+1)}, \) where \( \mu \) and \( \zeta \) were set to 0 and 0.25 respectively and \( \sigma \) was scaled for the desired \( R_0 \).

• **Half Normal Distribution** with the PDF \( f(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi \sigma}} \exp \left( -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma} \right) \) (for all \( x > 0 \)), where \( \sigma \) was scaled for the desired \( R_0 \).

• **Uniform Distribution** with the PDF \( f(x) = \frac{1}{L} \) for all \( x \) in the segment \([0, L]\) and 0 otherwise, where \( L \) was scaled for the desired \( R_0 \).