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We derive the most basic dynamical properties of random hyperbolic graphs (the distributions of contact and intercontact durations) in the hot regime (network temperature \( T > 1 \)). We show that in the thermodynamic limit the contact distribution decays as a power law with exponent \( 2 + T > 3 \) for durations \( t > T \), while for \( t < T \) it exhibits exponential-like decays. This result holds irrespective of the expected degree distribution, as long as it has a finite \( T^{\text{th}} \) moment. Otherwise, the contact distribution depends on the expected degree distribution and we show that if the latter is a power law with exponent \( \gamma \in [2, T + 1] \), then the former decays as a power law with exponent \( \gamma + 1 > 3 \). On the other hand, the intercontact distribution exhibits power-law decays with exponent \( 2 - T \in (0, 1) \) for \( T \in (1, 2) \), while for \( T > 2 \) it displays linear decays with a slope that depends on the observation interval. This result holds irrespective of the expected degree distribution as long as it has a finite \( T^{\text{th}} \) moment if \( T \in (1, 2) \), or a finite second moment if \( T > 2 \). Otherwise, the intercontact distribution depends on the expected degree distribution and if the latter is a power law with exponent \( \gamma \in (2, 3) \), then the former decays as a power law with exponent \( 3 - \gamma \in (0, 1) \). Thus, hot random hyperbolic graphs can give rise to contact and intercontact distributions that both decay as power laws. These power laws however are unrealistic for the case of the intercontact distribution, as their exponent is always less than one. These results suggest that hot random hyperbolic graphs are not adequate null models for real temporal networks, in stark contrast to cold random hyperbolic graphs \((T < 1)\). Since the configuration model emerges at \( T \to \infty \), these results also suggest that this is not an adequate null temporal network model either.

I. INTRODUCTION

It has been shown that random hyperbolic graphs (RHGs) are adequate models for real-world complex networks, as they naturally and simultaneously possess many of their common structural characteristics, including heterogeneous degree distributions, strong clustering and the small-world property, cf. [1–6]. The vast majority of existing work has focused on structural properties of network snapshots, i.e., of static graphs, where it has been shown that RHGs are adequate models only in the so-called “cold regime”, where the network temperature \( T \) in the model takes values between zero and one. This is because only when \( T \in (0, 1) \) RHGs can have strong clustering, as observed in real systems. In particular, clustering in RHGs is maximized at \( T = 0 \), it decreases to zero with \( T \in [0, 1) \), and it is asymptotically zero for \( T > 1 \) [2, 7]. At \( T = 1 \) there is a phase transition in RHGs, and for \( T > 1 \) RHGs are in the “hot regime” [2].

Motivated by the common dynamical properties observed across different human proximity networks, such as the broad distributions of contact and intercontact durations [8–11], the basic dynamical properties of cold RHGs have been recently analyzed in Ref. [12]. In particular, it has been shown that sequences of independent network realizations constructed by the RHG model in the cold regime exhibit power-law contact and intercontact distributions, with corresponding exponents \( 2 + T \in (2, 3) \) and \( 2 - T \in (1, 2) \), irrespective of the distribution of expected node degrees [12]. These distributions are compatible with contact and intercontact distributions found in real human proximity networks, which roughly follow power laws (with or without exponential cutoffs) [9–11, 13, 14]. Further, the exponents of these distributions in cold RHGs lie within the ranges observed in real systems. In particular, studies have reported power-law exponents larger than or close to two for the contact distribution [15–16], and between one and two for the intercontact distribution [10, 13, 14, 17]. In general, cold RHGs have been found adequate for realistically modeling human proximity networks, as also corroborated by the observation that epidemic and rumor spreading processes perform remarkably similar in real and modeled systems [12].

Snapshots of human proximity networks are often very sparse, consisting of a small number of interacting (i.e., non-zero degree) nodes, cf. [12]. Clustering in such snapshots is often close to zero, which raises the question of whether RHGs in the hot regime can also be adequate models for such networks. Motivated by this question, we derive the contact and intercontact distributions in temporal hot RHGs. We show that asymptotically the contact distribution decays as a power law with exponent \( 2 + T > 3 \) for durations \( t > T \), while for \( t < T \) it exhibits exponential-like decays. This result holds irrespective of the expected degree distribution, as long as it has a finite \( T^{\text{th}} \) moment. Otherwise, the contact distribution depends on the expected degree distribution and we show that if the latter is a power law with exponent \( \gamma \in (2, T + 1) \), then the former decays as a power law with exponent \( \gamma + 1 > 3 \). On the other hand, the
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intercontact distribution exhibits power-law decays with exponent $2 - T \in (0, 1)$ for $T \in (1, 2)$, while for $T > 2$ it displays linear decays with a slope that depends on the observation interval. This result holds irrespective of the expected degree distribution as long as it has a finite $T^{th}$ moment if $T \in (1, 2)$, or a finite 2nd moment if $T > 2$. Otherwise, the intercontact distribution depends on the expected degree distribution and we show that if the latter is a power law with exponent $\gamma \in (2, 3)$, then the former decays as a power law with exponent $3 - \gamma \in (0, 1)$.

Thus, hot RHGs can give rise to contact and intercontact distributions that both decay as power laws. These power laws have always exponents greater than three in the case of the contact distribution, and less than one in the case of the intercontact distribution. Power-law intercontact distributions with exponents less than one are non-normalizable (in a sense that will become precise in Sec. IV), and have not been observed in real systems. Our results therefore suggest that hot RHGs are not adequate models for real temporal networks (as we cannot realistically fix the exponent of the intercontact distribution in them), in stark contrast to cold RHGs [12]. Since the configuration model [15, 19] emerges at $T \to \infty$ [2], our results also suggest that this is not an adequate null network model from [2] and give the precise definition in them), in stark contrast to cold RHGs [12]. Since the configuration model [15, 19] emerges at $T \to \infty$ [2], our results also suggest that this is not an adequate null network model either. Our findings corroborate earlier results suggesting that only cold RHGs are adequate models for real networks, as they can reproduce both the amount of clustering in network snapshots, as well as the abundance of recurrent components in temporal networks [12, 20]. Here, we reach the same conclusion but from a different perspective; that of (inter)contact distributions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section we provide an overview of RHGs starting from their equivalent formulation, i.e., the $S^1$ model [2, 21], focusing in the hot regime. We also overview the dynamic-$S^1$ model from [12] and give the precise definitions of the contact and intercontact distributions. In Secs. III and IV we analyze the contact and intercontact distributions in hot RHGs and in two paradigmatic infinite-temperature limits (the configuration model with power-law distributed expected degrees and classical random graphs [22]). We conclude the paper with discussion in Sec. V.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. $S^1$ model/RHGs in the hot regime

In the $S^1$ model [2] each node has hidden variables $\kappa, \theta$. The hidden variable $\kappa$ determines the node’s expected degree in the resulting network. The hidden variable $\theta$ is the angular similarity coordinate of the node on a circle of radius $R = N/2\pi$, where $N$ is the total number of nodes. To construct a network with the $S^1$-model that has size $N$, average node degree $\bar{k}$, and temperature $T > 0$, we perform the following steps according to the $S^1$-model definition:

1. Coordinate assignment: for each node $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, sample its angular coordinate $\theta_i$ uniformly at random from $[0, 2\pi]$, and its degree variable $\kappa_i$ from a probability density function (PDF) $\rho(\kappa)$;

2. Creation of edges: connect every pair of nodes $i, j$ with the Fermi-Dirac connection probability

\[ p(\chi_{ij}) = \frac{1}{1 + \chi_{ij}^{1/T}}. \]

In the last expression, $\chi_{ij}$ is the effective distance between nodes $i$ and $j$

\[ \chi_{ij} = \frac{R\Delta\theta_{ij}}{\mu\kappa_i\kappa_j}, \]

where $\Delta\theta_{ij} = |\pi - |\theta_i - \theta_j||$ is the similarity distance between nodes $i$ and $j$. We note that since $\theta$ is uniformly distributed on $[0, 2\pi]$, the PDF of $\Delta\theta$ is the uniform PDF on $[0, \pi]$, $f(\Delta\theta) = 1/\pi$.

Parameter $\mu$ in (2) is derived from the condition that the expected degree in the network is indeed $\bar{k}$. In the hot regime ($T > 1$), and for sparse networks ($N \gg \bar{k}$), we have

\[ \mu = \frac{k^T(1 - 1/T)^T}{2NT^{-1}(\kappa^{1/T})^{2T}}, \]

where $\kappa^{1/T} = \int \kappa^{1/T}\rho(\kappa)d\kappa$. Further, the expected degree of a node with hidden variable $\kappa$ is

\[ \bar{k}(\kappa) = \frac{\bar{k}}{\kappa^{1/T}}\kappa^{1/T}. \]

The $S^1$ model is equivalent to RHGs, i.e., to the $H^2$ model [2], after transforming the degree variables $\kappa$ to radial coordinates $r$ via

\[ r = \bar{R} - 2\ln \frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}, \]

where $\kappa_0$ is the smallest $\kappa$, while $\bar{R}$ is the radius of the hyperbolic disk where all nodes reside. In hot RHGs, $\bar{R} = 2T\ln(N/\nu)$, where $\nu = (\pi\mu\kappa_0^2)^{1/T}N^{\mu - 1/T}$. After this change of variables, the effective distance in (2) becomes

\[ \chi_{ij} = e^{(\chi_{ij} - \bar{R})/2}, \]

Eq. (6) gives approximately the hyperbolic distance between nodes $i$ and $j$. See Ref. [2] for further details.

Instead of working directly with the $H^2$ model, we will be working with the more convenient $S^1$ model and in particular with its alternative formulation that we describe next.
B. Alternative formulation of the $S^1$ model that uses expected degrees

Instead of sampling and fixing for each node $i$ its hidden degree variable $\kappa_i$ in step (1) of the $S^1$ model definition, we can instead sample and fix its expected degree $k_i = \bar{k}(\kappa_i)$. Requiring that (4) holds, the corresponding $\kappa_i$ is

$$\kappa_i = \left(\frac{k^{1/T}}{\bar{k}}\right)^Tk_i^T. \quad (7)$$

Substituting the $\kappa_i$ and $\kappa_j$ in (2) with their above expression, we can re-write the effective distance between two nodes $i$ and $j$ as

$$\chi_{ij} = \frac{R\Delta\theta_{ij}}{\bar{k}k^Tk_j}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\bar{k} = \frac{(1 - 1/T)^T}{2NT - 1kT}. \quad (9)$$

Further, the connection probability in (1) can be re-written as

$$p(k_i, k_j, \Delta\theta_{ij}) = \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{\Delta\theta_{ij}}{\bar{k}}\right)^{1/T}\frac{Nk}{(1 - 1/T)k_i k_j}}. \quad (10)$$

Therefore, in this formulation we sample the nodes' angular coordinates and expected degrees, and connect each pair of nodes $i, j$ according to the probability in (10). We note that the distribution of the $\kappa$ is not explicitly fixed here, but implicitly imposed by the distribution of the $k$. For instance, if we sample the $k_i$ from a power-law, $\bar{\rho}(k) \propto k^{-\gamma}$, then the distribution of the $\kappa_i$ will also be a power law, $\rho(\kappa) \propto \kappa^{-\gamma}$, but with $\gamma = (\gamma - 1)/T + 1$. We work with this alternative formulation as we can explicitly fix it in the distribution of expected degrees. We also note that such formulation is not necessary in the cold regime, since there we have $k \propto \kappa$, instead of $k \propto k^{1/T}[2]$. In other words, in contrast to the hot regime, in the cold regime the distribution of the $k$ is the same as the distribution of the $\kappa$.

C. Limit to the configuration model and to classical random graphs

For $T \to \infty$ the connection probability in (10) converges to

$$p(k_i, k_j) = \frac{1}{1 + Nk/(k_i k_j)} \quad (11)$$

which is the connection probability in the configuration model (the ensemble of graphs with given expected degrees $[2, 18, 19]$). In this limit, only the nodes' expected degrees matter, while the similarity distances among the nodes are completely ignored. If we further let $k_i = \bar{k}$ for all nodes $i$, then the connection probability in (11) reduces to

$$p = \frac{1}{1 + N\bar{k}}. \quad (12)$$

In this case, the nodes' expected degrees do not matter either (as they are all the same) and the connection probability becomes the connection probability in classical random graphs $G_{N,p} [22]$, where each of the $N(N - 1)/2$ pairs of $N$ nodes is connected with the same probability $p = \bar{k}/N$.

D. Dynamic-$S^1$ model

The dynamic-$S^1$ model [12] models a sequence of network snapshots, $G_t$, $t = 1, \ldots, \tau$. Each snapshot is a realization of the $S^1$ model. Therefore, there are $N$ nodes that are assigned hidden variables $\kappa, \theta$ as in the $S^1$ model, which remain fixed. The temperature $T$ is also fixed, while in general each snapshot $G_t$ can have a different average degree $\bar{k}_t, t = 1, \ldots, \tau$. The snapshots are generated according to the following simple rules:

1. at each time slot $t = 1, \ldots, \tau$, snapshot $G_t$ starts with $N$ disconnected nodes;
2. each pair of nodes $i, j$ connects with probability given by (1);
3. at time slot $t + 1$, all the edges in snapshot $G_t$ are deleted and the process starts over again to generate snapshot $G_{t+1}$.

To facilitate the analysis we assume that $\bar{k}_t = \bar{k}, \forall t$, i.e., that all snapshots have the same average degree $\bar{k}$. We also assign expected degrees $k$ to nodes (instead of hidden degree variables $\kappa$) and connect each pair of nodes in each time slot according to the probability in (10). In the configuration model and classical random graphs, we connect each pair of nodes in each time slot according to the probability in (11) and (12), respectively.

We note that the snapshots generated by the dynamic-$S^1$ are conditionally independent given the nodes' hidden variables, but not independent. In other words, even though each snapshot $G_t$ is constructed anew, there are correlations among the snapshots induced by the nodes' effective distances $\chi_{ij}$. In particular, nodes at smaller effective distances have higher chances of being connected in each snapshot. Such correlations also exist in the configuration model, while there are no correlations among the snapshots in classical random graphs.

In Ref. [12] the contact and intercontact distributions in the dynamic-$S^1$ have been analyzed in the cold regime. The contact distribution is the distribution of the number of consecutive time slots that a pair of nodes is in contact,
i.e., connected. The intercontact distribution is the distribution of the number of consecutive time slots separating two contacts between the same pair of nodes. Next, we analyze these two distributions in the hot regime. We begin with the contact distribution.

III. CONTACT DISTRIBUTION

Consider the probability to observe a sequence of exactly \( t \) consecutive slots, where two nodes \( i \) and \( j \) with expected degrees \( k_i \) and \( k_j \) and angular distance \( \Delta \theta_{ij} \) are connected, \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, \tau - 2 \). This probability, denoted by \( r_c(t; k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij}) \), is the percentage of observation time \( \tau \) where we observe a slot where these two nodes are not connected, followed by \( t \) slots where they are connected, followed by a slot where they are again not connected \[23\].

For each duration \( t \), there are \( \tau - t - 1 \) possibilities where this duration can be realized. For instance, if \( t = 2 \) the two nodes can be disconnected in slot \( s-1 \), connected in slots \( s \) and \( s+1 \), and disconnected in slot \( s+2 \), where \( s = 2, \ldots, \tau - 2 \). Therefore, the percentage of observation time where a duration of \( t \) slots can be realized is

\[
g_r(t) \equiv \frac{\tau - t - 1}{\tau}. \tag{13}\]

Clearly, for any finite \( t \), \( g_r(t) \to 1 \) for \( \tau \to \infty \). Since two nodes \( i \) and \( j \) are connected in each slot with probability \( p(k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij}) \) given by \[10\], we can write

\[
r_c(t; k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij}) = g_r(t)p(k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij})^t \times [1 - p(k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij})]^{\tau - t}. \tag{14}\]

The contact distribution, \( P_c(t) \), gives the probability that two nodes are connected for exactly \( t \) consecutive slots, given that \( t \geq 1 \)

\[
P_c(t) = \frac{r_c(t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{\tau-2} r_c(j)}. \tag{15}\]

In the above relation, \( r_c(t) \) is obtained by removing the condition on \( k_i, k_j \) and \( \Delta \theta_{ij} \) from \[14\],

\[
r_c(t) = \int \int \int r_c(t; k, k', \Delta \theta) \times \rho(k)\rho(k')f(\Delta \theta)dkdk'd\Delta \theta, \tag{16}\]

where \( \rho(k) \) denotes the PDF of \( k \), while \( f(\Delta \theta) = 1/\pi \) is the PDF of \( \Delta \theta \). We note that since \( P_c(t) \propto r_c(t) \) we sometimes refer to \( r_c(t) \) as “contact distribution”.

Removing the condition on \( \Delta \theta_{ij} \) from \[14\], gives

\[
r_c(t; k_i, k_j) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi r_c(t; k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta)d\Delta \theta
\]

\[
= g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} \frac{N^2k_i^2}{(1 - 1/T)^2k_i^2k_j^2} \times 2F_1 \left[ \frac{t + 2}{T + 2}; T + 3; -\frac{Nk_i}{(1 - 1/T)k_j} \right], \tag{17}\]

where \( 2F_1[a, b; c; z] \) is the Gauss hypergeometric function \[24\]. To obtain \( r_c(t) \) we need to remove the condition on \( k_i \) and \( k_j \) from \[17\],

\[
r_c(t) = \int \int r_c(t; k, k')\rho(k)\rho(k')dkdk'. \tag{18}\]

However, \[17\] is not in closed-form, which renders analytic calculations of the integral in \[18\] non-obvious, and dependent on the form of \( \rho(k) \). An exception is the simplest case, \( \rho(k) = \delta(k - k') \), where \( \delta \) is the dirac delta function. In that case, \( r_c(t) = r_c(t; k', k') \). Yet, the shape of \( r_c(t; k', k') \) is still not apparent, and dependent on the values of \( N, \bar{k} \) and \( T \).

Given the above considerations, we do not analyze \[18\] for any network size \( N \). Instead, we analyze \[18\] in the thermodynamic limit (\( N \to \infty \)). In other words, we are interested in finding and analyzing the function to which the following limit converges

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} r_c(t) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \int \int r_c(t; k, k')\rho(k)\rho(k')dkdk'. \tag{19}\]

Analytic results at the above limit can approximate \( r_c(t) \) in sufficiently sparse networks. Below, we show that a generic analysis of \[19\] that does not depend on the form of \( \rho(k) \) is possible as long as \( \rho(k) \) has a finite \( T \)th moment.

A. Expected degree distributions with finite \( T \)th moment

If the distribution of expected degrees \( \rho(k) \) has a finite \( T \)th moment, i.e., the moment

\[
\frac{1}{k^T} = \int k^T \rho(k)dk \tag{20}\]

is finite, then we can exchange the order of the limit with the integral in \[19\] (see Appendix A). Therefore, we can first compute the \( \lim_{N \to \infty} r_c(t; k, k') \) and then perform the integration over \( k \) and \( k' \).

Ignoring the prefactor \( g_r(t) \), the dominant term in the Taylor series expansion of \[17\] for \( N \to \infty \) is

\[
\frac{TT(T + 2)(1 - 1/T)^T}{N^2T^T} \frac{\Gamma(t - T)}{\Gamma(t + 2)} k_i^T k_j^T + \frac{T}{T - t} \frac{(1 - 1/T)^t}{N^2T^t} k_i^t k_j^t, \tag{21}\]
where $\Gamma$ is the gamma function. We can identify the following two regimes. If $t > T$, then the first term in (21) dominates for $N \to \infty$, and we can write

$$r_c(t; k_i, k_j) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \frac{TT(T+2)(1-1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \frac{\Gamma(t-T)}{\Gamma(t+2)} \times k_i^T k_j^T.$$

(22)

On the other hand, if $t < T$, then the second term in (21) dominates, and we have

$$r_c(t; k_i, k_j) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \frac{T}{T-t} \frac{(1-1/T)^t}{N^T k^T} k_i^T k_j^T.$$

(23)

The corresponding expression for $t = T$ can be obtained by computing the limit of (21) for $t \to T$. Removing now the condition on $k_i$ and $k_j$ from (22) and (23), yields

$$r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \frac{TT(T+2)(1-1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \frac{\Gamma(t-T)}{\Gamma(t+2)} \times g_r(t) \frac{\Gamma(t-T)}{\Gamma(t+2)} \times k_i^T k_j^T.$$

(24)

for $t > T$, while for $t < T$

$$r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \frac{T}{T-t} \frac{(1-1/T)^t}{N^T k^T}.$$

(25)

For $t \ll \tau$, $g_r(t) \approx 1$, while $\Gamma(t-T)/\Gamma(t+2) \approx t^{-(2+T)}$ for $t \gg T$. Therefore, from (24), the contact distribution decays as a power law with exponent $2 + T$,

$$P_c(t) \propto \frac{1}{t^{2+T}},$$

(26)

for $T \ll t \ll \tau$. This behavior is similar as in the cold regime, where $P_c(t)$ also decays as a power law with exponent $2 + T$, irrespective of the form of $\rho(k)$ [12]. However, in the cold regime the exponent $2 + T$ is between two and three, while here it is greater than three. Further, in the cold regime this result holds as long as $\tilde{k}$ is finite, while here it holds if $\tilde{k}^T$ is finite.

For $t < T$, the form of $P_c(t)$ depends on the form of $\rho(k)$, as it depends on the moments $\tilde{k}^T$, see (25). In the simplest case, $\rho(k) = \delta(k - \tilde{k})$, and (25) gives

$$r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \frac{T}{T-t} \eta^{-t},$$

(27)

where

$$\eta \equiv \frac{N}{(1-1/T)\tilde{k}}.$$

(28)

As another example, if $\rho(k)$ is the exponential distribution, $\rho(k) = (1/\tilde{k}) e^{-k/\tilde{k}}$, then $\tilde{k}^t = \tilde{k}^t \Gamma(t+1)$, and (25) yields

$$r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \frac{TT(t+1)^2}{T-t} \eta^{-t}.$$

(29)

Finally, if $\rho(k)$ is a power law, $\rho(k) = k_0^{-\gamma-1}(\gamma-1)k^{-\gamma}$, $k \geq k_0$, $\gamma > 2$, then its $T$th moment is finite only if $\gamma > T + 1$. Noting that $\tilde{k} = k_0^{1/(\gamma-2)}$, in this case for $t < T$ we have

$$\tilde{k}^t = \tilde{k}^t \left(\frac{\gamma-2}{\gamma-1}\right)^t \frac{\gamma-1}{\tau-1},$$

(30)

while (25) yields

$$r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \frac{T(\gamma-1)^{2-2t}(\gamma-2)^{2t}}{(T-t)(\gamma-1)^2} \eta^{-t}.$$

(31)

We observe that all relations, (27), (29) and (31), contain the exponentially-decaying term $\eta^{-t}$, which is multiplied by some additional $t$-dependent factors. In Fig. 1(a,b) we validate the above analysis with simulations.

### B. Expected degree distributions with non-finite $T$th moment

If $\rho(k)$ does not have a finite $T$th moment, then we cannot exchange the order of the limit with the integral in (19) (Appendix A). Therefore, we have to (attempt to) compute the integral in (18) for the specific $\rho(k)$ we are interested in, and then compute its limit for $N \to \infty$. Below, we perform this analysis for the case of power-law distributed expected degrees, $\rho(k) = k_0^{-\gamma-1}(\gamma-1)k^{-\gamma}$, $k \geq k_0$, $\gamma > 2$.

Performing the integration in (18) yields the following long but exact expression, which holds for any network size $N$

$$r_c(t) = g_r(t) \frac{N^2 \tilde{k}^T \tilde{k}^T (\gamma-1)^2}{k_0(T-1)^2(1+T-\gamma)^2} \left[ \frac{\Gamma(T+2)}{\Gamma(T+3)} \sum_{j=0}^{2} F_1 \left[ t+2, T+2; T+3; -\frac{N \tilde{k}}{(1-1/T)k_0^2} \right] \right]$$

$$- \frac{\Gamma(\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(\gamma+2)} \sum_{j=0}^{2} F_1 \left[ t+2, \gamma + j; \gamma + j; -\frac{N \tilde{k}}{(1-1/T)k_0^2} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{(1+T-\gamma)}{(\gamma+1)^2} \sum_{j=0}^{2} F_2 \left[ t+2, \gamma + j; \gamma + j; \gamma + j + 1; -\frac{N \tilde{k}}{(1-1/T)k_0^2} \right],$$

(32)
where \( 3F_2[a_1, a_2, a_3; b_1, b_2; z] \) is the generalized hypergeometric function [24]. After performing the Taylor series expansion of \( 3F_2 \) for \( N \to \infty \), we can identify the following three regimes:

(R1) for \( t < T \) and \( t < \gamma - 1 \), we get the limit in (31):

(R2) for \( T < t \) and \( T < T + 1 \), we get the limit in (24):

(R3) for \( \gamma < T + 1 \) and \( t > \gamma - 1 \), we get the following limit

\[
  r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} \frac{g_r(t)\Gamma(\gamma + 1)\eta^{-(\gamma - 1)}\ln \eta(\gamma - 1)^2}{(\gamma - 2)^2} \\
  \times \frac{T(\gamma - 1)^2}{(\gamma - 1)^2(\gamma - 2)^2(\gamma - 1)(\gamma - 2)\Gamma(\gamma + 1)} \\
  \times \frac{\Gamma(t + 1 - \gamma)}{\Gamma(t + 2)}. \tag{33}
\]

We note that for \( \gamma > T + 1 \), the \( T \)th moment of \( \rho(k) \) is finite, and regimes (R1) and (R2), found also by the analysis of Sec. III A, apply. On the other hand, in regime (R3), \( \gamma < T + 1 \), and thus the \( T \)th moment of \( \rho(k) \) is not finite. This regime did not emerge in the analysis of Sec. III A. We also note that (R1) applies if \( \gamma < T + 1 \) and \( t < \gamma - 1 \).

For \( t \ll \tau \), \( g_r(t) \approx 1 \), while \( \Gamma(t + 1 - \gamma)/\Gamma(t + 2) \approx t^{-(\gamma + 1)} \) for \( t \gg \gamma \). Therefore, in (R3) the contact distribution decays as a power law with exponent \( \gamma + 1 \),

\[
P_c(t) \propto \frac{1}{t^{\gamma + 1}}, \tag{34}
\]

for \( \gamma \ll t \ll \tau \). Since \( \gamma > 2 \), the exponent of this power law is again larger than three, while there is no analogous behavior in the cold regime [12]. Fig. 1(c) validates regime (R3) with simulations, while Fig. 2 provides a schematic overview of the three contact distribution regimes.

We note that (32) does not hold for \( \gamma = T + 1 \). The corresponding relation for \( \gamma = T + 1 \) can be obtained by letting \( T = \gamma - 1 \) in (17), and then performing the integration in (18). In this case, for \( N \to \infty \) we get regime (R1) for \( t < \gamma - 1 \), while for \( t > \gamma - 1 \) we get

\[
r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t)\Gamma(\gamma + 1)\eta^{-(\gamma - 1)} \left[ \ln \frac{\eta(\gamma - 1)^2}{(\gamma - 2)^2} \right] \\
\times (\gamma - 1)^3(\gamma - 2)(\gamma - 1)^2(\gamma - 2)^2 \frac{\Gamma(t + 1 - \gamma)}{(t + 2)\Gamma(t + 2)}, \tag{35}
\]

which is similar to (R3).

C. Contact distribution in the configuration model

The contact distribution in the configuration model for \( N \to \infty \) can be obtained by letting \( T \to \infty \) in the corresponding finite-\( T \) relations. Let us consider again the case of power-law distributed expected degrees. Since \( T \to \infty \), only regimes (R1) and (R3) from Sec. III B are relevant. For \( t < \gamma - 1 \), \( r_c(t) \) is obtained by letting \( T \to \infty \) in (51),

\[
r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t)\Gamma(\gamma + 1)\frac{(\gamma - 1)^2(\gamma - 2)^2}{(\gamma - 1)^2(\gamma - 2)^2} \frac{\left( N/\bar{k} \right)^t}{k^t}. \tag{36}
\]

For \( t > \gamma - 1 \), \( r_c(t) \) is obtained by letting \( T \to \infty \) in (33),

\[
r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t)\Gamma(\gamma + 1)\frac{(\gamma - 1)^2(\gamma - 2)^2}{(\gamma - 1)^2(\gamma - 2)^2} \frac{\left( N/\bar{k} \right)^t}{k^t} \\
\times (\gamma - 1)^3(\gamma - 2)(\gamma - 1)^2(\gamma - 2)^2 \frac{\Gamma(t + 1 - \gamma)}{(t + 2)\Gamma(t + 2)} \times \frac{\Gamma(t + 1 - \gamma)}{\Gamma(t + 2)}. \tag{37}
\]

FIG. 1. Contact distribution in simulated networks with the dynamic-S\(^3\) model vs. theoretical predictions given by (15). The number of nodes is \( N = 2000 \), the average node degree is \( \bar{k} = 6 \), the network temperature \( T \) is shown in the legends and \( \tau = 100 \). The theoretical predictions are given by the solid and dashed/dotted lines. In (a), the distribution of expected degrees is \( \rho(k) = \delta(k - \bar{k}) \), and \( r_c(t) \) is given by (27) for contact durations \( t < T \), and by (24) for \( t > T \). In (b), the distribution of expected degrees is power law, \( \rho(k) \propto k^{-\gamma} \), with \( \gamma > T + 1 \) (shown in the legend); in this case the \( T \)th moment of \( \rho(k) \) is finite, and \( r_c(t) \) is given by (31) for \( t < \gamma - 1 \), and by (33) for \( t > \gamma - 1 \). The simulation results are averages over five runs and empirical distributions with durations \( t \geq 10 \) have been binned logarithmically. All axes are in logarithmic scale.
Therefore, \( P_c(t) \propto t^{-(\gamma+1)} \) for \( \gamma \ll t \ll \tau \). The non-thermodynamic-limit relation for \( r_c(t) \) can be obtained by letting \( T \to \infty \) in \( \text{[32]} \),

\[
 r_c(t) = g_r(t) \frac{N^2 k^2 (\gamma - 1)^2}{k_0^4 (\gamma + 1)^2} \times 3 F_2 \left[ t + 2, \gamma + 1, \gamma + 1; \gamma + 2, \gamma + 2; -\frac{Nk}{k_0^2} \right]. \tag{38}
\]

**D. Contact distribution in classical random graphs**

Finally, the contact distribution in classical random graphs for \( N \to \infty \) can be obtained by letting \( T \to \infty \) in \( \text{[27]} \),

\[
r_c(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \left( \frac{N}{k} \right)^{-t}. \tag{39}
\]

We can also deduce the above thermodynamic-limit expression directly from the non-thermodynamic-limit relation for \( r_c(t) \). In classical random graphs the connection probability is \( p \approx k/N \), while \( \text{[14]} \) becomes

\[
r_c(t) = g_r(t) p^t (1 - p)^2. \tag{40}
\]

The above expression is a product of the linearly-decaying term \( g_r(t) \) and the exponentially-decaying term \( p^t = (N/k)^{-t} \). For \( N \to \infty \), \( (1 - p)^2 \to 1 \), resulting in \( \text{[39]} \). Next, we turn our attention to the intercontact distribution.

**IV. INTERCONTACT DISTRIBUTION**

To analyze the intercontact distribution we follow a similar approach as in the contact distribution. Let \( r_{ic}(t; k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij}) \) be the probability to observe a sequence of exactly \( t \) consecutive slots, where two nodes \( i \) and \( j \) with expected degrees \( k_i \) and \( k_j \) and angular distance \( \Delta \theta_{ij} \) are not connected, \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, \tau - 2 \). This probability is the percentage of observation time \( \tau \) where we observe a slot where these two nodes are connected, followed by \( t \) slots where they are not connected, followed by a slot where they are again connected. We can write

\[
r_{ic}(t; k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij}) = g_r(t)p(k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij})^2 \times [1 - p(k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta_{ij})]^t. \tag{41}
\]

The intercontact distribution, \( P_{ic}(t) \), gives the probability that two nodes are disconnected for exactly \( t \) consecutive slots, given that \( t \geq 1 \)

\[
P_{ic}(t) = \frac{r_{ic}(t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{\tau-2} r_{ic}(j)}. \tag{42}
\]

In the above relation, \( r_{ic}(t) \) is obtained by removing the condition on \( k_i, k_j \) and \( \Delta \theta_{ij} \) from \( \text{[41]} \),

\[
r_{ic}(t) = \int \int \int r_{ic}(t; k, k', \Delta \theta) \times \rho(k)\rho(k')f(\Delta \theta)dkd\theta. \tag{43}
\]

Since \( P_{ic}(t) \propto r_{ic}(t) \) we sometimes refer to \( r_{ic}(t) \) as “intercontact distribution”.

Removing the condition on \( \Delta \theta_{ij} \) from \( \text{[41]} \), gives

\[
r_{ic}(t; k_i, k_j) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} r_{ic}(t; k_i, k_j, \Delta \theta) d\Delta \theta
\]

\[
= g_r(t) \frac{N^t k^t}{t + T} \frac{1}{(1 - 1/T)^t k_i k_j} \times 2 F_1 \left[ t + 2, t + T; t + T + 1; \frac{Nk}{(1 - 1/T)k_i k_j} \right]. \tag{44}
\]

To obtain \( r_{ic}(t) \) we need to remove the condition on \( k_i \) and \( k_j \) from \( \text{[41]} \),

\[
r_{ic}(t) = \int \int r_{ic}(t; k, k') \rho(k)\rho(k')dkd\theta. \tag{45}
\]

However, \( \text{[41]} \) is not in closed-form, and as in the case of the contact distribution, we are interested in finding and analyzing the function to which the following limit converges

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} r_{ic}(t) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \int \int r_{ic}(t; k, k') \rho(k)\rho(k')dkd\theta. \tag{46}
\]

Below, we show that a generic analysis of \( \text{[46]} \) that does not depend on \( \rho(k) \) is possible, as long as \( \rho(k) \) has a finite \( T^{th} \) moment if \( T \in (1, 2) \), or a finite \( 2^{nd} \) moment if \( T > 2 \).
A. Expected degree distributions with finite moments

If the distribution of expected degrees $\rho(\bar{k})$ has a finite $T^{th}$ moment if $T \in (1, 2)$, or a finite $2^{nd}$ moment if $T > 2$, then we can exchange the order of the limit with the integral in (16) (see Appendix B). Therefore, we can first compute the limit $\lim_{N \to \infty} r_{lc}(t; k, k')$ and then perform the integration over $k$ and $k'$. Ignoring the prefactor $r_{ic}(t)$, the dominant term in the Taylor series expansion of (44) for $N \to \infty$ is

$$
\frac{T T (2 - T) (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \Gamma(t + T) \frac{T (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \Gamma(t + 1) k_i^T k_j^T + \frac{T}{T - 2} \frac{(1 - 1/T)^2}{N^2 k^2} k_i^2 k_j^2.
$$

then we can exchange the order of the limit with the integral in (16) (see Appendix B). Therefore, we can first compute the limit $\lim_{N \to \infty} r_{ic}(t; k, k')$ and then perform the integration over $k$ and $k'$. Ignoring the prefactor $r_{ic}(t)$, the dominant term in the Taylor series expansion of (44) for $N \to \infty$ is

$$
\frac{T T (2 - T) (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \Gamma(t + T) \frac{T (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \Gamma(t + 1) k_i^T k_j^T + \frac{T}{T - 2} \frac{(1 - 1/T)^2}{N^2 k^2} k_i^2 k_j^2.
$$

Here, we can identify the following two regimes. If $T \in (1, 2)$, then the first term in (47) dominates for $N \to \infty$, and we can write

$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} r_{ic}(t; k, k_j) \frac{T T (2 - T) (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \Gamma(t + T) \frac{T (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^T k^T} \Gamma(t + 1) k_i^T k_j^T.
$$

On the other hand, if $T > 2$, then the second term in (47) dominates, and we have

$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} r_{ic}(t; k, k_j) \frac{T T (2 - T) (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^2 k^2} \Gamma(t + T) \frac{T (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^2 k^2} \Gamma(t + 1) k_i^2 k_j^2.
$$

The corresponding expression for $T = 2$ can be obtained by computing the limit of (47) for $T \to 2$. Removing now the condition on $k_i$ and $k_j$ from (48) and (49), yields

$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} r_{ic}(t) \frac{T}{T - 2} \frac{(1 - 1/T)^2}{N^2 k^2} \Gamma(t + T) \frac{T (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^2 k^2} \Gamma(t + 1) k_i^2 k_j^2.
$$

for $T \in (1, 2)$, while for $T > 2$

$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} r_{ic}(t) \frac{T}{T - 2} \frac{(1 - 1/T)^2}{N^2 k^2} \Gamma(t + T) \frac{T (1 - 1/T)^T}{N^2 k^2} \Gamma(t + 1) k_i^2 k_j^2.
$$

This means that in this case $P_{lc}(t)$ is determined only by the boundedness of the observation interval $\tau$, displaying a linear decay with a slope that depends on $\tau$. We provide intuition on this point by explicitly showing how (53) emerges in classical random graphs in Sec. IV D. In Fig. 3 (a,b) we validate the above analysis with simulations.

B. Expected degree distributions with non-finite moments

If $\rho(\bar{k})$ does not satisfy the finiteness of the moments as in Sec. IV A, then we cannot exchange the order of the limit with the integral in (16) (Appendix B). Therefore, we have to compute the integral in (45) for the specific $\rho(\bar{k})$ we are interested in, and then compute its limit for $N \to \infty$. Below, we again perform this analysis for the case where $\rho(\bar{k})$ is a power-law, $\rho(\bar{k}) = k^{-\gamma} \propto 1/k$, $k \geq k_0$, $\gamma > 2$. Performing the integration in (45) when $\rho(\bar{k})$ is the above power law, yields the following long expression that holds for any network size $N$:

\[ P_{lc}(t) \propto \frac{1}{k_{2-T}}. \]
These two regimes were also found by the analysis of \( (R3') \) for \( (R1') \) for probability \( \gamma < T \) after performing the Taylor series expansion of (54) for \( \gamma > T + 1 \) and \( \gamma \in (2,3) \); in this case \( r_{ic}(t) \) is given by (55). All axes are in logarithmic scale.

After performing the Taylor series expansion of (54) for \( N \to \infty \), we can identify the following three regimes:

- \( (R1') \) for \( T \in (1,2) \) and \( \gamma > T + 1 \), we get the limit in (50);
- \( (R2') \) for \( T > 2 \) and \( \gamma > 3 \), we get the limit in (51);
- \( (R3') \) for \( \gamma < T + 1 \) and \( \gamma \in (2,3) \), we get the following limit

\[
\begin{align*}
\lim_{N \to \infty} r_{ic}(t) &= g_r(t) \frac{N^k k^t T^{t+1}(\gamma - 1)^2}{k_0^2 (T - 1)^t (1 + T - \gamma)^2} \left\{ \frac{\Gamma(t + T)}{\Gamma(t + T + 1)} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. - \frac{\Gamma(t + \gamma - 1)}{\Gamma(t + \gamma)} \right\} _2 F_1 \left[ t + 2, t + T; t + T + 1; -\frac{N k}{1 - 1/T k_0^2} \right] \\
&\quad \quad + \left( \frac{1 - T - \gamma}{\gamma - 1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{t + \gamma - 1} \right)^2 F_2 \left[ t + 2, t + \gamma - 1, t + \gamma - 1; t + \gamma, t + \gamma - 1; -\frac{N k}{1 - 1/T k_0^2} \right].
\end{align*}
\]

\( (54) \)

Regime \( (R1') \) corresponds to the case where \( T \in (1,2) \), while the \( T^{th} \) moment of \( \rho(k) \) is finite; \( (R2') \) is the case where \( T > 2 \), while the \( 2^{nd} \) moment of \( \rho(k) \) is finite. These two regimes were also found by the analysis of Sec. IV A. On the other hand, regime \( (R3') \) emerges in the following two cases: (i) the case where \( T \in (1,2) \), while the \( T^{th} \) moment of \( \rho(k) \) is not finite; and (ii) the case where \( T > 2 \), while the \( 2^{nd} \) moment of \( \rho(k) \) is not finite. This regime did not emerge in the analysis of Sec. IV A.

For \( t \ll \tau \), \( g_r(t) \approx 1 \), while \( \Gamma(t + \gamma - 1)/\Gamma(t + 2) \approx t^{-(3-\gamma)} \) for \( t \gg \gamma \). Therefore, in \( (R3') \) the intercontact distribution decays as a power law with exponent \( 3 - \gamma \),

\[
P_{ic}(t) \propto \frac{1}{t^{3-\gamma}},
\]

\( (56) \)

for \( \gamma \ll t \ll \tau \). Since \( \gamma \in (2,3) \), the exponent of this power law is again less than one, while there is no analogous behavior in the cold regime [12]. Fig. 3(c) validates regime \( (R3') \) with simulations, while Fig. 4 provides a schematic overview of the three intercontact distribution regimes.

Eq. (54) does not hold for \( \gamma = T + 1 \). The corresponding relation for \( \gamma = T + 1 \) can be obtained by letting \( T = \gamma - 1 \) in (44), and then performing the integration in (45). In this case, for \( N \to \infty \) we get regime \( (R2') \) for \( \gamma > 3 \), while for \( \gamma \in (2,3) \) we get

\[
\begin{align*}
\lim_{N \to \infty} r_{ic}(t) &= g_r(t) \frac{N^k k^t T^{t+1}(\gamma - 1)^2}{k_0^2 (T - 1)^t (1 + T - \gamma)^2} \left\{ \frac{\Gamma(t + T)}{\Gamma(t + T + 1)} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. - \frac{\Gamma(t + \gamma - 1)}{\Gamma(t + \gamma)} \right\} _2 F_1 \left[ t + 2, t + T; t + T + 1; -\frac{N k}{1 - 1/T k_0^2} \right] \\
&\quad \quad + \left( \frac{1 - T - \gamma}{\gamma - 1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{t + \gamma - 1} \right)^2 F_2 \left[ t + 2, t + \gamma - 1, t + \gamma - 1; t + \gamma, t + \gamma - 1; -\frac{N k}{1 - 1/T k_0^2} \right] \\
&\quad \quad \times (\gamma - 1)^{3-2(\gamma - 1)}(\gamma - 2)^{2(\gamma - 1)} \frac{\Gamma(t + \gamma - 1)}{2\Gamma(t + 2)} \\
&\quad \quad \times g_r(t) \frac{\Gamma(t + \gamma - 1)}{\Gamma(t + 2)}.
\end{align*}
\]

\( (57) \)

which is similar to \( (R3') \).
C. Intercontact distribution in the configuration model

The intercontact distribution in the configuration model for $N \to \infty$ can be obtained by letting $T \to \infty$ in the corresponding finite-$T$ relations. Let us consider again the case of power-law distributed expected degrees. Since $T \to \infty$, only regimes (R2′) and (R3′) from Sec. IV B are relevant. For $\gamma > 3$, $r_{ic}(t)$ is obtained by letting $T \to \infty$ in (51),

$$r_{ic}(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \left[ \frac{k}{N} \frac{(\gamma - 2)^2}{(\gamma - 1)(\gamma - 3)} \right]^2. \quad (58)$$

For $\gamma \in (2, 3)$, $r_{ic}(t)$ is obtained by letting $T \to \infty$ in (55),

$$r_{ic}(t) \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} g_r(t) \Gamma(3 - \gamma)(N/k)^{-\gamma-1} \ln \frac{N(\gamma - 1)^2}{k(\gamma - 2)^2} \times (\gamma - 1)^2 - 2(\gamma - 1)(\gamma - 2)^2(\gamma - 3)^2 \frac{\Gamma(t + \gamma - 1)}{\Gamma(t + 2)}. \quad (59)$$

Therefore, for $\gamma \in (2, 3)$, $P_{ic}(t) \propto t^{-(3 - \gamma)}$ for $\gamma \ll t \ll \tau$, while for $\gamma > 3$, $P_{ic}(t) \propto g_r(t)$. The non-thermodynamic-limit relation for $r_{ic}(t)$ can be obtained by letting $T \to \infty$ in (54).

$$r_{ic}(t) = g_r(t) \left[ \frac{k t}{N} \frac{(\gamma - 1)^2}{(\gamma - 2)^2} \right]^{\gamma} \times _3 F_2 \left[ \begin{array}{c} t + 2, t + \gamma - 1, t + \gamma - 1; t + \gamma, t + 1; - \frac{N k}{k_0} \end{array} \right]. \quad (60)$$

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the thermodynamic limit the contact distribution in hot RHGs decays as a power law with exponent $2 + T > 3$, where $T$ is the network temperature. This result holds irrespective of the form of the expected degree distribution, as long as it has a finite $T$th moment. Indeed, even if all nodes have the same expected degree, the contact distribution still decays as a power law with the aforementioned exponent. This observation means that the emergence of this power law is due to the nodes’ angular (sim-
ilarity) coordinates, as more similar (closer along the angular direction) nodes tend to stay connected for a longer period of time. This result also holds in cold RHGs, where the power-law exponent is \(2 + \gamma\) and non-finite \(T\) moment \((\gamma \leq T + 1)\), then it shapes the contact distribution, which decays as a power law with exponent \(\gamma + 1 > 3\). This suggests that the power-law contact distribution in this case is due to the heterogeneity of the expected degrees, and not due to node similarities. Indeed, this result holds even if the nodes’ similarities are completely ignored, as is the case in the configuration model that emerges for \(T \rightarrow \infty\).

In the thermodynamic limit the intercontact distribution in hot RHGs decays as a power law with exponent \(2-T\) moment \((\gamma \leq T + 1)\), if the network’s temperature is \(T \in (1,2)\) and the expected degree distribution has a finite \(T\) moment. This result holds irrespective of the form of the expected degree distribution, which means that the emergence of this power law is again due to node similarities. This result also holds in cold RHGs, where the power-law exponent is \(2-T\) as long as the expected node degree is finite \(\gamma\). This observation suggests that the origin of broad intercontact distributions in real networks is also primarily due to node similarities, as more similar nodes tend to re-connect after shorter time intervals.

Finally, we have seen that power-law intercontact distributions with exponent \(3 - \gamma \in (0,1)\) emerge, if the expected degree distribution is power law with exponent \(\gamma \in (2,3)\) and \(\gamma \leq T + 1\). In this case, the emergence of the power-law intercontact distribution is due to the heterogeneity of the expected degrees. Indeed, this result holds even if the node similarities are completely ignored, as is the case in the configuration model.

No matter the origin of the power-law intercontact distribution in hot RHGs, our analysis suggests that the exponent of this distribution is always less than one, which is unrealistic. Therefore, hot RHGs are not adequate null models for real temporal networks, in stark contrast to cold RHGs \(\gamma\). At a higher level, our results shed light on the origin of broad (inter)contact distributions in temporal networks, showing that such distributions can emerge both as a result of node similarities and popularities, with the former providing a more probable cause in real-world systems.

Finally, we note that even though we sometimes presented exact formulas for the (inter)contact distributions (cf. \([32,34]\)), we reach our conclusions by analyzing these distributions in the thermodynamic limit. Our analytical results at this limit can be used as approximations in sufficienty sparse networks, as illustrated by simulations. How “sufficiently” sparse a network should be for the approximations to be accurate depends on the network’s characteristics, such as its expected degree distribution, how close its parameters are to the boundaries of the different regimes, etc. Also, in the case of the intercontact distribution in hot RHGs, the value of the observation interval \(\tau\) plays a significant role. Indeed, as we have seen in classical random graphs, the approximation in (61) can be reached from the exact relation in (62) if we assume \((1-p)^{\tau} \approx 1\). The larger the \(t\) the smaller should the \(p = k/N\) be for the last approximation to hold. In other words, the larger the observation interval \(\tau\) the sparser should the network be for the approximation in (61) to hold for all \(t \in [1,\tau-2]\). Investigating the accuracy of the thermodynamic-limit approximations as a function of network sparsity is beyond the scope of this paper.
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Appendix A: Exchanging the order of the limit with the integral in Eq. (19)

We first recall the dominated convergence theorem (DCT), which allows us to exchange the order of limits with integrals, cf. \([23]\). The DCT states that if a function \(f_N(x)\) converges to a function \(f(x)\) for \(N \rightarrow \infty\) and \(|f_N(x)| \leq h(x), \forall N, x\), where the dominating function \(h(x)\) is integrable, \(\int h(x)dx < \infty\), then \(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int f_N(x)dx = \int \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N(x)dx = \int f(x)dx\).

Now, denote the integrand in (19) as \(f_N(t; k, k') = r_c(t; k, k')\rho(k)\rho(k')\),

\[f_N(t; k, k') = r_c(t; k, k')\rho(k)\rho(k'),\quad (A1)\]

where the dependence on the network size \(N\) is inside \(r_c(t; k, k')\), which is given by (17). The integral \(I_t = \int \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N(t; k, k')dkdk'\) is given by (24) for \(t > T\), and it is proportional to \((\bar{k}^T)^2\). For \(t < T\), \(I_t\) is given by (25) and it is proportional to \((\bar{k}^T)^2\). If \(\bar{k}^T \rightarrow \infty\), then \(I_t \rightarrow \infty\) for \(t > T\). In this case, the DCT does not apply. On the other hand, if \(\bar{k}^T\) is finite, so is \(\bar{k}^T\) for \(t < T\), and \(I_t\) is finite for all \(t \geq 1\). Thus, the finiteness of \(\bar{k}^T\) is a necessary condition for being able to exchange the order of the limit with the integral in (19) for all \(t \geq 1\). Below, we show that this is also a sufficient condition, i.e., if \(\bar{k}^T\)
is finite, then the DCT applies for all \( t \geq 1 \), and we can exchange the order of the limit with the integral in \( \mathbf{19} \).

We first recall the following facts about the hypergeometric function (see \[24\] for further details). The hypergeometric function is defined by the Gauss series

\[
2F_1[a, b; c; z] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n(b)_n}{(c)_n n!} \frac{z^n}{n!}, \tag{A2}
\]

for \( |z| < 1 \), and by analytic continuation elsewhere. The symbol \((q)_n\) is the Pochhammer symbol, defined as \((q)_n = 1 \text{ for } n = 0\), and \((q)_n = q(q+1) \cdots (q+n-1)\) for \( n > 0 \). For \( z \geq 0 \) and \( z \in [0, 1) \) the following identities hold, respectively:

\[
2F_1[a, b; -z] = (1 + z)^{-b} 2F_1[c - a, b; c; \frac{z}{z+1}], \tag{A3}
\]

and

\[
2F_1[a, b; b; z] = (1 - z)^{-a}. \tag{A4}
\]

Further, we can show that for \( z \in [0, 1) \) the following upper bounds hold

\[
2F_1[a, b; b + 1; z] \leq 2F_1[a, b; b; z], \tag{A5}
\]

and

\[
2F_1[-m, b; b + 1; z] \leq 1, \tag{A6}
\]

for \( m \geq 0 \). Now, let

\[
z_{ij} = \frac{Nk}{1 - 1/T}k^i j^k. \tag{A7}
\]

Using \(\text{(A3)}\) and \(\text{(A7)}\), we can re-write \(\text{(17)}\) as

\[
r_c(t; k_i, j_k) = g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} z_{ij}^2 (1 + z_{ij})^{-(T+2)} \times 2F_1[T - t + 1, T + 2; T + 3; - \frac{z_{ij}}{z_{ij} + 1}]. \tag{A8}
\]

For \( t \leq T + 1 \), the first term inside \( 2F_1 \) in \(\text{(A8)}\) is nonnegative, and from \(\text{(A5)}\) and \(\text{(A4)}\) we can write

\[
r_c(t; k_i, j_k) \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} z_{ij}^2 (1 + z_{ij})^{-(T+2)} \times 2F_1[T - t + 1, T + 2; T + 3; - \frac{z_{ij}}{z_{ij} + 1}]
\]

\[
= g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} z_{ij}^2 (1 + z_{ij})^{-(t+1)}.
\]

On the other hand, for \( t \geq T + 1 \), the first term inside \( 2F_1 \) in \(\text{(A8)}\) is nonpositive, and from \(\text{(A6)}\) we can write

\[
r_c(t; k_i, j_k) \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} z_{ij}^2 (1 + z_{ij})^{-(T+2)} \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} z_{ij}^{T+t}.
\]

From \(\text{(A9)}\) and \(\text{(A10)}\), we can write the following upper bounds for the function \( f_N \) in \(\text{(A1)}\). For \( t \in [1, T + 1] \)

\[
f_N(t; k_i, j_k) \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} z_{ij}^{-(t-1)} \rho(k_i) \rho(k_j)
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{k_i k_j}{k} \right)^{t-1} \rho(k_i) \rho(k_j)
\]

\[
\equiv h(t; k_i, k_j),
\tag{A11}
\]

while for \( t > T + 1 \)

\[
f_N(t; k_i, j_k) \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{T + 2} z_{ij}^{-T} \rho(k_i) \rho(k_j)
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{k_i k_j}{k} \right)^T \rho(k_i) \rho(k_j)
\]

\[
= h(T + 1; k_i, k_j).
\tag{A12}
\]

If \( k^T \) is finite, then the dominating function \( h(t; k, k') \) in \(\text{(A11)}\) and \(\text{(A12)}\) is integrable,

\[
\int h(t; k, k') dk' = \frac{(k_i - 1)^2}{k^{t-1}} < \infty,
\tag{A13}
\]

for \( t \in [1, T + 1] \). Therefore, the DCT applies for all \( t \geq 1 \) and we can exchange the order of the limit with the integral in \(\mathbf{19}\).

\section*{Appendix B: Exchanging the order of the limit with the integral in Eq. (46)}

We follow similar steps as in Appendix A. Denote the integrand in \(\mathbf{46}\) as

\[
\tilde{f}_N(t; k, k') \equiv r_c(t; k, k') \rho(k) \rho(k'),
\tag{B1}
\]

where \( r_c(t; k, k') \) is given by \(\text{(44)}\). For \( T \in (1, 2) \), the integral \( \tilde{I}_t \equiv \int \int_{N-T} \tilde{f}_N(t; k, k') dk' dk'' \) is given by \(\text{(50)}\), and it is proportional to \( (k^T)^2 \). In this case, if \( k^T \to \infty \), \( \tilde{I}_t \to \infty \), and the DCT does not apply. For \( T > 2 \), \( \tilde{I}_t \) is given by \(\text{(51)}\) and it is proportional to \( (k^T)^4 \). In this case, if \( k^2 \to \infty \), \( \tilde{I}_t \to \infty \), and the DCT does not apply. Therefore, for \( T \in (1, 2) \) the finiteness of \( k^T \) is a necessary condition for exchanging the order of the limit with the integral in \(\mathbf{46}\), while for \( T > 2 \) the necessary condition is that \( k^2 \) is finite. Below, we show that these are also sufficient conditions in each case.

Let \( z_{ij} \) given by \(\text{(A7)}\). From \(\text{(A3)}\), \(\text{(A5)}\) and \(\text{(A4)}\), we
can write
\[
 r_{ic}(t; k_i, k_j) = g_r(t) \frac{T}{t + T} z_{ij}^{t} (1 + z_{ij})^{-(t+T)}
\]
\[
 \times {}_2F_1 \left[ T - 1, t + T; t + T + 1; \frac{z_{ij}}{1 + z_{ij}} \right]
\]
\[
 \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{t + T} z_{ij}^{t} (1 + z_{ij})^{-(t+T)}
\]
\[
 \times {}_2F_1 \left[ T - 1, t + T; t + T + 1; \frac{z_{ij}}{1 + z_{ij}} \right]
\]
\[
 = g_r(t) \frac{T}{t + T} z_{ij}^{t} (1 + z_{ij})^{-(t+1)}
\]
\[
 \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{t + T} \frac{1}{z_{ij}}.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (B2)

From (B2), we can write the following upper bound for the function \( f_N \) in (B1)
\[
 f_N(t; k_i, k_j) \leq g_r(t) \frac{T}{t + T} \frac{1}{z_{ij}} \rho(k_i) \rho(k_j)
\]
\[
 \leq \frac{k_i k_j}{k} \rho(k_i) \rho(k_j)
\]
\[
 \equiv \bar{h}(k_i, k_j).
\]  \hspace{1cm} (B3)

For finite \( k \), the dominating function \( \bar{h}(k, k') \) is integrable, \( \int \bar{h}(k, k') dk dk' = \bar{k} < \infty \). Further, if \( \bar{k}^T \) is finite for \( T > 1 \), so is \( \bar{k} \). Therefore, the DCT applies in both cases, i.e., both for \( T \in (1, 2) \) with finite \( k_T \), and for \( T > 2 \) with finite \( k_T \), and we can exchange the order of the limit with the integral in (46).

[7] By asymptotically or in the thermodynamic limit, we mean as the number of nodes \( N \) tends to infinity.
[23] For simplicity we ignore the cases where the first (last) of the slots that two nodes can be connected starts (ends) at the beginning (end) of the observation period.