Spreading Processes with Mutations over Multi-layer Networks

Mansi Sood^a, Anirudh Sridhar^b, Rashad Eletreby^c, Chai Wah Wu^d, Simon A. Levin^e, H. Vincent Poor^b, and Osman Yagan^a

^aDepartment of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213 USA; ^bDepartment of Electrical Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA; ^cRocket Travel, Inc, Chicago, IL 60661 USA; ^dThomas J. Watson Research Center, IBM, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598 USA; ^eDepartment of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA

This manuscript was compiled on November 28, 2023

A key scientific challenge during the outbreak of novel infectious diseases is to predict how changes to the patterns of interaction in the host population (arising from different countermeasures) impact the spread of infection. Most epidemiological models do not consider the role of mutations in the pathogens or the heterogeneity in the type of contacts over which the infection propagates. However, pathogens often mutate in response to changing environments and medical interventions. Moreover, the spread of infectious diseases depends intimately on the structural properties of the contact network of the host population, e.g., different congregate settings such as schools, hospitals, offices, and private social gatherings pose varying risks of transmission. In this work, we propose and analyze a multi-layer multi-strain model that more closely resembles real-world pandemics by taking into account the multi-layer structure typical to human contact networks and mutations in the contagion. In particular, we simultaneously account for variability in transmission risks associated with different pathogen strains and different social settings in which individuals congregate. We derive the probability of emergence of an epidemic, the mean fraction of individuals infected with each strain, and the phase transition point beyond which an epidemic emerges. Our results highlight that existing models fail to fully characterize the epidemic outbreak caused by mutating pathogens on multi-layer contact networks. Extensive analytical and numerical studies are presented to investigate different patterns of mutation and interaction within the hosts. Our results demonstrate that the impact of imposing/lifting mitigation measures concerning different contact network layers (e.g., school closures, or work-fromhome policies) should be evaluated in connection with their impact on the likelihood of the emergence of new pathogen strains. Our work further reinforces the need to develop network-based epidemiological models that simultaneously account for the heterogeneity in the pathogen strains and network structure to better predict the course of the disease outbreak.

Network Epidemics | Multi-layer Networks | Mutations | Agent-based Models | Branching Process

1. Introduction

The recent outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, fuelled by the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 led to a devastating loss of human life and upended livelihoods worldwide (1). The highly transmissible, virulent, and rapidly mutating (2) nature of the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus led to an unprecedented burden on critical healthcare infrastructure. The absence of a known treatment for the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus, testing shortages, and limited critical healthcare infrastructure forced governments worldwide to implement non-pharmacological interventions such as lockdowns, which in turn led to a socio-economic burden. During outbreaks of novel infectious diseases, particularly with limited access to pharmacological interventions, it is critical to predict the course of the disease outbreak to ensure that the healthcare infrastructure does not get overwhelmed (3), especially during the emergence of new variants. From the standpoint of epidemiological modeling, this requires us to develop models that simultaneously account for different patterns of interaction in the host population and different pathways of evolutionary adaptions in the pathogen.

Epidemiological models that analyze the speed and scale of the spread of infection can be broadly classified under two approaches. The first approach assumes *homogeneous mixing*, i.e., the population is well-mixed, and an infected individual is equally likely to infect any individual in the population regardless of location and social interactions (4, 5). The second is a *network-based* approach that explicitly models the contact patterns among individuals in the population and the probability of transmission through any given contact (6–8). Structural properties of the contact network such as *heterogeneity* in type of contacts, clustering (e.g., presence of tightly connected communities), centrality (e.g., presence of superspreaders) and degree-degree correlations are known to have profound implications for disease spread and its control (9– 13).

In addition to the contact structure within the host population, the course of an infectious disease is critically tied to evolutionary adaptations or mutations in the pathogen. There is growing evidence for the zoonotic origin of disease outbreaks, including COVID-19, SARS, and H1N1 influenza, as a result of cross-species transmission and subsequent evolutionary adaptations (14-17). When pathogens enter a new species, they are often poorly adapted to the physiological environment in the new hosts and undergo evolutionary mutations to adapt to the new hosts. The resulting variants or strains of the pathogen have varying risk of transmission, commonly measured through the reproduction number or R_0 , which quantifies the mean number of secondary infections triggered by an infected individual (18). Moreover, even when a sizeable fraction of the population gains immunity through vaccination or natural infection, the emergence of new variants that can evade the acquired immunity poses a continued threat to public health (19). A recent work (20) established that models which do not consider evolutionary adaptations lead to incorrect predictions about the spreading dynamics of mutating strains. This study further underscores the need for developing epidemiological models that account for evolutionary adaptations in the pathogen.

Existing approaches that analyze the spread of mutating

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

 $^{^2 \}text{To}$ whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: $\tt msood@andrew.cmu.edu$

pathogens assume a single-layered contact network, where the transmissibility, i.e., the probability that an infective individual passes on the infection to a contact, depends on the type of strain but not on the nature of link/contact over which the infection is transmitted (14, 20–24). However, different congregate settings such as schools, hospitals, offices, and private social gatherings pose varied transmission risks (25, 26). A growing body of work has analyzed epidemiological models that account for a multi-layer structure typical to human contact networks (25, 27–35), where each layer represents a different social setting in which an individual participates. But, there has been a dearth of analytical models that simultaneously account for the multi-layer contact network structure and the emergence of different pathogen variants through mutations.

In this paper, we build upon the mathematical theory proposed in (14, 20) to develop a modeling framework that more closely resembles real-world pandemics by taking into account the *multi-layer* structure typical to human contact networks. Specifically, we assume that the *transmissibility* depends not only on the type of strain carried by an infective individual but also on the *nature of links* used to infect their neighbors. The proposed *multi-layer multi-strain* model explicitly accounts for variability in transmissibility for variants of a pathogen across different layers of the host contact network. Below, we summarize the main contributions and findings of this work. We provide analytical results for characterizing the epidemic outbreaks caused by mutating pathogens over multilayer contact networks using tools from multi-type branching processes. In particular, we derive the three key metrics to quantify the epidemic outbreak: i) the probability of emergence of an epidemic, ii) the expected fraction of individuals infected with each strain, and iii) the critical threshold of phase transition beyond which an epidemic outbreak occurs with a positive probability.

Next, we propose a comprehensive set of transformations to simpler epidemiological models by a novel decoupling of the epidemic threshold as the product of factors corresponding to the network and transmission parameters. Our analysis of the transformations unravels conditions under which we can reduce the multi-layer multi-strain model to simpler models for accurately characterizing the epidemic outbreak. We show that while a reduction to a single-layer model can accurately predict the epidemic characteristics when the network layers are purely Poisson, a departure from Poisson distribution leads to incorrect predictions with single-layer models. Moreover, we show that the success of approaches that coalesce the multi-layer structure to an equivalent single-layer is critically dependent on the dispersion indices of the network layers being perfectly matched. However, in practice, since different network layers (representing different congregate settings) are expected to have different structural characteristics, further highlighting the need for considering multi-layer network models for predicting the course of an outbreak.

We supplement our theoretical findings with analytical case studies and simulations for different patterns of interaction in the host population and different types of mutation patterns in the pathogens. Our multi-layer modeling framework allows for understanding trade-offs, such as the relative impact of countermeasures such as lock-downs that alter the network layers on the emergence of highly contagious strains. For cases, where the spread of infection starts with a moderately transmissible strain, we study how imposing/lifting mitigation measures across different layers can alter the course of the epidemic by increasing the risk of mutation to a highly contagious strain. We derive the probability of mutation to a highly transmissible strain which in turn provides a lower bound on the probability of emergence. Interestingly, we find that reopening a new layer in the contact network may be considered low-risk based on the transmissibility of the current strain. Still, even a modest increase in infections caused by the additional layer can lead to an epidemic outbreak to occur with a much higher probability. For instance, our case study in Section 5 reveals that the addition of a network layer can lead to over a five-fold increase in the probability of emergence compared to the case of a single network layer. Our results further underscore the need for developing epidemiological models that simultaneously account for the multi-layer network structure and the multi-strain spreading process.

While the bulk of our discussion is on mutating contagions in the context of infectious diseases, our results also hold promise for applications in modeling social contagions, e.g., news items circulating in social networks (20, 36). Similar to different strains of a pathogen arising through mutations, different versions of the information are created as the content is altered on social media platforms (37). The resulting variants of the information may have varying propensities to be circulated in the social network. Moreover, with the burst of social media platforms, potential applications of our multi-layer analysis of mutating contagions are in analyzing the multi-platform spread of misinformation where the information gets altered across different platforms.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the network structure and transmission process for the multi-layer, multi-strain model. In Section 3, we present our main results characterizing the key epidemiological quantities with detailed proofs presented in the Appendix. Section 4 provides experimental validation of our analytical results for different network structures. In Section 5, we provide a parameterization of the network and mutation parameters to study the transition in the likelihood of an epidemic outbreak from a single-layer or a single-strain setting to a multi-layer multi-strain setting. Next, we take a closer look at the role of mutations (Section 6) and the network structure (Section 7), where we derive a lower bound on the probability of emergence and demonstrate challenges with the reduction to a model with a single network layer. The Appendix provides further transformations to single-strain multi-layer (SS-ML) or a multi-strain single-layer (MS-SL) mode and investigate the limitations of these models in predicting the epidemiological quantities for the given MS-ML model. We conclude in Section 8.

2. Model

A. Contact Network Model. Consider a population of size n with members in the set $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We represent the host population by a graph where each node corresponds to an individual, and an edge is drawn between two nodes if they can come in contact and potentially transmit the infection. To account for the multi-layer structure where individuals congregate in different social settings (e.g., neighborhood, school, workplace), we consider a multi-layer contact network.



Fig. 1. Multi-layer network model: A two-layer contact network for modeling the spread of an infection over the friendship network \mathbb{F} and work network \mathbb{W} . The resultant contact network $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{F} \amalg \mathbb{W}$. Neighboring nodes in \mathbb{H} can transmit infections to their neighbors either through links in the \mathbb{F} network (i.e., through type-*f* links) or \mathbb{W} network (through type-*w* links).

For simplicity, we focus on the case where each individual can participate *independently* in two networks layers denoted by \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{W} respectively. These network layers represent different interactions individuals make with those they come in contact with in different congregate settings. For instance, the network \mathbb{F} can be used to model the spread of infection between friends residing in the same neighborhood, while the network \mathbb{W} can model the spread of infections amongst individuals who congregate for work.

We let $\{f, w\}$ denote the space of possible types of edges; specifically, we say that edges in \mathbb{F} are of type-f, while the edges in the \mathbb{W} are of type-w. In order to model participation in each network layer, we first independently label each node as *non-participating* with probability α_a and *participating* in network layer-a with probability $1 - \alpha_a$, where $0 \le \alpha_a \le 1$, and where $a \in \{f, w\}$. Under this formulation, an individual participates in no network layer with probability $(w.p.) \ \alpha_f \alpha_w$, in exactly one network layer w.p. $\alpha_f(1 - \alpha_w) + (1 - \alpha_f)\alpha_w$, or in both layers w.p. $(1 - \alpha_f)(1 - \alpha_w)$. Next, for each node that participates in network layer-a, the number of typea edges incident on it is drawn from a degree distribution, denoted by $\{\tilde{p}_a^k, k = 0, 1, \ldots, n\}$, where $a \in \{f, w\}$. Under this formulation, the degree of a node in layer-a, denoted by $\{p_k^a, k = 0, 1, \ldots\}$, with $a \in \{f, w\}$, can be expressed as

$$p_k^a = (1 - \alpha_a)\tilde{p}_k^a + \alpha_a \mathbf{1}\{k = 0\}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$
[1]

The structure of the network layers \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{W} is given through the two independent degree distributions $\{p_k^f, k = 0, 1, ...\}$ and $\{p_k^w, k = 0, 1, ...\}$. We assign each node i = 1, ..., n in $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}(n; \{p_k^f\})$ (respectively, $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{W}(n; \{p_k^w\})$) with a random degree drawn from the distribution $\{p_k^f\}$ (resp., $\{p_k^w\}$) independently from any other node. This corresponds to generating both networks independently according to the *configuration* model (38, 39). We assume that the degree distributions are well-behaved in the sense that all moments of arbitrary order are finite.

The multi-layer contact network, denoted as \mathbb{H} , is constructed by taking the disjoint union (II) of network layers \mathbb{W} and \mathbb{F} (Figure 1). The multi-layer network $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{W} \amalg \mathbb{F}$ constitutes an ensemble of the *colored* degree-driven random graphs proposed in (40), where the colors correspond to the edgetypes ($\{f, w\}$). The colored degree of a node *i* is then represented by an integer vector $d_i = [d_i^f, d_i^w]$, where d_i^f (resp., d_i^w) stands for the number of type-*f* (resp., type-*w*) contacts that are incident on node *i*. Under the given assumptions on the degree distributions of \mathbb{W} and \mathbb{F} , the colored degrees of the



Fig. 2. Multi-strain transmission model: An illustration of the multistrain model with 2 strains on a contact network comprising 2 layers– (a) An arbitrary chosen seed node acquires strain-1; (b) The seed node independently infects their susceptible neighbors connected through type-f (resp., type-w) links with probability T_1^f (resp., T_1^w); (c) After infection, the pathogen mutates to strain-2 within the hosts with probabilities given by mutation matrices μ^f and μ^w ; (d) The infected nodes in turn infect their neighbors with transmission probabilities governed by the strain that they are carrying (i.e., strain-1 or strain-2), and the type of edge used to infect their neighbors (i.e., type-1 or type-2). The process terminates when no further infections are possible.

nodes (i.e., d_1, \ldots, d_n) are independent and identically distributed according to a colored degree distribution $\{p_d\}$ such that

$$p_d = p^f_{df} \cdot p^w_{dw} \tag{2}$$

where $d = (d^f, d^w)$ and with $p_{d^f}^f$ and $p_{d^w}^w$ defined through Eq. (1). If $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^f$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^w$ are even, we construct \mathbb{H} as in (6, 40); else, we re-sample both (d^f, d^w) until the degree sums $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^f$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^w$ are even. With $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^f$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^w$, each node $i = 1, \ldots, n$ is first given d_i^f and d_i^w stubs of type-f and type-w, respectively. Then, stub pairs of the same link type are randomly connected together to form edges. The pairing of stubs continues until none is left. The multi-layer contact network \mathbb{H} is constructed by taking the disjoint union of edge sets of the two networks \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{H} . We assume that the network \mathbb{H} is static and focus on the emergent spreading behavior in the limit of infinite population size $(n \to \infty)$.

B. Transmission Model. Existing models (14, 20) for multistrain spreading of a mutating pathogen focus on a singlelayered setting, where the likelihood of infection depends on the type of strain but not on the type of link/connection over which the transmission occurs. We extend the multi-strain model in (14, 20) on a single network layer to account for a multi-layer contact network \mathbb{H} composed of two network layers: \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{W} . Nodes that share a link in \mathbb{H} are considered acquaintances and can transmit infections to their neighbors either through links in the \mathbb{F} network (i.e., through type-f links) or \mathbb{W} network (through type-*w* links). We retain the assumption (14, 20) that given the type of strain carried by an infectious individual, the transmission of the infection occurs independently across all contacts of an infective individual. We assume that the *transmissibility*, i.e., the probability that an infective individual passes on the infection to their neighbor, depends on the type of *strain* carried by an infective individual and the type of *link* used to infect their neighbor.

Let m denote the number of pathogen strains co-existing in a population of size n. For each layer, the evolutionary adaptations in the pathogen are modeled by corresponding mutation matrices. For network layer \mathbb{F} (resp., \mathbb{W}), the mutation matrix, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{f}$ (resp., $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{w}$) is a $m \times m$ matrix. The entry μ_{ij}^{f} (resp., μ_{ij}^{w}) denotes the probability that strain-*i* mutates to strain-*j* within a host who got infected through a type-*f* (resp., type-*w*) link, with $\sum_{j} \mu_{ij}^{f} = 1$ (resp., $\sum_{j} \mu_{ij}^{w} = 1$). Given that an individual carrying strain-*i* makes an infectious contact through a type-*f* (resp., type-*w*) link, the newly infected individual acquires strain *j* with probability μ_{ij}^{f} (resp., μ_{ij}^{w}). In the succeeding discussion, we focus on the setting where two strains of the pathogen are dominant and assume m = 2, denoting

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}^{f} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{11}^{f} & \mu_{12}^{f} \\ \mu_{21}^{f} & \mu_{22}^{f} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\mu}^{w} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{11}^{w} & \mu_{12}^{w} \\ \mu_{21}^{w} & \mu_{22}^{w} \end{bmatrix}$$

We model the dependence of transmissibility on the type of links using $m \times m$ diagonal matrices \mathbf{T}^f (resp., \mathbf{T}^w), with $[T_i^f]$ (resp., $[T_i^w]$) representing the transmissibility of strain-*i* over a type-*f* link (resp., type-*w* link), for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. We have

$$oldsymbol{T}^f = egin{bmatrix} T_1^f & 0 \ 0 & T_2^f \end{bmatrix}, \qquad oldsymbol{T}^w = egin{bmatrix} T_1^w & 0 \ 0 & T_2^w \end{bmatrix}$$

We consider the following multi-strain spreading process on a multi-layer network (Figure 2) that accounts for pathogen transmission when epidemiological and evolutionary processes occur on a similar timescale and each new infection offers an opportunity for mutation (14). The process starts when a randomly chosen seed node is infected with strain-1. We refer to such a seed node as the *initial* infective and the nodes that are subsequently infected as later-generation infectives. The seed node independently infects their susceptible neighbors connected through type-f(resp., type-w) links with probability T_1^f (resp., T_1^w). After infection, the pathogen mutates to strain-i within the hosts with probabilities given by mutation matrices μ^{f} and μ^{w} . The infected nodes in turn infect their neighbors independently with transmission probabilities governed by the strain that they are carrying (i.e., strain-1 or strain-2), and the type of edge used to infect their neighbors (i.e., type-1 or type-2). The process terminates when no further infections are possible. We note that when the mutation matrices

3. Main Results

In this section, we provide our main results characterizing the epidemiological quantities in the steady state, i.e., when no new infections are possible. We derive the following metrics: the probability of emergence, the epidemic threshold and the epidemic size. Specifically, the probability of emergence is defined as the probability that a randomly chosen infectious seed node leads to an epidemic, i.e., a positive fraction of nodes get infected in the limit of large network size. The epidemic threshold defines the *critical* point at which a phase transition occurs leading to the possibility of an epidemic outbreak. In other words, the epidemic threshold defines a region in the parameter space in which the epidemic occurs with a positive probability while outside that region the outbreak dies out after a finite number of transmissions. Finally, we derive the conditional mean of the fraction of individuals who get infected by each type of strain during an epidemic outbreak.

A. Probability of Emergence. The first question that we investigate is whether a spreading process started by infecting a randomly chosen seed node with strain-1 causes an outbreak infecting a positive fraction of individuals, i.e., an outbreak of size $\Omega(n)$. For computing the probability of emergence, we first define probability generating functions (PGFs) of the excess degree distribution: Let $g(z^f, z^w)$ denote the PGF for joint degree distribution of a randomly selected node (*initial infective/ seed*). This corresponds to the PGF for the probability distribution p_d given in (2) and therefore,

$$g(z^f, z^w) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}} p_{\boldsymbol{d}} \left(z^f \right)^{d^f} \left(z^w \right)^{d^w}.$$
 [3]

For $a \in \{f, w\}$, we define, $G^a(z^f, z^w)$ as the PGF for excess joint degree distribution for the number of type-f and type-w contacts of a node reached by following a randomly selected type-a edge (*later-generation infective/ intermediate host*). While computing $G^a(z^f, z^w)$, we discount the type-a edge that was used to infect the given node. We have

$$G^{f}(z^{f}, z^{w}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}} \frac{d^{f} p_{\boldsymbol{d}}}{\langle d^{f} \rangle} \left(z^{f} \right)^{d^{f}-1} \left(z^{w} \right)^{d^{w}}, \qquad [4]$$

$$G^{w}(z^{f}, z^{w}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}} \frac{d^{w} p_{\boldsymbol{d}}}{\langle d^{w} \rangle} \left(z^{f} \right)^{d^{f}} (z^{w})^{d^{w}-1}.$$
 [5]

The factor $d^f p_d / \langle d^f \rangle$ (resp., $d^w p_d / \langle d^w \rangle$) gives the normalized probability that an edge of type-f (resp., type-w) is attached (at the other end) to a vertex with colored degree $d = (d^f, d^w)$ (6).

Suppose, an arbitrary node u carries strain-1 and transmits the infection to one of its susceptible neighbors, denoted as node v. Since there are two types of links/edges in the contact network and two types of strains circulating in the host population, there are four types of events that lead to the transmission of infection from node u to v, namely, whether edge (u, v) is

- (i) type-f and no mutation occurs in host v;
- (ii) type-f and mutation to strain-2 occurs in host v;
- (iii) type-w and no mutation occurs in host v;
- (iv) type-w and mutation to strain-2 occurs in host v.

In cases (i) and (iii) (resp., cases (ii) and (iv)) above, node v acquires strain-1 (respectively, strain-2). For applying a branching process argument (6, 41) and writing recursive equations using PGFs, it is crucial to keep track of both the types of edges used to transmit the infection and the types of strain acquired after mutation. Therefore, we keep a record of the number of newly infected individuals who acquire strain-1 or strain-2, and the type of edge through which they acquired the infection. We define the joint PGFs for transmitted infections over four random variables corresponding to the four infection events (i) - (iv) as follows.

$$\gamma_1(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w) = g\left(1 - T_1^f + T_1^f\left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j}^f z_j^f\right), 1 - T_1^w + T_1^w\left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j}^w z_j^w\right)\right),$$

For $a \in \{f, w\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, denote

$$\begin{split} &\Gamma_i^a(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w) = \\ &G^a\left(1 - T_i^f + T_i^f\left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{ij}^f z_j^f\right), 1 - T_i^w + T_i^w\left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{ij}^w z_j^w\right)\right). \end{split}$$

We show that the quantity $\gamma_1(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w)$ represents the PGF for the number of infection events of each type induced among the neighbors of a seed node when the seed node is infected with strain-1; see Appendix. Furthermore, for $a \in \{f, w\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we show that $\Gamma_i^a(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w)$ is the PGF for number of infection events of each type caused by a *later-generation* infective (i.e., a typical intermediate host in the process) that received the infection through a type-*a* edge and carries strain-*i*. Building upon the PGFs for the infection events caused by the seed and later-generation infectives, our first main result characterizes the probability of emergence when the outbreak starts at an arbitrary node infected with strain-1.

Theorem 1 (Probability of Emergence): It holds that

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{Emergence}] = 1 - \gamma_1(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w), \qquad [6]$$

where, $(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w)$ are the smallest non-negative roots of the fixed point equations:

$$q_1^f = \Gamma_1^f(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w)$$
^[7]

$$q_2^f = \Gamma_2^f(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w)$$
[8]

$$q_1^w = \Gamma_1^w(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w)$$
[9]

$$q_2^w = \Gamma_2^w(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w).$$
^[10]

Here, for $a \in \{w, f\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the term q_i^a can be interpreted as the probability of extinction starting from one latergeneration infective carrying strain-*i* (after mutation) which was infected through a type-*a* edge; see Appendix for a detailed proof. Therefore, the probability of emergence of an epidemic is given by the probability that at least one of the infected neighbors of the seed triggers an unbounded chain of transmission events. We note that Theorem 1 provides a strict generalization for the probability of emergence of multi-strain spreading on a single layer (14) and we can recover the probability of emergence for the case of single layer by substituting $\mathbf{T}^f = \mathbf{T}^w$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^f = \boldsymbol{\mu}^w$ in Equations Eq. (7)- Eq. (10).

B. Epidemic Threshold. Next, we characterize the epidemic threshold, which defines a boundary of the region in the parameter space inside which the outbreak always dies out after infecting only a finite number of individuals; while, outside which, there is a positive probability of a positive fraction of infections. The epidemic threshold is commonly studied as a metric to characterize and epidemic and ascertain risk factors (42). Let λ_f and λ_w denote the first moments of the distributions $\{p_{df}^f\}$ and $\{p_{dw}^w\}$, respectively. Let $\langle d_f^2 \rangle$ and $\langle d_w^2 \rangle$ denote the corresponding second moments for distributions $\{p_{df}^f\}$ and $\{p_{dw}^w\}$. Further, define β_f and β_w as the mean of the excess degree distributions respectively in the two layers. We have

$$\beta_f := \frac{\langle d_f^2 \rangle - \lambda_f}{\lambda_f} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_w := \frac{\langle d_w^2 \rangle - \lambda_w}{\lambda_w}.$$
 [11]

Theorem 2 (Epidemic Threshold): For

e

$$\boldsymbol{J} = \begin{bmatrix} T_1^f \mu_{11}^f \beta_f & T_1^f \mu_{12}^f \beta_f & T_1^w \mu_{11}^w \lambda_w & T_1^w \mu_{12}^w \lambda_w \\ T_2^f \mu_{21}^f \beta_f & T_2^f \mu_{22}^f \beta_f & T_2^w \mu_{21}^w \lambda_w & T_2^w \mu_{22}^w \lambda_w \\ T_1^f \mu_{11}^f \lambda_f & T_1^f \mu_{12}^f \lambda_f & T_1^w \mu_{11}^w \beta_w & T_1^w \mu_{12}^w \beta_w \\ T_2^f \mu_{21}^f \lambda_f & T_2^f \mu_{22}^f \lambda_f & T_2^w \mu_{21}^w \beta_w & T_2^w \mu_{22}^w \beta_w \end{bmatrix}, \quad [12]$$

let $\sigma(\mathbf{J})$ denote the spectral radius of $\sigma(\mathbf{J})$. The epidemic threshold is given by $\sigma(\mathbf{J}) = 1$.

The above theorem states that the epidemic threshold is tied to the spectral radius of the Jacobian matrix J, i.e., if $\sigma(\mathbf{J}) > 1$ then an epidemic occurs with a positive probability, whereas if $\sigma(\mathbf{J}) \leq 1$ then with high probability the infection causes a *self-limited* outbreak, where the fraction of infected nodes vanishes to 0 as $n \to \infty$. The matrix **J** is obtained while determining the stability of the fixed point of the recursive equations in Theorem 1 by linearization around $q_1^f = q_2^f = q_1^w = q_2^w = 1$. We note that when the mutation matrix is *indecomposable*, meaning that each type of strain eventually may have lead to the emergence of any other type of strain with a positive probability, the threshold theorem for multi-type branching processes (14) guarantees if $\sigma(\mathbf{J}) \leq 1$, then $q_i^a = 1$; whereas if $\sigma(\mathbf{J}) > 1$, then $0 \leq q_i^a < 1$, where $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $a \in \{f, w\}$. For *decomposable* processes, the threshold theorem (14) guarantees extinction $(q_i^a = 1)$ if $\sigma(J) \leq 1$; however the uniqueness of the fixed-point solution does not necessarily hold when $\sigma(\mathbf{J}) > 1$. Our next result provides a decoupling of the epidemic threshold into causal factors pertaining pathogen and mutation, and structural properties of different layers in the contact network.

Lemma 1: When $T_1^w/T_1^f = T_2^w/T_2^f = c$, where c > 0, and let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^f = \boldsymbol{\mu}^w$, we get,

$$\sigma(\boldsymbol{J}) = \sigma\left(\begin{bmatrix} \beta_f & c\lambda_w\\ \lambda_f & c\beta_w \end{bmatrix}\right) \times \sigma(\boldsymbol{T}^{\boldsymbol{f}}\boldsymbol{\mu}).$$
 [13]

Lemma 1 follows from the observation that with $T_1^w/T_1^f = T_2^w/T_2^f = c$, we can express J as a Kronecker product of two matrices (denoted by \otimes), as below.

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} \beta_{f} & T_{1}^{f} \mu_{12} \beta_{f} & T_{1}^{w} \mu_{11} \lambda_{w} & T_{1}^{w} \mu_{12} \lambda_{w} \\
T_{2}^{f} \mu_{21} \beta_{f} & T_{2}^{f} \mu_{22} \beta_{f} & T_{2}^{w} \mu_{21} \lambda_{w} & T_{2}^{w} \mu_{22} \lambda_{w} \\
T_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} \lambda_{f} & T_{1}^{f} \mu_{12} \lambda_{f} & T_{1}^{w} \mu_{11} \beta_{w} & T_{1}^{w} \mu_{12} \beta_{w} \\
T_{2}^{f} \mu_{21} \lambda_{f} & T_{2}^{f} \mu_{22} \lambda_{f} & T_{2}^{w} \mu_{21} \beta_{w} & T_{2}^{w} \mu_{22} \beta_{w}
\end{bmatrix} \\
= \begin{bmatrix}
T_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} \beta_{f} & T_{1}^{f} \mu_{12} \beta_{f} & cT_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} \lambda_{w} & cT_{1}^{f} \mu_{12} \lambda_{w} \\
T_{2}^{f} \mu_{21} \beta_{f} & T_{2}^{f} \mu_{22} \beta_{f} & cT_{2}^{f} \mu_{21} \lambda_{w} & cT_{2}^{f} \mu_{22} \lambda_{w} \\
T_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} \lambda_{f} & T_{1}^{f} \mu_{12} \lambda_{f} & cT_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} \beta_{w} & cT_{1}^{f} \mu_{12} \beta_{w} \\
T_{2}^{f} \mu_{21} \lambda_{f} & T_{2}^{f} \mu_{22} \lambda_{f} & cT_{2}^{f} \mu_{21} \beta_{w} & cT_{2}^{f} \mu_{22} \beta_{w}
\end{bmatrix} \\
= \begin{bmatrix}
\beta_{f} & c\lambda_{w} \\
\lambda_{f} & c\beta_{w}
\end{bmatrix} \otimes (\mathbf{T}^{f} \boldsymbol{\mu}).$$
[14]

We note that the first assumption $T_1^w/T_2^w = T_1^f/T_2^f$ is consistent with scenarios where the ratio of the transmissibility of the two strains in each layer is expected to be a property of the pathogen and not the contact networks. This assumption is supported by the typical modeling assumption (35) that social distancing measures such as increasing distance between individuals lead to a reduction in the transmissibility of the disease by a specific coefficient for the entire network layer. And therefore, when each network layer has specific restrictions in place (and corresponding coefficients for reduction in transmissibility), the ratio of the transmissibility of the two strains in each layer ends up being a property of the heterogeneity in the strains. The second assumption $(\boldsymbol{\mu}^f = \boldsymbol{\mu}^w)$ in Lemma 1 is motivated by the assumption that mutations occur *within* individual hosts, which is typical to multi-strain spreading models; see (14) and the references therein.

We note that the decoupling obtained through Eq. (13) reveals the delicate interplay of the network structure and the transmission parameters in determining the threshold for emergence of an epidemic outbreak. Lastly, we observe that Lemma 1 provides a unified analysis for the spectral radius including the case with a single-strain or a single-layer. For the multi-strain spreading on a single-layer network, the spectral radius can be derived by substituting $T_i^f = T_i^w$ in Eq. (13) and setting mean degree of one of the layers as 0, for instance, setting $\lambda_w = \beta_w = 0$, yielding the epidemic threshold, denoted as $\rho^{\text{MS-SL}}$,

$$\rho^{\rm MS-SL} = \beta_f \times \sigma(\boldsymbol{T}^f \boldsymbol{\mu}), \qquad [15]$$

where β corresponds to the mean of the excess degree distribution for the single-layered contact network. For the case of the spread of a single strain on a multi-layer contact network, we substitute $T_1^f = T_2^f$ in Eq. (13), which implies $\rho(\mathbf{T}^f \boldsymbol{\mu}) = T^f \rho(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = T^f$, yielding the epidemic threshold, denoted as $\rho^{\text{SS-ML}}$,

$$\rho^{\rm SS-ML} = \sigma \left(\begin{bmatrix} \beta_f & c\lambda_w \\ \lambda_f & c\beta_w \end{bmatrix} \right) \times T^f.$$
 [16]

It is easy to verify that the spectral radius as obtained from Eq. (15) and Eq. (16) is consistent with the results in (20) and (14).

C. Mean Epidemic Size. Next, we compute the mean epidemic size and the mean fraction of nodes infected by each type of strain. The knowledge of the fraction of individuals infected by each strain is vital for cases when different pathogen strains have different transmissibility and virulence. In such cases, predicting the expected fraction of the population hit by the more severe strain can help scale healthcare resources in time.

For computing the mean epidemic size, we consider the zero-temperature random-field Ising model on Bethe lattices (43), as done in (20). We refer to a node as being *active* if it is infected with either of the two strains (strain-1 or strain 2), and *inactive* otherwise. Since \mathbb{H} is locally tree-like (44), we consider the following hierarchical structure, such that at the top level, there is a single node (the *root*). The probability that an arbitrarily chosen root node is infected with strain 1 (resp., strain 2), gives mean value for fraction of individuals infected by strain 1 (resp., strain 2). Let Q_1 (resp., Q_2) denote the probability that the root node is active and carries strain-1 (resp., strain-2). We label the levels of the tree from level $\ell = 0$ at the bottom to level $\ell = \infty$ at the top, i.e., the root. We assume that *co-infection* is not possible, hence a node that receives x_1^f (resp., x_1^w) infections of strain-1 through type-f (resp., type-w) links, and x_2^f (resp., x_2^w) infections of strain-2 through type-f (resp., type-w) links, then it becomes infected by strain-*i* with probability $\frac{\mu_{1i}^f + \mu_{2i}^f x_2^f + \mu_{ii}^w x_1^w + \mu_{2i}^w x_2^w}{x_1^f + x_2^f + x_1^w + x_2^w}$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. For $a \in \{f, w\}$, and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $q_{\ell+1, i}^a$ denote the probability that a node at level $\ell + 1$ is active, carries strain-*i* and is connected to a node at level $\ell + 2$ through a type-*a* edge. Our next result characterizes the mean fraction of individuals infected by each type of strain during an epidemic outbreak. As a crucial step towards deriving the mean fraction of infected individuals, we first show that for i = 1, 2, we have

$$q_{\ell+1,i}^{f} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}} \frac{d^{f} p_{\boldsymbol{d}}}{\langle d^{f} \rangle} f_{i}(q_{\ell,1}^{f}, q_{\ell,2}^{f}, q_{\ell,1}^{w}, q_{\ell,2}^{w}, d^{f} - 1, d^{w}), \quad [17]$$

$$q_{\ell+1,i}^{w} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{d}} \frac{d^{w} p_{\boldsymbol{d}}}{\langle d^{w} \rangle} f_{i}(q_{\ell,1}^{f}, q_{\ell,2}^{f}, q_{\ell,1}^{w}, q_{\ell,2}^{w}, d^{f}, d^{w} - 1), \quad [18]$$

We present a proof of Eq. (18) and Eq. (17) in the Appendix. For $a \in \{f, w\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $q^a_{\infty,i}$ denote the limit of $q^a_{\ell,i}$ as $\ell \to \infty$.

Theorem 3 (Epidemic Size) For i = 1, 2, we have

$$Q_i = \sum_{d} p_d f_i(q_{\infty,1}^f, q_{\infty,2}^f, q_{\infty,1}^w, q_{\infty,2}^w, d^f, d^w), \qquad [19]$$

with the mean epidemic size

$$Q = Q_1 + Q_2,$$

where $f_i(u_1^f, u_2^f, u_1^w, u_2^w, z^f, z^w)$ is given by Eq. (52). Here, $f_i(u_1^f, u_2^f, u_1^w, u_2^w, z^f, z^w)$ denotes the probability that an arbitrary node u at level $\ell + 1$ gets infected with strain-1 through neighbors in level ℓ such that there are z^f and z^w neighbors of node u in layers f and w respectively. A precise definition of $f_i(u_1^f, u_2^f, u_1^w, u_2^w, z^f, z^w)$ and a proof of Theorem 3 is presented in the Appendix. As for the previous Theorems, we observe that Theorem 3 collapses to the multistrain spreading on a single network layer by substituting the transmissibilities of the two network layers as being equal.

4. Experiments and Simulation Setup

In this section, we present numerical studies on different contact structures and transmission patterns. For our simulations, we focus on the setting where the fitness landscape consists of two types of strains and two types of network layers. The two network layers are independently generated using the configuration model after sampling degree sequences from the distributions for the two layers $\{p_k^f, k = 0, 1, ...\}$ and $\{p_k^w, k = 0, 1, \ldots\}$. We first present results for the case when the network layers follow a Poisson degree distribution. Next, we consider a more realistic setting motivated by cutoffs on gathering limits, where the degree distributions for the two layers follow the power law degree distribution with exponential cutoff for both layers. It is well known that the structure of several real-world networks including social networks can be modeled by the power law degree distribution (45). The spreading process is initiated when a randomly chosen node is selected as the seed carrying strain-1 (Figure 2). In subsequent time-steps, each node independently infects their neighbors with a transmission probability that depends on both the type of strain carried and the nature of link through which contact occurs. After infection, the pathogen mutates within the hosts with probabilities given by the mutation matrices. In cases where a susceptible node comes in contact with multiple infectious neighbors, we resolve exposure to multiple infections by assigning the probability of acquiring each



Fig. 3. The probability of emergence and mean epidemic size when the degree distribution of the two network layers is Poisson with parameters λ_f and λ_w respectively, averaged over 500 independent experiments.

strain as the fraction of exposures received for that strain. In particular, if a node receives x_1^f (resp., x_1^w) infections of strain-1 through type-f (resp., type-w) links, and x_2^f (resp., x_2^w) infections of strain-2 through type-f (resp., type-w) links, with probability $\frac{\mu_{1i}^f x_1^f + \mu_{2i}^f x_2^f + \mu_{1i}^w x_1^w + \mu_{2i}^w x_2^w}{x_1^f + x_2^f + x_1^w + x_2^w}$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it acquires strain-i, which it spreads to its neighbors. The process reaches a steady state and terminates when no new infections are possible. Throughout, we let Q denote the mean epidemic size and Q_1 and Q_2 , respectively denote the final fraction of individuals infected by each strain in the steady state.

Poisson degree distribution: In the first set of simulations, we compare our analytical results for the probability of emergence and expected epidemic size with empirical values obtained by simulating the spread of infection over multiple independent experiments. We consider a contact network where the degree distribution for each layer is Poisson with parameters λ_f and λ_w , respectively. To model scenarios where there is a risk of the emergence of a new, more transmissible strain (strain-2) starting from strain-1, we set $T_1^f = 0.6, T_2^f = 0.8, T_1^w = 0.7, T_2^w = 0.9, \mu_{11}^f = \mu_{11}^w = 0.1, \text{ and } \mu_{22}^f = \mu_{22}^w = 0.95$ and we fix the number of nodes n = 10000. We plot the probability of emergence and epidemic size averaged over 500 independent experiments in Figure 3. We indicate the epidemic threshold as the vertical dashed line where we observe a phase transition, with the probability and expected epidemic size sharply increasing from zero to one as the epidemic threshold is exceeded. We plot the expected fraction of individuals infected by each strain $(Q_1 \text{ and } Q_2)$. The total epidemic size Q is the sum of the fraction of individuals infected by each strain $(Q = Q_1 + Q_2)$.

To demonstrate the impact of increasing edge density of



Fig. 4. Probability of emergence and the expected epidemic size for a contact network comprising two Poisson layers with mean degrees λ_f and λ_w respectively, averaged over 1000 independent experiments.

the contact network, we vary the mean node degree while keeping transmission and mutation parameters fixed. In Figure 4, we consider the case where the degree distribution for network layers are Poisson and we vary the mean degrees of the two layers. We set n = 10000, $T_1^f = 0.5, T_2^f = 0.7,$ $T_1^w = 0.3, T_2^w = 0.4, \mu_{11}^f = \mu_{11}^w = 0.2$, and $\mu_{22}^f = \mu_{22}^w = 0.5$. To see the impact of the edge density of the two layers on the epidemic characteristics, we vary λ_f and λ_w in [1, 2, 3]. The probability of emergence and epidemic size are averaged over 1000 independent experiments. We observe a good agreement between our analytical results in Theorems 1-3 and simulations in Figures 3 and 4.

Power law degree distribution with exponential cutoff: In the next set of experiments, we study power law degree distributions with gathering limits modeled through exponential cutoffs parameterized as follows.

$$d^{f} = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ for } k = 0\\ k^{-\nu_{f}} e^{-k/\tau_{f}} \left(\operatorname{Li}_{\nu_{f}}(e^{-1/\tau_{f}}) \right)^{-1} & \text{for } k \ge 1 \end{cases}$$
$$d^{w} = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ for } k = 0\\ k^{-\nu_{w}} e^{-k/\tau_{w}} \left(\operatorname{Li}_{\nu_{w}}(e^{-1/\tau_{w}}) \right)^{-1} & \text{for } k \ge 1, \end{cases}$$
[20]

where $\operatorname{Li}_{\nu}(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-\nu} z^k$ is the polylogarithm of order ν with argument z. In Figure 5, we plot the probability of emergence and mean epidemic size averaged over 500 independent experiments with the vertical dashed line indicating the epidemic threshold $\rho(\mathbf{J}) = 1$. To highlight the impact of varying the cutoff parameter, we set $\tau_f = \tau_w$ and vary it in the interval [1,5], while keeping the other parameters fixed at $T_1^f = 0.65, T_2^f = 0.7, T_1^w = 0.3, T_2^w = 0.4, \mu_{11}^f = \mu_{11}^w = 0.1, \mu_{22}^f = \mu_{22}^w = 0.95, \nu_f = 2.5, \text{ and } \nu_w = 2.3$. We again



Fig. 5. The probability of emergence and mean epidemic size for network layers following power-law degree distribution with exponential cut-off parameters τ_f and τ_w , averaged over 500 independent experiments.

notice that the analytical predictions in Theorems 1-3 align well with the simulations.

5. Transition from a Single-layer or Single-strain to Multi-layer and Multi-strain

So far, we discussed the applicability of the analytical results for different degree distributions and parameter settings. Next, we provide insights into how the model space and predictions of the multi-strain multi-layer model compare with related models(14, 46). In what follows, we demonstrate that the single-strain or single-layer models are subsumed as limiting cases of the multi-layer multi-strain model and fail to capture the full spectrum of emergent phenomena. Thus, the multi-strain multi-layer model provides a richer model space compared with models that do not simultaneously account for heterogeneity in transmissibility of different strains and different types of connections.

We illustrate this phenomenon by analyzing the case where the first strain by itself is not transmissible enough to cause an epidemic and the the course of the epidemic is tied to the emergence of a highly transmissible strain. This setting is also of importance from a practical standpoint during the early stages of the spread of an infectious disease, where it is crucial to understand whether the emergence of a highly contagious strain can drive an epidemic. We let the seed node be infected with strain-1 and we assume that strain-2 is the more transmissible strain. For modeling mutations that occur within hosts, we assume the mutation probabilities depend on the type of strain but not on the type of link over which the infection was transmitted. We let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ denote the mutation matrices in the two layers ($\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^f = \boldsymbol{\mu}^w$), and further we assume that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is one-step irreversible (14) with $\mu_{22} \rightarrow 1$, wherein with high probability, once the pathogen mutates to strain-2, it does not mutate back to strain-1. In particular, we consider the one-step irreversible mutation and transmission matrices as below:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{11} & 1 - \mu_{11} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, 0 < \mu_{11} < 1$$
 [21]

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_1^w & 0\\ 0 & T_2^w \end{bmatrix} = c \begin{bmatrix} T_1^f & 0\\ 0 & T_2^f \end{bmatrix}, c \ge 1; \quad T_1^w < T_2^w \text{ and } T_1^f < T_2^f.$$
[22]

When the probability that strain-1 does not undergo a mutation within the host, denoted by μ_{11} , approaches one, it corresponds to the case of the spread of pathogens without mutations. Thus, the deviation of μ_{11} away from one provides a way to characterize the departure from the case where no mutations take place. Similarly, to characterize the transition from a single-layer to a multi-layer network, we consider the following degree distributions for the two layers:

$$d^{f} \sim \begin{cases} 0 \text{ w.p. } \alpha_{f} \\ \text{Poisson}(\nu_{f}) \text{ w.p. } 1 - \alpha_{f}, \\ d^{w} \sim \text{Poisson}(\nu_{w}). \end{cases}$$
[23]

In Eq. (23) above, as α_f approaches one, no nodes participate in layer-f, while $\alpha_f = 0$. corresponds to the scenario where we have two independent Poisson layers. We first derive a result that throws light on how the mutation probability affects the epidemic threshold.

Lemma 2: For the one-step irreversible mutation matrix given by Eq. (21) and transmission parameters satisfying Eq. (22), the epidemic threshold does not depend on μ_{11} or T_1^f . Specifically,

$$\sigma(\boldsymbol{J}) = T_2^f \times \sigma\left(\begin{bmatrix} \beta_f & c\lambda_w \\ \lambda_f & c\beta_w \end{bmatrix} \right).$$
 [24]

Proof: Note that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is one-step irreversible, and the matrix $T^{\boldsymbol{f}}\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is upper triangular. Thus, $\sigma(T^{\boldsymbol{f}}\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \max\{T_1^f\mu_{11}, T_2^f\}$. Since strain-2 is more transmissible $(T_1^f < T_2^f)$, we have $\sigma(T^{\boldsymbol{f}}\boldsymbol{\mu}) = T_2^f$ and Eq. (13) implies that $\sigma(\boldsymbol{J})$ is not impacted by the magnitude of μ_{11} or T_1^f .

Next, in Figure 6, we characterize the transition from the single-layer to multi-layer setting by varying $\alpha_f \in [0, 1]$ and the transition from single-strain to multi-strain with $\mu_{11} \in [0, 1]$. The vertical line $\alpha_f = 1$ corresponds to the case when no nodes participate in layer-f and the contact network \mathbb{H} only comprises a single-layer \mathbb{W} . While, the horizontal line $\mu_{11} = 1$ corresponds to the case when no mutations to strain-2 appear with whp starting from strain-1. From Lemma 2, we know the epidemic threshold does not vary with μ_{11} , and it is evident that the contours for constant spectral radius are lines parallel to the horizontal axis α_f . Note that at the corners of the domain $(\alpha_f, \mu_{11}) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, the multi-strain multi-layer model effectively reduces to a simpler model as follows

α_f = 1, μ₁₁ = 0: one layer (W) and mutations to strain-2 occur whp (so effectively one strain),



Fig. 6. A parameterization of the multi-layer multi-strain model showing the transition from the presence of one layer to two layers and one strain to two strains. The vertical line $\alpha_f = 1$ corresponds to the case when there are no edges in layer-f and the contact network \mathbb{H} effectively has a single-layer \mathbb{W} . The horizontal line $\mu_{11} = 1$ corresponds to the case where no mutations to a different strain occur starting from strain-1. The vertical lines correspond to contours with a constant spectral radius $(\rho(\mathbf{J}) = c)$.



Fig. 7. The analytical probability of emergence with varying $(\alpha_f, \mu_{11}) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ for $T_1^f = 0.4, T_2^f = 0.8, c = 1.2 \nu_f = \nu_w = 1.2$. There remains a low probability of emergence when i) there is a single-layer present, i.e., $\alpha_f = 1$ (even with the highly contagious strain circulating), and ii) with a single strain circulating, i.e., $\mu_{11} = 1$ (even when the f layer is added). However, when both layers are open and mutations occur with a positive probability, we see a higher probability of emergence.

- α_f = 0, μ₁₁ = 1: two layers and there are no mutations to strain-2 whp,
- $\alpha_f = 1, \mu_{11} = 1$: one layer (W) and there are no mutations to strain-2 whp (with high probability),

while all points in the interior of the domain $(\alpha_f, \mu_{11}) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ and the point $\alpha_f = 0, \mu_{11} = 1$ correspond to the case where both types of edges and strains occur with a positive probability. In Figure 7, we plot the probability of emergence for the parameters $(\alpha_f, \mu_{11}) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ while setting $T_1^f = 0.4, T_2^f = 0.8, c = 1.2$, and $\nu_f = \nu_w = 1.2$. In light of Lemma 2, since the epidemic threshold is not affected by μ_{11} , it maybe tempting to consider a single-strain model as being sufficient to capture the epidemic characteristics. However, Figure 7 demonstrates that the possibility of mutations does matter in determining the likelihood of emergence of an epidemic. Moreover, we observe that for regions where there is effectively just a single-layer ($\alpha_f = 1$), the probability of emergence remains low despite the possible emergence of a highly contagious strain. Likewise, in cases where only a single, moderately-transmissible strain circulates with a high



Fig. 8. A lower bound for the probability of emergence when the mutation matrix is one step irreversible with $\mu_{22} \rightarrow 1$. The probability of emergence for the multi-layer multi-strain model can be expressed as a product of two factors- the probability of mutation to strain-2 along the chain of transmissions and the probability of emergence if only strain-2 was circulating in the population. Here, the network layers are taken to be Poisson with parameters $\lambda_f = 1$ and $\lambda_w \in [0, 10]$.

probability $(\mu_{11} = 1)$, even the addition of another layer-f does not lead to a high probability of emergence. In contrast, when both types of network layers are present, and there is a non-zero probability of mutation to strain-2, the probability of emergence is high. Moreover, there is a spectrum of intermediate values that the probability of emergence admits across the domain, with the single-layer or single-strain cases only capturing the limiting cases where α_f and μ_{11} respectively approach one. This observation sheds light on the impact of imposing/lifting mitigation measures concerning different contact network layers (e.g., school closures or many companies adopting work-from-home policies) on the emergence of more transmissible variants. For example, opening a new layer in the contact network may be deemed safe based on the transmissibility of the initial strain, but even a modest increase in infections caused by the new layer might increase the chances of a more transmissible strain to emerge. which in turn can make an epidemic more likely. Thus, by studying the mutations over a multi-layer network, our results can help understand the comprehensive impact of layer closures/openings.

The Impact of Mutations on the Probability of Emergence

Next, we derive an interpretable bound for probability of emergence to highlight the role of mutations for one-step irreversible mutation matrices, following the approach in (20). Throughout this discussion, we assume that Eq. (21) holds and $T_1^f < T_2^f, T_1^w < T_2^w$. We have

 $\mathbb{P}[\text{emergence}]$

 $\geq \mathbb{P}[\text{emergence} \mid \text{ at least 1 mutation to strain } -2]$ $\cdot \mathbb{P}[\text{at least 1 mutation to strain } -2]. \qquad [25]$

Let \mathcal{E}_1 denote the event that there is a positive fraction of strain-1 infections before a mutation to strain-2 appears. Further, let $P^{\mathrm{ML}-2}$ denote the probability of emergence on the multi-layer network \mathbb{H} when only strain-2 circulates in the

population. We have

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{P}[\text{emergence} \mid \text{ at least 1 mutation to strain} - 2 \mid] \\ & = \mathbb{P}[\text{emergence}, \ \mathcal{E}_1 \mid \text{ at least 1 mutation to strain} - 2] \\ & + \mathbb{P}[\text{emergence}, \ \mathcal{E}_1^c \mid \text{ at least 1 mutation to strain} - 2] \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}[\text{emergence}, \ \mathcal{E}_1^c \mid \text{ at least 1 mutation to strain} - 2] \end{split}$$

$$=P^{\mathrm{ML}-2}.$$
[27]

Note that the bound in Eq. (26) is tight, when the transmissibility of strain-1 is below the critical threshold, i.e., when

$$T_1^f \rho \left(\begin{bmatrix} \beta_f & c\lambda_w \\ \lambda_f & c\beta_w \end{bmatrix} \right) \le 1.$$
 [28]

[26]

Combining Eq. (25) and Eq. (27), we get

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{emergence}] \ge P_2^{\text{ML}} \mathbb{P}[\text{at least 1 mutation to strain} - 2].$$
[29]

In the above lower bound, P_2^{ML} can be obtained from Eq. (6) by substituting $(T_1^f, T_1^w) \leftarrow (T_2^f, T_2^w)$. For computing $\mathbb{P}[\text{at least 1 mutation to strain - 2 }]$, we find the complementary probability, i.e., the $\mathbb{P}[\text{no mutation to strain - 2 }]$ by solving a system of recursive equations. We first obtain $\mathbb{P}[\text{no mutation to strain - 2 }]$ in the chain of infection events emanating from a later generation infective reached by type-fedge (resp., type-w edge), which in turn yields the probability of no mutation starting from the initial infective (seed node). For, $a \in \{f, w\}$, let q^a denote the probability of there being no mutation to strain-2 in the chain of infections emanating from a later generation infective that was infected through a type-a edge. We have

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{at least 1 mutation to strain} - 2] = 1 - g(1 - T_1^f + T_1^f \mu_{11} q^f, 1 - T_1^w + T_1^w \mu_{11} q^w), \quad [30]$$

where

$$q^{f} = G^{f}(1 - T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\mu_{11}q^{f}, 1 - T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\mu_{11}q^{w}), \qquad [31]$$

$$q^{w} = G^{w}(1 - T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\mu_{11}q^{f}, 1 - T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\mu_{11}q^{w}), \qquad [32]$$

and the PGFs g, G^f, G^w are respectively defined through Eq. (3)-Eq. (5). To see why Eq. (30) holds, note that for no mutation to strain-2 to occur, each susceptible neighbor of a later-generation must either gets infected with strain-1 or remain uninfected. Let \bar{p}_{df} (respectively, \bar{p}_{dw}) denote the excess degree distribution of a later generation infective reached by following a type-f (respectively, type-w edge).

$$q^{f} = \sum_{df} \sum_{dw} \left(\bar{p}_{df} \bar{p}_{dw} \sum_{kf=0}^{d^{f}} (1 - T_{1}^{f})^{d^{f}-k^{f}} (T_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} q^{f})^{k^{f}} \right)$$
$$\cdot \sum_{k^{w}=0}^{d^{w}} (1 - T_{1}^{w})^{d^{w}-k^{w}} (T_{1}^{w} \mu_{11} q^{w})^{k^{w}} \right)$$
$$= \sum_{df} \sum_{dw} \bar{p}_{df} \bar{p}_{dw} (1 - T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} q^{f})^{d^{f}}$$
$$\cdot (1 - T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w} \mu_{11} q^{w})^{d^{w}}$$
$$= G^{f} (1 - T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f} \mu_{11} q^{f}, 1 - T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w} \mu_{11} q^{w}).$$



Fig. 9. For multi-strain spreading on a network comprising of two independent Poisson layers with parameters $\lambda_f = 1$ and λ_w , we plot the epidemic size obtained through Theorem 3 indicated as MS-ML. We also plot the corresponding prediction made by reduction to a single-layer(20) through the transformations Eq. (34) and Eq. (33), indicated as MS-SL.

In Figure 8, we plot the lower bound obtained through Eq. (29) and compare it with the probability of emergence obtained through Theorem 1. The degree distribution for layers f and w follow Poisson distributions with parameters λ_f and λ_w respectively. We set $T_1^f = 0.2$, $T_2^f = 0.5$, $T_1^w = 0.3$, $T_2^w = 0.6$; $\mu_{11}^f = \mu_{11}^w = 0.8$; $\lambda_f = 1$, and vary λ_w . We observe a tight correspondence between the lower bound and the probability of emergence. We note that as more edges are added to layer-w, the more likely it is for a mutation to the highly transmissible strain-2, which ultimately makes the outbreak more likely.

7. The Role of Network Structure

In this section, we look closely at the impact of heterogeneity in network layers on the epidemic outbreak. In what follows, we show that the success of predictions made by a singlelayer model in the presence of heterogeneous layers is critically tied to the form of the Poisson distribution. And as the network layers deviate from being Poisson, the transformation of the two layers to a single layer is no longer sufficient to describe the epidemic characteristics of the multi-strain multi-layer model.

The case of Poisson network layers: Suppose, the degree distribution for the network-layers \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{W} follow the distribution Poisson (λ_f) and Poisson (λ_w) respectively. Now consider the following transformations that reduce the two network layers into a single Poisson network layer with mean degree λ given by the sum of the mean degrees of the constituent layers. For each strain i = 1, 2, we take T_i to be the the weighted average of the transmissibilities in the two layers where the weights correspond to the mean degree in each layer. This gives

$$\lambda \leftarrow \lambda_f + \lambda_w. \tag{33}$$

$$T_1 \leftarrow \frac{\lambda_f T_1^f + \lambda_w T_1^w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w}; \quad T_2 \leftarrow \frac{\lambda_f T_2^f + \lambda_w T_2^w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w}.$$
 [34]

Next, we show that when both network layers are purely Poisson, the probability of emergence predicted by the multistrain model on a single through the mapping Eq. (33) and Eq. (34) is accurate. When a network layer is Poisson, say with parameter λ , the PGF for the degree distribution (denoted, g(z)) and excess degree distribution (denoted, G(z)) is given as $g(z) = G(z) = e^{-\lambda(1-z)}$. To prove the above, we note that when both layers are independent Poisson distributions, the analytical probability of emergence for the multi-layer model is given as follows.

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{emergence}] = \gamma_1(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w) \\ = g\left(1 - T_1^f + T_1^f \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j} q_j^f\right), \\ 1 - T_1^w + T_1^w \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j} q_j^w\right)\right), \\ = \exp\left\{\lambda_f \left(-T_1^f + T_1^f \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j} q_j^f\right)\right)\right\} \\ \cdot \exp\left\{\lambda_w \left(-T_1^w + T_1^w \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j} q_j^w\right)\right)\right\},$$
[35]

where for $a \in \{f, w\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$q_{i}^{a} = \Gamma_{i}^{a}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})$$

$$= G^{a}\left(1 - T_{i}^{f} + T_{i}^{f}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} \mu_{ij}^{f} z_{j}^{f}\right), \\ 1 - T_{i}^{w} + T_{i}^{w}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} \mu_{ij}^{w} z_{j}^{w}\right)\right),$$

$$= \exp\left\{\lambda_{f}\left(-T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} \mu_{1j} q_{j}^{f}\right)\right)\right\} \\ \cdot \exp\left\{\lambda_{w}\left(-T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} \mu_{1j} q_{j}^{w}\right)\right)\right\}.$$

where the last step follows from the independence of the degree distribution of the network layers and the fact that for the Poisson degree distribution, the PGF of the excess degree distribution shares the same functional form as the PGF of the degree distribution. Using Eq. (35), we have $q_1^f = q_1^w$ and $q_2^f = q_2^w$. Substituting in Eq. (35),

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{emergence}]$$

$$= \exp\left\{-(\lambda_f + \lambda_w)\frac{\lambda_f T_1^f + \lambda_w T_1^w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w} \left(-1 + \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j} q_j^f\right)\right)\right\}.$$
[36]

This is in line with the prediction on a single-layer model (14, 20) through the mapping Eq. (34) and Eq. (33). Since, we obtain the same system of recursive equations for the probability of emergence for the multi-layer model as with the reduction to the single-layer model, the corresponding epidemic threshold is also the same. Next, we plot the analytical epidemic size as predicted by reduction to a single-layer model through Eq. (33) and Eq. (34), when in fact there are two distinct layers in the network; see Figure 9. We set $T_1^f = 0.6, T_2^f = 0.8, T_1^w = 0.7, T_2^w = 0.9, \mu_{11} = 0.1, \mu_{22} = 0.95, \lambda_f = 1$, and vary λ_w in the interval [0, 4]. We observe

that the fraction of infected individuals for each type of strain $(Q_1 \text{ and } Q_2)$ is accurately predicted by the multi-strain model on a single Poisson layer with mean degree $\lambda_f + \lambda_w$.

So far we have seen that when the two network layers are Poisson, a reduction to a multi-strain single-layer model (MS-SL) is successful in predicting the epidemic characterisites. A natural question to ask is whether we can alternatively use a reduction to a single-strain multi-layer model to characterize the epidemic? It is known (7, 20) that when there are correlations between infection events, the predictions made by models that assume independent transmission events can lead to incorrect predictions. For the multi-strain transmission model, the infection events are conditionally independent given the type of strain carried by a node and dependent otherwise. Therefore, models that do not account for correlation in infection events, such as single-strain spreading on multilayer networks (46), lead to inaccurate predictions for multistrain settings; see (20) for a detailed discussion.

When the Poisson assumption breaks: Next, we discuss more realistic scenarios where the distribution of the individual layers may no longer be a pure Poisson distribution. When the network layers cease to be Poisson while reducing to a single-layer model, generating a degree distribution of the equivalent single-layer is challenging. We show that using models that do not account for differences in transmissibilities across different layers may lead to inaccurate predictions for the epidemic threshold, probability of emergence, and the mean epidemic size. Below, we provide an example where a naive reduction to a single-layer network, with the node degree defined as the sum of the node degree in the two layers, may lead to incorrect predictions and the challenges associated with defining such a reduction.

We now illustrate the potential pitfall of mapping a multilayer network to a single-layer structure generated using the configuration model. As a concrete example we study how well can the reduction to a single-layer allow us to predict the spectral radius for a multi-layer network. We first consider the case when the ratio of the transmissibilities in the two network layers is one for both strains, i.e., $\frac{T_1^{\rm ob}}{T_1^f} = \frac{T_2^{\rm ob}}{T_2^f} = 1$. In other words, the transmissibilities only depend on the type of strain and are agnostic of the type of link. Throughout, we let $\rho(.)$ denote the spectral radius of the matrix supplied as its argument. Let the single-layer network obtained by taking the sum of node degrees in the two layers be denoted by \mathbb{H} . Since the layers in the multi-layer network have independent degree distributions, the degree distribution for \mathbb{H} is given by $\tilde{p} = p^f * p^w$, where * denotes the convolution operator. For $a \in \{f, w\}$, recall that λ_a and β_a respectively denote the mean degree distribution and the mean excess degree of distribution for network layer a. It can be verified that for network H, the mean degree distribution and mean excess degree distribution, respectively denoted by $\tilde{\lambda}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ are given as:

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda_w + \lambda_f, \qquad [37]$$

$$\tilde{\beta} = \frac{\beta_f \lambda_f + \beta_w \lambda_w + 2\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w}.$$
[38]

From Eq. (13), it follows that for the multi-layer network $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{W} \cup \mathbb{F}$, the critical threshold for the emergence of the

epidemic outbreak is

$$\sigma\left(\begin{bmatrix}\beta_f & \lambda_w\\\lambda_f & \beta_w\end{bmatrix}\right) \times \sigma\left(\boldsymbol{T^f}\boldsymbol{\mu}\right) > 1.$$
[39]

Upon mapping the transmissibilities as per Eq. (34), the critical threshold for the emergence of the epidemic outbreak in \mathbb{H} (constructed using the configuration model with degree drawn from the distribution $p^f * p^w$) is given by

$$\frac{\beta_f \lambda_f + \beta_w \lambda_w + 2\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w} \times \sigma \left(\boldsymbol{T}^{\boldsymbol{f}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \right) > 1.$$
 [40]

Comparing the above thresholds in (39) and (40), we see that the predicted thresholds are identical if and only if

$$\sigma\left(\begin{bmatrix}\beta_f & \lambda_w\\\lambda_f & \beta_w\end{bmatrix}\right) = \frac{\beta_f \lambda_f + \beta_w \lambda_w + 2\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w}.$$
 [41]

It can be verified that with $\lambda_f, \lambda_w, \beta_f, \beta_w > 0$, Eq. (41) holds if and only if

$$\beta_f - \lambda_f = \beta_w - \lambda_w.$$
[42]

We provide a proof of Eq. (42) in the Appendix (Section D). The condition Eq. (42) is equivalent to the dispersion indices of the constituent layers being the same, where the dispersion index is defined as the ratio of the variance and mean of the degree distribution. For cases when the degree distribution of the constituent network layers are not from the same parametric family of distributions, depending on the magnitude of the dispersion index relative to one, the condition Eq. (42) may not hold. For instance, if the degree distribution of the two layers is respectively Poisson and Binomial, regardless of the choice of parameters of the distributions, the condition $\beta_f - \lambda_f = \beta_w - \lambda_w$ will never hold since the dispersion index of the Poisson distribution and the Binomial distribution are respectively = 1 and > 1.

Consider the case when the distribution for individuals participating in a network layer is Poisson. Since not every individual is likely to participate in each network layer, and we need to accommodate an arbitrary fraction of non-participating nodes, the degree distribution in each layer cannot be assumed Poisson. Next, to see the applicability of Eq. (42) while accounting for a positive probability for non-participation of nodes in each layer layers, we consider two mixture distributions as below. For layer f, degree distribution is w.p. α_f , 0; and w.p. $1 - \alpha_f$, Poisson(ν_f); similarly for layer w, degree distribution is w.p. α_w , 0; and w.p. $1 - \alpha_w$, Poisson(ν_w). Namely,

$$d^{f} = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ w.p. } \alpha_{f} \\ \text{Poisson}(\nu_{f}) \text{ w.p. } 1 - \alpha_{f} \end{cases}$$
$$d^{w} = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ w.p. } \alpha_{w} \\ \text{Poisson}(\nu_{w}) \text{ w.p. } 1 - \alpha_{w}. \end{cases}$$
[43]

Now, the degree distribution of sum of the degree distribution of (independent) network layers f and w becomes,

$$\tilde{d} = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ w.p. } \alpha_f \cdot \alpha_w \\ \text{Poisson}(\nu_f) \text{ w.p. } (1 - \alpha_f) \cdot \alpha_w \\ \text{Poisson}(\nu_w) \text{ w.p. } \alpha_f \cdot (1 - \alpha_w) \\ \text{Poisson}(\nu_w + \nu_f) \text{ w.p. } (1 - \alpha_f) \cdot (1 - \alpha_w), \end{cases}$$
[44]



Fig. 10. A comparison of the predictions made by reduction to a single-layer through Eq. (34) and Eq. (44) (denoted as MS-SL) with the predictions made through Theorems 1 and 2. While the degree distribution in the first network layer follows Poisson distribution, the distribution of layer w is a mixture of 0 (w.p. α_w) and Poisson distribution (w.p. $1 - \alpha_w$). For c = 1, the dispersion index of the two network layers and consequently the predicted epidemic thresholds are matched only when $\alpha_w = 0$, i.e., when both layers are purely Poisson.

where $\nu_f, \nu_w > 0$ and $0 \le \alpha_f, \alpha_w \le 1$. For $a \in \{f, w\}$, the mean degree distribution $\lambda_a = (1 - \alpha_a)\nu_a$ and the mean excess degree distribution $\beta_a = \nu_a$. Therefore, for the matching condition Eq. (42) to hold, we require $\alpha_f \nu_f = \alpha_w \nu_w$. Consequently, Eq. (42) cannot hold when exactly one of the layers is pure Poisson since it would amount to exactly one among α_f or α_w to be 0. A key takeaway from the discussion above regarding the sum of the degrees in the two layers as the degree distribution for a single-layer network $(\tilde{p} = p^f * p^w)$ is the following. Even with c = 1, matching the epidemic threshold is critically tied to the dispersion index of the two layers being perfectly matched, which is a strong assumption and would be violated whenever there is heterogeneity in the structure of the network layers.

In Figure 10, we compare how well the reduction to a single network layer through Eq. (34) and Eq. (44) does in predicting the emergent phenomena for the two-layered network with distributions Eq. (43). We set $\nu_f = 1, \nu_w = 4, \mu_{11} = \mu_{22} = 0.5, T_2^f = 0.8, T_1^f = 0.5, \alpha_f = 0$, and vary $\alpha_w \in [0, 1]$. Note that $\alpha_w = 0$ corresponds to the case when both layers are purely Poisson and their dispersion indices are perfectly matched, whereas $\alpha_w = 1$ renders layer f closed, and there is effectively a single Poisson layer (layer w) in the network. In both these cases, the probability of emergence predicted by the resulting single-layer model (indicated as MS-SL) matches the predictions through Theorem 1 (indicated as MS-ML). Notice that whenever $\alpha_w \neq 0$, the dispersion indices for the two layers are distinct and the condition Eq. (42) is not met. When $0 < \alpha_w < 1$, the single-layer model fails to accurately predict the probability of emergence and the epidemic threshold. We repeat the comparison for the parameter $c \in \{1, 0.5, 0.1\}$, where $c = \frac{T_1^w}{T_1^f} = \frac{T_2^w}{T_2^f}$ and consistently observe a gap in predictions made by the two models.

Next, we list further challenges in merging the multi-layer network structure into a single layer. We note that mapping the multi-layer network, which is a disjoint union of two independent layers generated with the configuration model, with a single-layer network generated using a configuration model leads to a different structure. For models that do not account for mutations, it is known (47) that depending on the parameters of the degree distribution, the assortativity of the multi-layer network \mathbb{H} can be very different from the assortativity of a single-layer network generated whose degree is the sum of the degree of the constituent layers. Here, assortativity is measured as the Pearson correlation coefficient of the degrees at either end of an edge (48). The authors (47) consider the spread of a single contagion strain on a multi-layer network given by the union of a purely Poisson and a Poisson distribution mixed with the constant 0. For the single-layer network with the degree distribution taken as the convolution of the degree distribution of the constituent layers, the degrees are uncorrelated and the assortativity is zero. In contrast, the assortativity for the multi-layer network varies with α_f and α_w . Our result regarding the critical role played by the difference in the dispersion index of the two network layers also throws light into why the resulting predictions made by the single-layer model are inaccurate. A further discussion on challenges with reducing the multi-strain multi-layer (MS-ML) model to single-strain multi-layer (SS-ML) or a multi-strain single-layer (MS-SL) model are presented in the Appendix.

8. Conclusion

This work analyzed the spreading characteristics of mutating contagions over multi-layer networks. We derived the fundamental epidemiological quantities for the proposed multi-layer multi-strain model: the probability of emergence, the epidemic threshold, and the mean fraction of individuals infected with each strain. We decoupled the epidemic threshold into terms eliciting the contributions of the network and transmission parameters. Moreover, we examined the role of different mutation patterns of the pathogen and the structure of the contact network of the host population on the epidemic characteristics. Our results highlight that the impact of imposing/lifting mitigation measures concerning different contact network layers should be evaluated in connection with their effect on the emergence of a new pathogen strain. By studying the mutation model over a multi-layer network, our work reveals the comprehensive impact of layer closures/openings. Furthermore, we proposed and analyzed several transformations to simpler models that do not simultaneously account for the heterogeneity in pathogen strains and network layers. We showed that existing models cannot be invoked to accurately characterize the multi-layer multi-strain setting while also unraveling conditions under which simpler models can be useful for making predictions. We observed that the accuracy of predictions made by a reduction to a single layer is contingent on the perfect matching of the dispersion index of the network layers, which makes for a strong assumption that does not hold in practice. On the other hand, we show that reductions to a single-strain setting fail to accurately predict the probability of emergence. This study further underscores the need to develop models that simultaneously capture the variability in transmissibility across different types of contact events and pathogen strains. Future directions include incorporating other modes of heterogeneity in the network structure into our analysis. A promising future application is to leverage models for mutating contagions to combat the spread of misinformation over social networks.

Appendix

A. Proof of Theorem 1 (Probability of Emergence).

Preliminaries: The proof of Theorem 1 uses the fact that the network \mathbb{H} is locally tree-like, which follows from the result (44) that the clustering coefficient of colored degree-driven networks scales as 1/n as n gets large. The key idea behind this proof is based on the bond percolation analysis for the configuration model (49, p. 385) where it is argued that a node does not belong to the giant component if and only if it is not connected to the giant component via any of its neighbors. This observation is extended to the multi-strain setting by noting that a randomly selected node v infects only a finite number of nodes if and only if all neighbors of v infect only a finite number of nodes (14).

Derivation of PGFs: For completing the proof of Theorem 6, we derive the PGFs for infected neighbors of the seed node and later generation infectives. Recall that the seed node is infected with strain-1. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $a \in \{f, w\}$, let X_i^a denote the number of infections of type-*i* transmitted by a seed node *u* to its neighbors which are connected through type-*a* edges. We first derive the PGF $\gamma_1(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w)$ for $X_1^f, X_2^f, X_1^w, X_2^w$ i.e., the number of infection events of each type induced among the neighbors of a seed node when the seed node is infected with strain-1.

$$\begin{split} &\gamma_{1}(z_{1}^{f}, z_{2}^{f}, z_{1}^{w}, z_{2}^{w}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(z_{1}^{f}\right)^{X_{1}^{f}}(z_{2}^{f})^{X_{2}^{f}}(z_{1}^{w})^{X_{1}^{w}}(z_{2}^{w})^{X_{2}^{w}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\left(z_{1}^{f}\right)^{X_{1}^{f}}(z_{2}^{f})^{X_{2}^{f}}(z_{1}^{w})^{X_{1}^{w}}(z_{2}^{w})^{X_{2}^{w}} \mid d_{u} \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x_{1}^{f}=0}^{d} \sum_{x_{2}^{f}=0}^{d_{u}^{f}-x_{1}^{f}} \left(\frac{d_{u}^{f}}{x_{1}^{f}} \right) \left(\frac{d_{u}^{f}-x_{1}^{f}}{x_{2}^{f}} \right) (1 - T_{1}^{f})^{d_{u}^{f}-x_{1}^{f}-x_{2}^{f}} (T_{1}^{f}\mu_{11}^{f})^{x_{1}^{f}}(T_{1}^{f}\mu_{12}^{f})^{x_{2}^{f}}(z_{1}^{f})^{x_{1}^{f}}(z_{2}^{f})^{x_{2}^{f}} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\sum_{x_{1}^{w}=0}^{d} \sum_{x_{2}^{w}=0}^{d_{w}^{w}-x_{1}^{w}} \left(\frac{d_{u}^{w}}{x_{1}^{w}} \right) \left(\frac{d_{u}^{w}-x_{1}^{w}}{x_{2}^{f}} \right) (1 - T_{1}^{w})^{d_{u}^{w}-x_{1}^{w}-x_{2}^{w}} (T_{1}^{w}\mu_{11}^{w})^{x_{1}^{w}} (T_{1}^{w}\mu_{12}^{w})^{x_{2}^{w}}(z_{1}^{w})^{x_{1}^{w}}(z_{2}^{w})^{x_{2}^{w}} \right) \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\sum_{x_{1}^{w}=0}^{d} \sum_{x_{2}^{w}=0}^{d} \left(\frac{d_{u}^{w}}{x_{1}^{w}} \right) \left(\frac{d_{u}^{w}-x_{1}^{w}}{x_{2}^{f}} \right) (1 - T_{1}^{w})^{d_{u}^{w}-x_{1}^{w}-x_{2}^{w}} (T_{1}^{w}\mu_{11}^{w})^{x_{1}^{w}} (T_{1}^{w}\mu_{12}^{w})^{x_{2}^{w}}(z_{1}^{w})^{x_{1}^{w}}(z_{2}^{w})^{x_{2}^{w}} \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[(1 - T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\mu_{11}^{f}z_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\mu_{12}^{f}z_{2}^{f})^{d_{u}^{f}} (1 - T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\mu_{11}^{w}z_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\mu_{12}^{w}z_{2}^{w})^{d_{u}^{f}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{d} p_{d}(1 - T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\mu_{11}^{f}z_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\mu_{12}^{f}z_{2}^{f})^{d_{u}^{f}} (1 - T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\mu_{11}^{w}z_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\mu_{12}^{w}z_{2}^{w})^{d_{u}^{f}} \\ &= g\left(1 - T_{1}^{f} + T_{1}^{f}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2}\mu_{1j}^{f}z_{j}^{f}\right), 1 - T_{1}^{w} + T_{1}^{w}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{2}\mu_{1j}^{w}z_{j}^{w}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Following the above sequence of steps, it is easy to verify that for $a \in \{f, w\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\Gamma_i^a(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w)$ is the PGF for the number of infection events of each type caused by a *later-generation* infective that acquired the infection through a type-*a* edge and carries strain-*i* after mutation. In particular,

$$\begin{split} & \Gamma_1^f(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w) = G^f \left(1 - T_1^f + T_1^f \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j}^f z_j^f \right), 1 - T_1^w + T_1^w \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j}^w z_j^w \right) \right) \\ & \Gamma_2^f(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w) = G^f \left(1 - T_2^f + T_2^f \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{2j}^f z_j^f \right), 1 - T_2^w + T_2^w \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{2j}^w z_j^w \right) \right) \\ & \Gamma_1^w(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w) = G^w \left(1 - T_1^f + T_1^f \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j}^f z_j^f \right), 1 - T_1^w + T_1^w \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{1j}^w z_j^w \right) \right) \\ & \Gamma_2^w(z_1^f, z_2^f, z_1^w, z_2^w) = G^w \left(1 - T_2^f + T_2^f \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{2j}^f z_j^f \right), 1 - T_2^w + T_2^w \left(\sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{2j}^w z_j^w \right) \right) \end{split}$$

Proof: For computing the probability of emergence, we define its complementary event– the probability of extinction, i.e, the probability that the disease outbreaks infects only a finite number of individuals and eventually dies out. We express the probability of extinction starting from an initial infective (denoted by $\mathbb{P}[\text{Extinction}]$) in terms of the probability of extinction starting from a later generation infective. For $a \in \{w, f\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let q_i^a denote the probability of extinction starting from one later-generation infective carrying strain-*i* which was infected through a type-*a* edge. Using the observation that the seed node infects only a finite number of nodes if and only if all its neigbors infect only a finite number of nodes (14), we get the following recursions between the probability of extinction of the epidemic starting from the seed node in terms of the the probability of extinction starting from later-generation infectives $(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w)$. We have,

 $\mathbb{P}[\text{Extinction}]$

$$= \sum_{\substack{x_1^f, x_2^f, x_1^w, x_1^w \\ x_1^f, x_2^f, x_1^w, x_1^w }} \mathbb{P}[\text{Extinction} \mid X_1^f = x_1^f, X_2^f = x_2^f, X_1^w = x_1^w, X_2^w = x_2^w] \mathbb{P}[X_1^f = x_1^f, X_2^f = x_2^f, X_1^w = x_1^w, X_2^w = x_2^w]$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{x_1^f, x_2^f, x_1^w, x_1^w \\ x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^w \\ x_1^f, x_2^f, x_1^w, x_1^w \\ x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^w \\ x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^f \\ x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^w \\ x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^f, x_1^f \\ x_1^f, x_1^f,$$

Similarly, for the later-generation infectives, we have

$$\begin{split} q_1^f &= \Gamma_1^f(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w) \\ q_2^f &= \Gamma_2^f(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w) \\ q_1^w &= \Gamma_1^w(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w) \\ q_2^w &= \Gamma_2^w(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w). \end{split}$$

Note that $q_1^f = q_2^f = q_1^w = q_2^w = 1$ is a trivial solution of the above fixed point equations. We derive the smallest non-negative root of the above fixed point equations and substitute in (45) to obtain the desired result:

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{Emergence}] = 1 - \gamma_1(q_1^f, q_2^f, q_1^w, q_2^w).$$
[46]

B. Proof of Theorem 2 (Epidemic Threshold)

Deriving the Jacobian matrix: The epidemic threshold is ascertained by determining the stability of the fixed point of the recursive equations in Theorem 6 by linearization around $q_1^f = q_2^f = q_1^w = q_2^w = 1$ which yields the Jacobian matrix in Theorem 2 as below.

$$\boldsymbol{J} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{f}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{f}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{w}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{f}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{f}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{w}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{f}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{f}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{f}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{1}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{w}}}{\partial q_{1}^{w}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}}{\partial q_{2}^{w}} \end{bmatrix}_{q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{f}}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{w}}}{\partial q_{1}^{w}}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} \end{bmatrix}_{q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w}})} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{1}^{w}}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} \end{bmatrix}_{q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} \end{bmatrix}_{q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} \end{bmatrix}_{q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} & \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{2}^{w}}} \\ \frac{\partial \Gamma_{2}^{w}(q_{1}^{f},$$

For $a, b \in \{f, w\}$ and $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, we have

$$\Gamma_{i}^{a}(z_{1}^{f}, z_{2}^{f}, z_{1}^{w}, z_{2}^{w}) = G^{a} \left(1 - T_{i}^{f} + T_{i}^{f} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} \mu_{ij}^{f} z_{j}^{f} \right), 1 - T_{i}^{w} + T_{i}^{w} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} \mu_{ij}^{w} z_{j}^{w} \right) \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_{i}^{a}(q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w})}{\partial q_{j}^{b}} \bigg|_{q_{1}^{f}, q_{2}^{f}, q_{1}^{w}, q_{2}^{w}=1} = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial G^{a}(z^{f}, z^{w})}{\partial z^{w}} \bigg|_{z^{f}, z^{w}=1}^{z^{f}, z^{w}=1} T_{i}^{f} \mu_{ij}^{f}, & \text{if } b = f \\ \frac{\partial G^{a}(z^{f}, z^{w})}{\partial z^{w}} \bigg|_{z^{f}, z^{w}=1}^{z^{f}, z^{w}=1} T_{i}^{w} \mu_{ij}^{w}, & \text{if } b = w. \end{cases}$$

$$[48]$$

From the properties of PGFs, note that for a later-generation infective which acquired a type-i strain (after mutation) through a type-a contact, equation (48) gives the mean number of neighbors/offsprings which were infected with type-j strain (after mutation) through type-b contacts.

$$\frac{\partial G^{f}(z^{f}, z^{w})}{\partial z^{f}}\Big|_{z^{f}, z^{w}=1} = \frac{\langle d_{f}^{2} \rangle - \lambda_{f}}{\lambda_{f}} = \beta_{f} \qquad \qquad \frac{\partial G^{f}(z^{f}, z^{w})}{\partial z^{w}}\Big|_{z^{f}, z^{w}=1} = \lambda_{w} \qquad [49]$$

$$\frac{\partial G^w(z^f, z^w)}{\partial z^f}\Big|_{z^f, z^w=1} = \lambda_f \qquad \qquad \frac{\partial G^w(z^f, z^w)}{\partial z^w}\Big|_{z^f, z^w=1} = \frac{\langle d_w^2 \rangle - \lambda_w}{\lambda_w} = \beta_w.$$

$$[50]$$

Substituing (48), (49) and (50) in (47) yields

$$\boldsymbol{J} = \begin{bmatrix} T_1^f \mu_{11}^f \beta_f & T_1^f \mu_{12}^f \beta_f & T_1^w \mu_{11}^w \lambda_w & T_1^w \mu_{12}^w \lambda_w \\ T_2^f \mu_{21}^f \beta_f & T_2^f \mu_{22}^f \beta_f & T_2^w \mu_{21}^w \lambda_w & T_2^w \mu_{22}^w \lambda_w \\ T_1^f \mu_{11}^f \lambda_f & T_1^f \mu_{12}^f \lambda_f & T_1^w \mu_{11}^w \beta_w & T_1^w \mu_{12}^w \beta_w \\ T_2^f \mu_{21}^f \lambda_f & T_2^f \mu_{22}^f \lambda_f & T_2^w \mu_{21}^w \beta_w & T_2^w \mu_{22}^w \beta_w \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$[51]$$

Note that $q_1^f = q_2^f = q_1^w = q_2^w = 1$ is always a solution of the above fixed point equations. An epidemic emerges starting from a seed with strain-1 when there is a positive probability that the pathogen escapes extinction in a later generation infective, i.e., when $q_i^a < 1$ for some $a \in \{f, w\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$ for which $\mu_{1i}^a > 0$. Invoking the theory from multi-type branching processes, we say that matrix J corresponds to an indecomposable multi-type branching process if there is a positive probability that a node u which received infection through a type-a edge and acquired the type-i strain after mutation, results in the event that a node v receives the infection from a type-b link and acquires the type-j strain after mutation, after a finite number of steps for all $a, b \in \{f, w\}, i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. When J represents an indecomposable multi-type branching process, it is known (14) that extinction occurs with probability 1 from any later generation infective, i.e., $q_1^f = q_2^f = q_1^w = q_2^w = 1$ is the smallest fixed point if and only if $\rho(J) \leq 1$; while if $\rho(J) > 1$, then $0 \leq q_i^a < 1$ for all $a \in \{f, w\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$ and thus there is a positive probability that the pathogen escapes extinction (14). For decomposable processes, as long as there is no type that produces exactly one offpsring in its class with probability one, we still get that extinction occurs with probability 1 if and only if $\rho(J) \leq 1$ (14). Therefore, the critical threshold for the emergence of the epidemic is $\rho(J) = 1$ and the super-critical regime corresponds to $\rho(J) > 1$.

C. Proof of Theorem 3 (Mean Epidemic Size)

Throughout, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i}(u_{1}^{f}, u_{2}^{f}, u_{1}^{w}, u_{2}^{w}, z^{f}, z^{w}) &:= \\ \sum_{k_{1}^{f}=0}^{z^{f}} \sum_{k_{2}^{f}=0}^{z^{f}-k_{1}^{f}} \sum_{k_{2}^{w}=0}^{z^{w}-k_{1}^{w}} \left[\begin{pmatrix} z^{f}\\k_{1}^{f} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z^{f}-k_{1}^{f}\\k_{2}^{f} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{1}^{f} \end{pmatrix}^{k_{1}^{f}} \begin{pmatrix} u_{2}^{f} \end{pmatrix}^{k_{2}^{f}} \begin{pmatrix} 1-u_{1}^{f}-u_{2}^{f} \end{pmatrix}^{z^{f}-k_{1}^{f}-k_{2}^{f}} \\ &\cdot \begin{pmatrix} z^{w}\\k_{1}^{w} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z^{w}-k_{1}^{w}\\k_{2}^{w} \end{pmatrix} (u_{1}^{w})^{k_{1}^{w}} (u_{2}^{w})^{k_{2}^{w}} (1-u_{1}^{w}-u_{2}^{w})^{z^{w}-k_{1}^{w}-k_{2}^{w}} \\ &\cdot \sum_{x_{1}^{f}=0}^{k_{1}^{f}} \sum_{x_{2}^{f}=0}^{k_{2}^{f}} \sum_{x_{1}^{w}=0}^{k_{2}^{w}} \sum_{x_{2}^{w}=0}^{k_{2}^{w}} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} k_{1}^{f}\\k_{1}^{f} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k_{2}^{f}\\k_{2}^{f} \end{pmatrix} (T_{1}^{f})^{x_{1}^{f}} (T_{2}^{f})^{x_{2}^{f}} (1-T_{1}^{f})^{k_{1}^{f}-x_{1}^{f}} (1-T_{2}^{f})^{k_{2}^{f}-x_{2}^{f}} \\ &\cdot \begin{pmatrix} k_{1}^{w}\\k_{1}^{w} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k_{2}^{w}\\k_{2}^{w} \end{pmatrix} (T_{1}^{w})^{x_{1}^{w}} (T_{2}^{w})^{x_{2}^{w}} (1-T_{1}^{w})^{k_{1}^{w}-x_{1}^{w}} (1-T_{2}^{w})^{k_{2}^{w}-x_{2}^{w}} \\ &\cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{1i}^{f}x_{1}^{f}+\mu_{2i}^{f}x_{2}^{f}+\mu_{1i}^{w}x_{1}^{w}+\mu_{2i}^{w}x_{2}^{w}} \\ &\cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{1i}^{f}x_{1}^{f}+\mu_{2i}^{f}x_{2}^{f}+\mu_{1i}^{w}x_{1}^{w}+\mu_{2i}^{w}x_{2}^{w}} \\ &\cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{1i}^{f}x_{1}^{f}+x_{2}^{f}+x_{1}^{w}+x_{2}^{w} \end{pmatrix} \right] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Consider an arbitrary node u at level $\ell+1$. For $i \in \{1,2\}, a \in \{f,w\}$, let Z^a denote the total number of type-a contacts of node u at level ℓ and let K_i^a denote the number of active type-a contacts of node u that carry strain-i at level ℓ . In the steps below, we express $q_{\ell+1,1}^f$ in terms of $q_{\ell,i}^a$, where $i \in \{1,2\}, a \in \{f,w\}$. Recall that the degree distribution of node u reached through a type-f edge (from a node in level $\ell+2$) is given by $\frac{d^f p_d}{\langle d^f \rangle}$. Let \mathcal{E} denote the event that u gets infected with strain-1 through contact with neighbors in level ℓ . We have

$$q_{\ell+1,i}^{f} = \sum_{d^{f},d^{w}} \frac{d^{f}p_{d}}{\langle d^{f} \rangle} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E} \mid Z^{f} = d^{f} - 1, Z^{w} = d^{w}]$$

$$= \sum_{d^{f},d^{w}} \frac{d^{f}p_{d}}{\langle d^{f} \rangle} \left(\sum_{k_{1}^{w}=0}^{d^{w}} \sum_{k_{2}^{w}=0}^{d^{w}} \sum_{k_{1}^{f}=0}^{d^{f}} \sum_{k_{2}^{f}=0}^{d^{f}-k_{1}^{f}} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E} \mid Z^{f} = d^{f} - 1, Z^{w} = d^{w}, K_{1}^{f} = k_{1}^{f}, K_{2}^{f} = k_{2}^{f}, K_{1}^{w} = k_{1}^{w}, K_{2}^{w} = k_{2}^{w}]$$

$$\cdot \mathbb{P}[K_{1}^{f} = k_{1}^{f}, K_{2}^{f} = k_{2}^{f}, K_{1}^{w} = k_{1}^{w}, K_{2}^{w} = k_{2}^{w} \mid Z^{f} = d^{f} - 1, Z^{w} = d^{w}] \right)$$

$$[53]$$

Note that for $a \in \{f, w\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$, given the random variable Z^a , we have $K_i^a = \text{Binomial}(Z^a, q_{\ell,i}^a)$. Further, given Z^f (resp., Z^w), the tuple $(K_1^f, K_2^f, Z^f - K_1^f - K_2^f)$ (resp., $K_1^w, K_2^w, Z^w - K_1^w - K_2^w)$ follow independent multinomial distributions and therefore

$$\mathbb{P}[K_{1}^{f} = k_{1}^{f}, K_{2}^{f} = k_{2}^{f}, K_{1}^{w} = k_{1}^{w}, K_{2}^{w} = k_{2}^{w} \mid Z^{f} = d^{f} - 1, Z^{w} = d^{w}] = \\ = \binom{z^{f}}{k_{1}^{f}} \binom{z^{f} - k_{1}^{f}}{k_{2}^{f}} \left(q_{\ell,1}^{f}\right)^{k_{1}^{f}} \left(q_{\ell,2}^{f}\right)^{k_{2}^{f}} \left(1 - q_{\ell,1}^{f} - q_{\ell,2}^{f}\right)^{z^{f} - k_{1} - k_{2}} \binom{z^{w}}{k_{1}^{w}} \binom{z^{w} - k_{1}^{w}}{k_{2}^{w}} \left(u_{1}^{w}\right)^{k_{1}^{w}} \left(u_{2}^{w}\right)^{k_{2}^{w}} \left(1 - u_{1}^{w} - u_{2}^{w}\right)^{z^{w} - k_{1} - k_{2}}$$

$$[54]$$

For obtaining in summation (52) we further condition on the number of active contacts who successfully transmit the infection to node u. Suppose, u receives X_1^f (resp., X_1^w) infections of strain-1 through type-f (resp., type-w) contacts, and X_2^f (resp., X_2^w) infections of strain-2 through type-f (resp., type-w) contacts, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E} \mid Z^{f} = d^{f} - 1, Z^{w} = d^{w}, K_{1}^{f} = k_{1}^{f}, K_{2}^{f} = k_{2}^{f}, K_{1}^{w} = k_{1}^{w}, K_{2}^{w} = k_{2}^{w}]$$

$$= \sum_{x_{1}^{f}=0}^{k_{1}^{f}} \sum_{x_{2}^{f}=0}^{k_{2}^{f}} \sum_{x_{2}^{f}=0}^{k_{1}^{f}} \sum_{x_{2}^{f}=0}^{k_{2}^{f}} \binom{k_{1}^{f}}{x_{1}^{f}} \binom{k_{2}^{f}}{x_{2}^{f}} (T_{1}^{f})^{x_{1}^{f}} (T_{2}^{f})^{x_{2}^{f}} (1 - T_{1}^{f})^{k_{1}^{f} - x_{1}^{f}} (1 - T_{2}^{f})^{k_{2}^{f} - x_{2}^{f}} \cdot \binom{k_{1}^{w}}{x_{1}^{w}} \binom{k_{2}^{w}}{x_{2}^{w}} (T_{1}^{w})^{x_{1}^{w}} (T_{2}^{w})^{x_{2}^{w}} (1 - T_{1}^{w})^{k_{1}^{w} - x_{1}^{w}} (1 - T_{2}^{w})^{k_{2}^{w} - x_{2}^{w}} \cdot \binom{\mu_{1i}^{f} x_{1}^{f} + \mu_{2i}^{f} x_{2}^{f} + \mu_{1i}^{w} x_{1}^{w} + \mu_{2i}^{w} x_{2}^{w}}{x_{1}^{f} + x_{2}^{f} + x_{1}^{w} + x_{2}^{w}} \mathbf{1}[x_{1}^{f} + x_{2}^{f} + x_{1}^{w} + x_{2}^{w} > 0]$$

$$[55]$$

Substituting (54) and (55) in (53), we get (17) for i = 1. Similarly, we can obtain (17) for i = 2 and (18). Using the limiting values $q_{\infty,i}^a$, for $a \in \{f, w\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$, and noting that all the edges incident on the root node arise from the level below the root yields (19).

D. Impact of the Dispersion Index of Network Layers on MS-SL Reductions

In this section, we prove that Eq. (42) is necessary and sufficient for Eq. (41) to hold. Namely, implying that matching the epidemic threshold through a reduction to a single layer with degree distribution (given as the sum of the degree distribution of the constituent layers) requires the dispersion index of constituent layers to be equal. Therefore, our goal is to show that

$$\sigma\left(\begin{bmatrix}\beta_f & \lambda_w\\\lambda_f & \beta_w\end{bmatrix}\right) = \frac{\beta_f \lambda_f + \beta_w \lambda_w + 2\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w} \iff \beta_f - \lambda_f = \beta_w - \lambda_w.$$
[56]

Proof: We have,

$$\sigma\left(\begin{bmatrix}\beta_f & \lambda_w\\\lambda_f & \beta_w\end{bmatrix}\right) = \frac{\beta_f + \beta_w + \sqrt{(\beta_f - \beta_w)^2 + 4\lambda_f \lambda_w}}{2}$$
[57]

Substituting in Eq. (56) and rearranging, we see that the proof of Eq. (56) requires

$$\sqrt{(\beta_f - \beta_w)^2 + 4\lambda_f \lambda_w} = 2 \times \frac{\beta_f \lambda_f + \beta_w \lambda_w + 2\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w} - (\beta_f + \beta_w).$$
[58]

Further, note that

$$2 \times \frac{\beta_f \lambda_f + \beta_w \lambda_w + 2\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w} - (\beta_f + \beta_w) = \frac{(\beta_f - \beta_w)(\lambda_f - \lambda_w) + 4\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w}.$$

Therefore, we need to show that

$$\left(\beta_f - \beta_w\right)^2 + 4\lambda_f \lambda_w = \left[\frac{(\beta_f - \beta_w)(\lambda_f - \lambda_w) + 4\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w}\right]^2.$$
[59]

Substituting $\beta_f - \beta_w \to t$ in Eq. (59) and rearranging, we need to show that

$$\left[\frac{t(\lambda_f - \lambda_w) + 4\lambda_f \lambda_w}{\lambda_f + \lambda_w}\right]^2 - t^2 = 4\lambda_f \lambda_w,$$
[60]

or equivalently

$$(t+2\lambda_w)\left(-t+2\lambda_f\right) = \left(\lambda_f + \lambda_w\right)^2.$$
[61]

From Eq. (61), it is evident that the line $f_1(t) = (\lambda_f + \lambda_w)^2$ is a tangent to the parabola $f_2(t) = (t + 2\lambda_w)(-t + 2\lambda_f)$ at $t = \lambda_f - \lambda_w$, and thus, $t = \beta_f - \beta_w = \lambda_f - \lambda_w$ emerges as the unique solution to Eq. (61); consequently Eq. (56) holds.

E. Further Comparisons with Related Models

In Section 7, we discussed challenges in approaches that reduce the multi-strain multi-layer (MS-ML) model into either a single-layer or a single-strain. Next, we propose and evaluate different transformations for finding a corresponding single-strain multi-layer (SS-ML) or a multi-strain single-layer (MS-SL) model for a given MS-ML model. In what follows, it will be useful to define the following quantity: for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $a \in \{f, w\}$, we define \overline{T}_i^a to be the probability that a given vertex is infected with strain *i* through layer *a*. Mathematically, this can be written as

$$\overline{T}_{i}^{a} := T_{1}^{a} \mu_{1i} + T_{2}^{a} \mu_{2i}.$$
[62]

I. Additional challenges with transformations to a single layer (MS-SL). We have seen challenges associated with reduction to MS-SL models by taking the sum of the degrees in the two layers as the degree for an equivalent single layer. Here, we outline another method for transforming to a single layer by matching the *mean matrix*; that is, we ensure that the mean number of secondary infections stemming from any given type of infected individual is the same across the models. For the branching process corresponding to the MS-SL model, we say that an infected vertex is type 1 if it has been infected with strain 1 and type 2 otherwise. It is known (14) that the mean matrix of this model is given by

$$\mathbf{M} := \beta \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \mu_{11} & T_1 \mu_{12} \\ T_2 \mu_{21} & T_2 \mu_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$
[63]

where, the (i, j) entry of the matrix denotes the expected number of type-*j* secondary infections caused by a type-*i* infective. Let \mathbf{J}^{MS-SL} denote the version of \mathbf{J} corresponding to the MS-SL model. By carrying out similar arguments as for the SS-ML reduction and noting that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{node infected through layer } f|\text{has strain } 1) = \frac{\overline{T}_1^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_1^w}$$
$$\mathbb{P}(\text{node infected through layer } w|\text{has strain } 2) = \frac{\overline{T}_1^w}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_1^w},$$

we can then write

$$\mathbf{J}_{11}^{MS-SL} = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_1^w} (T_1^f \beta_f + T_1^w \lambda_w) + \frac{\overline{T}_1^w}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_1^w} (T_1^w \beta_w + T_1^f \lambda_f)\right) \mu_{11}$$

More generally, we have for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ that

$$\mathbf{J}_{ij}^{MS-SL} = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_i^f}{\overline{T}_i^f + \overline{T}_i^w} (T_i^f \beta_f + T_i^w \lambda_w) + \frac{\overline{T}_i^w}{\overline{T}_i^f + \overline{T}_i^w} (T_i^w \beta_w + T_i^f \lambda_f)\right) \mu_{ij}.$$
[64]

From the general formula in Eq. (64), it is not straightforward to map the MS-ML model to the MS-SL model since the network parameters are intertwined with the transmissibilities in Eq. (64), whereas the network parameters are clearly separable from the viral transmission properties in Eq. (63). However, in the special case where $T_1^w/T_1^f = T_2^w/T_2^f = c$, some simplifications can be made. Under this assumption, it holds that

$$\overline{T}_i^f / (\overline{T}_i^f + \overline{T}_i^w) = 1/(1+c),$$

hence,

$$\mathbf{J}_{ij}^{MS-SL} = \left(\frac{1}{1+c}(\beta_f + c\lambda_w) + \frac{c^2}{1+c}(c\beta_w + \lambda_f)\right)T_i^f\mu_{ij}$$
$$=:\widetilde{\beta}T_i^f\mu_{ij}.$$

This indicates that a reasonable way to set the parameters of a corresponding MS-SL model with a matching mean matrix is to use the transmissibilities of layer f along with the *effective* mean excess degree parameter $\tilde{\beta}$. However, such a transformation does not provide a systematic way to infer the exact probability distribution for the single-layer, which is critical to predicting the epidemic characteristics using a MS-SL model.

II. Reductions to single-strain multi-layer (SS-ML) models. In the previous section, we have discussed how correlation of infection events can lead to inaccurate predictions by models that assume independence transmissions. Next, we more concretely delve into this question by looking at how well can transformations to SS-ML models predict the epidemic characteristics in presence of mutations. For reductions to SS-ML models, assuming $\frac{T_1^w}{T_1^f} = \frac{T_2^w}{T_2^f} = c$, we consider the following two approaches. The first approach involves using Eq. (13) and defining the equivalent transmissibilities for the two layers as:

$$\rho(\boldsymbol{T}^{\boldsymbol{f}}\boldsymbol{\mu}) \to \tilde{T}^{f},$$

$$\rho(\boldsymbol{T}^{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\mu}) \to \tilde{T}^{w} (\equiv c\rho(\boldsymbol{T}^{\boldsymbol{f}}\boldsymbol{\mu}) \to \tilde{T}^{w}).$$
[65]

Through Eq. (13), the transformation Eq. (65) ensures that the spectral radius predicted by the corresponding SS-ML reduction is the same as the MS-ML model. The second approach is based on matching the mean matrix as done for the MS-SL case.

In the branching process corresponding to the SS-ML model, there are two types of infected vertices: those that have been infected through layer f (type 1) and those that have been infected through layer w (type 2). The mean matrix for this model is given by

$$\mathbf{M} := \begin{pmatrix} T^f \beta_f & T^w \lambda_w \\ T^f \lambda_f & T^w \beta_w \end{pmatrix},$$

where the (i, j) entry represents the expected number of type-*j* secondary infectives caused by a type-*i* infective. Let \mathbf{J}^{SS-ML} denote the version of \mathbf{J} that corresponds to the SS-ML model. To compute the (i, j) entry of \mathbf{J}^{SS-ML} , we take an average over the probabilities that a given type-*i* node with a particular strain infects a type-*j* node. For instance, noting that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{node has strain 1}|\text{infected through layer } f) = \frac{\overline{T}_1^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_2^f}$$
$$\mathbb{P}(\text{node has strain 2}|\text{infected through layer } f) = \frac{\overline{T}_2^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_2^f}$$

we can then write

$$\mathbf{J}_{11}^{SS-ML} = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_2^f} T_1^f + \frac{\overline{T}_2^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_2^f} T_2^f\right) \beta_f.$$

Similarly, we have that



Fig. 11. A comparison of the predictions made by reduction to a single-strain (SS-ML) through: mapping the spectral radius through Eq. (65) (denoted as $Tx - \rho$) and mapping the mean matrix for infections through Eq. (66) (denoted as Tx - J). We set $\mu_{22} = 1 - \epsilon$ with $\epsilon = 10^{-10}$ and vary μ_{11} . We observe that while the SS-ML reduction through mapping the spectral radius ($Tx - \rho$) captures the size but it fails to predict the probability of emergence, whereas the transformation Tx - J neither accurately predicts the probability nor the size for the MS-ML model.

$$\mathbf{J}_{12}^{SS-ML} = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_2^f} T_1^w + \frac{\overline{T}_2^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_2^f} T_2^w\right) \lambda_w$$
$$\mathbf{J}_{21}^{SS-ML} = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1^w}{\overline{T}_1^w + \overline{T}_2^w} T_1^f + \frac{\overline{T}_2^w}{\overline{T}_1^w + \overline{T}_2^w} T_2^f\right) \lambda_f$$
$$\mathbf{J}_{22}^{SS-ML} = \left(\frac{\overline{T}_1^w}{\overline{T}_1^w + \overline{T}_2^w} T_1^w + \frac{\overline{T}_2^w}{\overline{T}_1^w + \overline{T}_2^w} T_2^w\right) \beta_w.$$



Fig. 12. The impact of varying mutation and transmission parameters on the predictions made by reduction to a single-strain (SS-ML) through: mapping the spectral radius through Eq. (65) (denoted as $Tx - \rho$) and mapping the mean matrix for infections through Eq. (66) (denoted as Tx - J). Throughout, we set $T_2^f = 0.8$ and vary the ratio $T_1^f/T_2^f = T_1^w/T_2^w$, denoted as T_1/T_2 on the X-axis. We observe that neither transformation accurately predicts the probability of emergence and the gap in prediction is more pronounced when the difference in strain transmissibilities is higher, i.e., when T_1/T_2 is smaller.

Note that under the above transformation, the MS-ML model can be mapped to SS-ML in the special case where $T_1^w/T_1^f = T_2^w/T_2^f = c$, it holds that

$$\frac{\overline{T}_1^f}{\overline{T}_1^f + \overline{T}_2^f} = \frac{\overline{T}_1^w}{\overline{T}_1^w + \overline{T}_2^w},$$

hence \mathbf{J}^{SS-ML} is of the same form as \mathbf{M} with

$$T^{f} := \frac{\overline{T}_{1}^{f}}{\overline{T}_{1}^{f} + \overline{T}_{2}^{f}} T_{1}^{f} + \frac{\overline{T}_{2}^{f}}{\overline{T}_{1}^{f} + \overline{T}_{2}^{f}} T_{2}^{f},$$

$$T^{w} := \frac{\overline{T}_{1}^{w}}{\overline{T}_{1}^{w} + \overline{T}_{2}^{w}} T_{1}^{w} + \frac{\overline{T}_{2}^{w}}{\overline{T}_{1}^{w} + \overline{T}_{2}^{w}} T_{2}^{w} = cT^{f}.$$
[66]

Next, we consider the contact network comprising one layer which is purely Poisson and the second layer being a mixture of Poisson distribution and the constant 0, as described in Eq. (43). Throughout, we hold the network parameters fixed and vary μ_{11} or the ratio of the transmissibility of the two strains. We set $\alpha_f = 0.2$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\nu_f = \nu_w = 1.2$, $T_2^f = 0.8$, and we assume $\frac{T_1^w}{T_1^f} = \frac{T_2^w}{T_2^f} = c = 1.2$. In Figure 11, we fix the transmissibility parameters and plot the predictions made by reduction to a single-strain (SS-ML) through mapping the spectral radius through Eq. (65) (denoted as $\mathrm{Tx} - \rho$) and mapping the mean matrix for infections through Eq. (66) (denoted as $\mathrm{Tx} - J$). We set $\mu_{22} = 1 - \epsilon$ with $\epsilon = 10^{-10}$ and vary μ_{11} in the interval [0, 1]. From Lemma 2, we know that as $\mu_{22} \to 1$, $\rho(\mathbf{T}^f \boldsymbol{\mu})$ remains constant, and thus, the prediction made by the SS-ML under the spectral radius mapping remains constant. We note that SS-ML models coalesce the transmissibility of the two strains into effective transmissibility for each layer and predict the same value of the probability of emergence and the epidemic size given. Substituting $T_1^f = T_2^f = \rho(\mathbf{T}^f \boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $T_1^w = T_2^w = c\rho(\mathbf{T}^f \boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^f = \boldsymbol{\mu}^w = I_2$ in Theorem 1, we get the predictions for the SS-ML model under the $\mathrm{Tx} - \rho$. We note that that while the SS-ML reduction through mapping the spectral radius (Tx - ρ) captures the size but it fails to predict the probability of emergence. This observation is consistent with the observation that reducing an MS-SL model to a bond-percolation model leads to inaccurate prediction for the probability of emergence but correctly predicts the total epidemic size (20).

In Figure 12, we plot how the predictions of the SS-ML model are impacted as a function of how different the transmissibilities for the two strains for different values of the mutation parameters. We do so by by varying the ratio $T_1^f/T_2^f = T_1^w/T_2^w$, denoting it by T_1/T_2 while keeping T_2^f constant at 0.8. We also observe that mapping through Tx - J neither accurately predicts the epidemic size nor the probability of emergence. We observe that the gap in the prediction of the probability of emergence by the SS-ML models is more pronounced when the difference in strain transmissibilities is higher, i.e., when T_1/T_2 is smaller. Further, when $\mu_{22} \rightarrow 1$, the predictions made by mapping the spectral radius are constant. Whereas, when $\mu_{22} = 0.5, 0.9$, we see that the SS-ML size predictions under the $\text{Tx} - \rho$ transformation vary with the ratio T_1/T_2 . As above, the SS-ML model under the $\text{Tx} - \rho$ transformation captures the size and the epidemic threshold while failing to predict the probability of emergence accurately. We also observe that when $\mu_{11} = \mu_{22} = 0.5$, the predictions made by both the SS-ML transforms align with the total epidemic size obtained with the MS-ML model. One general shortcoming of the SS-ML transformations is that they predict the same probability of emergence and epidemic size; they can at best only predict one of these metrics accurately. Moreover, they do not shed light on the fraction of individuals infected by each strain type. Also, notice both the transformations (matching the epidemic threshold and the mean mutation matrix) critically relied on the decoupling Eq. (13), which only holds when $T_1^f/T_1^w = T_2^f/T_2^w$. Our observations further highlight the importance of developing epidemiological models that account for the heterogeneity in network structure and pathogen strains.

Data Availability. Data will be available upon request from the corresponding author.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation through grants 2225513, 2026985 and 1813637, Army Research Office through grants W911NF-22-1-0181 and W911NF-20-1-0204, IBM academic award, Dowd Fellowship, Knight Fellowship, Lee-Stanziale Ohana Endowed Fellowship, and Cylab Presidential Fellowship from Carnegie Mellon University.

References

- 1. Organization WH (2020-09-21) Coronavirus disease (covid-19), 21 september 2020, Technical documents.
- 2. Harvey WT, et al. (2021) Sars-cov-2 variants, spike mutations and immune escape. Nature Reviews Microbiology 19(7):409-424.
- 3. Matrajt L, Leung T (2020) Evaluating the effectiveness of social distancing interventions to delay or flatten the epidemic curve of coronavirus disease. Emerging infectious diseases 26(8):1740.
- 4. Brauer F (2008) Compartmental models in epidemiology in Mathematical epidemiology. (Springer), pp. 19–79.
- 5. Anderson RM, May RM (1992) Infectious diseases of humans: dynamics and control. (Oxford university press).
- 6. Newman ME (2002) Spread of epidemic disease on networks. Phys. Rev. E 66(1).
- 7. Kenah E, Robins JM (2007) Second look at the spread of epidemics on networks. Phys. Rev. E 76(3):036113.
- 8. Salathé M, et al. (2010) A high-resolution human contact network for infectious disease transmission. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 107(51):22020–22025.
- 9. Sun K, et al. (2021) Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of sars-cov-2. Science 371(6526):eabe2424.
- 10. Cui PB, Colaiori F, Castellano C (2017) Mutually cooperative epidemics on power-law networks. Phys. Rev. E 96(2):022301.
- 11. Hébert-Dufresne L, Noël PA, Marceau V, Allard A, Dubé LJ (2010) Propagation dynamics on networks featuring complex topologies. Physical Review E 82(3):036115.
- 12. Zhuang Y, Arenas A, Yağan O (2017) Clustering determines the dynamics of complex contagions in multiplex networks. Phys. Rev. E 95(1):012312.
- 13. S Monteiro H, et al. (2021) Superspreading k-cores at the center of covid-19 pandemic persistence. Bulletin of the American Physical Society 66
- 14. Alexander H, Day T (2010) Risk factors for the evolutionary emergence of pathogens. Journal of The Royal Society Interface 7(51):1455–1474.
- 15. Ye ZW, et al. (2020) Zoonotic origins of human coronaviruses. International journal of biological sciences 16(10):1686.
- 16. Cui J, Li F, Shi ZL (2019) Origin and evolution of pathogenic coronaviruses. Nature reviews microbiology 17(3):181-192
- 17. Latinne A, et al. (2020) Origin and cross-species transmission of bat coronaviruses in china. Nature Communications 11(1):1-15.
- 18. Islam S, Islam T, Islam MR (2022) New coronavirus variants are creating more challenges to global healthcare system: a brief report on the current knowledge. Clinical Pathology 15:2632010X221075584.
- 19. Tregoning JS, Flight KE, Higham SL, Wang Z, Pierce BF (2021) Progress of the covid-19 vaccine effort: viruses, vaccines and variants versus efficacy, effectiveness and escape. Nature Reviews Immunology 21(10):626–636.
- 20. Eletreby R, Zhuang Y, Carley KM, Yağan O, Poor HV (2020) The effects of evolutionary adaptations on spreading processes in complex networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117(11):5664–5670.
- 21. Girvan M, Callaway DS, Newman ME, Strogatz SH (2002) Simple model of epidemics with pathogen mutation. Physical Review E 65(3):031915.

- 22. Marquioni VM, de Aguiar MA (2021) Modeling neutral viral mutations in the spread of sars-cov-2 epidemics. Plos One 16(7):e0255438.
- 23. Zhang X, et al. (2021) Epidemic spreading under pathogen evolution. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11066.
- 24. Yule GU, et al. (1925) li.—a mathematical theory of evolution, based on the conclusions of dr. jc willis, fr s. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B 213(402-410):21–87.
- 25. Liu QH, et al. (2018) Measurability of the epidemic reproduction number in data-driven contact networks. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 115(50):12680-12685.
- 26. Ajelli M, Poletti P, Melegaro A, Merler S (2014) The role of different social contexts in shaping influenza transmission during the 2009 pandemic. Scientific reports 4(1):1–7.
- 27. Azimi-Tafreshi N (2016) Cooperative epidemics on multiplex networks. Phys. Rev. E 93(4):042303.
- 28. Hackett A, Cellai D, Gómez S, Arenas A, Gleeson JP (2016) Bond percolation on multiplex networks. Phys. Rev. X 6(2):021002.
- 29. Yağan O, Qian D, Zhang J, Cochran D (2013) Conjoining speeds up information diffusion in overlaying social-physical networks. IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications 31(6):1038–1048.
- 30. Sahneh FD, Scoglio C, Van Mieghem P (2013) Generalized epidemic mean-field model for spreading processes over multilayer complex networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 21(5):1609–1620.
- 31. Zeng Q, Liu Y, Tang M, Gong J (2021) Identifying super-spreaders in information-epidemic coevolving dynamics on multiplex networks. Knowledge-Based Systems 229:107365.
- Bongiorno C, Zino L (2022) A multi-layer network model to assess school opening policies during a vaccination campaign: a case study on covid-19 in france. *Applied Network Science* 7(1):1–28.
 Marceau V, Noël PA, Hébert-Dufresne L, Allard A, Dubé LJ (2011) Modeling the dynamical interaction between epidemics on overlay networks. *Physical Review E* 84(2):026105.
- 34. Radicchi F (2015) Percolation in real interdependent networks. Nature Physics 11(7):597.
- 35. Aleta A, et al. (2020) Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves of covid-19. Nature Human Behaviour 4(9):964-971.
- 36. Dawkins R (2016) The selfish gene. (Oxford university press).
- 37. Adamic LA, Lento TM, Adar E, Ng PC (2016) Information evolution in social networks in ACM WSDM. pp. 473-482.
- 38. Bollobás B (2001) Random Graphs. (Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (UK)).
- 39. Molloy M, Reed B (1995) A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. Random Structures and Algorithms 6:161–179.
- 40. Söderberg B (2003) Random graphs with hidden color. Phys. Rev. E 68(015102(R)).
- 41. Newman ME, Strogatz SH, Watts DJ (2001) Random graphs with arbitrary degree distributions and their applications. Phys. Rev. E 64(2).
- 42. Zino L, Cao M (2021) Analysis, prediction, and control of epidemics: A survey from scalar to dynamic network models. IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine 21(4):4-23.
- 43. Sethna JP, et al. (1993) Hysteresis and hierarchies: Dynamics of disorder-driven first-order phase transformations. Phys. Rev. Lett. 70(21):3347-3350.
- 44. Söderberg B (2003) Properties of random graphs with hidden color. Phys. Rev. E 68(2):026107-.
- 45. Clauset A, Shalizi CR, Newman ME (2009) Power-law distributions in empirical data. SIAM Review 51(4):661–703.
- 46. Yagan O, Qian D, Zhang J, Cochran D (2013) Conjoining speeds up information diffusion in overlaying social-physical networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications* 31(6):1038–1048.
- 47. Zhuang Y, Yağan O (2016) Information propagation in clustered multilayer networks. IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering 3(4):211–224.
- 48. Newman ME (2002) Assortative mixing in networks. Phys. Rev. Lett. 89(20):208701.
- 49. Newman ME (2018) Networks. (Oxford university press).