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Abstract

In this paper, we study observational social learning and vaccine-preventable childhood disease spread over a bi-layer household network. The two overlapping networks are either Erdős-Rényi (random) network or Barabási-Albert network. We introduce a new Bayesian rule of observational social learning over the social network of which other decision models, like voting and DeGroot models, are special cases. We show how social learning can lead to convergence of opinions and affect levels of vaccine uptake. We also study the effect of the existence of two cultures of social learning on the establishment of social norms and levels of vaccine uptake and so on the disease spread. The mutual influence between the opinion change through observational social learning and the disease spread shows dependence on the network’s topology and on the vaccine safety and availability.

1. Introduction

People and households are connected to each other through different types of social networks. Here, we consider bi-layer networks in which two same-type overlapping networks and their mutual influence are of interest. The first network is the biological (physical) network through which physical contacts take place and pediatric disease transmission occurs. The second network is social (bi-directional) weighted network through which information and opinions about the vaccine are shared, shaping the decisions of parents. The pediatric disease spreads on the biological network within and between households. Whereas information and opinion sharing transpire on the social network of households, parents in that case. We assume that the two networks overlap with parents having connections to a larger number of other parents, relatives, coworkers and distant friends, whose children might or might not be connected.

From graph theory point of view, there is a number of types of network models, e.g. Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) and Barabási-Albert network model (BAN), see [1]. Different network models depict various real-life systems. Real-life networks are scale-free networks (SFN) in which the degree distribution is a power law with exponent $2 < \gamma \leq 3$, see [2]. Adjustments, however, should be made to those models to account for the number of children in households. Those adjustments must reflect that households without children will have no physical connections. Moreover, the expected degree of a household tends to increase with the number of occupying children.

Many studies modeled the spread of diseases on networks [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23] and on multiplex network models [6, 7, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30].
30, 31, 32, 33]. Some also considered household structure [9, 17, 34, 35]. Few of models of spread of diseases considered vaccine decision making on those networks via voter model [32], via DeGroot model of selection [2], via social norms [36], and via social learning [37]. But none of the published research considered vaccine decision making of vaccine-preventable paediatric diseases in households via the Bayesian update rule that we present below. Moreover, most of the mathematical models consider rational agents making decisions of vaccinating children [3, 8, 38, 39], except for a few like [33].

Human herding behavior or cascading is a convergence in opinion brought by social leaning [40, 41]. That learning takes place via different levels of information sharing or by observing and/or perceiving public choices [42]. Herding could be induced by payoff externalities, sanctions, preference interaction, direct communication, and/or observational influence [41]. Observational influence and informational cascades results from integrating learned behavior or signals of others with one’s own opinion. Observational social learning causes a subtle pressure on people to conform [43, 44, 45]. Boundedly rational observational learning, [46], happens however when there is incomplete or insufficient information about the behavior of others.

Parents usually share their sentiments about vaccinating their children while others observe those opinions causing a pressure on other parents. Mixed messages and signals can cause problems for parents when interpreting the stance of friends on vaccination. Incomplete information about the vaccine and opinions over social networks, creating boundedly social agents, can lead to problems in vaccine acceptance and so in vaccine uptake and disease spread. Resulting cascading of opinions can go either way, depending on vaccine safety and availability.

In this paper, We introduce a model of boundedly rational observational social learning that can give rise to social norms and at the same time encompasses other selection models like voting and DeGroot. Using that model, we study the vaccination opinion cascading in a boundedly rational observational social leaning and compare it to other models of social pressure [36, 47], see also [48]. We consider socially bounded agents (parents who value children the most) as they posses imperfect information about the choices of their network’s neighbors. They can only perceive a signal of good or bad, probably, due to the fear of retribution. There is a chance that the agents giving a matching signal to opinion with probability $q$ and mismatching signal with probability $1 - q$, see [49]. In this paper we will study the influence of those type of signal games on the spread of vaccination opinion and disease in the social and biological networks in the presence of resources limitations of actions represented in vaccine efficacy and accessibility as well as vaccine safety.

2. Model and Methods

Networks.

We use an agent-based network model whose nodes are $N$ households occupied by a number of children ($C_i$, such that $0 \leq C_i \leq 7$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$) who are connected through a physical network. Parents are connected through a different (social, internet and physical) bi-directional weighted network via which they exchange experiences and information, and observe choices. Parents in a household with no children could be still connected to other parents and shaping their opinions. We use two types of networks: Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) and Barabási-Albert
network model (BAN), see [1]. In the physical networks, we postulate the degree of nodes to be proportional to the number of children in the households. Meanwhile, the parent’s networks is overlapping with the children’s network via random rewiring of the children’s network but with wiring probabilities are greater than severance probabilities. See supplementary material (SI. Model) for complete information about the networks. An instance of a histogram for each random network is shown in Figure S1.

Birth process.

A birth process is postulated to be dependent on the number of children occupying a household. A pregnancy is initiated based on a probability that is decreasing in the number of children. A pregnancy lasts for period of 280 days. Delivery of newborn updates the number of children but not the number of links in children’s network. We consider miscarriages and children’s death to be rare and so are not included.

Disease spread.

We assume that a new measles-like (vaccine-preventable, paediatric) disease is spreading between children within and between households. We assume a mean length $m_p$ days of incubation period with a maximum of $\ell$ days. A new infection in a household happens with a probability $1 - (1 - \beta_h) I(i) \cdot (1 - \beta) n_i(i)/C_i$; where $\beta$ is the probability to infect a child in another household (through the biological network), $\beta_h$ is the probability to infect a sibling within the same household, and $I(i)$ is the total number of infected siblings in the same household. The number $n_i(i)$ is the number of infected children connected to household $i$ through the network. The number $n_i(i)$ is divided by $C_i$ in the probability of infection formula based on the assumption that the children in a household have the same number of friends on average. We assume that the epidemic starts with $I_0$ infected children in different households, and are randomly chosen.

Vaccination decision-making.

Parents are randomly allocated into three types: never-vaccinators, who oppose vaccination at all time, non-vaccinators and vaccinators. The last two types span a mover-stayer process or an imitation process. Parents in household $i$ shape their subjective decision to vaccinate their children based on the payoff of vaccination, given by $\pi_i = \alpha_i I - \gamma_i A$, where $I$ and $A$ are the total number of infected and vaccine adverse events, respectively, up to the the decision day. Parents who experience an adverse event due to vaccinating their children are switched to never-vaccinators in the sequel. The parameter $\alpha_i$ is the degree of relevance of the disease infectiousness, and $\gamma_i$ is the degree of relevance of the vaccine adverse events to the subjective opinion of household $i$. The probability to vaccinate against the disease is given by $pr_i = 1/(1 + \exp(-\pi_i))$ for the un-decided parents and it is zero for never-vaccinators. The probabilities $pr_i = 1/(1 + \exp(-\alpha_i I_0))$ are used to generate the initial stance of the parents towards vaccination.

Observational social learning.

Parents in household $i$ learn the actual opinion through their connection with household $j$ with probability $q_{j,i}$ for $j \in N_B(i)$, where $N_B(i)$ is the set of neighbors of household $i$. Let household $i$
have a set of vaccinator neighbors in the social network $N_V(i)$ with cardinality $n_V(i)$ and have a set of non-vaccinator’s social network neighbors $N_N(i)$ with cardinality $n_N(i)$. Let also the total number of neighbors be $n_S(i) = n_V(i) + n_N(i)$. Then parents in household $i$ make the decision to vaccinate their children based the following probability

\[ P_S(i) = \frac{pr_i \cdot \prod_{j \in N_V(i)} q_{j,i} \cdot \prod_{k \in N_N(i)} (1 - q_{k,i})}{pr_i \cdot \prod_{j \in N_V(i)} q_{j,i} + (1 - pr_i) \cdot \prod_{j \in N_V(i)} (1 - q_{j,i})} \]  

or what we call the Bayesian update rule in observational social learning. In that case, the learning probability $q_{j,i}$ is to define a directional observational social learning of household $i$ from household $j$.

Observational learning is a two-way channel and so the probabilities $q_{j,i}$ depend on both $i$ and $j$. One direction is based on household $j$’s willingness to and clarity in sharing their stance about vaccination. Another direction is based on household $i$’s interpretation of household $j$’s signal. At the same time social learning does not have to be symmetric, that is $q_{i,j} \neq q_{j,i}$. For instance, followers of a celebrity learn from the celebrity more than in the other way around. A reciprocal or symmetric social learning entails that $q_{j,i} = q_{i,j}$. A non-directional social learning, in the sense of outward uniformity, means $q_{j,i} = q_{j,k} = q_j$ for all $i \neq k$ and for all $j$.

In case that $q_j = q$ for all $j$ and $pr_i = pr$ for all $i$, then

\[ P_S(i) = \frac{pr \cdot q^{n_V(i)} \cdot (1 - q)^{n_N(i)}}{pr \cdot q^{n_V(i)} + (1 - pr) \cdot (1 - q)^{n_V(i)} \cdot q^{n_N(i)}} \]  

for $0 < q < 1$. An uninformative probability $q = .5$ results in no social influence on the parent since $P_S(i) = pr_i$.

The model in equation (2.1) can be re-written as

\[ P_S(i) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\Delta_i - \pi_i)} \]  

where $\pi_i = \logit(pr_i)$ and $\Delta_i = \sum_{j \in N_V(i)} \logit(q_{j,i}) - \sum_{k \in N_N(i)} \logit(q_{k,i})$. (Note: $\logit(p) = \log\left(\frac{p}{1 - p}\right)$)

DeGroot model of selection [2], can be seen also in the term $\Delta_i$ if neighbor $j \in N_B(i)$ is given a weight of $\logit(q_{j,i})$ and using the discrete opinions to be valued as $+1$ for vaccination and $-1$ for no-vaccination. That makes a stochastic DeGroot model of selection a special case of the Bayesian update rule in equation (2.1).

Similarly, when $q_i = q$ and $pr_i = pr$ for all $i$ as in the model of equation (2.2), the model can be re-written as

\[ P_S(i) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(-\delta_i \frac{n_V(i) - n_N(i)}{n_S(i)} - \pi\right)} \]  

where $\pi = \logit(pr)$ and $\delta_i = n_S(i) \logit(q)$ is the degree of injunctive social norm practiced by household $i$. See [36, 47, 48] for the case $\delta_i =: \delta$ for all $i$, in which case
which leads to the voting model of selection using $2nV_i(nS_i) - 1$ to decide the winner strategy. In other words, the latter model is also a special case of (2.1) in case of homogeneous observational learning. But since $\delta$ is non-negative then equation (2.5) can only reveal the human behavior when $q \geq 0.5$ and so the model in (2.5) is less attractive that in (2.1).

On each day, parental stance of vaccination is updated randomly based on the the probabilities $P_S$ and vaccinators are chosen with probability $\rho$ to vaccinate all of their children where $\rho$ is the probability to get access to vaccination based on the resources.

**Epidemiological measures.**

To analyze the effect of the learning probability $q_{j,i}$ on the parents’ opinion and on disease spread we use an number of epidemiological measures: size of epidemics, peak of epidemic, vaccine uptake, number of vaccinators, and the basic reproduction number $R_0$ which we use only for calibration of ERN. We use $R_0$ as an epidemiological measure and not as a threshold, see [50]. The size of the epidemic is the total number of infected children at the end of the epidemic. The vaccine uptake is the total number of children who get vaccinated. The ending number of vaccinators is used to measure whether vaccination opinion becomes a consensus at the end of the epidemic. The basic reproduction number $R_0$ is defined to be the average number of secondary cases in a completely susceptible population. We use that definition to make an algorithm to estimate the value of $R_0$ (see Algorithm 1 in the supplementary material SIII. Methods). In that algorithm, we use Bayes’ theorem to calculate the probability that infection happens due to a contact with the index case which is then used to calculate the average number of infections. To find the grand mean, we average up over several simulations of disease transmission and then over the $N$ households, that can include the index case, then finally over simulations of the several networks.

**Parameter values.**

Model paramertization is done using the literature, calibration and guesstimation. We use a number of $N = 100,000$ households in city with a random number of children in each household of mean two-and-half children. We assume that the mean degree in the children’s network is 40 and the mean degree of the parents’ network is 60 in the ERN. We assume that the epidemic starts with $I_0 = 10$ initially infected children that are randomly dispersed among the $N$ households. We postulate a disease of mean incubation period 11 days of and maximum of 16 days, [51, p.8]. We find values for $\beta$ by calibration using $R_0$ values between 12 and 18, [51, p.8]. We assume that a fraction of 5% of the population will refuse to vaccinate at all, due to medical or ideological reasons. The rest of the parents will consider subjectively their likelihood to vaccinate. For values of $q$ that are between 0 and 1, exclusively, parents will incorporate the observational social learning from their connections into their likelihood to vaccinate. A full table of parameter definition and values can be found in the supplementary material SII and Table S1.
Model simulation.

The model is implemented using stochastic simulation for 100 runs to examine the effect of social learning probability \( q_{j,i} \) on vaccine opinion and paediatric disease spread. We assume that \( q_{j,i} \) are uniformly distributed over \( q \pm 0.05 \) for a pre-specified value of \( q \) where \( 0 < q < 1 \). The stance towards vaccination and the disease states of infected children are updated at the beginning of each time step (day). Multiple infections can happen on the same day in the network and the numbers \( n_I(i) \) and \( I(i) \) are updated everyday for all \( i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). An infected child on the \( j^{th} \) day after infection jumps either to the end of the incubation period (recovers) or remains infected with a transition to the following day with probabilities given by truncated exponential distribution (see supplementary material SI. Model).

Our codes of simulations rely on the NumPy-compatible Python library CuPy [52], accelerated with NVIDIA CUDA [53] for parallel calculations on Graphical Processing Units (GPUs). Most of the calculations were done on a CentOS workstation with 8 NVIDIA Tesla (Kepler) K80 GPU cards, each having 2496 CUDA Cores and 12GB memory. For more information see Supplementary Material SV. Codes of Simulations.

3. Results

Using voting models of selection, the effect of degree of injunctive social norm on epidemic sizes and their peaks as well as the vaccine uptake is almost not noticeable for selected values of \( \delta \) in \([0.025, 0.225]\). That is true for the case of Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) in Figure 3.1 (a), (b) and (c), and clearer for Barabási-Albert network model in Figure 3.1 (d), (e) and (f). The topology of the network makes a difference on how the degree of injunctive social norm works on vaccine uptake and so on the sizes and peaks of epidemics as indicated by the the results of the simulation results shown in top panels versus bottom panels of Figure 3.1. Larger values of \( \delta \), as multiples of \( n_S \) are required to see any effect. But that is only comparable to values of \( q \) with \( q \geq 0.5 \), see below.
Figure 3.1: Simulations of sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic for different values of $\delta$ in equation (2.5). Simulations are done on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) in (a), (b) and (c), and on Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) in (d), (e) and (f). In all of the simulations $P_{adv} = .0001$ and $\rho = .01$.

In case of Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) and using the general Bayesian learning rule in equation (2.1), we find richer dynamical behaviors than those when $\delta$ is used. First, let us assume that there are enough vaccines to vaccinate one child in every 100 children every day. When $P_{adv} = .0001$, then the larger the value of $q$ becomes, the higher the pressure is imposed on parents, resulting in higher vaccine uptake and accordingly lower size and peak of epidemics, Figure 3.2 (a), (b) and (c). As the probability of an adverse event increases to $P_{adv} = .001$, more adverse events will happen. When $q < .5$, vaccine uptake will keep increasing with the values of $q$, a pattern that changes for $q > .5$, Figure 3.2 (d), (e) and (f). A larger probability of adverse events of $P_{adv} = .01$, results in a decrease in vaccine uptake as the value of $q$ increases. In that case, both the size and the peak of the epidemics increase with the increase in the probability $q$, Figure 3.2 (g), (h) and (i).
Those patterns change when we assume that vaccines are scarce, where it is only possible to vaccinate one child in every 1000 children every day. First, the outcomes’ uncertainty increases, compare panels of Figure 3.2 to Figure 3.3. The less vaccine is available, the less number of adverse cases will appear. It takes a higher probability of an adverse event to effectively make the learning probability motivate parents to refuse vaccinating their children, Figure 3.3 (b), (e), and (h). It is
noticeable that the peak of the epidemics in that case do not change significantly with the change in the learning probability.

Figure 3.3: Simulations of sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) for different values of $q$. Simulations are done using $P_{adv} = .0001$ in (a), (b) and (c), $P_{adv} = .001$ in (d), (e) and (f), and $P_{adv} = .01$ in (g), (h) and (i). In all of the simulations $\rho = .001$.

In case of Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) and using the general Bayesian learning rule in equation (2.1), while disease spreads faster on BANs, the sizes of the epidemics are smaller than
those on ERNs, compare panels of Figure 3.2 to Figure 3.4, and panels of Figure 3.3 to Figure 3.5. That is because of the increased vaccine uptake in contrast to the vaccine uptake on the ERN with also different behavior over the values of $q$. When the probability of adverse event is large $P_{adv} = .01$, the vaccine uptake drops, compare Figure 3.4 panel (h) to panels (b) and (e). However, in that case, the higher the learning probability is, the larger the vaccine uptake will be.

Figure 3.4: Simulations of sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) for different values of $q$. Simulations are done using $P_{adv} = .0001$ in (a), (b) and (c), $P_{adv} = .001$ in (d), (e) and (f), and $P_{adv} = .01$ in (g), (h) and (i). In all of the simulations $\rho = .01$. 
Again, those patterns disappear when we assume that vaccines are scarce and they are only available for one child in every 1000 children everyday. Like in the ERNs, the outcomes’ uncertainty increases, compare panels of Figure 3.4 to Figure 3.5. But in contrast to ERNs, the learning probability does not have significant influence over the vaccine uptake nor the size and peak of epidemics, compare panels of Figure 3.3 to Figure 3.5.

Figure 3.5: Simulations of sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) for different values of $q$. Simulations are done using $P_{adv} = .0001$ in (a), (b) and (c), $P_{adv} = .001$ in (d), (e) and (f), and $P_{adv} = .01$ in (g), (h) and (i). In all of the simulations $\rho = .001$. 
Parameter planes in Figure 3.6 for the relevance of the disease $\alpha$ and relevance of the vaccine’s adverse event $\gamma$ to the rational choice component and for different values of $q$ show consistent patterns with the simulations in Figure 3.2. That means that for diseases and opinions spreading on ERN, the learning’s effect is effectively suppressing the parent’s rational perception of the payoff of vaccination. Parameter planes in Figures S2 and S3 show consistent patterns as well.

Figure 3.6: Parameter planes of $\alpha$ against $q$ and $\gamma$ against $q$ for sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN). In all of the simulations, the median value of the simulations are used to plot the parameter planes that are performed at $P_{adv} = .0001$ and $\rho = .01$.

Similarly, parameter planes in Figure 3.7 for the relevance of the disease $\alpha$ and relevance of the vaccine’s adverse event $\gamma$ to the rational choice component and for different values of $q$ show consistent patterns with the simulations in Figure 3.4. Qualitatively, for diseases and opinion spreading on BAN, vaccine uptake and epidemics can have symmetric reaction to high and low learning probability. Quantitatively, the parent’s rational perception of the payoff of vaccination show influence over vaccine uptake and epidemics. As the perceived disease risk increases, vaccine uptake increases and epidemic sizes and peaks decrease, Figure 3.7 (a), (b), and (c). And as the perceived vaccine adverse events risk increases, vaccine uptake decreases and epidemic sizes and peaks increase, Figure 3.7 (d), (e), and (f). Parameter planes in Figures S4 and S5 show consistent patterns as well.
Figure 3.7: Parameter planes of $\alpha$ against $q$ and $\gamma$ against $q$ for sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Barabási-Albert network model (BAN). In all of the simulations, the median value of the simulations are used to plot the parameter planes that are performed at $P_{adv} = .0001$ and $\rho = .01$.

The parents’ learning probability can lead to a vaccination consensus in case of Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) and Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) shown in Figure 3.8 (a) and (b) as the number of vaccintors on the last day of the epidemic. Moderate to high learning probability is required in case of ERN, though. The pattern stays exactly the same as in Figure 3.8 (a) for ERN when $P_{adv} = .01$, data is not shown to avoid redundancy. It drastically changes, however, for BAN when $P_{adv} = .01$, Figure 3.8 (c). In the latter, fewer number of parents end up accepting to vaccinating their children with decline over the increase in the learning probability.
Up to this point, the simulations of the model assumed that the population has a homogeneous culture. That is, parents show their actual preference or strategy with probabilities \( q_{i,j} \in (q - .05, q + .05) \) for one fixed value of \( q \). In the next part, we examine the effect of the population having a cultural attribute. That attribute gives rise to a heterogeneous population, in which the population is comprised of two groups that use probabilities in two different regions: .1 ± .05 and .9 ± .05. We choose .1 and .9 as an extreme case. We call the group of the latter type, subpopulation with attribute 1. The proportion of those with attribute 1 can affect the fate of the vaccination uptake and the epidemic.

In case of epidemic spreading on an ERN, having small proportion of parents with attribute 1,
results in a large epidemic size and its peak as well as less vaccine uptake. That is apparent in the simulations shown in Figure 3.9. In case of epidemic spreading on an BAN, heterogeneity in the population’s culture does not show significant effect on the epidemics or vaccine uptake, see simulations in Figure 3.9.

Figure 3.9: Simulations of sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) for different proportions of attribute 1. Simulations are done using $\rho = .01$ in (a), (b) and (c), and $\rho = .001$ in (d), (e) and (f). In all of the simulations $P_{adv} = .0001$. 
Figure 3.10: Simulations of sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) for different proportions of attribute 1. Simulations are done using $\rho = .01$ in (a), (b) and (c), and $\rho = .001$ in (d), (e) and (f). In all of the simulations $P_{adv} = .0001$.

If the proportion of parents with attribute 1 is more than one-half, the vaccination becomes a consensus in case of ERN, see Figure 3.10 (a). Vaccination becomes a consensus in all cases for BAN, see Figure 3.10 (b).

Figure 3.11: Simulations of final total number of vaccinators on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) and Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) for different proportions of attribute 1. Simulations are done on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) in (a) and Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) in (b). In all of the simulations are done using $P_{adv} = .0001$ and $\rho = .01$. 
4. Discussions and conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a Bayesian model of boundedly rational observational social learning as a method of social pressure to accept vaccination and becoming a consensus. The model of learning is based on social observations of neighbors on the social network through which information is spreading. Other models in the literature are shown to be special cases of the model that we introduced. Some models, like degree of injunctive social norm $\delta$, in contrast, lack the scale that our model enjoys. The new model explores the influence of social learning on the development of a consensus in a network. The model also explores how heterogeneity in culture of observational social learning affects vaccine uptake.

We used stochastic simulations of the disease and information processes spreading on two overlapping networks. The processes took part over two types of networks: Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) and Barabási-Albert network model (BAN). The results of observational social learning on those different networks and its mutual influence on the disease spread on the overlapping network were dependent on the network type and on the vaccine safety and availability. The population is almost split into two opinions in the beginning of the epidemic. In ERN, as the adverse events become rare due to its small likelihood or inaccessibility to vaccines, the increase in pressure ensued through declaring the adopted strategy with higher probability, especially when $q \geq .5$, will result in an increase in vaccine uptake and eventually vaccination as a social norm. (Notice that $q = .5$ is the rational agent case.) The vaccine uptake in BAN is relatively higher than in ERN, and vice-versa for epidemic sizes. Moreover, the higher the learning probability when $q \geq .5$ in BAN, the less the vaccine uptake will be.

Based on the simulations of the epidemic processes on the ERN and BAN, the degree distribution plays a role in the levels of vaccine uptake and parental acceptance of vaccination. The vaccine uptake in the case of BAN is higher than in ERN. That might be for two reasons: As the disease is known to spread fast on BAN, then the accumulation of the number of cases will be quickly large and that will increase the subjective probability to vaccinate. A second reason is that the large number of neighbors will increase the inclination towards one of the two opinions even with small values of $q$.

Vaccine availability and accessibility interacts with vaccine adverse events in a way that could influence parental opinion and so the vaccine uptake. In ERN, the more the vaccine is available and the less the chances of its adverse events will assist the learning to increase the vaccine uptake and establishing the vaccination as a consensus. In BAN, that paradigm changes as the degree distribution have a heavy tail.

Mixed populations, with two different cultures of sharing their opinion about vaccination, could have a significant effect on the vaccine uptake. Having a fraction of the population with low learning probability $q_1$ in a population with $q_2 > q_1$ could decrease the resulting level of vaccine uptake and increase the epidemic size when compared with a homogeneous population with the same learning probability $q_2$.

Social studies using survey and experiments of behavioral games might consider the personal features of each parents that gives rise to a directional learning probabilities $q_{i,j}$ and $q_{j,i}$. Population surveys can then be used to predict the levels of vaccine uptake. To elicit an increase in vaccine
uptake, it is not enough to consider only the degrees of parents in the information network to spread awareness. Further efforts of promoting social information sharing in social norm interventions will induce pro-social decisions of vaccination [43, 44, 45, 54]. According to our model, those efforts can lead to a consensus on the vaccination opinion and increase vaccine uptake even in the presence of a fraction of never-vaccinators and amid the vaccine’s lack of safety and low availability.
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SI. Model

In this section we give complete description of physical and social networks, and the disease and information spread dynamics.

Children physical/biological network

The first network $N^C$ connects children in households physically through which child-to-child disease transmission takes place. Links between children represent face-to-face possibilities through school, clubs, communal activities, etc. Those links are assumed to be static; that is they do not change over time once established. At this level, we only allow transmission through the network and no other transmission routes (like environmental) are permissible. In that network we assume nodes are formed from a number of $N$ households that are linked via physical transmission connections for each child (agent) in the household. The set of neighbors of household $i$ on this network is denoted by $N_B(i)$ and their size is $n_B(i)$.

1. **Formation.** A number of children $C_i$ (possibly zero) is randomly assigned to each household $i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, using a binomial distribution with parameters $n_c$ and $p_c$. We consider three types of networks here:
   1) Erdős-Rényi (random) network (ERN): Two households $i$ and $j$ are physically connected with probability $p \cdot \sqrt{C_i C_j}$ which accounts for the number of children in both households. (A zero-children household will have no connections.) The parameter $p$ is selected to be less than $1/n_c$.
   2) Barabási-Albert Network (BAN): In this network, we connect the first two households then connect each of the following households, iteratively, according to the degree distribution of the preceding households. That is, household, say number $j$ ($j = 3, 4, \ldots, N$), is connected to one of the households $1, 2, \ldots, j - 1$ according to the their degree distribution $\frac{C_k d(k)}{\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i d(i)}$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots, j - 1$, where $d(k)$ is the degree of household $k$.

2. **Birth process.** Humans’ gestation period is assumed to be 280 days. The first 280 days of the simulation of the model are discarded as a burn-in period. Families decide to have a new baby (start a new pregnancy) with a probability dependent on the number of children per household. We assume that the probability of a new carriage in a household $i$, if not already in pregnancy, is given by

$$\frac{1}{1 + \exp(2.5(C_i - 2))}.$$ 

After 280 days $C_i$ gets updated to $C_i + 1$.

After delivery, parents either vaccinate or do not vaccinate their new baby. Vaccine is assumed to be $e$ efficacious with a probability $p_{adv}$ to trigger a serious adverse reaction. The decision to vaccinate is based on the opinion formed through the social network. It is going to be determined over the following network.

3. **Disease transmission within and between households.** Initially, a number of children $I_0$ are randomly and uniformly selected to be infected. A new infection happens in household, say
number $i$, on any single day due to transmission within the household or between households with probability $1 - (1 - \beta_h)I(i) \cdot (1 - \beta)^{n_I(i)/C_i}$. where $\beta$ is the probability to infect a child in another household (through the biological network), $\beta_h$ is the probability to infect a sibling within the same household, and $I(i) = \sum_{k=1}^k I(i, k)$ is the total number of infected siblings in the same household where $I(i, k)$ is the number of infected siblings at day/stage $k$ of the incubation period. The number $n_I(i) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_B(i)} I(j)$ is the number of infected children connected to that household $i$ through the network. The last number ($n_I(i)$) is divided by $C_i$ in the probability of infection formula to reflect the assumption that the children in a household have the same number of friends on average. Multiple infections can happen on the same day in the network and the numbers $n_I(i)$ and $I(i)$ are updated everyday for all $i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$.

4. **Disease progression.** The incubation period is assumed to be distributed according to a discretized gamma distribution with mean length of $m_p$ days and maximum $\ell$ days. An infected child on day $j$ after infection moves either to the end of the incubation period (recovers) or stay infected into the following day with probabilities $Q_j$ and $1 - Q_j$, respectively, such that

$$Q_j = \frac{\int_j^{j+1} f(x)dx}{\int_j^{\infty} f(x)dx}$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$, and $Q_\ell = 1$, where $f(x)$ is the probability density function of the gamma distribution.

**Parental social network**

The second network $\mathcal{N}^P$ overlaps with the children’s physical network and assumes larger social/information links between parents in households. Through social network, parents share information and signal opinions to network neighbors who are not necessarily physical neighbors but possibly friends, relatives, colleagues, online friends, etc. The set of neighbors of household $i$ on this network is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_S(i)$ and their size is $n_S(i)$.

1. **Formation and overlap with the children’s network.** To form an overlapping social network with the children’s network; links in children’s physical network are retained randomly with probability of $p_{re}$. Other links are added to any one of the updated non-connected households with probability $p_{ad}$. The joint degree distribution of both biological and social networks is given by

$$P(n_B(i) = b, n_S(i) = s) = P(n_B(i) = b) \cdot C_s^{N-b} p_{ad}^s (1 - p_{ad})^{N-b-s} (1 - p_{re})^b \times$$

$$2F_1(-s, -b; N - b - s + 1; p_{re}/(1 - p_{re})/p_{ad}/(1 - p_{ad}))$$

where $2F_1$ is the generalized hypergeometric function. Note that, according to the setup of the biological network, $P(n_B(i) = b)$ is dependent on $\{C_j; j = 1, 2, \ldots, N\}$. Note that $p_{re}$ determines the degree of overlap between the two network with the extreme $p_{re} = 0$ giving a correlation between $n_B$ and $n_S$ equal to $-p_{ad}/\sigma_S$ with two totally non-overlapping networks.
2. **Initial Vaccine Opinion.** An initial number of all time non-vaccinator parents/households \(NV_0\) are randomly and uniformly selected from the \(N\) households. The rest \(N – NV_0\) households are undecided or mover-stayer parents \(MS_0\). A household that experience a vaccine adverse event is added to all-time non-vaccinators.

**SII. Parameter Values**

The model simulation is run for a large number of times for different sets of values of parameters. A parameterization of the model is given in Table 1. The time unit in any one of the parameters is given in days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Base values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>Number of households (nodes)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
<td>Birth rate</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_c)</td>
<td>Maximum number of children per household</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p_c)</td>
<td>Initial probability of having a child in a household</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>Physical connection probability</td>
<td>.00013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\lambda)</td>
<td>Rate of exponential distribution in TRN</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p_{re})</td>
<td>Probability of retaining a physical connection to form the social network</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p_{ad})</td>
<td>Probability of adding a connection to the social network</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_0)</td>
<td>Initial number of infected children</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>Human to human transmission probability through network [36]</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Human to human factor of transmission probability within household</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m_p, t_p)</td>
<td>Mean and maximum length of infectious period</td>
<td>11, 16 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NV_0)</td>
<td>Initial number of all time non-vaccinators</td>
<td>10% \cdot N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MS_0)</td>
<td>Initial number of mover-stayer parents</td>
<td>(N – NV_0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_V)</td>
<td>Probability to vaccinate</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Vaccine efficacy</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p_{adv})</td>
<td>Probability of vaccine adverse event</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha)</td>
<td>Degree of relevance of infectiousness to the decision to vaccinate</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\gamma)</td>
<td>Degree of relevance of vaccine adverse events to the decision to vaccinate</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>Probability to give a high signal of vaccination</td>
<td>((0 – 1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\delta)</td>
<td>Injunctive social norm</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rho)</td>
<td>Probability to get access to vaccination</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SIII. Supplementary Figures**
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**Figure S1:** Degree histogram for a simulation of Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN) in (a) and Barabási-Albert network model (BAN) in (b).
Figure S2: Parameter planes of $\alpha$ against $q$ and $\gamma$ against $q$ for sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN). In all of the simulations, the median value of the simulations are used to plot the parameter planes that are performed at $P_{adv} = .001$ and $\rho = .01$. 
Figure S3: Parameter planes of $\alpha$ against $q$ and $\gamma$ against $q$ for sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Erdős-Rényi (random) network model (ERN). In all of the simulations, the median value of the simulations are used to plot the parameter planes that are performed at $P_{adv} = .01$ and $\rho = .01$. 
Figure S4: Parameter planes of $\alpha$ against $q$ and $\gamma$ against $q$ for sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Barabási-Albert network model (BAN). In all of the simulations, the median value of the simulations are used to plot the parameter planes that are performed at $P_{adv} = .001$ and $\rho = .01$. 
Figure S5: Parameter planes of $\alpha$ against $q$ and $\gamma$ against $q$ for sizes of epidemic, total number of vaccinated children, and the peak of the epidemic on Barabási-Albert network model (BAN). In all of the simulations, the median value of the simulations are used to plot the parameter planes that are performed at $P_{adv} = .01$ and $\rho = .01$.

SIV. Calculating the Basic Reproduction Number $R_0$

The basic reproduction number is defined to be the average number of secondary infections caused by an index case introduced to a completely susceptible population till its recovery. To calculate the basic reproduction number as it is defined for the disease process over a network $N^C$ of households, we carry out algorithm 1. It is based on running the diseases process for large number of times for an index case in a household that is selected uniformly from the network. Then the expected number of cases caused by the index case is estimated by the mean of binomial distributions whose probabilities are found using Bayes theorem.

In particular, the probabilities $P_i(t)$ and $P_j(t)$ are the probabilities that the index case is the cause of infection of a new case within the same family and in the neighbors, respectively. Then the mean number of infections among $IC_i(t)$ and $IC_j(t)$ that are caused by the index case are given by $IC_i(t)P_i(t)$ and $IC_j(t)P_j(t)$, respectively.

SV. Coding of Simulation.

Our numerical simulations rely on the NumPy-compatible Python library CuPy [52], accelerated with NVIDIA CUDA [53] for parallel calculations on Graphical Processing Units (GPUs).
Algorithm 1 To estimate the basic reproduction number using simulations of disease processes on networks.

Input: number of simulation runs of the disease process $L$, number of simulated networks $W$, inputs for process in table S1

Output: $R_0$

begin
  for $w = 1, 2, \ldots, W$
    $\triangleright$ Generate a network $N_w^C$ of $N$ households and number of children in households 
    $\{C_i(0) : i = 1, \ldots, N\}$. Also generate the starting stand of households about vaccination.
    for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, such that $C_i(0) > 0$
      for $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, L$
        $\triangleright$ Select one child in household $i$ to be the index case
        $\triangleright$ Run the disease process till recovery of the index case, say till day $T$, which will change from
        a run to another.
        $\triangleright$ Record the number of new cases in household $j$, $IC_j(t)$, and the total number of prevalent
        children in household $j$ less the index case, $I_j(t)$, for all $j \in \{i\} \cup N_B(i)$. Record the total number
        of prevalent children in the outer neighbors $k$ of the household $j$, $I_{j,k}(t)$, for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$ for all
        $j \in N_B(i)$, and $k \in N_B(j) - \{i\}$
        $\triangleright$ Calculate:
        
        $P_i(t) = \frac{h\beta}{h\beta + (1 - (1 - h\beta)L_i(t)) + \sum_{j \in N_B(i)}(1 - (1 - \beta)L_j(t)/C_j(t))}$
        and
        
        $P_j(t) = \frac{\beta}{\beta + (1 - (1 - \beta)L_i(t)) + (1 - (1 - h\beta)L_j(t)) + \sum_{k \in N_B(j) - \{i\}}(1 - (1 - \beta)L_{j,k}(t)/C_{j,k}(t))}$

        where $C_{j,k}(t)$ are the number of children in the outer neighbors $k$ of the household $j$.
        $\triangleright$ Calculate:
        
        $R_0(w, i, \ell) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{j \in \{i\} \cup N_B(i)} IC_j(t)P_j(t)$

        end
        $\triangleright$ Return $R_0(w, i) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} R_0(w, i, \ell)$
        end
        $\triangleright$ Return $R_0(w) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_0(w, i)$
        end
        $\triangleright$ Return $R_0 = \frac{1}{W} \sum_{w=1}^{W} R_0(w)$

end

Most of the calculations were done on a CentOS workstation with 8 NVIDIA Tesla (Kepler) K80
GPU cards, each having 2496 CUDA Cores and 12GB memory.

We introduce a sparse storage format for the adjacency matrices of the networks, where we
record only the position of the nonzero elements in the upper triangular part by a single index
number (see Figure S6). With $k$ denoting the index of the upper triangular entries in column-major order and $(i, j)$ denoting the corresponding row and column indices the following relationships hold:

\[
k = i + \frac{(j - 2)(j - 1)}{2}, \tag{4.1}
\]
\[
j = \text{floor} \left( \frac{3 + \sqrt{8k - 1}}{2} \right), \tag{4.2}
\]
\[
i = k - \frac{(j - 2)(j - 1)}{2}. \tag{4.3}
\]

The indexing formulas (4.1)–(4.3) provide a fast and efficient storage and calculations through parallel implementations on the GPUs.