

# Percolating under one roof

Joel C. Miller

Many different concepts of percolation exist for networks. We show that bond percolation, site percolation,  $k$ -core percolation, and bootstrap percolation are all special cases of the Watts Threshold model. We show that the “heterogeneous  $k$ -core” and a corresponding heterogeneous bootstrap model are equivalent to one another and the Watts Threshold Model. A more recent model of a “Generalized Epidemic Process” is also shown to be a special case. Finally, we show that a natural generalization of the Watts Threshold Model is a special case of the Watts Threshold Model, and thus it is equivalent to the Watts Threshold Model as well.

## INTRODUCTION

Given a static network  $G$ , we are frequently interested in the percolation properties of that network. Percolation comes in numerous flavors. The most frequent are bond and site percolation, but recently researchers have begun to study  $k$ -core percolation, bootstrap percolation, and the Watts Threshold Model in more detail. These processes are closely related, and indeed it has been shown that similar mathematical approaches can be used to analyze these [5, 8]. The main result of this paper is that in fact all of these (and some related) processes can be thought of as a special case of the Watts Threshold Model.

The most common percolation processes are bond and site percolation. In bond percolation, each node is preserved with probability  $p$  and removed with probability  $1 - p$ . In site percolation, each edge is preserved with probability  $p$  and removed with probability  $1 - p$ . The focus of attention is generally on the final size of the component containing a given node. It is typically observed that in the limit of large networks, there is a threshold value  $p_c$  at which a giant component emerges.

In  $k$ -core percolation, all nodes with degree less than some specified  $k$  are removed. This removal may reduce some nodes’ degrees below  $k$ . If so, these are then removed. The “pruning” process repeats until all remaining nodes have degree at least  $k$  neighbors among the other remaining nodes. It is straightforward to generalize this to allow each node  $u$  to have its own threshold  $k_u$ , resulting in “heterogeneous  $k$ -core” percolation [2]. We note that many authors have used the term “bootstrap percolation” to denote  $k$ -core percolation, and indeed this appears to be the original term [1, 4, 6], but we reserve “bootstrap percolation” for a closely related dual process.

In bootstrap percolation (introduced in [1] where it was called “diffusion percolation”), a collection of nodes is initially “activated”. Following the initial activation, if an inactive node has at least  $k$  neighbors, it becomes active. The process repeats until all inactive nodes have fewer than  $k$  active neighbors. As in  $k$ -core percolation, we can assign each node its own threshold, yielding heterogeneous bootstrap percolation.

In the “generalized epidemic process” (GEP) [3], an infection is spreading through the network. Whenever the  $k$ -th neighbor of  $u$  becomes infected, the probability that  $u$  remains uninfected is given by  $p_k$ . Decreasing  $p_k$  could correspond to individuals gaining immunity as they are exposed. It could also be a result of an initial heterogeneity in susceptibility, such that as the number of exposures increases the only remaining individuals have reduced susceptibility. Conversely, increasing  $p_k$  would correspond to a synergistic effect whereby more exposures make an individual more likely to become infected.

In the Watts Threshold Model (WTM), each node  $u$  is assigned a threshold  $r_u$ . This threshold may depend on properties of  $u$ . If the number of active neighbors reaches  $r_u$ , then  $u$  becomes active. A relatively straightforward generalization of the WTM allows nodes to “transmit” to their neighbors with some probability  $T < 1$ , and then a node becomes active if  $r_u$  neighbors have transmitted to it. We are typically interested in the final set of active nodes.

We will show that by appropriately structuring the WTM, both bond percolation and site percolation emerge as special cases. Both bootstrap percolation and  $k$ -core percolation can be thought of as a special case of the WTM, and taking the generalization to heterogeneous bootstrap percolation or heterogeneous  $k$ -core percolation we arrive at models that are identical to the WTM, with the distinction that the remaining nodes in the  $k$ -core version correspond to the inactive nodes in the WTM and bootstrap percolation. For the GEP we again find that it is a special case of the WTM. We will further show that the generalization of the WTM to have transmission probability  $T < 1$  can be thought of as a special case of the usual WTM by appropriately modifying the thresholds.

## ANALYSIS

### Site Percolation

We begin by considering site percolation, where each node is deleted with probability  $1 - p$ . We will identify a correspondance between site percolation and a partic-




FIG. 1: Comparison of site percolation and WTM on honeycomb lattice. Results for  $p = 0.4$  on left and  $p = 0.8$  on right. (top) Each node is assigned a weight. (middle) If the weight is less than  $p$ , then the node is given a threshold of 0 for WTM. Otherwise it is given  $k+1$ . Those with threshold 0 are shown in color, and will all be active in the final state. Those with threshold larger than their degree are uncolored and can never activate. (bottom) If the node's weight is less than  $p$  it is kept otherwise it is deleted in site percolation. Clearly the deleted nodes are exactly those that remain inactive.

ular case of the WTM such that the final active nodes in the WTM process corresponds exactly to the undeleted nodes in the site percolation process.

For each node  $v$  we assign a random number  $\alpha_v$  uniformly from the interval  $(0, 1)$ . Site percolation then corresponds to deleting  $v$  if  $\alpha_v > p$ . For the WTM process, if  $\alpha_v > p$  we set the threshold of  $v$  to be  $r_v = d_v + 1$  where  $d_v$  is the degree of  $v$ . Otherwise we set the threshold to be  $r_v = 0$ . This is shown in figure 1

## Bond Percolation

The bond percolation process correspondance to the WTM is more subtle than for site percolation. The equivalent WTM process does not give exactly which edges are kept in bond percolation. Rather, by appropriate choice of threshold, the WTM partitions the nodes into clusters of nodes such that the partitioning is indistinguishable from the partitioning in bond percolation.

We find this threshold by imagining a search through the network following bond percolation. Each time the search encounters a node  $v$  which was originally a neighbor of  $u$ , the probability that a  $u-v$  edge exists is  $p$ . Thus the number of neighbors of  $u$  which are visited before the first time the search finds an edge to  $u$  is geometrically distributed with parameter  $p$ . If we assign each node a threshold from this distribution, then the probability  $u$  will become activated following activation of the  $q$ th neighbor in the WTM model is equal to the probability that the  $q$ th neighbor encountered will be the first neighbor with an edge to  $u$ . This does not necessarily provide information about whether edges would exist between  $u$  and any other neighbors of  $u$  because both nodes are active before the algorithm considers the edge.

We can use the WTM to generate the full set of clusters that would be observed in the bond percolation process by the following process. We choose an initial node to activate, we then expand the active set until no more changes occur. This yields one cluster. We then choose a not yet active node and activate it, finding all the new nodes to become active. This forms the next cluster. Repeating the process yields the entire set. Figure 2 shows that on a  $K_5$  network the probability of having a given set of partitions is the same for both processes.

Once a given node is selected, the specific search process (*e.g.*, depth-first or breadth-first) used by the WTM is not important as long as for each starting node it runs until no new activations occur. Once the weights are chosen the observed clusters are determined by the order the starting nodes are chosen. This is shown in figure 3. This can be proven by assuming for contradiction that a given initial node is chosen, but two different searches result in some node that appears in one cluster ( $A$ ) but not the other ( $B$ ). Consider the first node  $u$  added to  $A$  which is not in  $B$ . All nodes in  $A$  that led to the activation of  $u$  are present in  $B$  and therefore  $u$  must be in  $B$  as well.

## $k$ -core percolation

The  $k$ -core percolation process is deterministic. This simplifies our explanation compared to the earlier examples. In  $k$ -core percolation, nodes are removed whenever they have fewer than  $k$  neighbors that have not been removed. To model this with the WTM, we assign each




FIG. 2: A comparison of bond percolation and the WTM process. For a  $K_5$  network, we compare the cluster sizes observed by bond percolation ('+') and WTM ('x'). We plot the probability of each observed collection of partition sizes for  $p = 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.5$  across 50000 simulations for each  $p$ .




FIG. 3: The activated clusters found using depth-first (left) and breadth-first (right) searching using the WTM with geometrically distributed thresholds having  $p = 0.51$  for a  $9 \times 9$  lattice. The number at each node is its threshold. The nodes that are circled are the initial nodes chosen for each cluster. The bottom left node is chosen first, and its cluster traced out. The next cluster is initialized by the bottom-most of the left-most nodes. The same ordering is used for determining the order to consider nodes in the depth-first and breadth-first search. This results in the same clusters forming. Solid edges are the edges that formed the final transmission that caused activation. Non-existent edges were edges that failed to cause activation (but moved the node closer to its threshold). Dashed edges are edges that were not attempted because both nodes were active prior to considering the edge. Note that the edges change between the two search orders, but not the clusters.




FIG. 4: A comparison of  $k$ -core percolation and the WTM for the karate club graph [9]. We look for the  $k = 4$ -core of the network. (top left) The original network. (top right) Thresholds of  $d_u - 4 + 1$ . (middle left) The first step of  $k$ -core percolation. (middle right) All nodes with negative thresholds are activated following the WTM. (bottom left) The second step of  $k$ -core percolation. (bottom right) The second step of the WTM. At each step, the activated nodes of the WTM are exactly the deleted nodes in  $k$ -core percolation.

node  $u$  a threshold  $r_u = d_u - k + 1$ , with the understanding that  $r_u \leq 0$  implies immediate activation.

Each node with fewer than  $k$  neighbors is thus immediately activated. By our choice of thresholds, at each successive step, nodes are removed from the inactive nodes whenever they have fewer than  $k$  inactive neighbors. This continues until all inactive nodes have at least  $k$  inactive neighbors.

The resulting inactive nodes are exactly the nodes remaining in  $k$ -core percolation. This is shown in figure 4 which shows the initial steps for finding the 4-core of the “karate club network” [9] as well as the initial steps for the WTM version. At each step, the set of active nodes for the WTM is exactly the set of deleted nodes for the 4-core.

We can generalize the concept of  $k$ -core percolation to create “heterogeneous  $k$ -core percolation” [2]. Each node is assigned its own threshold  $k_u$ . If we assign a WTM threshold of  $r_u = d_u - k_u + 1$ , we activate the complement of the heterogeneous  $k$ -core.

In fact, the inclusion works in both directions: given a WTM threshold of  $r_u$  for each node, if we define  $k_u = d_u - r_u + 1$ , then the heterogeneous  $k$ -core is the complement of the WTM active nodes: A node is activated

in the WTM if it has at least  $r_u$  active neighbors, which is equivalent to having fewer than  $k_u$  inactive neighbors. So it is removed from the inactive state whenever it has fewer than  $k_u$  remaining inactive neighbors. Similarly in the heterogeneous  $k$ -core it is removed from the  $k$ -core exactly when it has fewer than  $k_u$  remaining neighbors in the  $k$ -core.

Because the heterogeneous  $k$ -core can be reproduced using the WTM and any WTM result can be reproduced with the heterogeneous  $k$ -core, they are in fact equivalent.

### Bootstrap percolation

In bootstrap percolation, a set of initial nodes is activated and then nodes become active if  $k$  of their neighbors are activated. This bears similarity to  $k$ -core percolation, but  $k$ -core percolation is a “subtractive” process while bootstrap percolation is an additive process [2].

If we use the WTM with  $r_u = k$  for all nodes except for a set of initial active nodes, then the WTM with these thresholds is exactly bootstrap percolation. In fact, if we generalize bootstrap percolation to “heterogeneous bootstrap percolation” by allowing the threshold to be node-dependent, then we arrive exactly at the WTM.

The equivalence between heterogeneous bootstrap percolation and WTM combined with the equivalence between heterogeneous  $k$ -core percolation and WTM imply that heterogeneous bootstrap percolation is equivalent to heterogeneous  $k$ -core percolation.

At first glance, this contrasts with observations of [2]. They showed that the  $k$ -core and the activated nodes in bootstrap percolation are not the same and can have different internal structure. In fact, the distinction between the two turns out to be that the nodes defined to be active for the bootstrap version are the nodes deleted in the  $k$ -core version. They are complementary processes. Any scaling behavior observed in heterogeneous  $k$ -core percolation can be observed in heterogeneous bootstrap percolation. This is previously known [1].

### Generalized Epidemic Process

A recent paper [3] introduced a generalized epidemic process. In this model, an infectious process is spreading through the network. If a node is still uninfected after receiving  $m - 1$  transmissions (each from different neighbors), the probability that it escapes infection on its next transmission is  $p_m$ . This is again a special case of the WTM.

To see this, we revisit the approach used for bond percolation. In bond percolation we chose the threshold  $r_u$  such that it corresponded to the number of transmissions that would be required for  $u$  to become infected. If




FIG. 5: A comparison of heterogeneous bootstrap and heterogeneous  $k$ -core percolation for the social network of dolphins observed by [7]. (top left)  $k$ -core thresholds for deletion. As long as the node has at least its threshold number of non-deleted neighbors it will not be deleted. (top right) The corresponding bootstrap thresholds for activation. A node will become active when the number of active neighbors reaches its threshold. (middle left) The highest degree node and its neighbors are initially deleted to start heterogeneous  $k$ -core percolation. (middle right) The highest degree node and its neighbors are initially activated to start heterogeneous bootstrap percolation. (bottom left) The next step of the  $k$ -core percolation. (bottom right) The next step of the bootstrap percolation.

we use  $p_0$  to denote the probability of being initially infected, then the probability it is the  $m$ -th exposure that successfully infects node  $u$  will be  $p_m \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} (1 - p_i)$ . We can choose  $m$  in advance of watching the process spread because the distribution is known *a priori*. If we choose this  $m$  for each node in advance and set  $r_u$  to be the corresponding  $m$  for node  $u$ , then the model simply reduces to the WTM with the given thresholds.

### Generalized Watts Threshold Model

An obvious generalization of the WTM is to allow an activated node to “transmit” or pass a message to an inactive neighbor  $v$  with probability  $T < 1$  (where  $T$  is the same for every node). This might occur for example if every individual has an active period of fixed duration and

transmits at fixed rate during that period. We will show that in fact this can be reproduced by the usual WTM by appropriate modification of the thresholds. The method follows closely the approach for bond percolation.

We take this generalized WTM with given  $T$ . Assign a threshold  $r_u$  to each node  $u$ . The probability that the  $m$ -th activated neighbor of  $u$  will cause  $u$  to reach its threshold is equal to the probability that the previous  $m - 1$  neighbors resulted in exactly  $r_u - 1$  transmissions times the probability that the  $m$ -th neighbor transmits. This is

$$P(m|r_u) = \binom{m-1}{r_u-1} T^{r_u} (1-T)^{m-r_u}.$$

From this, we can return to the usual WTM by taking the threshold  $r_u$  and replacing it with a new threshold  $m$  with probability  $P(m|r_u)$ .

In fact we can do a more general case by allowing  $T = T_u$  to depend on the individual receiving (but not initiating) the transmission. Here  $P(m|r_u, T_u) = \binom{m-1}{r_u-1} T_u^{r_u} (1-T_u)^{m-r_u}$ .

## DISCUSSION

Many percolation processes have been studied in networks. In this paper we have shown that bond and site percolation are both special cases of the WTM. We have also seen that bootstrap percolation and  $k$ -core percolation are both special cases of the WTM and a relatively obvious generalization of either bootstrap or  $k$ -core percolation results in a process that is equivalent to the WTM.

This helps to explain why similar behaviors are observed and similar mathematical methods apply to these different processes.

We have further shown that generalizing the WTM to allow for a homogeneous transmission probability  $T$  from active nodes to neighboring inactive nodes results in a model which can be thought of as a special case of the

WTM. Thus the potential models are not increased by this modification.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Davide Ceddaï and James Gleeson for very useful conversations.

- 
- [1] Joan Adler and Amnon Aharony. Diffusion percolation. i. infinite time limit and bootstrap percolation. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 21(6):1387, 1988.
  - [2] Gareth J Baxter, Sergey N Dorogovtsev, Alexander V Goltsev, and José FF Mendes. Heterogeneous  $k$ -core versus bootstrap percolation on complex networks. *Physical Review E*, 83(5):051134, 2011.
  - [3] Golnoosh Bizhani, Maya Paczuski, and Peter Grassberger. Discontinuous percolation transitions in epidemic processes, surface depinning in random media, and hamiltonian random graphs. *Physical Review E*, 86(1):011128, 2012.
  - [4] John Chalupa, Paul L Leath, and Gary R Reich. Bootstrap percolation on a Bethe lattice. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 12(1):L31, 1979.
  - [5] James P Gleeson. Cascades on correlated and modular random networks. *Physical Review E*, 77(4):046117, 2008.
  - [6] Alexander V Goltsev, Sergey N Dorogovtsev, and JFF Mendes.  $k$ -core (bootstrap) percolation on complex networks: Critical phenomena and nonlocal effects. *Physical Review E*, 73(5):056101, 2006.
  - [7] David Lusseau, Karsten Schneider, Oliver J Boisseau, Patti Haase, Elisabeth Slooten, and Steve M Dawson. The bottlenose dolphin community of doubtful sound features a large proportion of long-lasting associations. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 54(4):396–405, 2003.
  - [8] Joel C. Miller. Complex contagions and hybrid phase transitions in unclustered and clustered random networks. *Under Review; arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.01585*, 2015.
  - [9] Wayne W Zachary. An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups. *Journal of anthropological research*, pages 452–473, 1977.