

# Effective edge-based approach for promoting the spreading of SIR model

Dan Yang<sup>a</sup>, Jiajun Xian<sup>b,\*</sup>, Liming Pan<sup>c</sup>, Wei Wang<sup>d</sup>, Tao Zhou<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Web Sciences Center, School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China*

<sup>c</sup>*School of Computer Science and Technology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210023, China*

<sup>d</sup>*Cybersecurity Research Institute, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China*

---

## Abstract

Promoting spreading dynamics in networked systems is of both theoretical and practical importance. In this study, we propose an effective edge-based approach for promoting the spreading dynamics of the susceptible-infected-recovered model on complex networks by adding connections that do not exist in the original networks. Specifically, we first quantify the influence of each latent edge (that is, each edge that does not exist or activated before) by a mathematical model. Then, we strategically add the latent edges to the original networks according to the influence of each latent edge. It should be mentioned that our strategy incorporates both the information of network structure and spreading dynamics. We verify the effectiveness of our strategy by extensive numerical simulations and prove that our strategy outperforms those approaches that only consider the network structure. Besides, the theoretical framework established in this study provides inspirations for the further investigations of edge-based promoting strategies for other spreading models.

*Keywords:* Spreading dynamics, SIR model, Complex networks

---

\*Corresponding author at: School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 611731, China

*Email address:* xianjiajun22@gmail.com (Jiajun Xian)

## 1. Introduction

The subject of promoting the spreading dynamics in networked systems is attracting substantial attention from multiple disciplines, for instance, computer science, statistical physics, and network science [1, 2]. Maximizing the spreading prevalence of some common spreading dynamics, including the spreading of information, vaccination guidance, innovation, commercial message, and political movement, can bring benefits to all aspects of the socio-economic systems [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. The study of promoting these spreading dynamics is of great importance in both theoretical and practical perspectives.

Understanding the evolutionary mechanisms of the spreading dynamics in real life and building suitable models to describe them play essential roles in developing promoting strategies. Various spreading models have been proposed for spreading cases with different spreading mechanisms. For instance, in some simple contagions (e.g., information diffusion and innovation spreading) where the infected individuals could infect the susceptible ones by a single contact, the classic susceptible–infected–susceptible (SIS) model [8, 9], susceptible–infected–recovered (SIR) model [10, 11] and many of their extensions [12, 13, 14, 15, 16] have been widely applied. Besides, for some complex contagions (e.g., behavior adoption [17] and political information spreading [18, 19]), researchers have proposed the threshold model which incorporates the social reinforcement mechanism (i.e., the mechanism that the susceptible individuals becoming infected with a probability which increases with the cumulative number of contacts with the infected ones) [20, 21]. More spreading models with other complex mechanisms can be found in [22, 23, 24].

Based on these spreading models, researchers have proposed numerous strategies to promote or enhance the spreading dynamics. Most of the strategies have been proposed can be divided into three categories, that is, designing effective transmission strategies [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30], choosing vital nodes to be seeds [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38], and performing perturbations on network structure [39, 40, 41]. Specifically, designing effective transmission strategies

means to develop smart protocols to avoid invalid contacts, for instance, the contact between two infected nodes. Besides, for strategies of identifying vital nodes, researchers select nodes with high centrality (e.g., degree, betweenness, and closeness centrality) to be the initial seeds for spreading. Last, in the third category of strategies, the structure of the network is modified slightly for promoting the spreading dynamics.

In addition to the three categories of strategies mentioned above, we propose an effective edge-based strategy for promoting the spreading dynamics in this study. Consider a classic SIR spreading model that runs on top of a complex network. The SIR model is first proposed to study the epidemic transmission. Later on, researchers extend it to various other contagion processes, including information diffusion, innovation spreading, promotion of commercial products and the spread of political movements [42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49]. Our strategy enhances the spreading dynamics on the network by adding edges that do not exist before. To be specific, we first develop a mathematical model to quantify the influence of each latent edge, i.e., each connection that does not exist in the original network. This developed mathematical model is able to facilitate the determination of the spreading prevalence of the SIR model. Then, we strategically add the latent edges to the original networks according to the influence of each latent edge. Note that our strategy incorporates both the information of network structure and spreading dynamics. This study will show that our strategy is effective and outperforms those approaches which only consider the network structure.

We organize this paper as follows. First, Sec. 2 describes the spreading model and our strategy in detail. Then, Sec. 3 gives the theoretical framework for determining the influence of each latent edge. Further, Sec. 4 presents the numerical simulations to verify the effectiveness of our strategy. Finally, Sec. 5 concludes the paper.

## 2. Model description

In this study, we consider a discrete-time SIR dynamics that runs on a complex network  $G$  with adjacency matrix  $A$ . The number of nodes and edges of  $G$  is denoted by  $N$  and  $M$ , respectively. Generally, each node in this model will be assigned with one of three different states, that is, the susceptible state (S), the informed (or infected) state (I), or the recovered state (R). Denote the state of node  $i$  by  $\varepsilon_i$ ; thus,  $\varepsilon_i \in \{S, I, R\}$ . Initially, all the nodes are set to be in the S state. Then, a small fraction of nodes are selected to be in the I state. For every time step, every node in the I state will infect or inform each of its neighbors in the S state with the transmission probability  $\lambda$ . After the transmission process, each node in the I state will turn to the R state with the recovery probability  $\gamma$ . We refer to  $\beta = \lambda/\gamma$  as the effective transmission probability. Denote  $S(t)$ ,  $I(t)$  and  $R(t)$  as the proportion of nodes in the S, I, and R state at time  $t$ , respectively. The spreading dynamic will be terminated once there is no node in the I state, that is,  $I(\infty) = 0$ . Besides,  $R(\infty)$  is referred to as the spreading prevalence.

According to the SIR dynamic evolution rules described in the above paragraph, we can obtain the probabilities of nodes and edges in different states when the dynamic is terminated, for instance, the probability  $P(\varepsilon_i = R)$  of node  $i$  being in R state or the joint probability  $P(\varepsilon_i = R, \varepsilon_j = S)$  of edge  $(i, j)$  being in RS state. Our objective is to maximize the spreading prevalence of the discrete-time SIR dynamic that runs on top of the network  $G$  by adding a fraction of latent edges, i.e., connections that do not exist in the original network  $G$  before. To determine which latent edge should be added first, we need a measure to rank the influence of each latent edge.

To begin with, consider we add an edge between nodes  $i$  and  $j$ . If the final state of them is  $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_j = S$ , then this added edge will make no difference to the spreading dynamics since both node  $i$  and  $j$  will still be in the S state and influence no other node. Similarly, if the final states of nodes  $i$  and  $j$  are supposed to be  $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_j = R$ , then adding an edge between them will barely

bring new nodes to the I state because nodes  $i$  and  $j$  will be infected or informed regardless of whether there is an edge between them. Therefore, only when the final states  $\varepsilon_i = R$  and  $\varepsilon_j = S$  or  $\varepsilon_i = S$  and  $\varepsilon_j = R$ , the spreading prevalence will be increased by adding an edge between node  $i$  and  $j$ . Take the former situation as an example. In this case, if we add an edge between nodes  $i$  and  $j$ , then the node  $i$  can bring the node  $j$  into the I state with probability  $\lambda$  in the next step after  $i$  itself enters into the I state. Afterward, as a new node in the I state, node  $j$  goes ahead to influence its neighbors in the S state. Obviously, if node  $j$  has a large expected number of neighbors whose final states are S, then adding the edge  $(i, j)$  can increase the spreading prevalence to a large extent. Specifically, the expected incremental number of infected or informed nodes that produced in the way as describe above can be approximately calculated as

$$\bar{\sigma}_{ij} = \lambda P(\varepsilon_i = R)P(\varepsilon_j = S)[1 + \sum_{r=1}^N A_{jr} \lambda P(\varepsilon_r = S | \varepsilon_j = R)], \quad (1)$$

where  $P(\varepsilon_r = S | \varepsilon_j = R)$  is the conditional probability that node  $r$  is in the S state when  $j$  is in the I state. Similarly, we can obtain the expected incremental number  $\bar{\sigma}_{ji}$  directly caused by adding the edge  $(i, j)$  when the final states of nodes  $i$  and  $j$  is  $\varepsilon_i = S$  and  $\varepsilon_j = R$ , respectively. Take both cases of  $\bar{\sigma}_{ij}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}_{ji}$  into consideration, we define the influence of latent edge  $(i, j)$  as

$$\sigma_{ij} = \bar{\sigma}_{ij} + \bar{\sigma}_{ji}. \quad (2)$$

Our approach to effectively promote the spreading dynamics of the SIR model is based on adding the latent edge with the highest influence  $\sigma_{ij}$ . Thus, we refer to our strategy as the latent-edge-influence (LEI) strategy. Hereafter, the problem reduces to solving the Eq. (2), that is, finding the probabilities of nodes in different states and the conditional probabilities.

### 3. Theoretical analysis

In this section, we will develop a new theoretical framework to study the discrete-time SIR spreading dynamics on complex networks. Based on this developed framework, Eq. (2) can be well solved.

Inspired by the epidemic link equations (ELE) model proposed by Matalas et al. [50], we first define a set of discrete-time equations for the probabilities of edges in different states and then solve the equations at the final state. For the sake of simplicity, we denote the joint probabilities  $P(\varepsilon_i = X, \varepsilon_j = Y)$  as  $\Theta_{ij}^{XY}$ , where  $X, Y \in \{S, I, R\}$ . The evolution of these denoted joint probabilities depends on each other according to the dynamic evolution rules of the SIR model.

For instance, the iteration of  $\Theta_{ij}^{II}(t)$  sponges on  $\Theta_{ij}^{SS}$ ,  $\Theta_{ij}^{SI}$ , and  $\Theta_{ij}^{IS}$ . Specifically, we can obtain the iteration formula of  $\Theta_{ij}^{II}(t)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{ij}^{II}(t+1) &= \Theta_{ij}^{SS}(t)(1 - q_{ij}(t))(1 - q_{ji}(t)) \\ &+ \Theta_{ji}^{SI}(t)(1 - \gamma)(1 - (1 - \lambda)q_{ji}(t)) \\ &+ \Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t)(1 - \gamma)(1 - (1 - \lambda)q_{ij}(t)) + \Theta_{ij}^{II}(t)(1 - \gamma)^2,\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where  $q_{ij}(t)$  represents the probability that node  $i$  (in the S state) is not brought into the I state by any of its neighbors (excluding  $j$ ). Note that Eq. (3) has taken into account all the possible state changes of nodes  $i$  and  $j$ . Given the states of nodes  $i$  and  $j$  at time  $t + 1$  as  $\varepsilon_i(t + 1) = \varepsilon_j(t + 1) = I$ , the first term of Eq. (3) considers the situation when  $\varepsilon_i(t) = \varepsilon_j(t) = S$  and both nodes  $i$  and  $j$  are brought into the state I by their neighbors at time  $t$ . Besides, the second term represents that the states of nodes  $i$  and  $j$  at time  $t$  are  $\varepsilon_i(t) = I$  and  $\varepsilon_j(t) = S$ , respectively, and then node  $i$  holds its state but node  $j$  is brought into the state I by its neighbors. Moreover, the third term accounts for that the state of node  $i$  ( $j$ ) is  $\varepsilon_i(t) = S$  [ $\varepsilon_j(t) = I$ ] at time  $t$  and then node  $i$  is brought into the state I while node  $j$  holds its state. Last, the fourth term considers that nodes  $i$  and  $j$  are both in the state I at time  $t$  and remain in the state I when it comes to time  $t + 1$ .

Similarly, the iteration formulas of joint probabilities  $\Theta_{ij}^{SS}(t)$  and  $\Theta_{ij}^{RR}(t)$  can be obtained as

$$\Theta_{ij}^{SS}(t+1) = \Theta_{ij}^{SS}(t)q_{ij}(t)q_{ji}(t)\quad (4)$$

and

$$\Theta_{ij}^{RR}(t+1) = \Theta_{ij}^{II}(t)\gamma^2 + \Theta_{ij}^{RI}(t)\gamma + \Theta_{ji}^{RI}(t)\gamma + \Theta_{ij}^{RR}(t), \quad (5)$$

respectively. Note that for the joint probability  $\Theta_{ij}^{XY}(t)$ , where  $X = Y$  and  $X \in \{S, I, R\}$ , we should have  $\Theta_{ij}^{XY}(t) = \Theta_{ji}^{XY}(t)$ . However, if  $X \neq Y$ ,  $\Theta_{ij}^{XY}(t)$  and  $\Theta_{ji}^{XY}(t)$  may have different values. That is to say, we should calculate  $\Theta_{ij}^{XY}(t)$  and  $\Theta_{ji}^{XY}(t)$  separately for a single edge  $(i, j)$  when  $X \neq Y$ . We obtain the expressions of these asymmetric joint probabilities, i.e.,  $\Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t)$ ,  $\Theta_{ij}^{SR}(t)$ , and  $\Theta_{ij}^{IR}(t)$  as follows:

$$\Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t+1) = \Theta_{ij}^{SS}(t)q_{ij}(t)(1 - q_{ji}(t)) + \Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t)(1 - \lambda)q_{ij}(t)(1 - \gamma), \quad (6)$$

$$\Theta_{ij}^{SR}(t+1) = \Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t)(1 - \lambda)q_{ij}(t)\gamma + \Theta_{ij}^{SR}(t)q_{ij}(t), \quad (7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{ij}^{IR}(t+1) &= \Theta_{ij}^{SR}(t)(1 - q_{ij}(t)) + \Theta_{ij}^{IR}(t)(1 - \gamma) \\ &+ \Theta_{ij}^{II}(t)(1 - \gamma)\gamma + \Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t)(1 - (1 - \lambda)q_{ij}(t))\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In addition,  $q_{ij}(t)$  in Eqs. (3)–(8) can be expressed as

$$q_{ij}(t) = \prod_{r=1, r \neq j}^N (1 - \lambda A_{ri} h_{ir}(t)), \quad (9)$$

where  $h_{ij}(t) = P[\varepsilon_j(t) = I | \varepsilon_i(t) = S]$  stands for the probability that node  $j$  is in the I state when node  $i$  is in the S state. The conditional probability  $h_{ij}(t)$  can be expressed as

$$h_{ij}(t) = \frac{\Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t)}{\Theta_{ij}^{SI}(t) + \Theta_{ij}^{SS}(t) + \Theta_{ij}^{SR}(t)}. \quad (10)$$

Iterating Eqs. (3)–(8) from any meaningful initial condition [e.g.,  $\Theta_{ij}^{SI}(0) = \Theta_{ji}^{SI}(0) = \rho_0(1 - \rho_0)$ ,  $\Theta_{ij}^{II}(0) = \rho_0^2$ ,  $\Theta_{ij}^{SS}(0) = (1 - \rho_0)^2$  and  $\Theta_{ij}^{RR}(0) = \Theta_{ij}^{SR}(0) = \Theta_{ij}^{IR}(0) = \Theta_{ji}^{IR}(0) = 0$ ] can give the probability of any possible state of edge  $(i, j)$  at the final state. For a network made up of  $N$  nodes and  $M$  edges, we will have  $9M$  equations in total for determining the probabilities of states

of all the edges. We refer to the approach of using the  $9M$  equations to solve the SIR model as the SIR-edge-equations (SIRee) approach. Denote the final value of  $\Theta_{ij}^{XY}(t)$  as  $\Theta_{ij}^{XY}$ . Then, we can obtain the probabilities of node  $i$  in R and S state as

$$\rho_i^R = \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij} (\Theta_{ji}^{RR} + \Theta_{ji}^{SR}) \quad (11)$$

and

$$\rho_i^S = 1 - \rho_i^R, \quad (12)$$

respectively. Thus, the spreading prevalence can be computed as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij} (\Theta_{ji}^{RR} + \Theta_{ji}^{SR}) \quad (13)$$

Besides, we can get the conditional probability  $P(\varepsilon_r = S | \varepsilon_j = R)$  in Eq. (2) as

$$P(\varepsilon_r = S | \varepsilon_j = R) = \frac{\Theta_{jr}^{SS}}{\Theta_{jr}^{SS} + \Theta_{jr}^{SR}} \quad (14)$$

Define short notations for convenience as follows,

$$c_i = \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{r=1}^N A_{ir} (\Theta_{ri}^{RR} + \Theta_{ri}^{SR}), \quad (15)$$

and

$$o_i = \left(1 + \sum_{r=1}^N \lambda A_{ir} \frac{\Theta_{ri}^{SR}}{\Theta_{ri}^{SR} + \Theta_{ri}^{RR}}\right). \quad (16)$$

Substituting Eqs. (11), (12) and (14) back into Eq. (2) yields the following expression of latent edge importance  $\sigma_{ij}$ :

$$\sigma_{ij} = \lambda c_i (1 - c_j) o_j + \lambda (1 - c_i) c_j o_i. \quad (17)$$

Eq. (17) reveals that the influence of each latent edge depends on both the network structure (e.g. the adjacency matrices  $A$ ) and the spreading dynamics (e.g.  $\lambda$  and  $\gamma$ ). As described in Sec. 2, our strategy for promoting the spreading of the SIR model on networks is based on the addition of the latent edge with



highest influence  $\sigma_{ij}$  iteratively. In order to ensure that we really add the current latent edge with the highest influence, we need to resolve Eqs. (3)–(8) and recalculate Eq. (17) after adding any single edge because the network structure changes after each edge addition.

#### 4. Simulation results

This section will present extensive numerical simulations on both synthetic and real-world networks to verify the effectiveness of our approach.

To begin with, we test the agreement between our SIR-ee numerical approach proposed in Sec. 3 and the empirical simulations for the SIR model. Figs. 1 (a) and (b) show the spreading prevalences predicted by Eq. (13) and obtained by Monte Carlo simulations on two synthetic scale-free (SF) networks  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , respectively. These two SF networks have the same degree exponent  $\alpha = 2.3$  but different average degrees. Specifically,  $G_1$  has an average degree of  $\langle k_1 \rangle = 5$  while  $G_2$  has an average degree of  $\langle k_2 \rangle = 3$ . More information about these two synthetic networks can be found in Tab. 1. As can be seen, there is a marked agreement between the results of our SIR-ee numerical approach and Monte Carlo simulations in the full range of effective transmission probability  $\beta$  on both the synthetic network we studied. Thus, it is valid to use our SIR-ee approach to determine the global impact of the SIR model.

Then, we go further to test the performance of our strategy in promoting the spreading of the SIR model on the two synthetic SF networks. As described in Sec. 3, our strategy is to add the latent edge  $L$ , which has the highest influence  $\sigma_{ij}$  calculated by Eq. (17) iteratively. After the addition of a single edge, we resolve Eqs. (3)–(8) and recalculate Eq. (17) to ensure that we really add the current latent edge with the highest influence. For comparison, we also test three additional strategies. First, we consider the approach to add the latent edge  $L^D$ , which has the largest degree product  $f^d$ , that is, the product of the degree of the nodes connected by the latent edge. This strategy is referred to as the degree-product (DP) strategy in the rest of the paper. Similarly, we also




Figure 1: (Color online) Spreading prevalence  $\rho$  versus effective transmission probability  $\beta$ . The spreading prevalence predicted by Eq. 13 (solid lines) or obtained by Monte Carlo simulations (circles) on the scale-free network with average degree (a)  $\langle k_1 \rangle = 5$  or (b)  $\langle k_2 \rangle = 3$ . The degree exponents of these two networks are both set to be  $\alpha = 2.3$ . More detailed information of these two synthetic networks can be found in Tab. 1. The recovery probability in the SIR model is set as  $\gamma = 0.5$ .

consider the strategy to add the latent edge  $L^E$ , which has the largest eigenvector centrality product  $f^e$ , that is, the product of the eigenvector centrality of the nodes connected by the latent edge. We refer to this strategy as the eigenvector-centrality-product (ECP) strategy. Last, we carry out the strategy to add the latent edge  $L^R$  selected by random and refer to this strategy as the random (RD) strategy. Note that we recalculate all the measures in the three strategies after the addition of any single edge, as in the case of our strategy.

Denote  $\hat{\rho}$  as the incremental spreading prevalence obtained by the SIR-ee numerical approach after adding the selected latent edge. Then we rank all the latent edges according to the values of  $\hat{\rho}$ . We call this kind of edge rank the numerical edge rank  $r$  and denote the normalized numerical edge rank as  $\zeta = r/M_l$ , where  $M_l$  is the number of all the latent edges. Fig. 2 presents the correlations between the theoretical edge ranks scored by different strategies and the numerical edge ranks. Specifically, Figs. 2 (a) and (b) demonstrate that the normalized edge rank of the optimal latent edge  $L$  selected by our strategy is close to  $1/M_l$  for the full range of effective transmission probability  $\beta$  on both the networks  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . The results prove that our strategy performs well in




Figure 2: (Color online) Correlations between the theoretical edge ranks and the numerical edge ranks. The normalized numerical rank  $\zeta$  of the optimal latent edge selected by strategy LEI (pink solid line), strategy DP (orange dashed line) or strategy ECP (green dotted line) on the SF network with average degree (a)  $\langle k_1 \rangle = 5$  or (c)  $\langle k_2 \rangle = 3$ . The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient  $m_s$  between the theoretical edge ranks scored by strategy LEI (pink solid line), strategy DP (orange dashed line), or strategy ECP (green dotted line) and the numerical edge ranks on the SF networks with average degree (b)  $\langle k_1 \rangle = 5$  or (d)  $\langle k_2 \rangle = 3$ . The corresponding degree exponents of both these two synthetic networks are  $\alpha = 2.3$ . More information about these two synthetic networks is presented in Tab. 1. We have set the recovery probability of the SIR model to be  $\gamma = 0.5$ .

finding the optimal latent edge, which is the key step in promoting strategies. However, the normalized edge ranks of the optimal edges  $L^D$  and  $L^E$  become large when  $\beta$  is big. Besides, Figs. 2 (c) and (d) also show the Spearman rank correlations  $m_s$  between the theoretical edge ranks scored by different strategies and the numerical edge ranks, that is,

$$m_s = 1 - 6 \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{M_l} (r_l - \hat{r}_l)^2}{M_l(M_l^2 - 1)} \quad (18)$$

where  $r_l$  and  $\hat{r}_l$  denote the theoretical edge rank and numerical edge rank of edge  $l$ , respectively. It can be seen that the Spearman rank correlation between the theoretical edge ranks scored by our strategy and the numerical edge ranks is close to 1 for the full range of effective transmission probability  $\beta$  on both networks. This suggests that our strategy can well predict the overall numerical ranks of the latent edges. However, the Spearman correlation between the theoretical edge ranks scored by the strategy DP or ECP, and the numerical edge ranks are close to 1 only for  $\beta$  of small values. This can be explained by the fact that nodes with a high degree or eigenvector centrality will be infected or informed with a larger probability compared with those nodes with small centralities when  $\beta$  is small. If we add the latent edges between them, then these high-centrality nodes together with their neighbors can form an infected or informed cluster that facilitates the spreading. Thus the DP and ECP strategies perform well in finding the optimal latent edge or predicting the overall numerical ranks when  $\beta$  is small. However, when  $\beta$  becomes large, the globally spreading outbreak occurs; thus, connecting the nodes with high centralities becomes unnecessary, but additional connections to those nodes with low centrality are required for the promoting of the spreading. Therefore, both the DP and ECP strategies fail. Note that random strategy is useless in finding the optimal latent edge or predicting the numerical ranks of the latent edges; thus, we have not included the corresponding results of random strategy here. All in all, Fig. 2 shows strong evidence for the potential superiority of our strategy in promoting the spreading of the SIR model.

Afterward, Figs. 3 and 4 give intuitive demonstrations of the performance of




Figure 3: (Color online) Performance of different strategies versus effective transmission probability  $\beta$ . The original spreading prevalence on the SF network (black dash-dot-dot line) with average degree (a)  $\langle k_1 \rangle = 5$  or (b)  $\langle k_2 \rangle = 3$ . The corresponding spreading prevalences after adding a number of  $N/2$  edges using strategy LEI, DP, ECP and RD are denoted by pink solid line, orange dashed line, green dotted line and yellow dash-dot line, respectively. The degree exponents of both these two synthetic networks are  $\alpha = 2.3$  and the recovery probability of the SIR model is  $\gamma = 0.5$ . Tab. 1 shows the detailed information of these two synthetic networks.




Figure 4: (Color online) Spreading prevalence  $\rho$  versus incremental average degree  $\langle k^a \rangle$ . The spreading prevalence as a function of the incremental average degree on the SF networks with original average degree (a)  $\langle k_1 \rangle = 5$  or (b)  $\langle k_2 \rangle = 3$ . We compare the results of strategy LEI (pink solid line), strategy DP (orange dashed line), strategy ECP (green dotted line) and strategy RD (yellow dash-dot line). The recovery probabilities of the SIR model on the two networks are both set to be  $\gamma = 0.5$ . Besides, we choose the transmission probabilities  $\lambda$  such that the original spreading prevalences of the SIR model are about  $\rho = 0.8$  for both the networks, i.e.,  $\lambda = 0.252$  and  $\lambda = 0.487$  for the network with original average degree  $\langle k_1 \rangle = 5$  and  $\langle k_2 \rangle = 3$ , respectively. The detailed information of the two synthetic SF networks is shown in Tab. (1).




Figure 5: (Color online) Incremental spreading prevalence  $\hat{\rho}$  versus effective transmission probability  $\beta$ . The incremental spreading prevalence after adding a number of  $N/2$  edges by strategy LEI (pink solid line), strategy DP (orange dashed line), strategy ECP (green dotted line) or strategy RD (yellow dash-dot line) as a function of the effective transmission probability on the real-world network (a) ca-CSphd, (b) 1138-bus, (c) Air traffic control, (d) web-EPA, (e) tech-routers-rf, (f) Physicians, (g) inf-USAir97, (h) econ-wm1, or (i) Jazz musicians. Detailed information of these real-world networks is presented in Tab. (1) and the recovery probability in the SIR model is set as  $\gamma = 0.5$ .

different strategies on the two synthetic networks from two perspectives. On the one hand, Fig. 3 compares the original spreading prevalence and the spreading prevalence after adding a number of  $N/2$  edges (that is, increasing the average degree of the network by 1) using different strategies. The results lead to the conclusion that our strategy performs the best in promoting the spreading of the SIR model for the full range of the effective transmission probability  $\beta$  on both networks. Meanwhile, the DP and ECP strategies have good performance only when  $\beta$  is small, and the RD strategy performs well only for  $\beta$  of large values. It also should be mentioned that the incremental spreading prevalences are much larger in the more sparse network  $G_2$  after adding the same number of edges by our strategy. That is to say, the effectiveness of our strategy is more obvious in sparse networks, which are common in the real world. On the other hand, Fig. 4 demonstrates that our strategy can bring the fastest full-blown break-out of the SIR model. In the numerical simulations, we set the recovery probability to be  $\gamma = 0.5$  and choose the transmission probability  $\lambda$  such that the original spreading prevalence of the SIR model is about  $\rho = 0.8$  for both the two synthetic networks, that is,  $\lambda = 0.252$  and  $\lambda = 0.487$  for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , respectively. It can be observed that our strategy performs the best in increasing the spreading prevalence to  $\rho = 1$  on both networks. Besides, the DP and ECP strategy both perform worse than the RD strategy since the value of effective transmission probabilities  $\beta$  are relatively large on both networks. These results about the three strategies (i.e., DP strategy, ECP strategy, and RD strategy) coincide with the findings we obtained from Fig. 3. Sum up, Figs. 3 and 4 give the direct proofs of the effectiveness and superiority of our strategy.

Finally, we test our strategy on 9 real-world networks: (a) caCSphd; (b) 1138bus; (c) Air traffic control; (d) web-EPA; (e) tech-routers-rf; (f) Physicians; (g) inf-USAir97; (h) econ-wm1; and (i) Jazz musicians. Detailed information of these real-world networks is presented in Tab. 1. They cover a wide range of average degree (between 2.035 and 27.697). We plot the incremental spreading prevalence  $\hat{\rho}$  after increasing the average degree by 1 (that is, adding a number of  $N/2$  edges) as a function of the effective transmission probability  $\beta$  in Fig. 5.

Table 1: Basic statistics of the two synthetic networks and nine real-world networks employed in this study: the number of nodes  $N$ , the number of edges  $M$ , the maximum degree  $k_{max}$ , the average degree  $\langle k \rangle$ , and the second moment of the degree distribution  $\langle k^2 \rangle$ .

Name	$N$	$M$	$k_{max}$	$\langle k \rangle$	$\langle k^2 \rangle$
SF2.3	200	500	14	5	31.27
sparse SF2.3	200	500	9	3	11.92
ca-CSphd	1025	1043	46	2.035	12.166
1138-bus	1038	1458	17	2.562	9.814
Air traffic control	1226	2408	34	3.928	28.899
web-EPA	4253	8897	175	4.184	118.451
tech-routers-rf	2113	6632	109	6.277	135.704
Physicians	117	465	26	7.95	79.162
inf-USAir97	332	2126	139	12.807	568.163
econ-wm1	258	2389	106	18.519	917.434
Jazz musicians	198	2742	100	27.697	1070.242

It can be seen that our strategy leads to the largest incremental spreading prevalence  $\hat{\rho}$  for the full range of effective transmission probability  $\beta$  on all the 9 real-world networks. Besides, the DP and ECP strategies perform better than the random strategy only for  $\beta$  of small values. Moreover, the incremental spreading prevalence  $\hat{\rho}$  is larger in the network with a smaller average degree. The results of these real-world networks are in concordance with the conclusions we draw on the synthetic networks  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

## 5. Conclusions

Promoting some common spreading dynamics (for instance, the spreading of information, vaccination guidance, commercial message, innovation, and political movements) in networked systems (for instance, the social platforms, community networks, and collaboration networks) can be of both theoretical and practical importance. In this study, we proposed an effective edge-based



strategy for promoting the spreading dynamics of the SIR model on complex networks.

To be specific, we first developed a mathematical model that is able to quantify the influence of each latent edge and facilitate the determination of the spreading prevalence on the networks. Then, we strategically add the latent edges to the original networks based on the influence of each latent edge. Extensive numerical simulations verified the effectiveness of our strategy and demonstrated that our strategy outperforms those static approaches, such as adding the latent edge between nodes with the highest degree or eigenvector centrality.

Previous approaches for promoting the spreading dynamics on complex networks mostly only consider the structure of networks or spreading dynamics. Our strategy incorporates both the information of network structure and spreading dynamics and has been proved to be effective. Besides, the theoretical framework we developed in this study offers inspirations for further investigations on edge-based promoting strategies for other spreading models.

### **Acknowledgements**

This work was partially supported by the China Postdoctoral Science Special Foundation (Grant No. 2019T120829), National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 61903266 and 61603074), Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, and Sichuan Science and Technology Program (NO. 20YYJC4001).

### **References**

### **References**

- [1] F. Morone, H. A. Makse, Influence maximization in complex networks through optimal percolation, *Nature* 524 (7563) (2015) 65.

- [2] L. Pan, W. Wang, S. Cai, T. Zhou, Optimal interlayer structure for promoting spreading of the susceptible-infected-susceptible model in two-layer networks, *Physical Review E* 100 (2) (2019) 022316.
- [3] Z. Wang, C. T. Bauch, S. Bhattacharyya, A. d'Onofrio, P. Manfredi, M. Perc, N. Perra, M. Salathe, D. Zhao, Statistical physics of vaccination, *Physics Reports* 664 (2016) 1–113.
- [4] M. Gong, J. Yan, B. Shen, L. Ma, Q. Cai, Influence maximization in social networks based on discrete particle swarm optimization, *Information Sciences* 367 (2016) 600–614.
- [5] G. Del Ferraro, A. Moreno, B. Min, F. Morone, Ú. Pérez-Ramírez, L. Pérez-Cervera, L. C. Parra, A. Holodny, S. Canals, H. A. Makse, Finding influential nodes for integration in brain networks using optimal percolation theory, *Nature Communications* 9 (1) (2018) 2274.
- [6] Y. Hu, S. Ji, Y. Jin, L. Feng, H. E. Stanley, S. Havlin, Local structure can identify and quantify influential global spreaders in large scale social networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (29) (2018) 7468–7472.
- [7] A. Y. Lokhov, D. Saad, Optimal deployment of resources for maximizing impact in spreading processes, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114 (39) (2017) E8138–E8146.
- [8] X. Fu, M. Small, D. M. Walker, H. Zhang, Epidemic dynamics on scale-free networks with piecewise linear infectivity and immunization, *Physical Review E* 77 (3) (2008) 036113.
- [9] J. Xian, D. Yang, L. Pan, W. Wang, The optimal edge for containing the spreading of sis model, [arXiv:2002.06567](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.06567).
- [10] D. J. Daley, D. G. Kendall, Epidemics and rumours, *Nature* 204 (4963) (1964) 1118–1118.

- [11] D. J. Daley, D. G. Kendall, Stochastic rumours, *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics* 1 (1) (1965) 42–55.
- [12] Z. Wang, H. Zhang, Z. Wang, Multiple effects of self-protection on the spreading of epidemics, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 61 (2014) 1–7.
- [13] G.-Q. Sun, M. Jusup, Z. Jin, Y. Wang, Z. Wang, Pattern transitions in spatial epidemics: Mechanisms and emergent properties, *Physics of Life Reviews* 19 (2016) 43–73.
- [14] L. A. Zuzek, H. Stanley, L. Braunstein, Epidemic model with isolation in multilayer networks, *Scientific Reports* 5 (2015) 12151.
- [15] Z. Wang, Q. Guo, S. Sun, C. Xia, The impact of awareness diffusion on sir-like epidemics in multiplex networks, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 349 (2019) 134–147.
- [16] C. Xia, Z. Wang, C. Zheng, Q. Guo, Y. Shi, M. Dehmer, Z. Chen, A new coupled disease-awareness spreading model with mass media on multiplex networks, *Information Sciences* 471 (2019) 185–200.
- [17] S. Aral, C. Nicolaides, Exercise contagion in a global social network, *Nature Communications* 8 (2017) 14753.
- [18] D. M. Romero, B. Meeder, J. Kleinberg, Differences in the mechanics of information diffusion across topics: idioms, political hashtags, and complex contagion on twitter, in: *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on World Wide Web*, ACM, 2011, pp. 695–704.
- [19] D. Centola, M. Macy, Complex contagions and the weakness of long ties, *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (3) (2007) 702–734.
- [20] D. J. Watts, A simple model of global cascades on random networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 99 (9) (2002) 5766–5771.

- [21] L. Lü, D.-B. Chen, T. Zhou, The small world yields the most effective information spreading, *New Journal of Physics* 13 (12) (2011) 123005.
- [22] W. Wang, Q.-H. Liu, J. Liang, Y. Hu, T. Zhou, Coevolution spreading in complex networks, *Physics Reports* 820 (2019) 1–51.
- [23] S. Boccaletti, G. Bianconi, R. Criado, C. I. Del Genio, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, M. Romance, I. Sendiña-Nadal, Z. Wang, M. Zanin, The structure and dynamics of multilayer networks, *Physics Reports* 544 (1) (2014) 1–122.
- [24] Z. Wang, M. A. Andrews, Z.-X. Wu, L. Wang, C. T. Bauch, Coupled disease–behavior dynamics on complex networks: A review, *Physics of Life Reviews* 15 (2015) 1–29.
- [25] R. Yang, T. Zhou, Y.-B. Xie, Y.-C. Lai, B.-H. Wang, Optimal contact process on complex networks, *Physical Review E* 78 (6) (2008) 066109.
- [26] L. Gao, W. Wang, L. Pan, M. Tang, H.-F. Zhang, Effective information spreading based on local information in correlated networks, *Scientific Reports* 6 (2016) 38220.
- [27] R. Yang, L. Huang, Y.-C. Lai, Selectivity-based spreading dynamics on complex networks, *Physical Review E* 78 (2) (2008) 026111.
- [28] F. Roshani, Y. Naimi, Effects of degree-biased transmission rate and non-linear infectivity on rumor spreading in complex social networks, *Physical Review E* 85 (3) (2012) 036109.
- [29] L. Gao, W. Wang, P. Shu, H. Gao, L. A. Braunstein, Promoting information spreading by using contact memory, *Europhysics Letters* 118 (1) (2017) 18001.
- [30] P.-B. Cui, W. Wang, S.-M. Cai, T. Zhou, Y.-C. Lai, et al., Close and ordinary social contacts: How important are they in promoting large-scale contagion?, *Physical Review E* 98 (5) (2018) 052311.

- [31] L. Lü, D. Chen, X.-L. Ren, Q.-M. Zhang, Y.-C. Zhang, T. Zhou, Vital nodes identification in complex networks, *Physics Reports* 650 (2016) 1–63.
- [32] H. Liao, M. S. Mariani, M. Medo, Y.-C. Zhang, M.-Y. Zhou, Ranking in evolving complex networks, *Physics Reports* 689 (2017) 1–54.
- [33] Y. Xin, C. Gao, Z. Wang, X. Zhen, X. Li, Discerning influential spreaders in complex networks by accounting the spreading heterogeneity of the nodes, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 92070–92078.
- [34] W. Chen, C. Wang, Y. Wang, Scalable influence maximization for prevalent viral marketing in large-scale social networks, in: *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2010, pp. 1029–1038.
- [35] F. Riquelme, P. González-Cantergiani, Measuring user influence on twitter: A survey, *Information Processing & Management* 52 (5) (2016) 949–975.
- [36] M. Kitsak, L. K. Gallos, S. Havlin, F. Liljeros, L. Muchnik, H. E. Stanley, H. A. Makse, Identifying influential spreaders in complex networks, *Nature Physics* 6 (11) (2010) 888–893.
- [37] L. Lü, T. Zhou, Q.-M. Zhang, H. E. Stanley, The h-index of a network node and its relation to degree and coreness, *Nature Communications* 7 (2016) 10168.
- [38] W. Chen, Y. Wang, S. Yang, Efficient influence maximization in social networks, in: *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2009, pp. 199–208.
- [39] J. Aguirre, D. Papo, J. M. Buldú, Successful strategies for competing networks, *Nature Physics* 9 (4) (2013) 230–234.
- [40] A. Milanese, J. Sun, T. Nishikawa, Approximating spectral impact of structural perturbations in large networks, *Physical Review E* 81 (4) (2010) 046112.

- [41] P. Van Mieghem, H. Wang, X. Ge, S. Tang, F. A. Kuipers, Influence of assortativity and degree-preserving rewiring on the spectra of networks, *The European Physical Journal B* 76 (4) (2010) 643–652.
- [42] J. Xian, D. Yang, L. Pan, W. Wang, Z. Wang, Misinformation spreading on correlated multiplex networks, *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 29 (11) (2019) 113123.
- [43] K. Zhu, L. Ying, Information source detection in the sir model: A sample-path-based approach, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 24 (1) (2014) 408–421.
- [44] B. Shulgin, L. Stone, Z. Agur, Pulse vaccination strategy in the sir epidemic model, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 60 (6) (1998) 1123–1148.
- [45] L. Zhao, H. Cui, X. Qiu, X. Wang, J. Wang, Sir rumor spreading model in the new media age, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 392 (4) (2013) 995–1003.
- [46] Z. Chen, K. Zhu, L. Ying, Detecting multiple information sources in networks under the sir model, *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering* 3 (1) (2016) 17–31.
- [47] J. Wu, Z. Gao, H. Sun, Simulation of traffic congestion with sir model, *Modern Physics Letters B* 18 (30) (2004) 1537–1542.
- [48] J. Woo, J. Son, H. Chen, An sir model for violent topic diffusion in social media, in: *Proceedings of 2011 IEEE International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics, IEEE, 2011*, pp. 15–19.
- [49] J. Xian, D. Yang, L. Pan, M. Liu, W. Wang, Containing rumors spreading on correlated multiplex networks, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2020 (2) (2020) 023402.
- [50] J. T. Matamalas, A. Arenas, S. Gómez, Effective approach to epidemic containment using link equations in complex networks, *Science Advances* 4 (12) (2018) eaau4212.