

# Symmetry of random propagation on a graph

Peiyao Liu

September 24, 2024

## Abstract

The spread of influence on social networks can be modeled by the activation of vertices in a random graph model. Each edge is associated with a probability of an activated vertex activating its neighbor in each update. When the probability associated with each edge does not depend on direction, a natural question is, does this local symmetry indicate a global symmetry, i.e. the influence of any pair of vertices on each other is symmetric after arbitrary time. We define a simple criterion to capture this global symmetry, and prove that this criterion is met with a method based on random matrices.

First, we give a brief introduction of the model in question. This is a special version of the Cascade model used to study the spread of influence on social networks[1][2]. Consider a graph, each vertex can be in one of two states: activated and not activated. Each pair of vertices,  $i$  and  $j$ , is associated with a probability  $p_{ij} = p_{ji}$ . If  $p_{ij} > 0$ ,  $i$  and  $j$  are connected by an edge, and we say  $i$  and  $j$  are neighbors. In each update, for each activated vertex  $i$ , it has a probability  $p_{ij}$  of activating a neighbor  $j$  that is not activated. A vertex only needs to be activated by one neighbor to become activated. For example, suppose vertex 1 is not activated and its activated neighbors are vertices 2 and 3, then the probability of 1 becoming activated after an update is  $1 - (1 - p_{12})(1 - p_{13})$ . Once a vertex becomes activated, it will stay activated. So if the graph is connected and there are activated vertices initially, the probability that all vertices are activated tends to 1 as the number of updates approaches infinity.

Then we will explain and prove the hypothesis. Suppose initially only vertex  $i$  is activated. The probability that vertex  $j$  is activated after  $n$  updates is denoted by  $P_{ij}(n)$ . It is obvious that  $P_{ij}(1) = P_{ji}(1)$ , since for it to be nonzero  $i$  and  $j$  must be neighbors, then  $P_{ij}(1) = p_{ij} = p_{ji} = P_{ji}(1)$ . The interesting question is: is it true that  $P_{ij}(n) = P_{ji}(n)$  for any pair of vertices after any number of updates? The answer is yes.

*Proof.* Suppose there are  $N$  vertices. Let  $T$  be an  $N \times N$  random matrix. For  $i > j$ , each  $T_{ij}$  follows an independent distribution, the probability of  $T_{ij} = 1$  is  $p_{ij}$ , the probability of  $T_{ij} = 0$  is  $1 - p_{ij}$ . We require  $T_{ii} = 1$  and  $T_{ij} = T_{ji}$ .

Suppose  $(\vec{v})_i = 0$ . Let  $\{j_s \mid s = 1, \dots, m\}$  be the set of indices such that  $p_{i,j_s} > 0$  and  $(\vec{v})_{j_s} > 0$ . Then the probability that  $(T\vec{v})_i > 0$  is  $1 - \prod_{s=1}^m (1 - p_{ij_s})$ . If  $(\vec{v})_i$  is nonzero,  $(T\vec{v})_i$  is also nonzero. Thus if we interpret whether a component of the vector is nonzero as whether the corresponding vertex is activated, the evolution of the distribution of the vector under the random matrix is equivalent to that of the random graph.

Now consider  $n$  copies of  $T$ , each following independent distribution described above. Denote them as  $T^{(1)}, T^{(2)}, \dots, T^{(n)}$ . Let  $\vec{e}_i$  be the vector in which the  $i$ th component is 1 and other components are 0. Then if only  $i$  is activated in the beginning, the probability  $P_{ij}(n)$  that  $j$  is activated after  $n$  updates is the probability that the  $j$ th component of  $T^{(n)}T^{(n-1)}\dots T^{(1)}\vec{e}_i$  is nonzero. Define

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x > 0 \\ 0 & x = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Then the probability above can be expressed as

$$P_{ij}(n) = \langle F((T^{(n)}\dots T^{(1)})_{ji}) \rangle \quad (2)$$

where the expectation is taken over identical independent distributions of each matrix. But for each possibility,  $\{T^{(i)}\}$  are always symmetric, thus

$$P_{ij}(n) = \langle F((T^{(n)}\dots T^{(1)})_{ji}) \rangle = \langle F((T^{(n)}\dots T^{(1)})_{ij}) \rangle = P_{ji}(n) \quad (3)$$

confirming our hypothesis. □

## References

- [1] David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 137–146, 2003.
- [2] Yuxin Ye, Yunliang Chen, and Wei Han. Influence maximization in social networks: Theories, methods and challenges. *Array*, 16:100264, 2022.