

MEASURING RECIPROCITY IN A DIRECTED PREFERENTIAL ATTACHMENT NETWORK

TIANDONG WANG,* *Texas A&M University*

SIDNEY I. RESNICK,** *Cornell University*

Abstract

Empirical studies [7, 10] show that online social networks have not only in- and out-degree distributions with Pareto-like tails, but also a high proportion of reciprocal edges. A classical directed preferential attachment (PA) model generates in- and out-degree distribution with power-law tails, but theoretical properties of the reciprocity feature in this model have not yet been studied. We derive the asymptotic results on the number of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes, as well as the proportion of reciprocal edges in the entire PA network. We see that with certain choices of parameters, the proportion of reciprocal edges in a directed PA network is close to 0, which differs from the empirical observation. This points out one potential problem of fitting a classical PA model to a given network dataset with high reciprocity, and indicates alternative models need to be considered.

Keywords: Reciprocity, preferential attachment, in- and out-degrees.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60F15; 60G46

Secondary 05C82

1. Introduction

In social network analysis, reciprocated edges characterize the communication between two users. For instance, on Facebook, one user leaves messages on another user's wall page, and the response from the target user then creates a reciprocal edge. *Reciprocity*, which is classically defined as the proportion of reciprocated edges (cf. [12, 21]), is one important network metric to measure interactions among individual users. The directed network constructed from Facebook wall posts [17] is one example of social networks with a large proportion of reciprocal edges. The study on eight different types of networks in [7] shows online social networks (e.g. [3, 6, 9, 10, 17]) tend to have a higher proportion of reciprocal edges, compared to other types of networks such as biological networks, communication networks, software call graphs and P2P networks.

Another widely observed feature of directed social networks is the scale-free property, where both in- and out-degree distributions have Pareto-like tails. The directed preferential attachment (PA) network model is appealing (cf. [2, 8]), since theoretically the

* Postal address: Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, U.S.

* Email address: twang@stat.tamu.edu

** Postal address: School of Operations Research and Information Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, U.S.

** Email address: sir1@cornell.edu

directed PA mechanism generates a network with the scale-free property because nodes with large degrees are likely to attract more edges than those with small degrees (cf. [14, 15, 18, 20]). However, asymptotic behavior of the proportion of reciprocal edges in a directed PA model has not yet been explored in the literature. In this paper, we derive asymptotic results about: (1) the number of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes; (2) the proportion of reciprocal edges in a directed PA network, provided that the network has a large number of edges.


Our theoretical results suggest that for certain choices of model parameters, especially when the proportion of edges added between two existing nodes is small, the proportion of reciprocal edges in the entire graph is close to 0, even though the total number of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes may be of order $O(n^a)$, $a \in (0, 1)$. Such behavior flags potential problems for fitting a directed PA model in practice. When fitting a directed PA model to a real network with high reciprocity using existing methods developed in [18, 19], there is no guarantee that the calibrated model will also have a high proportion of reciprocal edges. Such discrepancy indicates a poor fit of the PA model, since the fitted model fails to capture the important feature of high reciprocity. In these cases, variants of the directed PA model need to be considered. For instance, [4] provides several different ways to predict the reciprocal edges between two given nodes, and one may incorporate those features to construct a refined network model that is both scale-free and of high reciprocity.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We provide an overview of the evolution in a directed PA model in Section 1.1. Then we collect useful preliminary results on the growth of in- and out-degrees for a fixed node in Section 2 with detailed proofs given in Appendix A. In Section 3, we derive the limiting behavior of: (1) the number of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes; (2) the first time when a reciprocal pair of edges is formed between two fixed nodes; (3) the proportion of reciprocal edges in a given directed PA model. Discussion of the theoretical results and future research directions are then summarized in Section 4.

1.1. Model Setup

We now outline the basic setup of the directed PA model. Initialize the model with graph $G(0)$, which consists of one node (labeled as Node 1) and a self-loop. Let $G(n)$ denote the graph after n steps and $V(n)$ be the set of nodes in $G(n)$ with $V(0) = \{1\}$ and $|V(0)| = 1$. Denote the set of directed edges in $G(n)$ by $E(n)$ such that an ordered pair $(i, j) \in E(n)$, $i, j \in V(n)$, represents a directed edge $i \mapsto j$. When $n = 0$, we have $E(0) = \{(1, 1)\}$.

Set $(D_v^{\text{in}}(n), D_v^{\text{out}}(n))$ to be the in- and out-degrees of node v in $G(n)$. We use the convention that $D_i^{\text{in}}(n) = 0$ if $i \notin V(n)$, and similarly, $D_j^{\text{out}}(n) = 0$ if $j \notin V(n)$. From $G(n)$ to $G(n+1)$, one of the three scenarios happens:



1. With probability α , we add a new edge (w, v) , where $v \in V(n)$, and $w \notin V(n)$ is a new node. The existing node v is chosen with probability

$$\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{\sum_{v \in V(n)} (D_v^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}})} = \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(n)|}.$$

2. With probability β , a new edge (w, v) is added between two existing nodes $w, v \in V(n)$, where the starting and the ending nodes w, v are chosen independently with probability

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{\sum_{v \in V(n)} (D_v^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}})} \frac{D_w^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{\sum_{w \in V(n)} (D_w^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}})} \\ &= \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(n)|} \frac{D_w^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{out}}|V(n)|}. \end{aligned}$$

For brevity of notation, we set

$$A_{vw}(n) := \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(n)|} \frac{D_w^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{out}}|V(n)|}, \quad (1.1)$$

then the attachment probability in the β -scheme is $\beta A_{vw}(n)$.

3. With probability γ , we add a new edge (v, w) , where $v \in V(n)$, and $w \notin V(n)$ is a new node. The existing node v is chosen with probability

$$\frac{D_v^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{\sum_{v \in V(n)} (D_v^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}})} = \frac{D_v^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{out}}|V(n)|}.$$

We assume $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$, $\beta \in [0, 1)$, and $\delta_{\text{in}}, \delta_{\text{out}} > 0$. Due to the α - and γ -schemes, $|V(n)| - 1$ follows a binomial distribution with size n and success probability $\alpha + \gamma = 1 - \beta$, so that $|V(n)| \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For $v \geq 1$, we define S_v to be the time when node v is created, i.e.

$$S_v := \inf\{n \geq 0 : |V(n)| = v\}. \quad (1.2)$$

Since we use the convention that $D_v^{\text{in}}(n) = 0$ and $D_v^{\text{out}}(n) = 0$ if $S_v > n$, we have by (1.1) that $A_{vw}(n) \in [0, 1]$, for all n .

2. Preliminaries on $D_v^{\text{in}}(n)$, $D_v^{\text{out}}(n)$

Fix $i, j \in V(n)$, $n \geq 1$, and write

$$c_1 = \frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta)}, \quad c_2 = \frac{\beta + \gamma}{1 + \delta_{\text{out}}(1 - \beta)}. \quad (2.1)$$

We see from (2.1) that $0 < c_1 < \alpha + \beta$, $0 < c_2 < \beta + \gamma$, and $0 < c_1 + c_2 < 1 + \beta$. In fact, we can re-parametrize the PA model using $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, c_1, c_2)$, and later in Lemma 2.2, we show that c_1, c_2 control the growth rates of in- and out-degrees for a fixed node v , respectively.

Let \mathcal{F}_n denote the σ -field generated by observing the network evolution up to the creation of n -th new edge. Suppose τ is a stopping time with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$, then

$$\mathcal{F}_\tau = \{F : F \cap \{\tau = n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n\}.$$

By (1.2), we see that S_v is a stopping time with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$. For $n \geq k \geq 0$, we have

$$\{S_v + k = n\} = \{S_v = n - k\} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-k} \subset \mathcal{F}_n,$$

so $S_v + k$, $k \geq 0$, is a stopping time with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$. Note that for $v > n - k$, $\{S_v = n - k\} = \emptyset \in \mathcal{F}_{n-k} \subset \mathcal{F}_n$. We now collect useful lemmas for later analyses, and their proofs are collected in Section A.

Lemma 2.1. *For some integer $p \geq 1$, $k \geq 0$, and $v \geq 1$, we have:*

(i) For $p = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{S_v+k}} (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}}) \\ &= (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}}) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

(ii) For an integer $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{S_v+k}} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right) \\ &= (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \left(1 + p \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right) \\ &+ \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \sum_{r=2}^p \binom{p}{r} (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^{p-r+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

The proof of Lemma 2.1 is given in Appendix A.1.

Next, we study properties of $\mathbb{E}[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k))^p]$ and $\mathbb{E}[(D_v^{\text{out}}(S_v + k))^p]$, $k \geq 1$, which are useful preliminary results for deriving theorems in Section 3.

Lemma 2.2. *For $v \in V(n)$ and $p \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[(D_v^{\text{in}}(k))^p]}{k^{c_1 p}} < \infty, \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[(D_v^{\text{out}}(k))^p]}{k^{c_2 p}} < \infty.$$

The proof of Lemma 2.2 is given in Appendix A.2.

Remark 2.1. In the proof of Lemma 2.2, if we revise the inequality $|V(S_v + k)| \geq |V(k)|$ by $|V(S_v + k)| \geq |V(v + k - 1)|$, then we have for $p \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{v \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n)}{(n/v)^{c_1}} \right)^p \right) < \infty, \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{v \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{out}}(n)}{(n/v)^{c_2}} \right)^p \right) < \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

These results are useful when we study the asymptotic behavior of the proportion of reciprocal edges in Section 3.2.

The following lemma summarizes the asymptotic properties of $(D_v^{\text{in}}(n), D_v^{\text{out}}(n))$, from which we can derive the limiting behavior of the number of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes in Section 3.1.

Lemma 2.3. For $v \geq 1$, there exist random variables $\xi_v^{\text{in}}, \xi_v^{\text{out}}$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\xi_v^{\text{in}} \in (0, \infty)) = 1 = \mathbb{P}(\xi_v^{\text{out}} \in (0, \infty))$, such that

$$\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n)}{n^{c_1}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \xi_v^{\text{in}}, \quad \frac{D_v^{\text{out}}(n)}{n^{c_2}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \xi_v^{\text{out}}.$$

The proof of Lemma 2.3 is given in Appendix A.3.

3. Measuring Reciprocity in a PA Network

To assess goodness of fit of the directed PA model to a particular dataset, it is useful to evaluate statistics to see if the empirical values match those from the fitted model. The statistic we focus on here is *reciprocity*. If there is a huge discrepancy in the reciprocity measure between the fitted PA model and the given network, then we conclude that variants of the classical PA model should be considered. In this section, we focus on the asymptotic behavior of the number of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes i and j as well as that of the proportion of reciprocal edges in the entire graph.




FIGURE 3.1: A graphical illustration of reciprocal edges with edge set $E = \{(1, 2), (1, 2), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 1), (2, 3)\}$ and $V = \{1, 2, 3\}$. If a pair of reciprocated edges are observed, we label them with the same color. Here we have $R_6 = 4/6 = 0.667$.

Given an arbitrary graph G with edge set E and node set V , we let $L_{(i,j)} = L_{(i,j)}(G)$ be the number of directed edges (i, j) in graph G for $i, j \in V$. Then for $|E| = k$, define

the *reciprocity coefficient*, R_k , as:

$$R_k = \frac{2}{|E|} \sum_{i,j \in V} \min \{L_{(i,j)}, L_{(j,i)}\} = \frac{2}{k} \sum_{i,j \in V} \min \{L_{(i,j)}, L_{(j,i)}\}.$$

Note that a node pair can be counted more than once. For example, consider the graph given in Figure 3.1, where there are $|E| = 6$ edges and node set $V = \{1, 2, 3\}$. We distinguish multiple edges between two nodes by different colors, and if a pair of reciprocated edges are observed, we label the pair with the same color. The graph in Figure 3.1 contains a pair of blue edges and a pair of red edges, thus giving $R_6 = 4/6 = 0.667$. In \mathbb{R} , we can easily compute the reciprocity coefficient by applying the `dyad_census()` function in the `igraph` package to the graph object, and its `mut` value outputs the total number of unordered node pairs $\{i, j\}$ with reciprocal connections (i, j) and (j, i) , allowing multiplicity.

Suppose we have a graph $G(n) = (V(n), E(n))$ constructed following the PA rule with parameters $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_{\text{in}}, \delta_{\text{out}})$ as outlined in Section 1.1. For two nodes $i, j \in V(n)$, write $L_{(i,j)}(n) = L_{(i,j)}(G(n))$. Note that under the PA setup, where $|E(n)| = n + 1$, we denote the reciprocity coefficient for the PA network $G(n)$ as

$$R_n^{\text{pa}} = \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{i,j \in V(n): i < j} \min \{L_{(i,j)}(n), L_{(j,i)}(n)\}. \quad (3.1)$$

The definition in (3.1) excludes self-loops from reciprocal edges. In Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we study the asymptotic behavior of $L_{(i,j)}(n)$ for fixed i, j , and R_n^{pa} in a PA network $G(n)$, respectively.

3.1. Reciprocal Edges between Two Fixed Nodes.

In a directed PA network, the total number of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes, i, j , is equal to

$$L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(n) := 2 \min \{L_{(i,j)}(n), L_{(j,i)}(n)\}.$$

In this section, we will first study the limiting behavior of the number of edges between two fixed nodes i, j , $L_{(i,j)}(n)$, when n is large. The asymptotics of $L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(n)$ then follow from a continuous mapping argument. With asymptotic results of $L_{(i,j)}(n)$ available, we also give the behavior of the first time when a reciprocal pair is formed between i and j .

3.1.1. *Convergence of $L_{(i,j)}(n)$.* Main asymptotic results are given in Theorem 3.1, and we start by presenting a lemma on $A_{ij}(n)$, which is useful for the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.1. *Recall the definition of $A_{ij}(n)$ in (1.1). For fixed $1 \leq i < j$,*

$$\frac{A_{ij}(n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-2}} \longrightarrow \frac{1}{(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))(1 + \delta_{\text{out}}(1 - \beta))} \xi_j^{\text{in}} \xi_i^{\text{out}}, \quad \text{a.s. and in } L_1. \quad (3.2)$$

This further gives:

1. When $c_1 + c_2 > 1$, there exist constants $C_{ij} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{c_1 + c_2 - 1}{n^{c_1+c_2-1}} \sum_{k=S_j}^{S_j+n} A_{ij}(k) \longrightarrow C_{ij} \xi_j^{\text{in}} \xi_i^{\text{out}}, \quad \text{a.s. and in } L_1. \quad (3.3)$$

2. When $c_1 + c_2 = 1$, there exist constants $C'_{ij} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{k=S_j}^{S_j+n} A_{ij}(k) \longrightarrow C'_{ij} \xi_j^{\text{in}} \xi_i^{\text{out}}, \quad \text{a.s. and in } L_1. \quad (3.4)$$

3. When $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, there exist constants $C''_{ij} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n^{c_1+c_2-1}} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} A_{ij}(k) \longrightarrow C''_{ij} \xi_j^{\text{in}} \xi_i^{\text{out}}, \quad \text{a.s. and in } L_1, \quad (3.5)$$

which further implies $\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E}(A_{ij}(k)) < \infty$, and $\sum_{k \geq 1} A_{ij}(k) < \infty$ a.s..

In addition, we have similar convergence results for $A_{ji}(n)$ by replacing $A_{ij}(n)$, ξ_j^{in} , and ξ_i^{out} , with $A_{ji}(n)$, ξ_i^{in} , and ξ_j^{out} , respectively.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A_{ij}(n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-2}} &= \frac{(D_i^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}})(D_j^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}})}{n^{c_1+c_2}} \frac{n^2}{(n+1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(n)|)(n+1 + \delta_{\text{out}}|V(n)|)} \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{1}{(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))(1 + \delta_{\text{out}}(1 - \beta))} \xi_j^{\text{in}} \xi_i^{\text{out}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that once we show

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{A_{ij}(n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-2}} \right)^2 \right] < \infty, \quad (3.6)$$

then by [5, Theorem 4.6.2], $\{A_{ij}(n)/n^{c_1+c_2-2} : n \geq 1\}$ is uniformly integrable, which gives the L_1 -convergence in (3.2).

To prove (3.6), we now use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{A_{ij}(n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-2}} \right)^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(D_i^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}})^2 (D_j^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}})^2}{n^{2(c_1+c_2)}} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^{2(c_1+c_2)}} (\mathbb{E} [(D_i^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}})^4] \mathbb{E} [(D_j^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}})^4])^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{A_{ij}(n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-2}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(D_i^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}})^4]}}{n^{2c_2}} \times \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E} [(D_j^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}})^4]}}{n^{2c_1}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

With (3.2) established, results in (3.3)–(3.5) follow directly from the Karamata's theorem (cf. [13, Theorem 2.1]). The results for $A_{ji}(n)$ follow from a similar reasoning. \square

We now give the asymptotic behavior of $L_{(i,j)}(n)$ in a directed PA model.

Theorem 3.1. *Consider two fixed nodes $1 \leq i < j$:*

(i) *If $c_1 + c_2 > 1$, then there exists some random variable ξ_{ij} satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\xi_{ij} = 0) = 0$, such that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{L_{(i,j)}(n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-1}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \xi_{ij}. \quad (3.7)$$

So for large n , the number of (i, j) edges is of order $n^{c_1+c_2-1}$.

(ii) *If $c_1 + c_2 = 1$, then there exists some random variable ζ_{ij} , satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{ij} = 0) = 0$, such that*

$$\frac{L_{(i,j)}(n)}{\log n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \zeta_{ij}. \quad (3.8)$$

So for large n , the number of (i, j) edges is of order $\log n$.

(iii) *If $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, then for any $i < j$, there is a last time for an (i, j) edge to form. Further, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$L_{(i,j)}(n) \uparrow L_{(i,j)}(\infty) < \infty, \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (3.9)$$

and $L_{(i,j)}(n) - L_{(i,j)}(\infty) = 0$ a.s. for n large.

In addition, we have similar convergence results for $L_{(j,i)}(n)$ by replacing $L_{(i,j)}(n)$, $L_{(i,j)}(\infty)$, ξ_{ij} , and ζ_{ij} with $L_{(j,i)}(n)$, $L_{(j,i)}(\infty)$, ξ_{ji} , and ζ_{ji} , respectively.

Proof. Set

$$\Delta_k(i, j) = \mathbf{1}_{\{E(k) = E(k-1) \cup \{(i, j)\}\}},$$

i.e. $\Delta_k(i, j) = 1$ if a directed edge (i, j) is created from $G(k-1)$ to $G(k)$. For $1 \leq i < j$, notice that

$$L_{(i,j)}(S_j + n) = \sum_{k=1}^{S_j+n} \Delta_k(i, j) = \sum_{k=0}^n \Delta_{S_j+k}(i, j). \quad (3.10)$$

For $n \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{S_j+n}} (\Delta_{S_j+n+1}(i, j)) = \beta A_{ji}(S_j + n), \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{S_j-1}} (\Delta_{S_j}(i, j)) = \gamma \frac{D_i^{\text{out}}(S_j - 1) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{S_j + \delta_{\text{out}}(j - 1)}. \quad (3.12)$$

When $c_1 + c_2 \geq 1$, (3.3) and (3.4) suggest that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \beta A_{ji}(S_j + k) = \infty$ a.s.. Then we apply [5, Theorem 4.5.5] to get:

$$\frac{L_{(i,j)}(S_j + n)}{\gamma \frac{D_i^{\text{out}}(S_j-1) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{S_j + \delta_{\text{out}}(j-1)} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta A_{ji}(S_j + k)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 1. \quad (3.13)$$

Also, by a similar argument as in (3.3), we have that when $c_1 + c_2 > 1$, there exists some constant $\tilde{C}_{ij} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n^{c_1+c_2-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta A_{ji}(S_j + k) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \beta \tilde{C}_{ij} \xi_i^{\text{out}} \xi_j^{\text{in}}. \quad (3.14)$$

Then combining (3.13) with (3.14) gives

$$\frac{L_{(i,j)}(S_j + n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-1}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \beta \tilde{C}_j \xi_i^{\text{out}} \xi_j^{\text{in}}. \quad (3.15)$$

An analogous reasoning is also applicable to the $c_1 + c_2 = 1$ case, where the scaling function $n^{c_1+c_2-1}$ is replaced with $\log n$, according to (3.4).

Next, consider the case $c_1 + c_2 < 1$. By the corollary in [11, Chapter IV.6, p. 151], we have a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \sum_{k \geq S_j} \Delta_{k+1}(i, j) < \infty \right\} &= \left\{ \sum_{k \geq S_j} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_k}(\Delta_{k+1}(i, j)) < \infty \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \sum_{k \geq S_j} \beta A_{ji}(k) < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument as in Lemma 3.1(3), we have $\sum_{k \geq S_j} A_{ji}(k) < \infty$ a.s., thus giving

$$\sum_{k \geq S_j} \Delta_{k+1}(i, j) < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Hence, with probability 1, there is a finite number of (i, j) edges can be formed, and there exists a last time for an (i, j) edge to form. \square

Note that by the definition of $L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(n)$, applying the continuous mapping theorem gives the asymptotic results of $L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(n)$, which also depends on the value of $c_1 + c_2$:

- (1) If $c_1 + c_2 > 1$, then there exists some random variable $\bar{\xi}_{ij}$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\xi}_{ij} = 0) = 0$, such that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(n)}{n^{c_1+c_2-1}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \bar{\xi}_{ij}.$$

So for large n , the number of reciprocated edges between i and j is of order $n^{c_1+c_2-1}$.

- (2) If $c_1 + c_2 = 1$, then there exists some random variable $\bar{\zeta}_{ij}$, satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\zeta}_{ij} = 0) = 0$, such that

$$\frac{L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(n)}{\log n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \bar{\zeta}_{ij}.$$

So for large n , the number of reciprocated edges between i and j is of order $\log n$.

- (3) If $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, then almost surely

$$L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(n) \uparrow L_{i \leftrightarrow j}(\infty) < \infty.$$

Now consider a special case with $\gamma = 0$ and $\delta_{\text{in}} = \delta_{\text{out}} = \delta > 0$, then

$$c_1 + c_2 < 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \alpha > \frac{1}{1 + \delta}.$$

From Theorem 3.1, we see that when the probability of generating a new node in a PA network at each step is too high, the node set grows strongly and it is difficult to form reciprocal edges. Then the number of reciprocal edges between two nodes is finite a.s.. If $\beta = 0$, then for $\delta_{\text{in}}, \delta_{\text{out}} > 0$, we always have $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, indicating that the number of edges between two fixed nodes is finite a.s. when no edge is added between two existing nodes.

3.1.2. The first time when a reciprocal pair forms. Based on Theorem 3.1, we present some immediate results with regard to the first time when a reciprocal pair of formed between nodes i and j . The $c_1 + c_2 \geq 1$ scenario is discussed in Corollary 3.1, while the $c_1 + c_2 < 1$ case is analyzed in Proposition 3.1.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j}$ be the first time when a reciprocal pair of edges $i \leftrightarrow j$ is formed between nodes i, j , i.e.*

$$N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} := \inf \{n \geq 0 : (i, j) \in E(n), \text{ and } (j, i) \in E(n)\}, \quad (3.16)$$

with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Suppose $1 \leq i < j$ are fixed, and c_1, c_2 are as given in (2.1), then $N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} < \infty$ a.s. if $c_1 + c_2 \geq 1$.

Proof. We will show that for $c_1 + c_2 \geq 1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} > S_j + n) = \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} = \infty) = 0$. Note that when $c_1 + c_2 \geq 1$, (3.15) indicates that $L_{(i,j)}(S_j + n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \infty$, and similarly, $L_{(j,i)}(S_j + n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \infty$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} > S_j + n) &\leq \mathbb{P}((i, j) \notin E(S_j + n)) + \mathbb{P}((j, i) \notin E(S_j + n)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(L_{(i,j)}(S_j + n) = 0) + \mathbb{P}(L_{(j,i)}(S_j + n) = 0) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

When $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, if we have $\mathbb{E}(L_{(i,j)}(\infty)) < 1$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(L_{(i,j)}(\infty) < 1) > 0,$$

which implies $\mathbb{P}(L_{(i,j)}(\infty) = 0) > 0$, and $\mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} = \infty) > 0$. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}(L_{(i,j)}(\infty)) = \gamma \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{D_i^{\text{out}}(S_j - 1) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{S_j + \delta_{\text{out}}(j - 1)} \right) + \beta \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(A_{ji}(S_j + k)),$$

and by (2.4), there exists some constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$, such that for $n \geq i \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}((D_i^{\text{in}}(n))^2) \leq K_1(n/i)^{2c_1}, \quad \mathbb{E}((D_i^{\text{out}}(n))^2) \leq K_2(n/i)^{2c_2}.$$

Then applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality gives that for $n \geq j > i \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(A_{ji}(n)) &\leq \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_i^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(n)|} \right)^2 \right) \right]^{1/2} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_j^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}}}{n + 1 + \delta_{\text{out}}|V(n)|} \right)^2 \right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left[\mathbb{E}((D_i^{\text{in}}(n) + \delta_{\text{in}})^2) \mathbb{E}((D_j^{\text{out}}(n) + \delta_{\text{out}})^2) \right]^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq (K_1 K_2)^{1/2} \frac{n^{c_1+c_2-2}}{i^{c_1} j^{c_2}} =: K' \frac{n^{c_1+c_2-2}}{i^{c_1} j^{c_2}}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(A_{ji}(S_j + k)) \leq K' \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \frac{k^{c_1+c_2-2}}{i^{c_1} j^{c_2}} \leq \frac{K'}{1-c_1-c_2} i^{-c_1} j^{c_1-1},$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{E}(L_{(i,j)}(\infty)) \leq \gamma + \frac{\beta K'}{1-c_1-c_2} i^{-c_1} j^{c_1-1}. \quad (3.17)$$

Since $c_1 - 1 < 0$, then for j sufficiently large, we have $\mathbb{E}(L_{(i,j)}(\infty)) < 1$, thus giving $\mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} = \infty) > 0$. In other words, when $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, it is possible to have zero pair of reciprocal edges between two fixed nodes i, j , if j is created at a late stage of network evolution.

Equation (3.17) also suggests that for arbitrarily chosen i, j , $\mathbb{E}(L_{(i,j)}(\infty)) < 1$ if β is small enough. Hence, if few edges are created between existing nodes, it is possible for two fixed nodes to never form a reciprocal pair of edges. In particular, when $\beta = 0$, there is no reciprocal pair of edges, i.e. $\mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} = \infty) = 1$, for all fixed i, j .

In the following proposition, we give the asymptotic behavior of $\sup_{j \geq n\epsilon} \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq n)$ in the $c_1 + c_2 < 1$ case.

Proposition 3.1. *If $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, then for $i \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $\sup_{j \geq n\epsilon} \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq n) \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Applying the union bound to $\mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq S_j + n)$ gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq S_j + n) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P}(E(S_j + k) = E(S_j + k - 1) \cup \{(i, j)\}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P}(E(S_j + k) = E(S_j + k - 1) \cup \{(j, i)\}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta A_{ji}(S_j + k) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \beta A_{ij}(S_j + k) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \beta A_{ji}(k) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \beta A_{ij}(k) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.5), we see that for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{j \geq n\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} A_{ji}(k) \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \sup_{j \geq n\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} A_{ij}(k) \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which gives

$$\sup_{j \geq n\epsilon} \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq n) \leq \sup_{j \geq n\epsilon} \mathbb{P}(N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq S_j + n) \rightarrow 0.$$

□

3.2. Reciprocity in the Entire Graph.

Then we consider the proportion of reciprocal edges in the entire PA network, R_n^{pa} , and the next theorem specifies the asymptotic behavior of R_n for $0 < c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose R_n^{pa} is as defined in (3.1). Then for $0 < c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, we have*

$$R_n^{\text{pa}} \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Results in Theorem 3.2 show that for certain combination of model parameters such that $c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, it is likely to have a small reciprocity coefficient, R_n^{pa} , provided that the number of edges in the PA network is large. In particular, when $c_1 + c_2 \leq 1$, i.e. the second and third cases in Theorem 3.1, we have $R_n^{\text{pa}} \xrightarrow{p} 0$.

Proof. Note that it suffices to show $\mathbb{E}(R_n^{\text{pa}}) \rightarrow 0$ for $0 < c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that

$$\Delta_k(i, j) = \mathbf{1}_{\{E(k) = E(k-1) \cup \{(i, j)\}\}},$$

then $\Delta_k(i, j) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1)\}}$ denotes the event that from $G(k-1)$ to $G(k)$, an edge (i, j) is created when (j, i) already exists in $G(k-1)$. By the definition of R_n^{pa} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_n^{\text{pa}} &\leq \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i < j} \sum_{k=S_j}^n \Delta_k(i, j) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1)\}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i < j} \sum_{k=S_j}^n \Delta_k(i, j) \mathbf{1}_{\{(i, j) \in E(k-1)\}} \\ &= \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i < j} \sum_{k=S_j+1}^n \Delta_k(i, j) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1)\}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i < j} \sum_{k=S_j+1}^n \Delta_k(i, j) \mathbf{1}_{\{(i, j) \in E(k-1)\}} \\ &=: Q_1(n) + Q_2(n). \end{aligned}$$

For $Q_1(n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) &= \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=S_j+1}^n \Delta_k(i, j) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1)\}} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=S_j+1}^n \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}^{k-1}} (\Delta_k(i, j)) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1)\}} \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=S_j+1}^n \beta A_{ji}(k-1) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1)\}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Since $S_j \geq j-1$ for $j \geq 2$, then (3.18) implies

$$\mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) \leq \frac{2}{n+1} \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sum_{k=j}^n \mathbb{E} (A_{ji}(k-1) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1), k \geq S_j+1\}}). \quad (3.19)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}(k-1) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j,i) \in E(k-1), k \geq S_j+1\}} \right) \\
& \leq \left[\mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}^2(k-1) \right) \right]^{1/2} \left[\mathbb{P} \left((j,i) \in E(k-1), k \geq S_j+1 \right) \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq \left[\mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}^2(k-1) \right) \right]^{1/2} \left[\sum_{l=j}^{k-1} \mathbb{P} \left(E(l) = E(l-1) \cup \{(i,j)\}, l \geq S_j+1 \right) \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq \left[\mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}^2(k-1) \right) \right]^{1/2} \left[\sum_{l=j}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left(A_{ij}(l) \right) + \alpha \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{D_i^{\text{in}}(S_j-1) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{S_j + \delta_{\text{in}}(j-1)} \right) \right]^{1/2}. \quad (3.20)
\end{aligned}$$

When $c_1 + c_2 > 1$, Lemma 2.2 and (2.4) together imply that there exist constants $M_1, M_2, M_3 > 0$ such that for $i < j \leq k \leq n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}^2(k-1) \right) \leq M_1 \frac{k^{2(c_1+c_2-2)}}{i^{2c_2} j^{2c_1}}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{D_i^{\text{in}}(S_j-1) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{S_j + \delta_{\text{in}}(j-1)} \right) \leq M_3 \frac{j^{c_1-1}}{i^{c_1}},$$

and that for $j \leq l \leq k-1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(A_{ij}(l) \right) \leq M_2 \frac{l^{c_1+c_2-2}}{i^{c_1} j^{c_2}}.$$

Therefore, when $c_1 + c_2 > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}(k-1) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j,i) \in E(k-1), k \geq S_j+1\}} \right) \\
& \leq \sqrt{M_1} \frac{k^{c_1+c_2-2}}{i^{c_2} j^{c_1}} \left(\frac{M_2}{c_1 + c_2 - 1} \frac{k^{c_1+c_2-1}}{i^{c_1} j^{c_2}} + \alpha M_3 j^{c_1-1} / i^{c_1} \right)^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

and since $k^{c_1+c_2-1} / (i^{c_1} j^{c_2}) \geq j^{c_1-1} / i^{c_1}$ for $k \geq j$, there exists some constant $M > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}(k-1) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j,i) \in E(k-1), k \geq S_j+1\}} \right) \leq M \frac{k^{\frac{3}{2}(c_1+c_2)-\frac{5}{2}}}{i^{c_1/2+c_2} j^{c_1+c_2/2}}. \quad (3.21)$$

Then (3.19) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) & \leq \frac{2M}{n+1} \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \sum_{k=j}^n \frac{k^{\frac{3}{2}(c_1+c_2)-\frac{5}{2}}}{i^{c_1/2+c_2} j^{c_1+c_2/2}} \\
& \leq \frac{2M}{3/2(c_1+c_2-1)} n^{\frac{3}{2}(c_1+c_2)-\frac{5}{2}} \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} i^{-(c_1/2+c_2)} j^{-(c_1+c_2/2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $c_1/2 + c_2 > 1$, $c_1 + c_2/2 > 1$, and $c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, then

$$\mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) \leq \frac{2M}{3/2(c_1+c_2-1)} n^{\frac{3}{2}(c_1+c_2)-\frac{5}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-(c_1/2+c_2)} \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} j^{-(c_1+c_2/2)} \rightarrow 0.$$

If $c_1/2 + c_2 < 1$, $c_1 + c_2/2 < 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) &\leq \frac{2M}{3/2(c_1 + c_2 - 1)} n^{\frac{3}{2}(c_1+c_2)-\frac{5}{2}} \frac{n^{2-3/2(c_1+c_2)}}{(1 - c_1/2 - c_2)(1 - c_1 - c_2/2)} \\ &= \frac{2Mn^{-1/2}}{3/2(c_1 + c_2 - 1)(1 - c_1/2 - c_2)(1 - c_1 - c_2/2)} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $c_1/2 + c_2 < 1$, $c_1 + c_2/2 > 1$, and $c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) &\leq \frac{2M}{3/2(c_1 + c_2 - 1)} n^{\frac{3}{2}(c_1+c_2)-\frac{5}{2}} \frac{1}{1 - (c_1/2 + c_2)} \sum_{j=2}^n j^{1-(c_1/2+c_2)} j^{-1} \\ &\leq \frac{2Mn^{c_1+c_2/2-3/2}}{3/2(c_1 + c_2 - 1)(1 - (c_1/2 + c_2))^2} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $c_1 + c_2/2 < 1 + 1/2 = 3/2$. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}(Q_2(n)) \rightarrow 0$, when $c_1/2 + c_2 > 1$, $c_1 + c_2/2 < 1$, and $c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$. The proof machinery also applies to the case where either $c_1/2 + c_2 = 1$ or $c_1 + c_2/2 = 1$, and $c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, which gives the conclusion that for $1 < c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, $\mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) \rightarrow 0$. Following the same reasoning, we have $\mathbb{E}(Q_2(n)) \rightarrow 0$, for $1 < c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$, thus implying $R_n^{\text{pa}} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ for $1 < c_1 + c_2 < 5/3$.

When $c_1 + c_2 = 1$, we revise the bound in (3.21) to get: for some constant $\widetilde{M} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}(k-1) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j,i) \in E(k-1), k \geq S_j+1\}} \right) \leq \widetilde{M} \frac{k^{-1}(\log k)^{1/2}}{i^{c_1/2+c_2} j^{c_1+c_2/2}}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) &\leq \frac{2\widetilde{M}}{n} (\log n)^{3/2} \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} i^{-(c_1/2+c_2)} j^{-(c_1+c_2/2)} \\ &\leq \frac{2\widetilde{M}}{(1 - c_1/2 - c_2)(1 - c_1 - c_2/2)} \frac{(\log n)^{3/2}}{n^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, for some constant $\widetilde{M}' > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Q_2(n)) &\leq \frac{2\widetilde{M}'}{n} (\log n)^{3/2} \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} i^{-(c_2/2+c_1)} j^{-(c_2+c_1/2)} \\ &\leq \frac{2\widetilde{M}'}{(1 - c_1/2 - c_2)(1 - c_1 - c_2/2)} \frac{(\log n)^{3/2}}{n^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $R_n^{\text{pa}} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ when $c_1 + c_2 = 1$.

When $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, the bound in (3.20) implies that there exists some constant $\bar{M} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(A_{ji}(k-1) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j,i) \in E(k-1), k \geq S_j+1\}} \right) &\leq \bar{M} \frac{k^{c_1+c_2-2}}{i^{c_2} j^{c_1}} \left(\frac{j^{c_1+c_2-1}}{i^{c_1} j^{c_2}} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \bar{M} \frac{k^{c_1+c_2-2}}{i^{c_1/2+c_2} j^{c_1/2+1/2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{E}(Q_1(n)) \leq \frac{2\bar{M}}{(1 - c_1 - c_2)(1 - c_1/2 - c_2)} n^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Similar reasoning also gives $\mathbb{E}(Q_2(n)) \rightarrow 0$ when $c_1 + c_2 < 1$, thus giving $\mathbb{E}(R_n^{\text{pa}}) \rightarrow 0$ and completing the proof of the theorem. \square

Remark 3.1. (i) Recall the definition of c_1 and c_2 in (2.1), and if $\beta \leq 2/3$, then $c_1 + c_2 < 1 + \beta \leq 5/3$. Theorem 3.2 suggests that if the proportion of edges added between two existing nodes is less than $2/3$ and n is sufficiently large, the corresponding PA network will have R_n^{pa} close to 0.

(ii) Note also that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq n\}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \Delta_k(i, j) \mathbf{1}_{\{(j, i) \in E(k-1)\}} + \sum_{k=1}^n \Delta_k(j, i) \mathbf{1}_{\{(i, j) \in E(k-1)\}}.$$

Hence, when $c_1 + 2c_2 < 1$, applying the bound in (3.22) gives: for fixed i , there exists some constant $\tilde{M} > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j \in V(n)} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_0^{i \leftrightarrow j} \leq n\}} \right) \leq \tilde{M} i^{-(c_1/2 + c_2)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{c_1/2 + c_2 - 3/2} < \infty.$$

This indicates when $c_1 + 2c_2 < 1$, a fixed node i can form a reciprocal pair of edges only with finitely many nodes.

3.3. Simulation for $c_1 + c_2 \geq 5/3$.

We are left with the asymptotic behavior of R_n^{pa} for $c_1 + c_2 \in [5/3, 1 + \beta)$, provided that $\beta \in (2/3, 1)$. For comparison, we choose three sets of parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 &= (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_{\text{in}}, \delta_{\text{out}}) = (0.1, 0.8, 0.1, 2, 1), \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 &= (0.1, 0.8, 0.1, .4, .4), \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_3 = (0.05, 0.9, 0.05, 1, 1), \end{aligned}$$

such that values of $c_1 + c_2$ are equal to 1.393, 1.667, and 1.727, respectively. In other words, the three sets of parameter values correspond to the cases where $c_1 + c_2$ are strictly smaller than, equal to, and strictly greater than $5/3$, respectively. For each $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, we simulate 1000 replications of the directed PA network with 10^5 edges, and compute the value of R_n^{pa} for each replication.

Numerical results are summarized as boxplots in Figure 3.2. For each boxplot, we use the dark red dots to mark the corresponding averaged empirical R_n^{pa} . Under $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$, all 1000 empirical R_n^{pa} values are close to 0, with a maximum of 0.090 and a minimum of 0.021. The empirical R_n^{pa} values under $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_3$ are more variable, but both have a higher mean than the $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ case. This simulation experiment confirms that the asymptotic behavior of R_n^{pa} in a directed PA model depends on the value of $c_1 + c_2$. Meanwhile, when $c_1 + c_2 \geq 5/3$, the value of R_n^{pa} may not necessarily concentrate around a specific value, but vary over a certain range.




FIGURE 3.2: Boxplots of R_n^{pa} for directed PA models simulated using θ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$. The red dots represent the averaged empirical R_n^{pa} for each θ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$.

4. Discussion

Suppose that we are given a scale-free network with a large proportion of reciprocal edges, e.g. Facebook wall posts [17], Twitter [6], Google+ [9], and Flickr [3, 10]. When fitting a directed PA model to such a dataset using inference methods developed in [18, 19], there is no guarantee that the calibrated model also has a large R_n^{pa} . In fact, estimated \hat{c}_1 and \hat{c}_2 do not necessarily satisfy $\hat{c}_1 + \hat{c}_2 \geq 5/3$. If we have $\hat{c}_1 + \hat{c}_2 < 5/3$ in the calibrated model, then by Theorem 3.2, the corresponding R_n^{pa} is close to 0, which differs from the feature of high reciprocity in the given dataset. This flags modeling error and suggests considering alternative models or variants of the classical PA network. For instance, once a directed edge (i, j) is created following the PA rule, we may add a reciprocal edge (j, i) with probability $\rho \in (0, 1)$. The study in [4] also provides other features that can be employed to predict reciprocal edges, and we will defer the analysis of these variants of directed PA models as future research.

Appendix A. Proofs in Section 2

In this section, we give proofs of lemmas in Section 2.

A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.1

Note that the right hand sides of (2.2) and (2.3) are both \mathcal{F}_{S_v+k} -measurable. We show the results for $p \geq 2$, and the case $p = 1$ follows by a similar argument. Let

$F \in \mathcal{F}_{S_v+k}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_F \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{S_v+k}} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_F (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \sum_{l \geq k} \int_{F \cap \{S_v+k=l\}} (D_v^{\text{in}}(l + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p d\mathbb{P}, \end{aligned}$$

and since $D_v^{\text{in}}(l + 1) = D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Node } v \text{ is chosen at step } l + 1\}} =: D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \Delta_v(l + 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{l \geq k} \int_{F \cap \{S_v+k=l\}} (D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \delta_{\text{in}} + \Delta_v(l + 1))^p d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \sum_{l \geq k} \int_{F \cap \{S_v+k=l\}} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p + \sum_{r=1}^p \binom{p}{r} (D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \delta_{\text{in}})^{p-r} \Delta_v(l + 1) \right) d\mathbb{P}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Since $F \cap \{S_v + k = l\} \in \mathcal{F}_l$, then the quantity in (A.1) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l \geq k} \int_{F \cap \{S_v+k=l\}} (D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p d\mathbb{P} \\ & \quad + \sum_{l \geq k} \int_{F \cap \{S_v+k=l\}} p (D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \delta_{\text{in}})^{p-1} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_l}(\Delta_v(l + 1)) d\mathbb{P} \\ & \quad + \sum_{r=2}^p \sum_{l \geq k} \int_{F \cap \{S_v+k=l\}} \binom{p}{r} (D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \delta_{\text{in}})^{p-r} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_l}(\Delta_v(l + 1)) d\mathbb{P}. \end{aligned}$$

Note also that $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_l}(\Delta_v(l + 1)) = (\alpha + \beta)(D_v^{\text{in}}(l) + \delta_{\text{in}})/(l + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(l)|)$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_F \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{S_v+k}} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_F (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \left(1 + p \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right) d\mathbb{P} \\ & \quad + \int_F \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \sum_{r=2}^p \binom{p}{r} (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^{p-r+1} d\mathbb{P}. \end{aligned}$$

A.2. Proof of Lemma 2.2

For $p = 1$, we see from (2.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} (D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}}) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and since $S_v \geq 0$ and $|V(S_v + k)| \geq |V(k)|$, then

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}}) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k)|} \right) \right),$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{k} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \frac{(\alpha + \beta)\delta_{\text{in}} \left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right|}{(k + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k)|)(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))k} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and as $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{k} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right|}{(k + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k)|)(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))k} \right) \\ &=: H_v^{(1)}(k) + H_v^{(2)}(k). \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

Applying the Chernoff bound, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right| \geq \sqrt{12(1 - \beta)k \log k} \right) \leq \frac{2}{k^4}, \tag{A.3}$$

and rewrite the term $H_v^{(2)}(k)$ in (A.2) as

$$\begin{aligned} &H_v^{(2)}(k) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right|}{(k + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k)|)(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))k} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right| \leq \sqrt{12(1 - \beta)k \log k} \right\}} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right|}{(k + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k)|)(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))k} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right| > \sqrt{12(1 - \beta)k \log k} \right\}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) \leq k + 1$ and $\left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right| \leq k + 1$, then the forgoing term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12(1 - \beta)k \log k}}{k^2} + \frac{\delta_{\text{in}}(k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}})(k + 1)}{(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))k^2} \frac{2}{k^4} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12k \log k}}{k^2} + \frac{2\delta_{\text{in}}(k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}})(k + 1)}{k^6}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

Combining the bound in (A.4) with (A.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{k} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right|}{(k + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k)|)(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))k} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{k} + \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12k \log k}}{k^2} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2\delta_{\text{in}}(k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}})(k + 1)}{k^6}. \end{aligned}$$

Recursively applying the inequality above k times, we have:

$$\mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{k} + \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12k \log k}}{k^2} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{2\delta_{\text{in}}(k+1 + \delta_{\text{in}})(k+1)}{k^6} \\
&\leq \dots \leq \mathbb{E} \left(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v) + \delta_{\text{in}} \right) \prod_{l=1}^k \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{l} + \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12l \log l}}{l^2} \right) \\
&\quad + 2\delta_{\text{in}} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{(l+1 + \delta_{\text{in}})(l+1)}{l^6} \prod_{s=l+1}^k \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{s} + \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12s \log s}}{s^2} \right). \quad (\text{A.5})
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $\mathbb{E}(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v) + \delta_{\text{in}}) = \alpha\delta_{\text{in}} + \gamma(1 + \delta_{\text{in}})$, depending on whether the α - or γ -scenario occurs. Note that there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\prod_{l=1}^k \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{l} + \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12l \log l}}{l^2} \right) \leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^k \left(\frac{c_1}{l} + \frac{\delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{12l \log l}}{l^2} \right) \right\} \leq M k^{c_1}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and it follows from (A.5) that

$$\sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E} [D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k)]}{k^{c_1}} \leq \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E} [D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}}]}{k^{c_1}} < \infty.$$

For $p \geq 2$, suppose $\sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^r]}{k^{c_1 r}} \leq A_r < \infty$, holds for some constants, A_r , $r = 1, \dots, p-1$. Let $A_0 = \max\{A_r : r = 1, \dots, p-1\}$, then by (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \left(1 + p \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} (\alpha + \beta) \binom{p}{2} A_r k^{c_1 r - 1} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \left(1 + p \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right) \right) \\
&\quad + (\alpha + \beta) p(p-1)^2 / 2 A_0 k^{c_1(p-1)-1} \\
&=: C_v^{(1)}(k) + C_v^{(2)}(k). \quad (\text{A.7})
\end{aligned}$$

We rewrite the $C_v^{(1)}(k)$ term in (A.7) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
C_v^{(1)}(k) &= \left(1 + \frac{c_1 p}{k} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \left(\frac{p(\alpha + \beta)}{S_v + k + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} - \frac{c_1 p}{k} \right) \right] \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{c_1 p}{k} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \frac{p\delta_{\text{in}} |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k}{(k + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(k)|)(1 + \delta_{\text{in}}(1 - \beta))k} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{c_1 p}{k}\right) \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} | |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k |}{k^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the Chernoff bound in (A.3), we have for $p \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k \right| \geq \sqrt{6p(1 - \beta)k \log k} \right) \leq \frac{2}{k^{2p}}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Therefore, analogous to the calculation in (A.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} | |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k |}{k^2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} | |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k |}{k^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k | \leq \sqrt{6p(1 - \beta)k \log k}\}} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} | |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k |}{k^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{| |V(k)| - (1 - \beta)k | > \sqrt{6p(1 - \beta)k \log k}\}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and since $(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \leq (k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}})^p$,

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right] \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{6p k \log k}}{k^2} + \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} (k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}})^p (k + 1)}{k^2} \cdot \frac{2}{k^{2p}}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} C_v^{(1)}(k) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right] \left(1 + \frac{c_1 p}{k} + \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{6p k \log k}}{k^2} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2p \delta_{\text{in}} (k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}})^p (k + 1)}{k^{2p+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note also that $(k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}})^p (k + 1) k^{-2p-2} \leq k^{c_1(p-1)-1}$, for all $k \geq 1$, $p \geq 2$, and we conclude from (A.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left((D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right) \left(1 + \frac{c_1 p}{k} + \frac{p \delta_{\text{in}} \sqrt{6p k \log k}}{k^2} \right) \\ &\quad + (A_0(\alpha + \beta)p(p-1)^2/2 + 2p\delta_{\text{in}}) k^{c_1(p-1)-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Following the recursive step as for the $p = 1$ case gives

$$\sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k))^p \right]}{k^{c_1 p}} \leq \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + k) + \delta_{\text{in}})^p \right]}{k^{c_1 p}} < \infty.$$

Note that for $p \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n)}{n^{c_1}} \right)^p \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n)}{n^{c_1}} \right)^p \mathbf{1}_{\{S_v \leq n-1\}} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n)}{n^{c_1}} \right)^p \mathbf{1}_{\{S_v \geq n\}} \right)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n)}{n^{c_1}} \right)^p \right) + \left(\frac{1}{n^{c_1}} \right)^p,$$

since $D_v^{\text{in}}(n)$ is monotone in n . Then we have for $v \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n)}{n^{c_1}} \right)^p \right) < \infty.$$

Applying a similar argument to the out-degrees completes the proof of the lemma.

A.3. Proof of Lemma 2.3

We only show the results for $D_v^{\text{in}}(n)$, and those for $D_v^{\text{out}}(n)$ follow from a similar argument. First, by Lemma 2.1, we see that for $n \geq 1$,

$$\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right)} =: \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{X_n^{(v)}} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

is a non-negative $(\mathcal{F}_{S_v+n})_{n \geq 0}$ -martingale, which by the martingale convergence theorem, converges to some limit L_v a.s. as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It remains to analyze the denominator and to verify $\mathbb{P}(L_v = 0) = 0$. We do this by applying a similar proof machinery as in [16, Lemma 8.17].

By Markov's inequality, we see that for $\epsilon > 0$, and $\max\{-1, -\delta_{\text{in}}\} < m < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(L_v \leq \epsilon) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{X_n^{(v)}} \leq \epsilon \right) \\ &\leq \epsilon^{|m|} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}}}{X_n^{(v)}} \right)^m \right] \\ &\leq \epsilon^{|m|} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})^m}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

By (A.10), it suffices to show

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})^m}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right)} \right] < \infty.$$

Similar to [16, Equation (8.7.23)], there exists some constant C_m such that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})^m}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right)} \right] \\ \leq C_m \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m) / \Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, once we show

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m) / \Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}} |V(S_v + k)|} \right)} \right] < \infty, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

then the inequality in (A.10) implies $\mathbb{P}(L_v = 0) = 0$.

We prove (A.11) by showing

$$M_n^{(m)} := \frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m) / \Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right)},$$

is a $(\mathcal{F}_{S_v+n})_{n \geq 0}$ -martingale. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_{S_v+n}} \left(\frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m)}{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n + 1) + \delta_{\text{in}})} \right) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m)}{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})} \left(1 - \frac{(\alpha + \beta)(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})}{S_v + n + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + n)|} \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})}{S_v + n + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + n)|} \frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m)}{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})} \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m}{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}}} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m)}{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n) + \delta_{\text{in}})} \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + n + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + n)|} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which confirms $M_n^{(m)}$ being a $(\mathcal{F}_{S_v+n})_{n \geq 0}$ -martingale. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(M_n^{(m)}) &= \mathbb{E}(M_0^{(m)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m) / \Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v) + \delta_{\text{in}})}{1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}v}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $m < 0$ and $S_v \geq v - 1 \geq 0$, then $\left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{S_v + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}v} \right)^{-1} \leq \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{(1 + \delta_{\text{in}})v} \right)^{-1}$. This further implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(M_n^{(m)}) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{(1 + \delta_{\text{in}})v} \right)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v) + \delta_{\text{in}} + m) / \Gamma(D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v) + \delta_{\text{in}}) \right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{(\alpha + \beta)m}{(1 + \delta_{\text{in}})v} \right)^{-1} \left(\alpha \frac{\Gamma(\delta_{\text{in}} + m)}{\Gamma(\delta_{\text{in}})} + \gamma \frac{\Gamma(\delta_{\text{in}} + 1 + m)}{\Gamma(1 + \delta_{\text{in}})} \right) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

thus completing the proof of (A.11).

Next, we consider the convergence of $X_n^{(v)}$ by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & \log X_n^{(v)} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left[\log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right) - \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} - \frac{c_1}{S_v + k + 1} \right) \\ & \quad + \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{c_1}{S_v + k + 1} - c_1 \log \frac{S_v + n}{S_v + 1} \right) + c_1 \log \frac{S_v + n}{S_v + 1} \end{aligned}$$

$$=: I_v(n) + II_v(n) + III_v(n) + c_1 \log \frac{S_v + n}{S_v + 1}.$$

Since $\log(1+x) \leq x$, for all $x \geq 0$, then $I_v(n+1) - I_v(n) \leq 0$ for all n , i.e. $I_v(n)$ is decreasing in n . Note also that $|\log(1+x) - x| \leq x^2/2$, for all $x \geq 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right) - \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right) - \frac{\alpha + \beta}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{(\alpha + \beta)^2}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{S_v + k + 1 + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(S_v + k)|} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $I_v(\infty) < \infty$ a.s., and $I_v(n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} I_v(\infty)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By [1, Theorem 3.9.4], we see that there exists a finite r.v. Z such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{k + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k-1)|} - \frac{c_1}{k} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z,$$

then

$$II_v(n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z - \sum_{k=1}^{S_v} \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{k + \delta_{\text{in}}|V(k-1)|} - \frac{c_1}{k} \right) =: II_v(\infty).$$

Since $\sum_{k=1}^n 1/k - \log n \rightarrow \tilde{c}$, where \tilde{c} is Euler's constant, then for $v = 1$, $III_1(n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} c_1 \tilde{c} =: III_1(\infty)$, and for $v \geq 2$,

$$III_v(n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} c_1 \left(\tilde{c} + \log(S_v + 1) - \sum_{k=1}^{S_v} \frac{1}{k} \right) =: III_v(\infty).$$

Hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{((S_v + n)/(S_v + 1))^{c_1}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \exp \{ I_v(\infty) + II_v(\infty) + III_v(\infty) \}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Combining (A.12) with the convergence of the martingale in (A.9), we have

$$\frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n)}{(S_v + n)^{c_1}} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{L_v}{(S_v + 1)^{c_1}} \exp \{ -(I_v(\infty) + II_v(\infty) + III_v(\infty)) \} =: \xi_v^{\text{in}},$$

then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(n)}{n^{c_1}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D_v^{\text{in}}(S_v + n)}{(S_v + n)^{c_1}} \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \xi_v^{\text{in}}.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(L_v = 0) = 0$ and $S_v + 1 \geq v \geq 1$, we also have $\mathbb{P}(\xi_v^{\text{in}} = 0) = 0$.

References

- [1] K.B. Athreya and P. Ney. *Branching processes. Reprint of the 1972 original*. Springer, New York, 2004.
- [2] B. Bollobás, C. Borgs, J. Chayes, and O. Riordan. Directed scale-free graphs. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (Baltimore, 2003)*, pages 132–139, New York, 2003. ACM.
- [3] M. Cha, A. Mislove, and K.P. Gummadi. A measurement-driven analysis of information propagation in the Flickr social network. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '09*, page 721–730, New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [4] J. Cheng, D.M. Romero, B. Meeder, and J. Kleinberg. Predicting reciprocity in social networks. In *2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Social Computing*, pages 49–56. IEEE, 2011.
- [5] R. Durrett. *Probability: Theory and Examples*, volume 49. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [6] A. Java, X. Song, T. Finin, and B. Tseng. Why we Twitter: Understanding microblogging usage and communities. *WebKDD/SNA-KDD '07*, pages 56–65, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [7] B. Jiang, Z.L. Zhang, and D. Towsley. Reciprocity in social networks with capacity constraints. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '15*, pages 457–466, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [8] P.L. Krapivsky and S. Redner. Organization of growing random networks. *Physical Review E*, 63(6):066123:1–14, 2001.
- [9] G.l. Magno, G. Comarela, D. Saez-Trumper, M. Cha, and V. Almeida. New kid on the block: Exploring the Google+ social graph. In *Proceedings of the 2012 Internet Measurement Conference, IMC '12*, pages 159–170, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [10] A. Mislove, M. Marcon, K.P. Gummadi, P. Druschel, and B. Bhattacharjee. Measurement and analysis of online social networks. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement, IMC '07*, pages 29–42, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [11] J. Neveu. *Mathematical Foundations of the Calculus of Probability*. Holden-Day, San Francisco, Ca., 1965.
- [12] M.E.J. Newman, S. Forrest, and J. Balthrop. Email networks and the spread of computer viruses. *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 66(3), September 2002.
- [13] S.I. Resnick. *Heavy Tail Phenomena: Probabilistic and Statistical Modeling*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2007. ISBN: 0-387-24272-4.
- [14] S.I. Resnick and G. Samorodnitsky. Tauberian theory for multivariate regularly varying distributions with application to preferential attachment networks. *Extremes*, 18(3):349–367, 2015.
- [15] G. Samorodnitsky, S. Resnick, D. Towsley, R. Davis, A. Willis, and P. Wan. Nonstandard regular variation of in-degree and out-degree in the preferential attachment model. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 53(1):146–161, March 2016.
- [16] R. van der Hofstad. *Random Graphs and Complex Networks. Vol. 1*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.

- [17] B. Viswanath, A. Mislove, M. Cha, and K.P. Gummadi. On the evolution of user interaction in Facebook. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Social Networks (WOSN'09)*, August 2009.
- [18] P. Wan, T. Wang, R. A. Davis, and S. I. Resnick. Fitting the linear preferential attachment model. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 11(2):3738–3780, 2017.
- [19] P. Wan, T. Wang, R.A. Davis, and S.I. Resnick. Are extreme value estimation methods useful for network data? *Extremes*, 23(1):171–195, 2020.
- [20] T. Wang and S.I. Resnick. Degree growth rates and index estimation in a directed preferential attachment model. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130(2):878–906, 2020.
- [21] S. Wasserman and K. Faust. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Structural Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge University Press, 1994.