Disentangling the Role of Heterogeneity and Hyperedge Overlap in Explosive Contagion on Higher-Order Networks

Federico Malizia,^{1,*} Andrés Guzmán,¹ Iacopo Iacopini,^{1,2} and István Z. Kiss^{1,3,†}

¹Network Science Institute, Northeastern University London, London EIW 1LP, United Kingdom

²Department of Physics, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

³Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

(Dated: January 30, 2025)

Higher-order networks are used to model complex contagion processes in social groups of varying sizes, where heterogeneity and microscopic group arrangements can critically influence the dynamics. However, existing frameworks fail to fully capture the interplay between these features. Here, we introduce group-based compartmental modeling (GBCM), a mean-field framework for irreversible contagion that incorporates heterogeneity and captures correlations across group sizes. Validated through numerical simulations, GBCM analytically disentangles the contributions of different interaction orders to global epidemic dynamics. Our results reveal how heterogeneity and inter-order correlations shape epidemic thresholds and demonstrate that high heterogeneity in group membership drives rapid infection growth, leading to abrupt phase transitions. This provides an explanation for the emergence of explosive contagion in higher-order networks.

The propagation of contagions and behaviors in complex systems often involves repeated or simultaneous stimuli that individuals receive from their social contacts [1, 2]. One way to mechanistically encode these non-linear effects into contagion models is to consider interactions that go beyond simple pairwise connections [3–5]. Recent studies have highlighted the critical role of these higher-order interactions-group involving three or more individuals-in shaping the dynamics of spreading processes [6-8], but also in synchronization [9-11], and game theory [12–15]. In fact, higher-order mechanisms [16] on complex networks give rise to a variety of new phenomena [17, 18], such as explosive transitions [19], vanishing size of critical mass [20], multi-stability [8, 21, 22] and chaos [23]. Crucially, it has been shown that the way these group interactions are distributed across the system plays a central role in determining its behavior [24-28]. From a macroscopic point of view, the presence of hubs in higherorder structures significantly impacts the onset and evolution of spreading processes [29, 30]. More recently, the role of the microscopic arrangement of groups has been studied via two key structural concepts: intra-order correlations, describing dependencies within interactions of the same order [31], and inter-order correlations for the interplay across orders [32]. While intra-order correlations mainly depend on the microscopic arrangement of groups of the same size, inter-order correlations [33] depend on the full hierarchy of groups, and can profoundly influence collective dynamics. For instance, higher-order networks with uncorrelated sets of hyperedges behave fundamentally differently from those structured as simplicial complexes-where the downward closure requirement maximizes correlations across orders [32, 34, 35]. Although significant progress has been made in characterizing the impact of structural network properties on the contagion dynamics that unfolds over it [8, 24, 28-32, 36], capturing at the same time inter- and intra-order correlations, degree distributions, and state dependencies across different orders of interactions remains a challenge. These features introduce substantial complexity, and existing frameworks often fail to balance analytical tractability with the need to account for both structural and dynamical heterogeneity [32, 37].

Here, we introduce a group-based mean-field framework to study the dynamics of the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model in systems with higher-order interactions. Our model explicitly accounts for both the heterogeneity in connectivity distributions across interaction orders and the interorder hyperedge overlap [33], a metric which quantifies correlations between different orders of interactions. Using this framework, we derive analytical expressions for the epidemic threshold, uncovering the intricate interplay between structural heterogeneity and the microscopic arrangement of group interactions. Additionally, our model predicts the emergence of explosive phenomena in the temporal evolution of infected individuals, driven by the combined effects of inter-order correlations and high heterogeneity in group membership. We validate our analytical findings with numerical simulations on synthetic hypergraphs featuring tunable heterogeneity and inter-order overlap. Finally, we validate our approach on hypergraphs constructed from real-world data, demonstrating that higher-order structures play a decisive role in shaping the onset and progression of epidemic processes.

Modeling higher-order interactions.—We model a system with higher-order interactions as a hypergraph $H = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{N} is the set of $N = |\mathcal{N}|$ nodes that interact via $E = |\mathcal{E}|$ hyperedges, i.e., groups of two or more nodes. Each hyperedge $e \in \mathcal{E}$, a subset of \mathcal{N} , can be characterized by its order m = |e| - 1, with m = 1 representing pairwise interactions, m = 2 corresponding to group interactions of three nodes, etc. Its counterpart it's k_m , the generalized degree of order m, also called k-hyperdegree, that denotes the number of mhyperedges connected to a node [38]. We call $P(k_m)$ their probability distribution, whose first and second moment, $\langle k_m \rangle$ and $\langle k_m^2 \rangle$, can thus be used to jointly quantify the mean con-

^{*} federico.malizia@nulondon.ac.uk

[†] istvan.kiss@nulondon.ac.uk




FIG. 1. **Group-based compartmental modeling.** (a) Graphical representation of the model for M = 2. A test node u is connected to four infectious (red) and two susceptible (blue) nodes via two 1-hyperedges and two 2-hyperedges. Arrows show the different channels of infection through the rate parameters in Eq. (4). (b) Final epidemic size (\mathcal{R}_{∞}) as a function of infectivity λ_1 , with $\lambda_2 = 3$. Model results (lines) are compared with Gillespie simulations (markers) on Scale-free and an Erdős-Rényi simplicial complexes, respectively with 2000 and 10000 nodes (see characteristics in Table I).

nectivity and degree heterogeneity of higher-order networks. Notice, however, that these distributions alone provide no information about the microscopic arrangement of hyperedges or the correlations among different order of interactions. To quantify such correlations, we need to assess the extent to which a given structure adheres to or deviates from the inclusion property of simplicial complexes [39]. Calling $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}^{(n)})$ the set of *m*-cliques within *n*-hyperedges, and given two orders of interaction *m* and *n* (*m* < *n*), the *inter-order hyper-edge overlap* is then expressed as [33]

$$\alpha^{(m,n)} = \frac{\left|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}^{(m)} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}^{(n)})\right|}{\left|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}^{(n)})\right|},\tag{1}$$

where the numerator counts the *m*-cliques within *n*-hyperedges that are also *m*-hyperedges, and it's normalized by the total number of *m*-cliques in *n*-hyperedges. This yields $\alpha^{(m,n)} \in [0,1]$, with $\alpha^{(m,n)} = 0$ indicating no overlap, and $\alpha^{(m,n)} = 1$ maximum overlap—when all *m*-cliques in *n*-hyperedges are also *m*-hyperedges. By construction, $\alpha^{(m,n)} = 0$ for m > n.

Group-based compartmental modeling (GBCM).—To understand how correlations between different orders of interactions affect the onset and outcome of outbreaks, we propose a mathematical framework that explicitly includes inter-order overlap of Eq. (1) as a free parameter. To this aim, we consider the edge-based compartmental modeling approach for the SIR process [40, 41] defined in [42, 43], generalizing it to capture infection dynamics within groups of different orders. Each order m, with $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$, corresponds to an infection rate β_m , the rate at which a susceptible node is infected via a "contagious" m-hyperedge-one where all others m nodes are infectious. The recovery rate for infected nodes is denoted by μ , and once a node recovers it cannot be infected again. Our formalism relies on two key quantities defined from the point of view of a test node u which is part of hyperedges of different orders: $\theta_m(t)$, the probability that uat time t has not yet been infected by any of the infectious mhyperedges it is part of; $\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}(t)$, the probability that u is still susceptible and member of an m-hyperedge containing other

s susceptible and i infected nodes at time t. With these definitions, $\theta_m(t)$ can be expressed as $\theta_m(t) = \sum_{(s,i)\in\Omega} \Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}(t)$, where $\Omega = \{(s,i) \mid 0 \leq s+i \leq m\}$ is the set of all possible combinations of s susceptible and i infected members of an $m\text{-}\mathrm{hyperedge}.$ The variables $\Phi^{(m)}_{s,i}(t)$ are thus used to describe the progression of the epidemics within mhyperedges, transitioning from fully susceptible to fully infected states. It is worth stressing that their dynamics directly depend on the inter-order overlap $\alpha^{(m,n)}$, which contributes to the progression of infection within hyperedges-in addition to contagion events originating from groups of different orders. Henceforth, for simplicity, we omit the obvious time dependence. The evolution of θ_m depends on the probability that u is not infected by any of the m-hyperedges, as given by $\dot{\theta}_m = -\beta_m \Phi_{0,m}^{(m)}$. Let us now leverage the formalism of probability generating function (PGFs) [44, 45] to account for the fact that a node can take part of different hyperedges with a probability distribution $P(k_m)$. The PGF of order m reads

$$G_m(\theta_m) = \sum_{k_m=0}^{\infty} P(k_m) \theta_m^{k_m}.$$
 (2)

Given that, and assuming independence among orders of interaction, the probability of having a given susceptible population at time t is given by $\langle S \rangle = \prod_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{k_m} P(k_m) \theta_m^{k_m}$. In contrast to classical SIR dynamics on dyadic networks, here we can disentangle the contribution of each interaction order to the overall epidemic. Hence, differentiating Eq. (2), disaggregated by order, and accounting for recovery, leads to

$$\langle I_m \rangle = -G'_m(\theta_m)\dot{\theta}_m - \mu \langle I_m \rangle.$$
 (3)

Finally, the total density of infected and recovered population at time t is, respectively, $\langle I \rangle = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \langle I_m \rangle$ and $\langle R \rangle = 1 - \langle S \rangle - \langle I \rangle$. To fully appreciate and explicitly show all the components of the GBCM, we restrict our analysis to interactions up to order $m \leq 2$ (see Appendix for a general formulation up to any order M). In this case, the interorder hyperedge overlap introduced in Eq. (1) is captured by a single value, $\alpha^{(1,2)}$. To simplify the notation, we define $G(\theta_1) \equiv G_1(\theta_1), H(\theta_2) \equiv G_2(\theta_2),$ and $\alpha \equiv \alpha^{(1,2)}$. Similarly, we also redefine $\phi_S \equiv \Phi_{1,0}^{(1)}, \phi_I \equiv \Phi_{0,1}^{(1)}, \phi_{SI} \equiv \Phi_{1,1}^{(2)},$ and $\phi_{II} \equiv \Phi_{0,2}^{(2)}$. We now have a single parameter of interest, α , quantifying the extent to which 2-body interactions are contained within 3-body interactions. Under these assumptions, the resulting system of coupled equations for the group-based approximation with M = 2 is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{1} &= -\beta_{1}\phi_{I}; \quad \theta_{2} = -\beta_{2}\phi_{II}, \\
\phi_{I} &= B_{1}\phi_{S} - (\beta_{1} + \mu)\phi_{I} - 2\alpha\beta_{1}\phi_{II}, \\
\phi_{SI} &= 2B_{2}\phi_{SS} - (B_{2} + \mu)\phi_{SI} - 2\alpha\beta_{1}\phi_{SI}, \\
\phi_{II} &= B_{2}\phi_{SI} - (\beta_{2} + 2\mu)\phi_{II} + \alpha\beta_{1}(\phi_{SI} - 2\phi_{II}),
\end{aligned}$$
(4)

where $\phi_S = G'(\theta_1)H(\theta_2)/\langle k_1 \rangle$ and $\phi_{SS} = (G(\theta_1)H'(\theta_2)/\langle k_2 \rangle)^2$, with $\langle k_m \rangle = \sum_{k_m} k_m P(k_m)$, corresponding to the first derivative of the PGF, defined




FIG. 2. The role of inter-order hyperedge overlap. Epidemic thresholds in the (λ_1, λ_2) plane predicted by the GBCM, Eq. (14): (a) for simplicial complexes ($\alpha = 1$) in Table I; (b) for Erdős-Rényi hypergraphs with different α values. (c) Epidemic threshold λ_1^* as a function of α (fixed $\lambda_2 = 3$) for the three classes of hypergraphs. (d)-(f) Comparison of the final epidemic size \mathcal{R}_{∞} from the GBCM model (lines) and simulations (markers) on ER hypergraphs with N = 10,000 nodes, for different α . In (d) we show \mathcal{R}_{∞} against λ_1 for different overlap values. In (e) and (f), we consider the extreme cases $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$ and show \mathcal{R}_{∞} disaggregated by contributions from 1- and 2-hyperedges. In all cases, $\mu = 1$.

in Eq. (2), when $\theta_m(t) = 1$. Moreover, B_1 and B_2 in Eq. (4) represent the rate of infection from external 1- and 2-hyperedges, respectively (see Appendix for their detailed expressions). Notice how α appears explicitly in the equations for the evolution of ϕ_I , ϕ_{SI} and ϕ_{II} . In particular, the term $-2\alpha\beta_1\phi_{SI}$ accounts for the potential infections coming from pairwise interactions nested within 2-hyperedges—with similar arguments for the other terms involving α . The ability of the formalism to capture both independent contributions from different orders and their interplay (through α) is exemplified in Fig. 1(a). In Fig. 1(b), we validate our approach by comparing the final epidemic size (\mathcal{R}_{∞}) predicted by the GBCM with average values of 500 Gillespie simulations over different higher-order networks, both featuring $\alpha = 1$ (i.e., simplicial complexes). The structures used to run simulations exhibit scale-free (SF) and Erdős-Rényi-like (ER) degree distributions at both orders m = 1 and m = 2, with their characteristics summarized in Table I. The ER simplicial complex was generated following the methodology in [6], while the SF one was constructed using the model in [46]. In both cases, the GBCM predictions show excellent agreement with the simulated results, demonstrating the capability of the model to capture the behavior of systems with higher-order interactions.

The role of inter-order hyperedge overlap.—Here, we study the stability of the disease-free state of the system in Eqs. (4) by evaluating the Jacobian around the disease-free

Higher-order networks	$\langle k_1 \rangle$	$\langle k_1^2 \rangle$	$\langle k_2 \rangle$	$\langle k_2^2 \rangle$
Regular	6.00	42.00	1.00	2.00
Erdős Rényi	11.83	169.51	2.90	14.30
Scale-Free	11.98	649.76	9.00	610.10

TABLE I. Characteristics of different higher-order networks considered in the study, where $\langle k_1 \rangle$ and $\langle k_2 \rangle$ denote the mean generalized degrees of pairwise and higher-order interactions, respectively, while $\langle k_1^2 \rangle$ and $\langle k_2^2 \rangle$ are the second moments of the degree distributions.

steady state $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \phi_I, \phi_{SI}, \phi_{II}) = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$. We rescale the infectivity parameters for both orders as $\lambda_1 = \langle k_1 \rangle \beta_1 / \mu$ and $\lambda_2 = \langle k_2 \rangle \beta_2 / \mu$. Despite the complexity of the model, it is possible to find an analytical expression for the epidemic threshold, revealing its explicit dependence on the interplay between structural overlap and heterogeneity of the degree distributions. This, in turn, allows us to map the critical relationship between λ_1 and λ_2 at the epidemic threshold (see Appendix for the exact analytical expression). This is explored in Fig. 2(a), where we plot the epidemic threshold in the (λ_1, λ_2) plane by numerically evaluating our analytical threshold on simplicial complexes ($\alpha = 1$) with three different levels of heterogeneity (as detailed in Table I). Dashed lines indicate $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1^c$, where $\lambda_2 \to \infty$, showing that no outbreak is possible if $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_1^c$, regardless of the value of λ_2 . Thus, the pairwise infection rate λ_1 plays a dominant role in determining the outbreak. In Fig. 2(b), we consider the case of ER hypergraphs with different levels of overlap, and we observe that increasing values of α consistently lower the epidemic threshold. To further explore the dependency of the epidemic threshold on α , we rearrange it as a third-order polynomial in λ_1 . The solution of this polynomial, λ_1^* , which represents the value of λ_1 at which an epidemic occurs, can be approximated using an asymptotic expansion for small α (see SM for details). This yields

$$\lambda_1^* \approx \ \frac{\langle k_1 \rangle^2}{\Delta_1} - \alpha \lambda_2 \frac{2 \langle k_1 \rangle^5 \langle k_2 \rangle}{\Delta_1^3 \left(2 \langle k_2 \rangle + \lambda_2 \right)},\tag{5}$$

where $\Delta_m = \Pi_m - \langle k_m \rangle$ and $\Pi_m = \langle k_m^2 \rangle - \langle k_m \rangle = \sum_{k_m} k_m (k_m - 1) P(k_m)$. The latter expression represents the second derivative of the PGF evaluated at $\theta_m(t) = 1$. It is worth noting that Δ_m represents the difference between the second and first derivatives of the PGF at $\theta_m(t) = 1$. This result highlights that stronger inter-order correlations ($\alpha > 0$) make the system more sensitive to outbreaks. Furthermore, for $\alpha \neq 0$, λ_1^* depends on the strength of higher-order interactions (λ_2), in agreement with recent findings [32, 37]. Additionally, Eq. (5) demonstrates that increasing heterogeneity in the pairwise degree distribution, captured by Δ_1 , reduces the influence of higher-order interactions on λ_1^* . The dependence of the exact epidemic threshold λ_1^* on α , evaluated numerically from the Jacobian matrix of the system in Eq.(4), is shown in Fig. 2(c) for $\lambda_2 = 3$ —where the case $\alpha = 0$ is reported as a dashed-dotted line for reference.

Next, we focus on the behavior of the final epidemic size. In Fig. 2(d)-(f), we compare the final epidemic sizes predicted by the GBCM with those obtained from the average of 500 simulations on ER hypergraphs with different values of α . To create a continuous spectrum of higher-order networks with varying inter-order overlap (α) ranging from 1 to 0, we rewired the layer of 1-hyperedges in the original ER simplicial complex, while preserving the initial degree distribution of 1-hyperedges and the structure of the 2-hyperedges (see SM for details on network generation and rewiring). In Fig.2(d), we observe that the GBCM accurately predicts the epidemic threshold, which depends on the level of inter-order




FIG. 3. Explosive behavior in SIR processes. (a) Final epidemic sizes (\mathcal{R}_{∞}) from GBCM predictions (solid lines) and Gillespie simulations (circles), showing excellent agreement. Panels (b)-(d) illustrate a double-transition process: (b)-(c) compare \mathcal{R}_{∞} for two levels of heterogeneity in 2-hyperedges, with (c) revealing continuous transitions at λ_1^* for pairwise interactions and abrupt transitions at $\hat{\lambda}_1$ driven by high heterogeneity. (d) Contribution of 2-hyperedges to \mathcal{R}_{∞} for $\Delta_2 \approx [100, 250, 600]$, demonstrating that higher heterogeneity amplifies abrupt epidemic growth. All panels above use $\lambda_2 = 6$. Panels (e)-(h) show the temporal evolution of total infected density (orange) and contributions from pairwise (blue, 1-HE) and three-body (red, 2-HE) interactions for $\Delta_2\,\approx\,100,$ with varying λ_2 , obtained from the GBCM. Panels (i)-(l) show the same for $\Delta_2 \approx 600$, highlighting abrupt dynamics dominated by higher-order interactions. Hypergraphs are generated with negative binomial degree distributions with $\alpha = 0$, as detailed in the main text.

overlap in the underlying higher-order networks. Namely, as shown before, with increasing values of α the epidemic starts earlier. Additionally, in Fig.2(e)-(f) we explicitly separate the contributions coming from contagions via 2- and 3-body interactions to the overall final epidemic size, for $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$, respectively. For $\alpha = 0$, the impact of three-body interactions is delayed, requiring a critical mass of total infections to initiate higher-order contagion. In contrast, for $\alpha = 1$, both pairwise and higher-order processes commence simultaneously at the critical value λ_1^* predicted by Eq. (14).

High heterogeneity of group interactions leads to explosive phenomena.-We now systematically analyze the impact of heterogeneity in higher-order interactions on the epidemic dynamics. Specifically, we investigate how variations in the degree distribution of higher-order interactions influence both the final epidemic size and the temporal evolution of the outbreak. We consider three synthetic hypergraphs, each composed by N = 10000 nodes, whose pairwise (1-hyperedge) and three-body (2-hyperedge) interactions are modeled with uncorrelated negative binomial hyperdegree distributions [47]. This allows to independently tune the variance of the 2-hyperdegree distribution while keeping the mean degrees fixed. The mean pairwise degree is $\langle k_1 \rangle = 20$ with $\langle k_1^2 \rangle = 327$. For three-body interactions, we study three scenarios with $\langle k_2 \rangle = 9$ and varying heterogeneity, which, for simplicity, we indicate in terms of the difference between the second and first derivative of the PGF at $\theta_2(t) = 1$, namely $\Delta_2 \approx [100, 250, 600]$ (see SM for more details). Since generalized degree distributions are uncorrelated, the inter-order overlap is zero ($\alpha = 0$) in all cases. Figure 3(a) shows the final epidemic size as a function of λ_1 for three levels of 4

heterogeneity in $P(k_2)$, where predictions from the GBCM are compared to averages from 500 simulations, for $\lambda_2 = 6$ $(\beta_2 \approx 0.66)$. Again, the GBCM accurately reproduces the system's behavior across all scenarios. Notably, as heterogeneity increases, epidemic transitions changes, leading to more abrupt growth in \mathcal{R}_{∞} . Figures 3(b) and 3(c) further decompose the contributions of 1- and 2-hyperedges to the final epidemic size for $\Delta_2\,\approx\,250$ and $\Delta_2\,\approx\,600.$ In both cases, a double transition occurs due to $\alpha = 0$. At λ_1^* , corresponding to the epidemic threshold derived from Eq. (14), the system exhibits a continuous transition primarily driven by 1hyperedges. However, as shown in Fig. 3(b), a secondary shift in the final epidemic size occurs at λ_1 , reflecting outbreaks driven by 2-hyperedges. In contrast, Fig. 3(c) reveals hybrid transitions for $\Delta_2 \approx 600$, where abrupt changes in the contribution from 2-hyperedges dominate the dynamics. Finally, Fig. 3(d) highlights the role of heterogeneity in driving explosive phenomena. As Δ_2 increases, the growth of \mathcal{R}_{∞} driven by 2-hyperedges becomes progressively more abrupt.

Characterizing the temporal evolution.-We are now interested in exploring the behavior of the system through the temporal evolution of the epidemic. We fix the pairwise infectivity to $\lambda_1 = 1$, while varying varying λ_2 , and we follow the prevalence ρ in time, accounting for the contributions to the infections coming from the different orders. Figure 3 shows the curves for the total prevalence (orange) and contributions from pairwise (blue) and three-body (red) interactions obtained from the GBCM. For $\Delta_2 \approx 100$ [(e)-(h)], the growth of infections in 2-hyperedges is delayed until a critical mass of infections from pairwise interactions is reached. By contrast, higher values of $\Delta_2 \approx 600$ [(i)-(l)] lead to an abrupt increase in prevalence as higher-order interactions amplify the dynamics. Notably, in Figs. 3(k)-(1), the rapid growth in infections is driven by 2-hyperedges, which are triggered when pairwise interactions excheed a critical mass. It turns out that the equation governing the density of infected individuals through 2hyperedges, given by $\langle I_2 \rangle = -H'(\theta_2)\theta_2 - \mu \langle I_2 \rangle$, provides an intuitive explanation for explosive phenomena and how these are driven by heterogeneity. Our analysis focuses on identifying the conditions under which an abrupt change, or explosion, occurs in the temporal evolution of $\langle I_2 \rangle$ at a specific time $\hat{t} > 0$, which also coincides with high values of $\langle I_2 \rangle$ at and around this time point. This occurs when 2-hyperedges with two infectious nodes proliferate, and we assume that this corresponds to a peak in ϕ_{II} ($\hat{\phi}_{II}$), when $\dot{\phi}_{II} = 0$, at \hat{t} (see Eq. (4)). This can be solved to obtain ϕ_{II} , which then via equation $\dot{\theta}_2 = -\beta \phi_{II}$, can be substituted in Eq. (3) to obtain an approximate expression for $\langle I_2 \rangle$. This in turn leads to an explicit critical condition which, if satisfied, implies that $\langle I_2 \rangle \rightarrow \infty$. Rearranging this, leads to a condition for the critical value of $\hat{\lambda}_2$ as given below

$$\hat{\lambda}_2 \approx \frac{2\langle k_2 \rangle^2 \left(\langle k_1 \rangle + \alpha \lambda_1\right)}{\langle k_1 \rangle \left(\Delta_2 \hat{\phi}_{SI} + \langle k_2 \rangle (\hat{\phi}_{SI} - 1)\right)},\tag{6}$$

where ϕ_{SI} represents the critical density of ϕ_{SI} required for




FIG. 4. Explosive behavior of SIR processes on real-world hypergraphs. Final epidemic sizes disaggregated by mode of contagion (via 1- or 2-hyperedges) for different values of λ_2 . Curves are averaged over 500 simulations on an empirical hypergraph of social contacts at University ($\alpha = 1$). (a) For $\lambda_2 = 5$, the system exhibits continuous transitions, consistent with classical SIR models on networks. (b) For $\lambda_2 = 20$, an abrupt transition emerges, driven by the contagion process on 2-hyperedges, highlighting the role of higherorder interactions in shaping epidemic dynamics.

infection propagation through 2-hyperedges, constrained by $\epsilon \leq \hat{\phi}_{SI} \leq 1$. Eq.(6) represents the condition at which the growth of the density of infections through 2-hyperedges tends to infinity (See SM for the detailed derivation).

For $t < \hat{t}$, the dynamics of ϕ_{SI} are dominated by pairwise interactions, resulting in $\theta_2 \approx 0$. However, at $t \geq 0$ \hat{t} , higher-order interactions start to dominate, leading to an abrupt change in the temporal evolution. This marks a critical transition where the dynamics shift from being almost exclusively pairwise-driven to a regime where the higher-order infection shapes the onset of the epidemic outbreak. Furthermore, Eq. (6) shows that in case of $\alpha = 0$, i.e., uncorrelated sets of 1- and 2-hyperedges, the onset of explosive behavior depends exclusively on Δ_2 . Higher values of Δ_2 reduce λ_2 , making explosive behavior more likely, whereas lower Δ_2 suppresses such phenomena by increasing $\hat{\lambda}_2$. However, due to the inherent analytical complexity of the GBCM and implicit dependencies in the dynamical variables, an exact closed-form solution for ϕ_{SI} is not analytically feasible. Despite this, Eq. (6) provides an important explanation of the role of heterogeneity in the three-body interactions, both from a structural and dynamical viewpoint.

Explosive behavior in real-world hypergraphs.— We now examine epidemic dynamics on an empirical hypergraph constructed using contact data between university students collected by the Copenhagen Network Study [48] and processed as in [31]. The obtained structure is a hypergraph with maximal inter-order hyperedge overlap (simplicial complex), $\alpha =$ 1, with $\langle k_1 \rangle \approx 23$, $\langle k_1^2 \rangle \approx 740$, $\langle k_2 \rangle \approx 23$ and $\langle k_2^2 \rangle \approx 1300$ (see SM for more details). In Fig. 4, we show the final epidemic sizes averaged over 500 simulations for two values of λ_2 : panel (a) corresponds to $\lambda_2 = 5$ ($\beta_2 \approx 0.2$), and panel (b) corresponds to $\lambda_2 = 20$ ($\beta_2 \approx 0.8$). Remarkably, for sufficiently high values of λ_2 , an abrupt transition in \mathcal{R}_{∞} emerges, driven by the contributions of 2-hyperedges. Due to the maximal overlap between 1- and 2-hyperedges ($\alpha = 1$), the epidemic process on both interaction types initiates simultaneously at λ_1^* . This phenomenon aligns with the predictions from the GBCM. For a comprehensive study involving realworld datasets, including the detailed procedure for hypergraph construction from these data, and an in-depth comparison with GBCM predictions, we refer the reader to the SM.

Conclusions.—We introduced a mean-field framework for irreversible epidemic processes on higher-order networks, able to capture the effects of heterogeneity in degree distributions and correlations between interactions of different orders. Focusing on 2- and 3-body interactions, our model accurately captures the influence of groups and reveals that higher inter-order overlap increases epidemic sensitivity, though hindered by high levels of heterogeneity on pairwise connectivity. We also predict and validate the emergence of explosive temporal outbreaks, driven by strong higher-order interactions and high levels of degree heterogeneity in group membership, which provide a pathway leading to the well-studied abrupt phase transitions observed in epidemic processes on higher-order networks [6, 17, 19, 36, 49–51].

These findings, supported by Gillespie simulations on synthetic and empirical hypergraphs, show the impact of higherorder interactions on irreversible contagion processes and highlight the importance of structural and dynamical correlations in shaping epidemic behavior. More in general, our approach provides the foundation for the development of more sophisticated ways to capture key structural features proper of real-world systems, that could be further extended to account for their dynamic [52] and temporal [53, 54] nature, or to access their impact on multiple interacting processes [55–57].

Acknowledgments.— Authors acknowledge useful discussion with Joel C. Miller on the capabilities and features of the edge-based compartmental model.

Appendix A: Group-based approximation modeling up to order M.— We consider a Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) process with higher-order interactions of size $m = 1, \ldots, M$. Each order m has an associated infection rate β_m , which represents the rate at which a susceptible node becomes infected when connected to an m-hyperedge where all m neighbors are infected. The recovery rate is given by μ .

To describe the infection dynamics in a general way, we define $\theta_m(t)$ as the probability that a test node u has not been infected by any of the m nodes connected to it through an m-hyperedge at time t. If the test node u is connected to k_m m-hyperedges, the probability that u has not received the disease via an m-hyperedge is $\theta_m(t)^{k_m}$. Using the probability generating function (PGF) $G_m(x)$ of the m-hyperedge degree distribution, the probability that a randomly chosen node has not received the disease via any m-hyperedge is given by $G_m(\theta_m(t)) = \sum_{k_m=0}^{\infty} P(k_m)\theta_m(t)^{k_m}$. The probability of a node being susceptible at time t is the product of these probabilities across all orders of interaction, which corresponds to the average susceptible population:

$$\langle S(t) \rangle = \prod_{m=1}^{M} G_m(\theta_m(t)) = \prod_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_m(k) \theta_m(t)^k.$$
 (7)

If a test node u is in an m-hyperedge containing s susceptible, i infected, and m - (s+i) recovered neighbors, the probability that u remains uninfected through this m-hyperedge is

defined as $\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}(t)$. Thus, $\theta_m(t)$ can be decomposed as:

The temporal evolution of $\theta_m(t)$ is governed by:

$$\dot{\theta}_m(t) = -\beta_m \Phi_{0,m}^{(m)}(t),$$
(9)

$$\theta_m(t) = \sum_{(s,i)\in\Omega} \Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}(t), \tag{8}$$

where $\Omega = \{(s,i) \mid 0 \le s+i \le m\}$. For example, $\Phi_{1,3}^{(5)}(t)$ represents the probability that a test node is in a 5-hyperedge with 1 susceptible, 3 infected, and 1 recovered neighbor, and has not being infected up to time t.

since infections through an *m*-hyperedge occur only when all its *m* neighbors are infected. The evolution of $\Phi_{0,m}^{(m)}(t)$ depends on transitions between all $\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}$ states in Ω . These transitions are influenced by external infections, internal infections, and recoveries, leading to recursive dependencies.

At the start of the epidemic, $\theta_m(t) \approx \Phi_{m,0}^{(m)}(t) \approx 1$ for m > 1. Transitions from $\Phi_{m,0}^{(m)}$ to $\Phi_{m-1,1}^{(m)}$ occur due to external infections, where a susceptible neighbor of u becomes infected through another group. The rate of external infections for an m-hyperedge, denoted B_m , can be expressed as:

$$B_m = -\frac{G_m''(\theta_m) \prod_{n \neq m} G_n(\theta_n) \dot{\theta}_m + \sum_{n \neq m} G_m'(\theta_m) G_n'(\theta_n) \prod_{p \neq m, n} G_p(\theta_p) \dot{\theta}_n}{G_m'(\theta_m) \prod_{n \neq m} G_n(\theta_n)}.$$
(10)

The probabilities $\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}$ are treated as compartments, and the transitions between them are described by a set of differential equations. For a generic probability $\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}$, the rate of change $\dot{\Phi}_{s,i}^{(m)}$ accounts for eight terms: four increasing (external infection, internal infection, and recovery) and four decreasing

(infection of a susceptible neighbor or the test node itself, and recovery of an infected neighbor). For some $\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}$, certain terms may not apply, depending on the states.

Considering these transitions, the differential equation for $\dot{\Phi}^{(m)}_{s,i}$ is:

$$\dot{\Phi}_{s,i}^{(m)} = -sB_m\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)} - \sum_{j=1}^i s\binom{i}{j}\alpha_{j,m}\beta_j\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)} - \delta_{i,0}^*\sum_{j=1}^i \binom{i}{j}\alpha_{j,m}\beta_j\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)} - \delta_{i,m}\delta_{M,m}^*\sum_{k=m+1}^M\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}(k-j+1)\alpha_{j,k}\beta_j\Phi_{0,k}^{(k)} - \mu i\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)} + (s+1)B_m\Phi_{s+1,i-1}^{(m)} + \delta_{s+i,m}^*\mu(i+1)\Phi_{s,i+1}^{(m)} + \delta_{i,0}^*\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}(s+1)\binom{i-1}{j}\alpha_{jm}\beta_j\Phi_{s+1,i-1}^{(m)},$$
(11)

where $\alpha_{i,j}$ is the inter-order overlap between *i*- and *j*-hyperedges, $\delta_{i,j}$ represents the Kronecker delta and $\delta_{i,j}^* = (1 - \delta_{i,j})$.

The system is solved numerically using the following equations:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} = -\beta \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{I},$$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{B}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(2)} \dots \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(M)}),$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}^{(M)} = \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{B}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(2)} \dots \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(M)})),$$
(12)

where we used the following notations $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2 ... \beta_M)$, $\boldsymbol{B} = (B_1, B_2 ... B_M)$, $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2 ... \theta_M)$, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_I = (\Phi_{0,1}^{(1)}, \Phi_{0,2}^{(2)} ... \Phi_{0,M}^{(M)})$ and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(m)}$ represents the set of $\Phi_{s,i}^{(m)}$ such that $(s, i) \in \Omega$. Appendix B: Derivation of the epidemic threshold for M = 2.— To derive the epidemic threshold for the GBCM in the case of M = 2, we consider the system in Eqs.(4). Here, B_1 and B_2 represent the rates of infection to a susceptible node connected to the test node u through 1-hyperedges and 2-hyperedges, respectively. From Eq. (10), they are defined as:

$$B_{1} = -\frac{G''(\theta_{1})H(\theta_{2})\theta_{1} + H'(\theta_{2})G'(\theta_{1})\theta_{1}}{G'(\theta_{1})H(\theta_{2})},$$

$$B_{2} = -\frac{G'(\theta_{1})H'(\theta_{2})\dot{\theta}_{1} + G(\theta_{1})H''(\theta_{2})\dot{\theta}_{2}}{G(\theta_{1})H'(\theta_{2})}.$$
(13)

To assess the stability of the system, we substitute the equations for $\dot{\theta_1}$ and $\dot{\theta_2}$ given by Eqs. (4) and evaluate the Jacobian matrix of the system around the disease-free equilibrium $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \phi_I, \phi_{SI}, \phi_{II}) = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0)$. By considering the free term in the characteristic polynomial of the Jacobian

matrix, we derive the epidemic threshold as

$$\lambda_{2} = \frac{2\langle k_{2}\rangle^{2} \left[(\langle k_{1}\rangle + \alpha\lambda_{1}) \left(\langle k_{1}\rangle + 2\alpha\lambda_{1} \right) \left(\langle k_{1}\rangle^{2} - \lambda_{1}\Delta_{1} \right) - \Pi_{1}(\langle k_{1}\rangle - 1)\langle k_{1}\rangle^{2}\lambda_{1} + 2\alpha^{2}\langle k_{1}\rangle^{4}\lambda_{1}^{3} \right]}{\langle k_{1}\rangle \left[\langle k_{1}\rangle^{3}\langle k_{2}\rangle - \langle k_{1}\rangle\langle k_{2}\rangle\Delta_{1}\lambda_{1} - 2\langle k_{1}\rangle^{2}\Delta_{2}\alpha\lambda_{1} + 2\left[\Omega_{1,2} - 2\left(\langle k_{1}\rangle\Pi_{2} + \langle k_{2}\rangle\Pi_{1} \right)\right]\alpha\lambda_{1}^{2} \right]},$$
(14)

where $\Pi_m = \langle k_m^2 \rangle - \langle k_m \rangle = \sum_{k_m} k_m (k_m - 1) P(k_m)$ represents the second derivative of the PGF evaluated at $\theta_m(t) = 1$. Additionally, $\Delta_m = \Pi_m - \langle k_m \rangle$ captures the difference between the second and first derivatives of the PGF at $\theta_m(t) = 1$, and $\Omega_{m,n} = \langle k_m^2 \rangle \langle k_n^2 \rangle - \langle k_m \rangle^2 \langle k_n \rangle^2$. The detailed calculations are provided in the Supplementary Material (SM).

Appendix C: Derivation of the Condition for Explosive Dynamics for M = 2.— Here, we provide a detailed derivation of the condition in Eq. (7) of the main text, which represents the critical point at which the system exhibits an abrupt change in the temporal evolution of the infected densities, occurring at time \hat{t} .

We begin with the equation governing the density ϕ_{II} , as provided in Eq. (4) of the main text:

$$\phi_{II} = B_2 \phi_{SI} - (\beta_2 + 2\mu) \phi_{II} + \alpha \beta_1 (\phi_{SI} - 2\phi_{II}).$$
(15)

Assuming that the peak of ϕ_{II} occurs at time \hat{t} , where $\dot{\phi}_{II} = 0$, we solve for the peak value $\hat{\phi}_{II}$:

$$\hat{\phi}_{II} = \frac{\hat{\phi}_{SI} \left(G(\theta_1) \langle k_2 \rangle \alpha \beta_1 - G'(\theta_1) H'(\theta_2) \dot{\theta}_1 \right)}{G(\theta_1) \left[\langle k_2 \rangle \left(2\alpha \beta_1 + \beta_2 + 2\mu \right) - H''(\theta_2) \beta_2 \hat{\phi}_{SI} \right]},\tag{16}$$

where $\hat{\phi}_{SI}$ represents the density of ϕ_{SI} at $t = \hat{t}$. This quantity corresponds to the critical density required for infection propagation through 2-hyperedges and is constrained by $\epsilon \leq \hat{\phi}_{SI} \leq 1$.

For $t < \hat{t}$, the dynamics of ϕ_{SI} are dominated by pairwise interactions, leading to $\dot{\theta}_2 \approx 0$. Consequently, $\theta_2 \approx 1$, implying $H'(\theta_2) \rightarrow \langle k_2 \rangle$ and $H''(\theta_2) \rightarrow \Pi_2$. Additionally, we assume $\langle I_2 \rangle \approx 0$ for $t < \hat{t}$. At $t \ge \hat{t}$, higher-order interactions begin to dominate, resulting in an abrupt change in the temporal evolution of the system.

The temporal evolution of the density of nodes infected through 2-hyperedges is governed by:

$$\langle I_2 \rangle = -H'(\theta_2)\dot{\theta}_2 - \mu \langle I_2 \rangle. \tag{17}$$

At $t = \hat{t}$, substituting $\dot{\theta}_2 = -\beta_2 \hat{\phi}_{II}$ and the assumptions for $H'(\theta_2)$, $H''(\theta_2)$ and $\langle I_2 \rangle \approx 0$ for $t < \hat{t}$, we find:

$$\langle \dot{I}_2 \rangle \approx \frac{\langle k_2 \rangle \beta_2 \hat{\phi}_{SI} \left(G(\theta_1) \langle k_2 \rangle \alpha \beta_1 - G'(\theta_1) \langle k_2 \rangle \dot{\theta}_1 \right)}{G(\theta_1) \left[\langle k_2 \rangle \left(2\alpha \beta_1 + \beta_2 + 2\mu \right) - \Pi_2 \beta_2 \hat{\phi}_{SI} \right]}.$$
 (18)

The condition for explosive growth is defined by $\langle I_2 \rangle \rightarrow \infty$, leading to:

$$2\langle k_2 \rangle \alpha \beta_1 + \langle k_2 \rangle \beta_2 + 2\langle k_2 \rangle \mu - \Pi_2 \beta_2 \phi_{SI} = 0.$$
 (19)

Rewriting this condition in terms of the rescaled infectivities $\lambda_1 = \langle k_1 \rangle \beta_1 / \mu$ and $\lambda_2 = \langle k_2 \rangle \beta_2 / \mu$, we obtain the critical value $\hat{\lambda}_2$:

$$\hat{\lambda}_2 \approx \frac{2\langle k_2 \rangle^2 \left(\langle k_1 \rangle + \alpha \lambda_1\right)}{\langle k_1 \rangle \left(\Pi_2 \hat{\phi}_{SI} - \langle k_2 \rangle\right)}.$$
(20)

By expressing Π_2 in terms of $\Delta_2 = \Pi_2 - \langle k_2 \rangle$, the critical condition becomes:

$$\hat{\lambda}_2 \approx \frac{2\langle k_2 \rangle^2 \left(\langle k_1 \rangle + \alpha \lambda_1\right)}{\langle k_1 \rangle \left(\Delta_2 \hat{\phi_{SI}} + \langle k_2 \rangle (\hat{\phi}_{SI} - 1)\right)}, \qquad (21)$$

which corresponds to Eq. (7) of the main text.

- Damon Centola and Michael Macy. Complex contagions and the weakness of long ties. *American journal of Sociology*, 113(3):702–734, 2007.
- [2] Nathan O Hodas and Kristina Lerman. The simple rules of social contagion. *Scientific reports*, 4(1):4343, 2014.
- [3] Federico Battiston, Giulia Cencetti, Iacopo Iacopini, Vito Latora, Maxime Lucas, Alice Patania, Jean-Gabriel Young, and Giovanni Petri. Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics. *Physics reports*, 874:1–92, 2020.
- [4] Leo Torres, Ann S Blevins, Danielle Bassett, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. The why, how, and when of representations for complex systems. *SIAM Review*, 63(3):435–485, 2021.
- [5] Christian Bick, Elizabeth Gross, Heather A Harrington, and Michael T Schaub. What are higher-order networks? *SIAM Review*, 65(3):686–731, 2023.
- [6] Iacopo Iacopini, Giovanni Petri, Alain Barrat, and Vito Latora. Simplicial models of social contagion. *Nature communications*, 10(1):2485, 2019.
- [7] Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda, Alberto Aleta, and Yamir Moreno. Contagion dynamics on higher-order networks. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 6(8):468–482, 2024.
- [8] Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda, Giovanni Petri, Pablo Martin Rodriguez, and Yamir Moreno. Multistability, intermittency, and hybrid transitions in social contagion models on hypergraphs. *Nature communications*, 14(1):1375, 2023.
- [9] Takuma Tanaka and Toshio Aoyagi. Multistable attractors in a network of phase oscillators with three-body interactions. *Physical Review Letters*, 106(22):224101, 2011.
- [10] Ana P Millán, Joaquín J Torres, and Ginestra Bianconi. Explosive higher-order kuramoto dynamics on simplicial complexes. *Physical Review Letters*, 124(21):218301, 2020.
- [11] Per Sebastian Skardal and Alex Arenas. Higher order interactions in complex networks of phase oscillators promote abrupt synchronization switching. *Communications Physics*, 3(1):218, 2020.

- [12] U. Alvarez-Rodriguez, F. Battiston, G.F. de Arruda, Y. Moreno, M. Perc, and V. Latora. Evolutionary dynamics of higher-order interactions in social networks. *Nat Hum Behav*, 5:586, 2021.
- [13] Andrea Civilini, Nejat Anbarci, and Vito Latora. Evolutionary game model of group choice dilemmas on hypergraphs. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 127:268301, Dec 2021.
- [14] Andrea Civilini, Onkar Sadekar, Federico Battiston, Jesús Gómez-Gardeñes, and Vito Latora. Explosive cooperation in social dilemmas on higher-order networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 132(16):167401, 2024.
- [15] Jiachao Guo, Yao Meng, and Aming Li. Evolutionary game dynamics for higher-order interactions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06411, 2025.
- [16] Fernando E Rosas, Pedro AM Mediano, Andrea I Luppi, Thomas F Varley, Joseph T Lizier, Sebastiano Stramaglia, Henrik J Jensen, and Daniele Marinazzo. Disentangling high-order mechanisms and high-order behaviours in complex systems. *Nature Physics*, 18(5):476–477, 2022.
- [17] Federico Battiston, Enrico Amico, Alain Barrat, Ginestra Bianconi, Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda, Benedetta Franceschiello, Iacopo Iacopini, Sonia Kéfi, Vito Latora, Yamir Moreno, et al. The physics of higher-order interactions in complex systems. *Nature Physics*, 17(10):1093–1098, 2021.
- [18] Ginestra Bianconi. *Higher-order networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [19] Christian Kuehn and Christian Bick. A universal route to explosive phenomena. *Science advances*, 7(16):eabe3824, 2021.
- [20] Iacopo Iacopini, Giovanni Petri, Andrea Baronchelli, and Alain Barrat. Group interactions modulate critical mass dynamics in social convention. *Communications Physics*, 5(1):64, 2022.
- [21] Per Sebastian Skardal, Sabina Adhikari, and Juan G Restrepo. Multistability in coupled oscillator systems with higher-order interactions and community structure. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 33(2), 2023.
- [22] Yuanzhao Zhang, Per Sebastian Skardal, Federico Battiston, Giovanni Petri, and Maxime Lucas. Deeper but smaller: Higher-order interactions increase linear stability but shrink basins. *Science Advances*, 10(40):eado8049, 2024.
- [23] Hanlin Sun, Filippo Radicchi, Jürgen Kurths, and Ginestra Bianconi. The dynamic nature of percolation on networks with triadic interactions. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):1308, 2023.
- [24] Guillaume St-Onge, Hanlin Sun, Antoine Allard, Laurent Hébert-Dufresne, and Ginestra Bianconi. Universal nonlinear infection kernel from heterogeneous exposure on higher-order networks. *Physical review letters*, 127(15):158301, 2021.
- [25] Soumen Majhi, Matjaž Perc, and Dibakar Ghosh. Dynamics on higher-order networks: A review. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 19(188):20220043, 2022.
- [26] Marco Mancastroppa, Iacopo Iacopini, Giovanni Petri, and Alain Barrat. Hyper-cores promote localization and efficient seeding in higher-order processes. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):6223, 2023.
- [27] Sagnik Nandy and Bhaswar B Bhattacharya. Degree heterogeneity in higher-order networks: Inference in the hypergraph β -model. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2024.
- [28] Jung-Ho Kim and K-I Goh. Higher-order components dictate higher-order contagion dynamics in hypergraphs. *Physical re*view letters, 132(8):087401, 2024.
- [29] Nicholas W Landry and Juan G Restrepo. The effect of heterogeneity on hypergraph contagion models. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 30(10), 2020.
- [30] Guillaume St-Onge, Iacopo Iacopini, Vito Latora, Alain Barrat, Giovanni Petri, Antoine Allard, and Laurent Hébert-Dufresne. Influential groups for seeding and sustaining nonlinear conta-

gion in heterogeneous hypergraphs. *Communications Physics*, 5(1):25, 2022.

- [31] Federico Malizia, Santiago Lamata-Otín, Mattia Frasca, Vito Latora, and Jesús Gómez-Gardeñes. Hyperedge overlap drives explosive transitions in systems with higher-order interactions. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):555, 2025.
- [32] Giulio Burgio, Sergio Gómez, and Alex Arenas. Triadic approximation reveals the role of interaction overlap on the spread of complex contagions on higher-order networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 132(7):077401, 2024.
- [33] Santiago Lamata-Otín, Federico Malizia, Vito Latora, Mattia Frasca, and Jesús Gómez-Gardeñes. Hyperedge overlap drives synchronizability of systems with higher-order interactions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.07366, 2025.
- [34] Yuanzhao Zhang, Maxime Lucas, and Federico Battiston. Higher-order interactions shape collective dynamics differently in hypergraphs and simplicial complexes. *Nature communications*, 14(1):1605, 2023.
- [35] Jihye Kim, Deok-Sun Lee, and K-I Goh. Contagion dynamics on hypergraphs with nested hyperedges. *Physical Review E*, 108(3):034313, 2023.
- [36] Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda, Michele Tizzani, and Yamir Moreno. Phase transitions and stability of dynamical processes on hypergraphs. *Communications Physics*, 4(1):24, 2021.
- [37] Federico Malizia, Luca Gallo, Mattia Frasca, Vito Latora, and Giovanni Russo. A pair-based approximation for simplicial contagion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10151, 2023.
- [38] Owen T Courtney and Ginestra Bianconi. Generalized network structures: The configuration model and the canonical ensemble of simplicial complexes. *Physical Review E*, 93(6):062311, 2016.
- [39] Allen Hatcher. Algebraic topology. 2002.
- [40] Romualdo Pastor-Satorras, Claudio Castellano, Piet Van Mieghem, and Alessandro Vespignani. Epidemic processes in complex networks. *Reviews of modern physics*, 87(3):925–979, 2015.
- [41] István Z Kiss, Joel C Miller, Péter L Simon, et al. Mathematics of epidemics on networks. *Cham: Springer*, 598(2017):31, 2017.
- [42] Joel C Miller, Anja C Slim, and Erik M Volz. Edge-based compartmental modelling for infectious disease spread. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 9(70):890–906, 2012.
- [43] Erik M Volz, Joel C Miller, Alison Galvani, and Lauren Ancel Meyers. Effects of heterogeneous and clustered contact patterns on infectious disease dynamics. *PLoS computational biology*, 7(6):e1002042, 2011.
- [44] Mark EJ Newman. Spread of epidemic disease on networks. *Physical review E*, 66(1):016128, 2002.
- [45] Joel C Miller. A primer on the use of probability generating functions in infectious disease modeling. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 3:192–248, 2018.
- [46] Kiriil Kovalenko, Irene Sendiña-Nadal, Nagi Khalil, Alex Dainiak, Daniil Musatov, Andrei M Raigorodskii, Karin Alfaro-Bittner, Baruch Barzel, and Stefano Boccaletti. Growing scale-free simplices. *Communications physics*, 4(1):43, 2021.
- [47] István Z Kiss, Eben Kenah, and Grzegorz A Rempała. Necessary and sufficient conditions for exact closures of epidemic equations on configuration model networks. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 87(2):36, 2023.
- [48] Piotr Sapiezynski, Arkadiusz Stopczynski, David Dreyer Lassen, and Sune Lehmann. Interaction data from the copenhagen networks study. *Scientific Data*, 6(1):315, 2019.
- [49] Joan T Matamalas, Sergio Gómez, and Alex Arenas. Abrupt phase transition of epidemic spreading in simplicial complexes.

Physical Review Research, 2(1):012049, 2020.

- [50] Alain Barrat, Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda, Iacopo Iacopini, and Yamir Moreno. Social contagion on higher-order structures. In *Higher-order systems*, pages 329–346. Springer, 2022.
- [51] Guilherme Ferraz de Arruda, Giovanni Petri, and Yamir Moreno. Social contagion models on hypergraphs. *Physical Review Research*, 2(2):023032, 2020.
- [52] Giulio Burgio, Guillaume St-Onge, and Laurent Hébert-Dufresne. Adaptive hypergraphs and the characteristic scale of higher-order contagions using generalized approximate master equations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11268, 2023.
- [53] Luca Gallo, Lucas Lacasa, Vito Latora, and Federico Battiston. Higher-order correlations reveal complex memory in temporal hypergraphs. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):4754, 2024.

- [54] Iacopo Iacopini, Márton Karsai, and Alain Barrat. The temporal dynamics of group interactions in higher-order social networks. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):7391, 2024.
- [55] Byungjoon Min and Maxi San Miguel. Competing contagion processes: Complex contagion triggered by simple contagion. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):10422, 2018.
- [56] Maxime Lucas, Iacopo Iacopini, Thomas Robiglio, Alain Barrat, and Giovanni Petri. Simplicially driven simple contagion. *Physical Review Research*, 5(1):013201, 2023.
- [57] Elsa Andres, Romualdo Pastor-Satorras, Michele Starnini, and Márton Karsai. Competition between simple and complex contagion on temporal networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.22115*, 2024.