

Network Models with Feedback

Network Modeling for Epidemics @ SISMID 2024

Module 8

Causes of Model Feedback

- Changes to the node set
 - Demographic churn (birth, death, migration)
 - Deaths and out-migration result in inactive nodes, which also dissolve edges
 - Births and in-migration result in newly active nodes, open for new edges
 - Sometimes, entry and exit from the epidemic-relevant network means something other than birth and death
 - e.g., initiation and cessation of sexual activity
 - We use the terms arrival and departure accordingly
- Changes to nodal attributes
 - Simulating from an ERGM involves evaluating current nodal attributes reference in formula
 - e.g., preferential mixing on age and disease status with absdiff and nodematch terms
 - These attributes may change over time, in different ways
- Broader temporal shifts in behavior or biology
 - Monotonic increases in sexual partnership rates
 - Social distancing!

Model Feedback

Models without Feedback



Models with Feedback



"Epidemic"* = biological, behavioral, demographic, etc., changes

"Built-in Epidemiology"



EpiModel Extensions



As social networks change in size (say, for instance, as a village of n = 5,000 nodes grows to n = 10,000 nodes), which of the following do you think is generally preserved?

Number of edges? e

Mean degree? 2e/n

Density? e/(n choose 2)

- Applying the coefficients as-is from a TERGM fit to a network of changing size will lead to preservation of density across time
- For one-mode networks, preserving mean degree instead requires a simple transformation of the edges coefficient in the formation model:

 $\Theta_{new} = \Theta_{old} + log(N_{old}) - log(N_{new})$

 Mathematically equivalent to partitioning the original edges term into an offset equal to *log(N)* and a residual, and then updating the offset as N changes

Relational Dissolution through Death

- We fit our dynamic network using static data, with a process for dissolving relationships governed by a coefficient derived from relational duration
- All of this was done in a context that contained no information about death another process that terminates relationships
- If we simply layer death on to our model (even with the size correction on the previous slide) we will see two measures drop down below the expected values we want:
 - Relationship durations
 - Number of relationships
- Some aspect of this might be desired...
 - If we could interview deceased people, we might find their past relationships to be shorter than those of the same birth cohort in our sample who are still alive
- ... but others are likely not

Relational Dissolution through Death

An approximate correct for this is:

- 1. Calculate dissolution coefficients as before (without considering death)
- 2. Estimate formation coefficients conditional on these dissolution coefficients
- 3. Calculate new dissolution coefficients that reflect the log-odds of a relationship sustaining conditional on both actors living, which equals:

$$\operatorname{logit}\left[1 - \frac{P(E_t) - P(N_t)}{P(\neg N_t)}\right]$$

where

- $P(E_t)$ = the overall probability of a tie dissolving at time *t* from any cause = 1/D
- $P(N_t)$ = the probability of either incident node dying at time t

When approximating the fit of a formation STERGM conditional on dissolution STERGM	subtract dissolution coefficients from corresponding formation ones (edapprox=TRUE)
When network size N changes and you want to preserve mean degree	add the <i>In</i> of the old N and subtract the <i>In</i> of the new N to the edges coefficient in the formation model (or equivalently, use an edges offset and update it with <i>In</i> of new N)
To adjust for node departures in simulating from a STERGM model estimated from a cross-sectional network and durations	$\operatorname{logit}\left[1 - \frac{P(E_t) - P(N_t)}{P(\neg N_t)}\right]$