

Approximating Network Dynamics in Compartmental System Dynamics Models

PJ Lamberson*

Over the past few decades, the field of “network science” has exploded in popularity. A fundamental tenant of this research is that network structure – who interacts with whom – matters for individual and collective outcomes (e.g. Watts and Strogatz, 1998; Newman, 2003; Burt, 2005). One criticism of compartmental system dynamics (CSD) models is the lack of an underlying network specifying the topological structure of interactions among individuals. Within compartments, individuals are assumed to be well-mixed, and the effect of this assumption can be substantial. For example, Rahmandad and Sterman (2008) show that for clustered network topologies the predicted dynamics of a standard contagion model differ significantly when simulated using an agent-based model (AB) versus a CSD. Despite this potential shortcoming, CSDs have many advantages over models with fully represented networks including computational efficiency, clarity of exposition, and more tractable analysis.

However, as this paper demonstrates, CSDs and networks are not mutually exclusive. We describe a framework developed primarily in theoretical biology, known as a *pair approximation* or *correlation model*, that can be readily implemented using standard CSD tools, thus retaining the speed, simplicity, and tractability of the CSD approach, while capturing a substantial portion of the effect of an underlying network structure. We illustrate the approach and its effectiveness using two examples, a standard SIS epidemiological model and a new model of social contagion that we call SIS2.

While the mathematics of the pair approximation have been substantially developed elsewhere (Keeling, Rand and Morris, 1997; Morris, 1997; Van Baalen, 2000), we see two important contributions of exploring this method in this special anniversary issue of the *System Dynamics Review*. First, for system dynamics modelers, this paper introduces a relatively simple method of capturing the sometimes important effects of network structure while maintaining the many benefits

*University of California, Los Angeles. lamberson@ucla.edu.

of the CSD methodology. Second, we believe that with this tool in hand, experts in CSD modeling will be able to make new contributions to understanding phenomenon where networks matter. To date, applications of the pair approximation approach have been largely confined to analytic models, and while the mathematical analysis of the pair approximation is substantially more tractable than analysis of fully represented networks, in all but the simplest models analytic solutions remain unobtainable. The simulation toolkit of CSDs is perfectly suited to expanding the range of dynamic systems that can be represented and analyzed with this approximation method.

The basic idea behind the pair approximation is to move from compartments that represent individuals in a given state to compartments that represent connected pairs of individuals in pairs of states. For example, in the standard SIS CSD, there are two compartments – S and I – representing the number of individuals in the population in the susceptible and infected states, respectively. In the pair approximation CSD, there are three compartments, SS , SI , and II representing connected susceptible-susceptible pairs, susceptible-infected pairs, and infected-infected pairs, respectively. Flows specify the rates of transitions between these pair types. As we show by comparing simulation results with CSD predictions from the standard SIS model and the pair approximation CSD, this modest increase in model complexity goes a long way towards closing the gap between the standard well-mixed CSD and the full blown AB simulation.

We then apply the pair approximation CSD to a new model of social contagion that we call SIS2. In this model, just as infected individuals can transmit an infection to susceptible individuals, susceptible individuals can “cure” their infected contacts. This model of two-way influence may be a more accurate representation of how social contagions, such as rumors (Sunstein, 2014), emotional states (Kramer, Guillory and Hancock, 2014), or political behavior (Bond, Fariss, Jones, Kramer, Marlow, Settle and Fowler, 2012) spread. As we show, in a standard CSD two-contagion is equivalent to one-way contagion with a reduced infectivity parameter. But using an AB, we demonstrate that in fact the dynamics of two-contagion are substantially different, and the pair approximation CSD accurately captures discrepancy.

References

Bond, Robert M, Christopher J Fariss, Jason J Jones, Adam DI Kramer, Cameron Marlow, Jaime E Settle, and James H Fowler, “A 61-million-

- person experiment in social influence and political mobilization,” *Nature*, 2012, 489 (7415), 295–298.
- Burt, Ronald S**, *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital*, Oxford university press, 2005.
- Keeling, M. J., D. A. Rand, and A. J. Morris**, “Correlation Models for Childhood Epidemics,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B*, 1997, 264, 1149–1156.
- Kramer, Adam DI, Jamie E Guillory, and Jeffrey T Hancock**, “Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2014, 111 (24), 8788–8790.
- Morris, Andrew John**, “Representing Spatial Interactions in Simple Ecological Models.” PhD dissertation, University of Warwick 1997.
- Newman, MEJ**, “The Structure and Function of Complex Networks,” *SIAM Review*, 2003, 45 (2), 167.
- Rahmandad, Hazhir and John Sterman**, “Heterogeneity and network structure in the dynamics of diffusion: Comparing agent-based and differential equation models,” *Management Science*, 2008, 54 (5), 998–1014.
- Sunstein, Cass R**, *On rumors: How falsehoods spread, why we believe them, and what can be done*, Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Van Baalen, Minus**, “Pair Approximations for Different Spatial Geometries,” in U Dieckmann, R Law, and J Metz, eds., *The Geometry of Ecological Interactions: Simplifying Spatial Complexity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 359–387.
- Watts, D.J. and S.H. Strogatz**, “Collective Dynamics of ‘Small-world’ Networks,” *Nature*, 1998, 393, 440–442.