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Abstract—We provide a dynamic policy for the rapid containment of a contagion process modeled as an SIS epidemic on a bounded degree undirected graph with \( n \) nodes. We show that if the budget \( r \) of curing resources available at each time is \( \Omega(W) \), where \( W \) is the CutWidth of the graph, and also of order \( \Omega(\log n) \), then the expected time until the extinction of the epidemic is of order \( O(n/r) \), which is within a constant factor from optimal, as well as sublinear in the number of nodes. Furthermore, if the CutWidth increases only sublinearly with \( n \), a sublinear expected time to extinction is possible with a sublinearly increasing budget \( r \).
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1 INTRODUCTION

MANY contagion processes over large networks can lead to costly cascades unless controlled by outside intervention. Examples include epidemics spreading over a population of individuals, viruses attacking a network of connected computers, or financial contagion in a network of banks. In this paper we study how this type of contagion can be prevented or contained by dynamically curing some of the infected nodes under a budget constraint on the amount of curing resources (curing budget) that can be deployed at each time.

More specifically, we consider a canonical SIS epidemic model on an undirected graph with \( n \) nodes, with a common infection rate along any edge that connects an infected and a healthy node, and node-specific curing rates \( \rho_v(t) \) at each node \( v \). The curing rates are to be chosen according to a curing policy which is based on the past history of the process and the network structure, subject to an upper bound on the total curing rate \( \sum_v \rho_v(t) \) at every time instant \( t \). Curing policies are evaluated in terms of the expected time it takes for the epidemic to become extinct, i.e., the process to reach the state where all nodes are healthy.

The main contribution of this paper is the construction of a policy for the dynamic control of epidemics. Our analysis involves the CutWidth of the underlying graph. Intuitively, the CutWidth measures the required budget of curing resources in a simpler deterministic curing problem, in which infected nodes are cured one at a time, subject to the constraint that the number of edges between healthy and infected nodes is at all times less than or equal to the budget of curing resources. Our policy, called from now on the CURE policy, possesses several desirable properties:

i) Assuming that the available curing resources are larger than a certain quantity that depends on several global characteristics of the underlying network (maximum degree and CutWidth) and considering the worst case where all nodes are initially infected, our policy is (order) optimal.

ii) When a strict subset of the nodes is initially infected our policy is (order) optimal with high probability if the available curing resources are larger than a certain quantity that depends on local properties of the set of initially infected nodes (“impedance”) and the maximum degree of the graph.

iii) In a companion paper [6], we show that for certain bounded degree graphs a contagion process cannot be rapidly contained, i.e., the expected time to extinction cannot be made sublinear in the number \( n \) of nodes using a sublinear curing budget at each time. Specifically we establish that if the CutWidth increases at least linearly with \( n \), then a sublinear (in \( n \)) expected time to extinction is impossible with such a sublinear budget \( r \). In this paper we prove that for graphs with bounded degree and sublinear CutWidth, a sublinear curing budget at each time is enough to guarantee sublinear extinction time. The combination of these two results provides a qualitative characterization of the best possible scaling of the extinction time in terms of the CutWidth.

Our policy is based on a combinatorial result which states the following. Given an initial set of infected nodes, nodes can be removed from that set, one at a time, in way that the maximum cut (number of edges) between healthy and infected nodes encountered during this process is upper bounded by the sum of the CutWidth of the graph and the cut associated with the initial set. Let us refer to the sequence of subsets encountered during this process as a target path. The main idea underlying our policy is to allocate the entire curing budget to appropriate nodes so that we stay most of
the time, with high probability, on or near the target path. We show that this is indeed possible, as long as the curing budget scales in proportion to the CutWidth. We also show that the policy is optimal (within a multiplicative constant) if the available budget at each time is also $\Omega(\log n)$.

A similar model, but in which the curing rate allocation is done stochastically (open-loop) has been studied in [3], [5], [8], [14], but the proposed methods were either heuristic or based on mean-field approximations of the evolution process. Closer to our work, the authors of [2] let the curing rates be proportional to the degree of each node, but independent of the current state of the network, which means that curing resources may be wasted on healthy nodes. On a graph with bounded degree, the policy in [2] achieves sublinear time to extinction, but requires a curing budget that is proportional to the number of nodes. In contrast, our policy achieves sublinear time to extinction, but requires a curing budget that is proportional to the number of nodes. In contrast, our policy achieves the same performance (sublinear time to extinction) for all bounded degree graphs with small CutWidth.

We define the cutwidth of a graph $G = (V, E)$ as the minimum number of vertices $|I|$ such that $G[V \setminus I]$ is disconnected. The cutwidth of $G$ is the minimum cutwidth over all possible removals of vertices from $G$. It is a measure of how difficult it is to disconnect a graph.

2. The Model

We consider a network, represented by a connected undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, where $V$ denotes the set of nodes and $E$ denotes the set of edges. We use $n$ to denote the number of nodes. Two nodes $u, v \in V$ are neighbors if $(u, v) \in E$. We denote by $\Delta$ the maximum of the node degrees.

We assume that the nodes in a set $I_0 \subseteq V$ are initially infected and that the infection spreads according to a controlled contact process where the rate at which infected nodes get cured is determined by a network controller. Specifically, each node can be in one of two states: infected or healthy. The controlled contact process—also known as the SIS epidemic model—on $G$ is a right-continuous, continuous-time Markov process $\{I_t \}_{t \geq 0}$ on the state space $\{0, 1\}^V$, where $I_t$ stands for the set of infected nodes at time $t$. We refer to $I_t$ as the infection process.

State transitions at each node occur independently according to the following dynamics.

a) The process is initialized at the given initial state $I_0$.

b) If a node $v$ is healthy, i.e., if $v \notin I_t$, the transition rate associated with a change of the state of that node to being infected is equal to an infection rate $\beta$ times the number of infected neighbors of $v$, that is,

$$\beta \cdot |\{(u, v) \in E : u \in I_t\}|,$$

where we use $|\cdot|$ to denote the cardinality of a set. By rescaling time, we can and will assume throughout the paper that $\beta = 1$.

c) If a node $v$ is infected, i.e., if $v \in I_t$, the transition rate associated with a change of the state of that node to being healthy is equal to a curing rate $\rho_v(t)$ that is determined by the network controller, as a function of the current and past states of the process. We are assuming here that the network controller has access to the entire past evolution of the process.

We assume a budget constraint of the form

$$\sum_{v \in V} \rho_v(t) \leq r,$$

for each time instant $t$, reflecting the fact that curing is costly. A curing policy is a mapping which at any time $t$ maps the past history of the process to a curing vector $\rho(t) = \{\rho_v(t)\}_{v \in V}$ that satisfies (1).

We define the time to extinction as the time until the process reaches the absorbing state where all nodes are healthy:

$$\tau = \min\{t \geq 0 : I_t = \emptyset\}.$$

The expected time to extinction (the expected value of $\tau$) is the performance measure that we will be focusing on.

3 Graph Theoretic Preliminaries

In this section we introduce the notions of a cut and of the CutWidth that will be used in the description of our policy. We state some of their properties and then proceed to develop a key combinatorial result that will play a critical role in the analysis of our policy’s performance. Throughout, we assume that we are dealing with a particular given graph $G$.

3.1 CutWidth

For convenience, we will be using the shorthand term “bag” to refer to “a subset of $V$.” We also use the following notation. For any two bags $A$ and $B$, and any $v \in V$, we let

$$A \setminus B = \{v \in A : v \notin B\},$$

and

$$A - v = A \setminus \{v\}.$$

We also use $A^c$ to denote the complement, $V \setminus A$ of $A$.  

---

2. We write $f(n) = o(g(n))$ if $\lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/g(n) = 0$. We write $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ if $\lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/g(n) > 0$. Finally, we write $f(n) = O(g(n))$ if $\lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/g(n) < \infty$. 

We next define the concept of a monotone crusade. A monotone crusade from a bag $A$ to another bag $B$, where $B \subseteq A$, is a finite sequence of bags that starts with $A$ and ends with $B$, so that at each step of the sequence no nodes are added (cf. Part (iii) of Definition 1), and exactly one node is removed (cf. Part (iv) of Definition 1).

**Definition 1.** For any two bags $A$ and $B$, with $B \subseteq A$, a (monotone) crusade from $A$ to $B$, or $(A \upharpoonright B)$-crusade for short, is a sequence $\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_k)$ of bags of length $|\omega| = k + 1$, with the following properties:

i) $\omega_0 = A$,

ii) $\omega_k = B$,

iii) $\omega_{i+1} \subseteq \omega_i$, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1$, and

iv) $|\omega_i \setminus \omega_{i+1}| = 1$, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1$.

We denote by $\mathcal{C}(A \upharpoonright B)$ the set of all $(A \upharpoonright B)$-crusades.

The number of edges connecting a bag $A$ with its complement is called the cut of the bag. It is equal to the total rate at which new infections occur, when the set of currently infected nodes is $A$.

**Definition 2.** For any bag $A$, its cut, $c(A)$, is defined as the cardinality of the set of edges

$$\{(u, v) : u \in A, v \in A^c\}.$$ 

In Proposition 1 below, we record, without proof, an elementary property of cuts.

**Proposition 1.** For any two bags $A$ and $B$, we have

$$c(A \cup B) \leq c(A) + c(B) \leq c(A) + \Delta \cdot |B|.$$ 

We define the width of a monotone crusade $\omega$ as the maximum cut encountered during the crusade. Intuitively, this is the largest infection rate to be encountered if the nodes were to be cured according to the sequence prescribed by the crusade deterministically, if no new infections happen in between.

**Definition 3.** Given an $(A \upharpoonright B)$-crusade $\omega = (\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_k)$, its width $z(\omega)$ is defined by

$$z(\omega) = \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{c(\omega_i)\}.$$ 

We next define what we call the impedance of a bag $A$, as the minimum possible width among the $\mathcal{C}(A \upharpoonright \emptyset)$-crusades. This minimization captures the objective of finding a crusade along which the total infection rate is always small.

**Definition 4.** The impedance $\delta(A)$ of a bag $A$ is defined by

$$\delta(A) = \min_{\omega \in \mathcal{C}(A \upharpoonright \emptyset)} z(\omega).$$ (2)

For the special case where $A = V$, the impedance is known as the CutWidth $W$, and will be denoted by $W$. Fig. 1 illustrates examples of graphs with typical values of CutWidth.

We say that a (monotone) crusade $(A \upharpoonright B)$-crusade $\omega$ is optimal if it attains the minimum in Eq. (2). It can be seen that the impedances satisfy the Bellman equation:

$$\delta(A) = \max \{c(A), \min \{\delta(B) : B \subseteq A, |A \setminus B| = 1\}\}. \quad (3)$$

**Lemma 1.** For any bag $A$, we have

$$\delta(A) \leq W + c(A).$$

**Proof.** Consider a monotone crusade $\omega \in \mathcal{C}(V \upharpoonright \emptyset)$ whose width is equal to the CutWidth $W$. This crusade starts with $V$ and removes nodes one at a time, until the empty

3. As an example, consider a line graph, and let $A$ be the set of even-numbered nodes. Then, $c(A)$ is approximately $n$, whereas the CutWidth of the line graph is equal to 1.
4.1 Description of the CuRe Policy

Waiting period. A typical attempt starts at some bag \( A \), with a waiting period. (If this is the first attempt, then \( A = I_0 \). Otherwise, \( A \) is the bag at the end of the preceding attempt.) During the waiting period, all curing rates \( \rho_v(t) \) are kept at zero. The waiting period ends at the first subsequent time that

\[ c(I_t) \leq r/8. \]

Let \( B \) be the bag \( I_t \) right at the end of the waiting period, and let \( \omega = \omega_B^B \) be the corresponding optimal crusade, which we refer to as the target path.

Segments. Each segment of an attempt starts either at the end of the waiting period or at the end of a preceding segment of the same attempt. In all cases, the segment starts with a bag on the target path. For the first segment, this is guaranteed by the definition of the target path. For subsequent segments, it will be guaranteed by our specifications of what happens at the end of the preceding segment. Let \( v_1, \ldots, v_n \) be the nodes in the bag at the beginning of a segment, arranged in the order according to which they are to be removed along the target path. For example, the bag at the beginning of the segment is \( \omega_0^B = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\} \), the next bag is \( \omega_1^B = \{v_2, \ldots, v_m\} \), etc. The node \( v_1 \) is called the target node; the goal of the segment is to cure the target node and reach the bag \( C = \{v_2, \ldots, v_m\} \). For all \( t \) during the segment, we define \( D_t = I_t \Delta C \); this is the set of infected nodes that do not belong to the next bag on the target path. At the beginning of the segment, \( I_t = C \cup \{v\} \) and therefore \( D_t = \{v\} \). During the segment, the entire curing budget is allocated to an arbitrarily chosen node from \( D_t \). Note that \( \rho_v(t) = 0 \) for \( v \in C \) during the segment and therefore, we always have \( I_t \geq C \).

The segment ends when either:

i) all nodes have been cured, i.e., \( I_t = \emptyset \); in this case, the attempt is considered successful and the process is over.

ii) \( I_t = C \) and \( C \neq \emptyset \) in which case the target node is cured, the process is on the target path, and we are ready to start the next segment. In this case, we say that we have a short segment.

iii) \(|D_t| \geq r/8\Delta\), in which case we say that the segment was long, and that the attempt has failed. In this case, the attempt has no more segments, and a new attempt will be initiated, starting with a waiting period.

4.2 Performance Analysis—Outline

We now proceed to establish an upper bound on the expected time to extinction, under the assumption that

4. During the waiting period the curing budget is wasted and not allocated to any of the nodes. Note that the cut of \( I_t \) during the waiting phase could be linear in the number of nodes, while we focus on the regime where the available budget is sublinear. Therefore, regardless of the allocation, during the waiting period the process would have an upward drift. For this reason, allocating budget to a subset of nodes in this period would not have a significant effect on the performance.

Note that the waiting period is guaranteed to terminate in finite time, with probability 1. This is because if it were infinite, then healthy nodes would keep getting infected until eventually \( I_t = V \). But \( c(V) = 0 \), which means that at some point the condition \( c(I_t) \leq r/8 \) would be satisfied and the waiting period would be finite, a contradiction.
$r \geq 4W$, for any set of initially infected nodes. If the process always stayed on the target path, that is, if we had no infections, the expected time to extinction would be the time until all nodes (at most $n$ of them) were cured. Given that nodes are cured at a rate of $r$, the expected time to extinction would have been $O(n/r)$. On the other hand, infections do delay the curing process, by increasing $|D_t|$ during segments, and we need to show that these do not have a major impact.

There are two kinds of segments to consider, short ones, at the end of which $|D_t| = 0$, and long ones, at the end of which $|D_t| \geq r/8\Delta$. During a segment, the size of $D_t$ (the “distance” from the target path) is at most $r/8\Delta$. Using also an upper bound on the size of the cut along the target path, we can show that the infection rate throughout a segment is smaller than the curing rate. For this reason, during a segment, the process $|D_t|$ has a downward drift. As a consequence, using a standard argument, the expected duration of a segment is small and there is high probability that the segment ends with $|D_t| = 0$, so that the segment is short and we continue with the next segment. As a result, the expected duration of an attempt behaves similar to the case of no infections and is of order $O(n/r)$. Finally, by studying the number of failed attempts until a successful one, we can establish an upper bound for the overall policy. A formal version of this argument is the content of the rest of this section.

### 4.3 Segment Analysis

Let us focus on a particular segment, and let $M_t = |D_t|$. The process $M_t$ evolves on the finite set $\{0, 1, \ldots, r/8\Delta\}$. (For simplicity, and without loss of generality, we assume that $r/8\Delta$ is an integer.) Recall that $C$ was defined as the bag on the target path that we were trying to reach at the end of the segment. The difference $D_t$ at the time that the segment starts consists of exactly one node: the target node. Thus, the process $M_t$ is initialized at one, at the beginning of the segment. The process $M_t$ is stopped as soon one of the two boundary points, 0 or $r/8\Delta$, is reached. At each time before the process is stopped, there is a rate equal to $r$ of downward transitions. Furthermore, there is a rate $c(I_t)$ of upward transitions, corresponding to new infections.

**Lemma 2.** The rate $c(I_t)$ of upward transitions during a segment satisfies $c(I_t) \leq r/2$.

**Proof.** The definition $D_t = I_t \setminus C$ implies that $I_t \subseteq C \cup D_t$. Consequently,

$$c(I_t) \leq c(C) + c(D_t) \leq c(C) + \Delta \cdot |D_t| = c(C) + \Delta \cdot M_t \leq c(C) + \frac{r}{8}. \quad (4)$$

We have used here Proposition 1, in the first and second inequality, together with the fact $M_t \leq r/8\Delta$.

On the other hand, $C$ is on the target path associated with $B$, the bag obtained at the end of the waiting period. As remarked at the end of Section 3.1, the impedance does not increase along an optimal crusade, and therefore, $\delta(C) \leq \delta(B)$. Using also Lemma 1, we have

$$c(C) \leq \delta(C) \leq \delta(B) \leq W + c(B).$$

Recall now that a waiting period ends with a bag whose cut is at most $r/8$. Therefore, $c(B) \leq r/8$. Using this fact, together with the assumption $r \geq 4W$ and Eq. (4), we obtain

$$c(I_t) \leq c(C) + \frac{r}{8} \leq \left(W + \frac{r}{8}\right) + \frac{r}{8} \leq \frac{r}{4} + \frac{r}{8} + \frac{r}{8} = \frac{r}{2}. \quad \square$$

We now establish the properties of the segments that we have claimed earlier; namely, that segments are short, with high probability, and do not last too long.

**Lemma 3.**

(a) The probability that the segment is long is at most

$$p = \frac{1}{2r/\Delta - 1}.$$

(b) The expected length of a segment is upper bounded by $2/r$.

**Proof.**

(a) Using Lemma 2, the process $M_t$ is stochastically dominated by a process $N_t$ on the same space $\{0, 1, \ldots, r/8\Delta\}$, which is initialized to be equal to the value of $M_t$ at the beginning of the segment (which is one), has a rate $r$ of downward transitions, a rate $r/2$ of upward transitions, and stops at the first time that it reaches one of the two boundary values. Note that the ratio of the downward to the upward drift is equal to $2$. The probability, denoted by $p$, that the process $N_t$ will first reach the upper boundary is a well-studied quantity and is given by the expression in part (a) of the Lemma. The proof is standard and can be found in Section 2.1 of [11] (for a non-martingale based proof) or Section 2.3 of [16] (for a martingale based proof). Since $M_t$ is stochastically dominated by $N_t$, the probability that $M_t$ will first reach the upper boundary is no larger.

(b) For simplicity, let us suppose that the segment starts at time $t = 0$. We define the process

$$H_t = M_t + \frac{r}{2} t$$

and the stopped version, $\tilde{H}_t$, which stops at the time $T$ that the segment ends. It is straightforward to verify that $H_t$ is a supermartingale, because the upward drift of the process is $\beta c(I_t) \leq r/2$ and the downward drift is $r$, so that the total downward drift at least $r/2$. Furthermore, $\tilde{H}_0 = H_0 = M_0 = 1$. Using Doob’s optional stopping theorem we obtain

$$1 = E[M_0] = E[\tilde{H}_0] \geq E[\tilde{H}_T] + \frac{r}{2} E[T] \geq \frac{r}{2} E[T],$$

from which we conclude that

$$E[T] \leq \frac{2}{r}. \quad \square$$
Note that if \( r \geq \alpha \log n \), where \( \alpha \) is a sufficiently large constant, then \( p \) can be made smaller that \( 1/n^2 \), so that \( np \) tends to zero. We will be using this observation later on. We will now bound the length of a waiting period.

**Lemma 4.** The expected length of a waiting period is bounded above by \( 8n/r \).

**Proof.** A waiting period involves at most \( n \) infections. The waiting period ends as soon as \( e(I_t) \leq r/8 \). Therefore, during the waiting period, infections happen at a rate of at least \( r/8 \). In particular, during the waiting period, the expected time between consecutive infections is at most \( 8/r \). For a maximum of \( n \) infections, the expected time is upper bounded by \( 8n/r \). \( \square \)

We can now combine the various bounds we have derived so far in order to bound the expected time to extinction under our policy.

**Theorem 1.** Suppose that \( r \geq 4W \) and that \( r \) is large enough so that \( np < 1 \), where \( p \) is as defined in Lemma 3. For any initial bag, the expected time to extinction under the CURE policy is upper bounded by

\[
\frac{1}{1 - np} \cdot \frac{10n}{r}
\]

**Proof.** We start by upper bounding the expected duration of an attempt. The expected length of the waiting period of an attempt is upper bounded by \( 8n/r \), by Lemma 4. The number of segments during an attempt is at most \( n \) since each segment is associated with one target node and there can be at most \( n \) different target nodes. By Lemma 3, the expected length of a segment is at most \( 2/r \).

Putting everything together, the expected duration of an attempt is at most \( (8n/r) + (2n/r) = 10n/r \).

Each attempt involves \( n \) segments. During each segment, there is probability at most \( p \) that the segment is long and that the attempt fails. Therefore, the overall probability that an attempt will fail is at most \( np \) (here we used the union bound). We note that his upper bound \( (np) \) on the failure probability holds regardless of the initial bag at the beginning of an attempt. It follows that the attempt is stochastically dominated by a geometric random variable with parameter \( 1 - np \). For this reason, the expected number of attempts is at most \( 1/(1 - np) \), and the desired result follows. \( \square \)

### 5 Corollaries and Near-Optimality of the CURE Policy

Theorem 1 has a number of interesting consequences, which we collect in the corollary that follows. We argue that if all nodes are initially infected, then the expected time to extinction under any policy is at least \( n/r \). Furthermore, in a certain regime of parameters, our policy achieves \( O(n/r) \) expected time to extinction and is therefore optimal within a multiplicative constant. Finally, if the CutWidth increases sublinearly with the number of nodes, then the expected time to extinction can be made sublinear in \( n \), using only a sublinear budget. This last result is also proved in [6], using a different, nonconstructive argument.

**Corollary 1.**

a) For any graph with \( n \) nodes and with all nodes initially infected, the expected time to extinction is at least \( n/r \), under any policy.

b) Suppose that the budget \( r \) satisfies

\[
r \geq 4W, \quad r \geq 16\Delta \log_2 n.
\]

Then, for large enough \( n \), and for any initial set of infected nodes, the expected time to extinction under the CURE policy is of order \( 2Wn/r \), which is sublinear in \( n \) and within a multiplicative factor from optimal.

c) Suppose that the maximum degree is bounded, i.e., \( \Delta = O(1) \). If the CutWidth increases sublinearly with \( n \), then it is possible to have sublinear time to extinction with a sublinear budget.

**Proof.**

a) Since nodes are cured at a rate of at most \( r \), and there are \( n \) nodes to be cured, the expected time to extinction must be at least \( n/r \), even in the absence of infections.

b) When \( r \geq 16 \cdot \log_2 n \cdot \Delta \), we have \( r/8\Delta \geq 2 \log_2 n \), and \( 2^{r/8\Delta} \geq n^2 \). Thus, the probability \( p \) in Lemma 3 is of order \( O(1/n^2) \), and \( np \) is of order \( O(1/n) \). In particular, for large enough \( n \), the factor \( 1/(1 - np) \) is less than 2. By Theorem 1, the expected time to extinction is at most \( 20n/r \). This is sublinear in \( n \), because \( r \) tends to infinity. Order optimality follows from part (a).

c) Suppose that the budget \( r \) satisfies the conditions in part (b), together with the condition

\[
r = \Omega(n/\log n).
\]

Then, it follows from part (b) that the expected time to extinction under the CURE policy is of order \( O(\log n) \). If \( W \) increases sublinearly with \( n \), we can satisfy the conditions in parts (b) and (c) while keeping \( r \) sublinear in \( n \), and still achieve sublinear, e.g., \( O(\log n) \) expected time to extinction. \( \square \)

We continue with some examples. For a line graph with \( n \) nodes, the CutWidth is equal to 1 and \( \Delta = 2 \). Therefore, by part (b) of Corollary 1 we can guarantee an approximately optimal expected time to extinction, of order \( O(n/r) \), as long as \( r \geq 16 \cdot \log_2 n \cdot \Delta = 32 \log_2 n \). We note, however, that for this example, our analysis is not tight, and the requirement \( r \geq 32 \log_2 n \) is stronger than necessary.

For a square grid-graph with \( n \) nodes, the Cut-Width is approximately \( \sqrt{n} \) and \( \Delta = 4 \). In this case, the requirement \( r \geq 4W = 4\sqrt{n} \) is the dominant one, and suffices to guarantee an approximately optimal expected time to extinction, of order \( O(n/r) \).

In both of these examples, we can of course let \( r \) be much larger than the minimum required, which was \( O(\log n) \) and \( O(\sqrt{n}) \), respectively, in order to obtain a smaller expected time to extinction, e.g., the \( O(\log n) \) expected time to extinction in part (c) of the corollary.
6 PERFORMANCE OF THE CURE POLICY UNDER ARBITRARY INITIAL INFECTIONS

The results of Section 5 are stated in terms of n and W which are global characteristics of the network and do not take into account the possibility of a favorable set of initially infected nodes. In this section we obtain performance guarantees for our policy as a function of |A| and δ(A), where A is the bag of initially infected nodes. Our goal is to explore conditions under which the CURE policy is (order) optimal, i.e., achieves expected extinction time of order O(|A|/r).

Note that if c(A) > r/8, a waiting phase is initiated. By the end of the waiting phase a superset of A (potentially the whole graph) is infected and thus the performance of the CURE policy cannot be related to the properties of A. For this reason, we focus on the case where c(A) < r/8. Section 5 illustrates that when the budget is larger than 4W then, the CuRe policy is (order) optimal. In this section we are interested in the case where the impedance of the initial bag, δ(A), is smaller than the CutWidth of the graph, i.e., δ(A) < W. Under such conditions, we expect to require less curing budget in order to attain (order) optimal extinction time; the main theorem of this section confirms this fact.

First we establish some properties of the first attempt of the CURE policy, when \( r \geq \max\{4δ(A), 8c(A)\} \). Note the similarity between the latter condition and that of Corollary 1(a).

**Lemma 5.** Suppose that the set of initially infected nodes is A, and that \( r \geq \max\{4δ(A), 8c(A)\} \). Let \( τ_A \) denote the duration of a segment and let S denote the event that the segment is short. Moreover, we write \( p_t = P(S) \). Then, for the first attempt the following properties hold:

a) The probability \( p_t \) that a segment is long is at most

\[
P = \frac{1}{2r/8A - 1}.
\]

b) The expected length of a segment is upper bounded by \( 2/r \), i.e., \( E[τ_A] \leq 2/r \).

c) The conditional expectation of a segment, given that it is short, \( E[τ_A | S] \), is upper bounded by \( 2/(r(1 - p)) \).

**Proof.**

a) Note that since \( c(A) \leq r/8 \) there is no waiting phase and the target path of the first attempt is the crusade associated with \( δ(A) \). Given this observation, the proofs are identical to Lemma 3 after replacing \( W \) by \( δ(A) \) in all arguments.

c) We have,

\[
E[τ_A] = E[τ_A | S](1 - p_t) + E[τ_A | S^c]p_t \\
\geq E[τ_A | S](1 - p_t) \geq E[τ_A | S](1 - p).
\]

Solving for \( E[τ_A | S] \) and using part (b) the result follows.

We now combine the bounds we derived in order to bound the expected time to extinction under our policy.

**Lemma 6.** Suppose that the set of initially infected nodes is A with \( r \geq \max\{4δ(A), 8c(A)\} \). Moreover, suppose that r is large enough so that \( |A|p < 1 \) and let \( E \) denote the event that the first attempt is successful. Then

\[
E[r | E] \leq \frac{2}{(1 - p)r}.
\]

**Proof.** First, the conditional expectation is well defined since \( P(E) \geq 1 - |A|p > 0 \) by the assumptions of the lemma. Conditioned on the success of the first attempt, the number of segments is \( |A| \) and the result follows from Lemma 5c.

Lemma 6 is mainly relevant in the regime where \( |A| \) grows to infinity with

\[
r \geq \max\{4δ(A), 16Δ log_2|A|, 8c(A)\}.
\] (5)

In this regime, the budget is sufficiently high for the first attempt to be successful with high probability. Thus, the performance indicated by Lemma 6 is achieved conditioned on an event which occurs with high probability, as the following theorem states.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that the budget satisfies Eq. (5) and that the set of initially infected nodes is A, whose size \( |A| \) grows to infinity. Let \( E \) be the event that the first attempt is successful. Then, \( P(E) = 1 - o(1) \), \( E[r | E] \) is of order \( O(|A|/r) \), and thus our policy is (order) optimal with high probability.

**Proof.** Following similar reasoning as in Corollary 1, under the condition (5), the probability \( p \) in Lemma 5 is of order \( O(1/|A|^2) \). This implies that

\[
\lim_{|A| \to \infty} P(E) \geq \lim_{|A| \to \infty} (1 - |A|p) = 1.
\]

Moreover, for large enough \( |A| \), \( 1 - p \) is larger than \( 1/2 \) and thus, by Lemma 6 the expected time to extinction, conditioned on \( E \) is at most \( 4|A|/r \) and thus \( O(|A|/r) \).

Note that Theorem 2 establishes (order) optimality with high probability, which is weaker than (order) optimality in Corollary 1. This is due to the fact that the lower budget requirements \( r \geq \max\{4δ(A), 16Δ log_2|A|, 8c(A)\} \) versus \( r \geq \max\{4W, 16Δ log_2 n \cdot |A|\} \) come at a cost: if we have a long segment and a failed attempt (which is a small probability event) the process can potentially be uncontrollable and the extinction time from then on large.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a dynamic curing policy which achieves sublinear expected time to extinction, using a sublinear curing budget when the CutWidth of the underlying graph is sublinear in the number of nodes. This policy applies to any subset of initially infected nodes and the resulting expected time to extinction is order-optimal when the available budget is sufficiently large.

The analysis of the extinction time under our policy is based on a drift analysis of the epidemic process. The upward drift is equal to the cut of the set of infected nodes \( c(I_t) \) and the downward drift is proportional to the curing budget \( r \). While the process is on the target path, \( c(I_t) \), and therefore the upward drift, can be bounded from above by the impedance of the starting bag. On the other hand, when
the process deviates from the target path this is no longer the case. For this reason we invoke the maximum degree Δ of the graph in order to bound the change of the cut during each such deviation. Note that none of our results (except for Corollary 1c) requires bounded degree. The maximum degree appears in the minimum budget requirement but is not required to be bounded. Furthermore, our results indicate that under our policy, the process has low probability of deviating significantly from the target path and therefore only the locally maximum degree is relevant to the analysis, and not the global maximum. In other words, as long as the infection does not reach high degree nodes we should have results similar to those for the bounded degree case. However, the performance analysis for this case is expected to be significantly harder and the statement of the results more complicated.

Our policy allocates all the available budget to one node at every time instant. This is permitted by our formulation but in practice each infected agent can only be offered a bounded amount of curing resources. Our policy, cannot be directly generalized to account for such a constraint but the insights of our solution can be directly adapted to such a scenario.

A drawback of the CURE policy is computational complexity because calculating the impedance of a bag or finding a target path is computationally hard. Like many other interesting graph problems, CutWidth is NP-complete [7], even if we restrict to planar graphs or graphs with maximum degree three [13] but in general fixed parameter linear [17]. Several approximation algorithms have been developed for computing the CutWidth of a graph. Specifically, there is a polynomial time $O(\log^2 n)$-approximation algorithm for general graphs [10], and a polynomial time constant factor approximation algorithm for dense graphs [15]. We leave it as an interesting future direction to develop such algorithms for computing the impedance of a bag. Finally, we have argued in this paper that the CURE policy is efficient in the sense of attaining near-optimal, $O(n/r)$ expected time to extinction, in a certain parameter regime. It is an interesting problem to look for approximately optimal policies over a wider set of regimes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research partially supported by the Draper Laboratories and NSF grant CMMI-1234062. A preliminary version of some of the results in this paper are included in a paper submitted to the 53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, December 2014. K. Drakopoulos is the corresponding author.

REFERENCES


Kimon Drakopoulos received the diploma in electrical and computer engineering from the National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece, in 2009 and the MSc degree in electrical engineering and computer science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, in 2011. From 2011 to present, he is working towards the PhD degree at the Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA. His current research interests include social network analysis, network science, applied probability, game theory, and network economics. He is a member of the IEEE.
Asu Ozdaglar received the BS degree in electrical engineering from the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey, in 1996, and the SM and the PhD degrees in electrical engineering and computer science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, in 1998 and 2003, respectively. She is currently a professor in the Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the director of the Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems. She is also a member of the Operations Research Center. Her research expertise includes optimization theory, with emphasis on nonlinear programming and convex analysis, game theory, with applications in communication, social, and economic networks, distributed optimization and control, and network analysis with special emphasis on contagious processes, systemic risk and dynamic control. She is the recipient of a Microsoft fellowship, the MIT Graduate Student Council Teaching award, the NSF Career award, the 2008 Donald P. Eckman award of the American Automatic Control Council, the inaugural Steven and Renee Finn Innovation Fellowship, and the 2014 Spira teaching award. She served as a member of the Board of Governors of the Control System Society and as an associate editor for the IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control. She is currently the area co-editor for a new area for the journal Operations Research, entitled “Games, Information and Networks” and the chair of the Control System Society Technical Committee “Networks and Communication Systems”. She is the co-author of the book entitled “Convex Analysis and Optimization” (Athena Scientific, 2003).

John N. Tsitsiklis received the BS degree in mathematics and the BS, MS, and PhD degrees in electrical engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, in 1980, 1980, 1981, and 1984, respectively. He is currently a Clarence J. Lebel professor with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at MIT. He has served as a co-director of the MIT Operations Research Center from 2002 to 2005, in the National Council on Research and Technology in Greece (2005-2007), and currently chairs the Council of the Harokopio University in Athens, Greece. His research interests are in systems, optimization, communications, control, and operations research. He has coauthored four books and several journal papers in these areas. He has been a recipient of an Outstanding Paper Award from the IEEE Control Systems Society (1986), the M.I.T. Edgerton Faculty Achievement Award (1989), the Bodossakis Foundation Prize (1995), an ACM Sigmetrics Best Paper Award (2013), and a co-recipient of two INFORMS Computing Society prizes (1997, 2012). He is a member of the National Academy of Engineering. In 2008, he was conferred the title of Doctor honoris causa, from the Universit Catholique de Louvain. He is a fellow of the IEEE.

For more information on this or any other computing topic, please visit our Digital Library at www.computer.org/publications/dlib.