

As before, we have the following property:

Property 2. ILFM, for  $\Pi_e$ , is neutral w.r.t. to the local preferential attachment effect.

Proof: The proof is identical to the first part of the proof for Property 1.

The definition of the local degree we have used does not directly translate to  $\Pi_g$  as it is based on the knowledge of  $\Phi$ . One can nevertheless define an expected local degree for  $\Pi_g$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{d_{i,k}}^{(n)} &= \mathbb{E}_{\Phi, \phi} [d_{i,k}^{(n)}] \\ &= \int_{\Phi, \phi} P(\Pi | \Pi_g) P(\Phi | \Pi_g) d_{i,k}^{(n)} d\Phi d\phi \end{aligned}$$

A notion of local preferential attachment for  $\Pi_g$  can then be defined on the basis of this expected local degree.

Definition (ILFM - local preferential attachment;  $\Pi_g$ ) We say that ILFM in  $\Pi_g$  satisfies the local preferential attachment effect iff for any indexing, for any node  $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq N$ ), for any step  $p$  ( $1 \leq p \leq N$ ),  $\exists \varepsilon \in ]0, 1[$  s.t.  $P(g_{d_{i,k}}^{(n)} \geq x + \varepsilon | g_{d_{i,k}}^{(n)} \geq x; \Pi_g)$  increases with  $x$ ,  $x \in ]0, N[$ .

[INCLUDE A ~~NEW~~ § ON LINK TO CONTINUOUS BUSINESS]

~~As a consequence~~

One has  $\forall \varepsilon \in ]0, 1[, x \in ]0, N[$ :

$$\begin{aligned} P(g_{d_{i,k}}^{(n)} \geq x + \varepsilon | g_{d_{i,k}}^{(n)} \geq x; \Pi_g) &= 1 - P(g_{d_{i,k}}^{(n)} = x | g_{d_{i,k}}^{(n)} \geq x; \Pi_g) \\ &= 1 - P(y_{i,p_1} = 0, \dots, y_{i,p_n} = 0 | \Pi_g) \end{aligned}$$