

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB NO. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA, 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</p>				
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)
		Technical Report		-
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
Organizing Principles for Social Networks and Dynamics			W911NF-09-1-0254	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	611102
6. AUTHORS			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
Chjan C. Lim			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAMES AND ADDRESSES			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Office of Sponsored Research Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, NY 12180 -				
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) ARO	
U.S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
			54107-NS.11	
12. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT				
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.				
14. ABSTRACT				
PPT of talk given at the Center for Vision Research at U Central Florida March 25 - 26 2013				
Invited tour of facility by Dr. Mubarak Shah				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
Tipping points, scalar stochastic diff eqn, expected times to consensus				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	15. NUMBER OF PAGES
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE	UU	
UU	UU	UU		19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
				Chjan Lim
				19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER
				518-276-6904

Report Title

Organizing Principles for Social Networks and Dynamics

ABSTRACT

PPT of talk given at the Center for Vision Research at U Central Florida March 25 - 26 2013

Invited tour of facility by Dr. Mubarak Shah

Organizing Principles in Network Science- Scalar SDE, Tipping Points of opinion dynamics

Chjan Lim, Mathematical Sciences,
RPI

Funding

- Main: ARO grant 2009 – 2013 we thank C. Arney, R. Zachary; ARO grant 2012 – 2015 we thank P. Iyer
- Secondary: ARL grants 2009 – 2012

Misc



○ Collaborators: Dr W Zhang, Y Treitman, B Szymanski, G Korniss

● Papers:


- Weituo Zhang, Chjan C. Lim, B. Szymanski, “Analytic Treatment of Tipping Points for Social Consensus in Large Random Networks”, Phys Rev E 86 (6), 061134, 2012

Weituo Zhang, Chjan Lim, and Boleslaw Szymanski, [Tipping Points of Diehards in Social Consensus on Large Random Networks](#), Complex Networks, Proc. 3rd Workshop on Complex Networks, CompleNet, Melbourne, FL, March 7-9, 2012, Studies in Computational Intelligence, vol. 424, Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2013, pp. 161-168.

Yosef Treitman, Chjan Lim, W. Zhang and A. Thompson, “Naming Game with Greater Stubbornness and Unilateral Zealots”, IEEE NSW Conf., April 29 – May 1 2013, West Point, NY


Tipping Point of NG

- A minority of committed agents can persuade the whole network to a global consensus.
- The critical value for phase transition is called the “tipping point”.




J. Xie, S. Sreenivasan, G. Korniss, W. Zhang, C. Lim and B. K. Szymanski
PHYSICAL REVIEW E (2011)


Saddle node bifurcation



Below Critical



Above Critical




Meanfield Assumption and Complete Network




- The network structure is ignored. Every node is only affected by the meanfield.
- The meanfield depends only on the fractions(or numbers) of all types of nodes.
- Describe the dynamics by an equation of the meanfield (macrostate).


Scale of consensus time on complete graph



Expected Time Spend on Each Macrostate before Consensus (without committed agents)




NG with Committed Agents



q is the fraction of agents committed in A.
When q is below a critical value q_c , the process may stuck in a meta-stable state for a very long time.

2 Word Naming Game as a 2D random walk




$$P(A-) = n_A(N - n_A + n_B)/2N^2$$

$$P(A+) = (N - n_A - n_B)(N + n_A - n_B)/2N^2$$

$$P(B-) = n_B(N + n_A - n_B)/2N^2$$

$$P(B+) = (N - n_A - n_B)(N - n_A + n_B)/2N^2$$

$$P_0 = (n_A + n_B)/2N + (n_A - n_B)^2/2N^2$$



Linear Solver for 2-Name NG

$\tau(n_A, n_B)$ is the absorbing time starting from network state (n_A, n_B) .

$t(n_A, n_B)$ is the average time stay in network state (n_A, n_B) before leaving.

Have equations:

$$\tau(n_A, n_B) = \frac{P(A+)\tau(n_A + 1, n_B) + P(A-)\tau(n_A - 1, n_B) + P(B+)\tau(n_A, n_B + 1) + P(B-)\tau(n_A, n_B - 1)}{1 - P_0} + t(n_A, n_B)$$

Then we assign an order to the coordinates, make $\tau(n_A, n_B)$, $t(n_A, n_B)$ into vectors, and finally write equations in the linear system form:

$$\vec{\tau} = M\vec{\tau} + \vec{t}$$


SDE models for NG, NG and NG

$$d\vec{X} = \vec{\mu} dt + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}} d\vec{W}$$

Diffusion vs Drift



- Diffusion scales are clear from broadening of trajectories bundles
- Drift governed by mean field nonlinear ODEs can be seen from the average / midlines of bundles



Assume a very natural social – political condition, generalizing NG

Where the network is divided into $k+1$ sub-populations

Each with a different fixed propensity to signal/vote/utter the opinion A

When hearing the word A a node from subgroup $j < k$ will move to subgroup $j+1$

Likewise hearing B a node from $j > 0$ will move to subgroup $j-1$

The probability that a node from subgroup j will signal A is j/k


Same node has probability $1 - j/k$ of signalling word B

Additional rules of k-NG




- A node s is drawn at random from the network and sends out a signal A with prob p
- or s sends signals B with prob $= 1 - p$
- Next a node L is drawn at random to receive the signal A
- or node L is drawn to receive the signal B

k-NG



- The subgroups $j = 0, k$ correspond to those nodes that are completely convinced of the B and A opinion resp. OR
- Equivalently those nodes that with prob 1
- Signals B, A resp.

Voting or Polling



- The key network quantity is an average network opinion obtained by polling:
 -
 - $p = \text{sum over subgrps } j = 0 \text{ to } k$
 - of $n(j) j / kN$
- It gives the probability of a speaker chosen at random signalling the word A

Stochastic Dynamics

- Derivation of k-dim coupled Random Walk:
- For $j = 1$ to $k-1$,
- $n(j,t+1) = n(j,t) + 1, -1$ with resp. prob.
- $P(+1) = p(t) n(j-1,t)/N + (1-p(t)) n(j+1,t)/N$
- $P(-1) = (1-p(t)) n(j,t)/N + p(t) n(j,t)/N$
- $= n(j,t)/N$


Random walk

- For the distinguished subgrps at both ends of the opinion spectrum, $j = 0, k$
- $n(0,t+1) = n(0,t) + 1, 0, -1$ with prob.
- $P(+1) = (1-p(t)) n(1,t)/N$
- $P(0) = (1-p(t)) n(0,t)/N$
- $P(-1) = p(t) n(0,t)/N$

Subgroup k

- $n(k,t+1) = n(k,t) + 1, 0, -1$ with prob.
- $P(+1) = p(t) n(k-1,t)/N$
- $P(0) = p(t) n(k,t)/N$
- $P(-1) = (1-p(t)) n(k,t)/N$

Shadow Walk



- Define a scalar nonlazy random walk on the quantity p whose consensus times are lower bounds for the actual expected times.
- $p(t+1) = p(t) + 1/kN, -1/kN$ with prob
- $P(+1) = p(t)$
- $P(-1) = 1-p(t)$

SDE or Diffusion Model

In continuous time the SDE is

$$dP_t = M(P_t)dt + V(P_t)dW_t$$

$$M = (2P_t - 1)/k$$

$$V = \frac{2}{k\sqrt{N}}\sqrt{P_t(1 - P_t)}$$

Solution of SDE

now done using standard Kolmogorov Backwards Equation method

$$\frac{\partial u(p, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{V}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial p^2} + M \frac{\partial u}{\partial p}$$

$$u(0, t) = 0, u(1, t) = 1 \text{ where } u(p, t) = \Pr\{P_t = 1 | P_0 = p\}$$

$$u(p) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(p, t)$$

Expected Times to Consensus

First calculate

$$\begin{aligned} G(p) &= \exp\left\{-2 \int \frac{M}{V} dp\right\} = \exp\left(2\sqrt{N} \int d\sqrt{(p-p^2)}\right) \\ &= e^{2\sqrt{N}\sqrt{p-p^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we get

$$0 \leq u(p) = \frac{\int_0^p G(x) dx}{\int_0^1 G(x) dx} = \frac{\int_0^p \exp\left(2\sqrt{N}\sqrt{x-x^2}\right) dx}{\int_0^1 \exp\left(2\sqrt{N}\sqrt{x-x^2}\right) dx} \leq 1$$

Expected times - exit times – stop times

and the expected time to consensus of the A opinion without committed agents and conditioned on eventual fixation of the A opinion is given by

$$t(p) = \frac{T(p)}{u(p)}$$

where

$$T(p) = \int_0^\infty t \frac{\partial u(p, t)}{\partial t} dt$$

is the unconditioned expected time to consensus given that $P_0 = p$ and solves the stationary form of the KBE

$$\frac{d^2 T}{dp^2} + \frac{2M}{V} \frac{dT}{dp} + \frac{2u(p)}{V} = 0$$

with boundary conditions

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} t < \infty$$
$$t(1) = 0.$$



continued

The solution is given by

$$T(p) = u(p) \int_p^1 F(y)u(y) (1 - u(y)) dy \\ + (1 - u(p)) \int_0^p F(y)u^2(y)dy$$

which evaluates to the following closed form expression for the $k - NG$ problem,

$$T(p) = \frac{k\sqrt{N}}{\left[\int_0^1 G(x)dx\right]^2} \left\{ \int_0^p G(x)dx \int_p^1 dy \frac{\int_0^y G(x)dx \int_y^1 G(x)dx}{G(y)\sqrt{y-y^2}} \right. \\ \left. + \int_p^1 G(x)dx \int_0^p dy \frac{\int_0^y G(x)dx \int_0^y G(x)dx}{G(y)\sqrt{y-y^2}} \right\}$$

Higher stubbornness – same qualitative, robust result




Figure 1: Simulations of the Naming Game with $K=3$ and $N = 500$. Note the existence of a center manifold to which all trajectories tend. The simulations that start far away from the center manifold approach it before drifting to a consensus state.

Higher stubbornness – same qualitative, robust result




Figure 1: Simulations of the Naming Game with $K=3$ and $N = 500$. Note the existence of a center manifold to which all trajectories tend. The simulations that start far away from the center manifold approach it before drifting to a consensus state.

Other NG variants – same 1D manifold




Figure 2: Simulations of the Naming Game with $K=10$ and $N = 500$. Some trajectories do not approach the center manifold as quickly as they did in the $K=3$ case. Those simulations that start with $p=0.5$ approach the center manifold before drifting to the consensus state. However, the simulations that start with a less centralized p value drift to the consensus state more quickly. Note that the simulations starting in the polarized state with $p=0.4$ come close to the center manifold before drifting to consensus. On the other hand, the simulations in the centralized state with $p=0.6$ drift to consensus before any significant number of agents enter N_0 .

3D plot of trajectory bundles – stubbornness $K = 10$ as example of




Figure 4: A 3D plot of the simulations of the Naming Game with $K=3$ and $N = 500$. Here, all simulations approach the center manifold before p deviates too much from its initial value.

Consensus time distribution

- Recursive relationship of $P(X, T)$, the probability for consensus at T starting from X , Q is the transition matrix.

$$\begin{aligned} P(n_A, n_B, T + 1) = & Q(n_A + 1, n_B | n_A, n_B) P(n_A + 1, n_B, T) + Q(n_A - 1, n_B | n_A, n_B) P(n_A - 1, n_B, T) \\ & + Q(n_A, n_B + 1 | n_A, n_B) P(n_A, n_B + 1, T) + Q(n_A, n_B - 1 | n_A, n_B) P(n_A, n_B - 1, T) \\ & + Q(n_A, n_B + 2 | n_A, n_B) P(n_A, n_B + 2, T) + Q(n_A + 2, n_B | n_A, n_B) P(n_A + 2, n_B, T) \end{aligned}$$

Take each column for the same T as a vector:


$$\vec{P}(T + 1) = Q * \vec{P}(T)$$

Calculate the whole table $P(X, T)$ iteratively.

Take each row for the same X as a vector:

$$\mathcal{P}_{(n_A, n_B)}(T_c = T) = (P(n_A, n_B, T)).$$



Consensus time distribution



Red lines are calculated through the recursive equation.

Blue lines are statistics of consensus times from numerical simulation(very expensive),
(done by Jerry Xie)



Consensus Time distribution




Below critical, consensus time distribution tends to exponential.
Above critical, consensus time distribution tends to Gaussian.

For large enough system, only the mean and the variance of the consensus time is needed.

NG on RGG



NG on RGG past Tipping point



Homogeneous Pairwis Assumption

The mean field is not uniform but varies for the nodes with different opinion.

Make it rigorous:

suppose three nodes are linked as 1-2-3

X_i is the opinion of node i

k_i is the degree of node i


$$P(X_1|X_2) \neq P(X_1)$$

$$P(X_1|X_2, X_3) = P(X_1|X_2)$$


$$E[k_1|X_1] = \langle k \rangle$$

$$P(X_1|k_1) = P(X_1)$$


$$P(X_1|X_1, k_1, k_2) = P(X_1|X_2)$$




Numerical comparison




Trajectories mapped to 2D macrostate space



Concentration of the consensus time



Change of the tipping point w.r.t. the average degree



The local mean field for the node with opinion C :

$$\vec{P}(\cdot|C) = [P(A|C), P(B|C), P(AB|C)]^T, C = A, B, AB$$

The number of different type of links:

$$\vec{L} = [L_{A-A}, L_{A-B}, L_{A-AB}, L_{B-B}, L_{B-AB}, L_{AB-AB}]^T$$


$$\overrightarrow{P(\cdot|A)}(\vec{L}) = \begin{pmatrix} P(A|A) \\ P(B|A) \\ P(AB|A) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2L_{A-A} + L_{A-B} + L_{A-AB}} \begin{pmatrix} 2L_{A-A} \\ L_{A-B} \\ L_{A-AB} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\overrightarrow{P(\cdot|B)}(\vec{L}) = \begin{pmatrix} P(A|B) \\ P(B|B) \\ P(AB|B) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{L_{A-B} + 2L_{B-B} + L_{B-AB}} \begin{pmatrix} L_{A-B} \\ 2L_{B-B} \\ L_{B-AB} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\overrightarrow{P(\cdot|AB)}(\vec{L}) = \begin{pmatrix} P(A|AB) \\ P(B|AB) \\ P(AB|AB) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{L_{A-AB} + L_{B-AB} + 2L_{AB-AB}} \begin{pmatrix} L_{A-AB} \\ L_{B-AB} \\ 2L_{AB-AB} \end{pmatrix}$$

Analyze the dynamics

1. Choosing one type of links, say A-B, and A is the listener.
2. Direct change: A-B changes into AB-B.
3. Related changes: since A changes into AB, $\langle k \rangle - 1$ related links C-A change into C-AB. The probability distribution of C is the local mean field $P(\cdot|A)$.



Local mean field equation

$$E[\Delta \vec{L} | \vec{L}] = \frac{1}{M} [D + (\langle k \rangle - 1)R] \vec{L}$$

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{4} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{4} & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_A = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$R = \left(\vec{0}, \frac{1}{2} [Q_A \overrightarrow{P(\cdot|A)} + Q_B \overrightarrow{P(\cdot|B)}], Q_A [\frac{1}{4} \overrightarrow{P(\cdot|A)} - \frac{3}{4} \overrightarrow{P(\cdot|AB)}], \vec{0}, Q_B [\frac{1}{4} \overrightarrow{P(\cdot|B)} - \frac{3}{4} \overrightarrow{P(\cdot|AB)}], -(Q_A + Q_B) \overrightarrow{P(\cdot|AB)} \right)$$


Normalized equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \vec{l} = 2 \left[\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} D + \left(\frac{\langle k \rangle - 1}{\langle k \rangle} \right) R \right] \vec{l}$$

Merits of SDE model

$$d\vec{X} = \vec{\mu}dt + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}d\vec{W}$$

- Include all types of NG and other communication models in one framework and distinguish them by two parameters.
- Present the effect of system size explicitly.
- Collapse complicated dynamics into 1-d SDE equation on the center manifold.



Thanks