

The iterative persuasion-polarization opinion dynamics and its mean-field analysis

Fei Cao ^{*} Stephanie Reed [†]

August 2, 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Iterative persuasion-polarization (IPP) model	4
3	Large time analysis	7
3.1	Convergence to “almost consensus” for $\alpha = 1$	8
3.2	Emergence of polarized society for $\alpha = 0$	16
3.3	Relaxation to uniformly mixed opinions when $\alpha = 1/2$	21
4	Conclusion	25

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the Iterative Persuasion-Polarization (IPP) model to study the dynamics of opinion formation and change within a population. The IPP model integrates mechanisms of persuasion and repulsion, where individuals influence each other through interactions that can either align opinions incrementally or lead to greater divergence. The probability of each interaction type is governed by a parameter α , representing the population’s receptiveness to persuasion. We investigate how these interaction dynamics shape the long-term distribution of opinions, examining conditions that promote consensus or polarization. By deriving a system of nonlinear and autonomous ordinary differential equations (ODEs), we provide a

¹University of Massachusetts Amherst - Department of Mathematics and Statistics, 710 N Pleasant St, Amherst, MA 01003, USA

²California State University, Fullerton - Department of Mathematics, 800 N State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA 92831, USA

rigorous mathematical framework for analyzing the distributional behavior of opinions in large populations. Our findings contribute to a deeper understanding of social influence dynamics and their implications in complex social systems.

Key words: Sociophysics, Agent-based model, Opinion dynamics, Interacting agents, Mean-field

1 Introduction

Decoding how people form opinions and how individuals within a population influence the opinions of others has been a subject of mathematical interest since at least the mid nineteen-sixties [1,2]. In recent decades, the application of physics principles to various fields such as sociology and economics to describe natural phenomena has proliferated. The fields of sociophysics and econophysics [7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 33–36] have witnessed significant developments by virtue of tools and techniques from statistical physics. In particular, sociophysics, introduced in [23], which applies statistical physics to social contexts to infer the inner workings of human social behavior. Sociophysics has seen tremendous growth in interest since the turn of the century, with many now-classical models being introduced and studied during this time [3, 20, 46]. We now recall a series of prototypical sociophysics models which have been subject to intensive research activities over the last few decades:

Axelrod Model: Proposed by Robert Axelrod in [3], this model features agents with multiple attributes that form their opinion profiles. In each iteration, an agent x and one of their neighbors y are chosen. With probability equal to their cultural similarity they will interact. Through this interaction a feature for which x and y differ will be chosen at random and agent x will update this feature to match that of agent y . The Axelrod model is further investigated in [32].

Sznajd Model: Introduced in [46] and known as the “United we stand, divided we fall” (USDF) model, it was motivated by the Ising Model [26] which was proposed in order to describe magnetism of atoms in matter. In the original model, the one dimensional lattice of length N makes up the underlying social structure. Each individual has an binary opinion in the set $\{1, -1\}$. Letting S_i be the opinion of agent $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, at each iteration a deterministic process based on the current configuration takes place;

- If $S_i S_{i+1} = 1$, then set $S_{i-1} = S_{i+2} = S_i$,
- If $S_i S_{i+1} = -1$, then set $S_{i-1} = S_{i+1}$ and $S_{i+2} = S_i$.

Many variations of the USDF model have been studied in [22, 37, 40, 43, 44, 47, 48].

Bounded Confidence Models: Bounded Confidence (BC) models consist of a class of models where neighbors influence each other only if their opinions do not differ too much. Classic BC models were proposed in [4, 19–21, 25, 28]. The Deffuant model [20] is one such pioneering BC model that has been widely studied [29–31, 45, 51] since its inception. The Deffuant model assumes that each agent i has a continuous opinion x_i . The convergence parameter μ typically in $[0, 0.5]$ controls how large of a change is made when opinions are updated and d determines the maximum allowable difference in opinion of two interacting agents. At each time step, two agents with opinions x and x_* are chosen to interact. As long as $|x - x_*| < d$, they update their opinions to x' and x'_* respectively according to the following rule:

$$\begin{cases} x' = x + \mu(x_* - x), \\ x'_* = x_* + \mu(x - x_*). \end{cases}$$

Each of these models, despite their relatively simple interaction schemes, can lead to very rich and complex behaviors in the long run. They also aim to capture real elements of how humans influence one another in reality. In this paper, we propose a novel model, the Iterative Persuasion-Polarization (IPP) Model, which highlights several key features of human interaction:

- We assume that not all interactions result in the “persuasion” of one of the interacting individuals although this is still a possibility. In real-world scenarios, it is also possible to have negative interactions resulting in “repulsion” (or more polarization than existed prior to the interaction).
- We also aim to capture the idea that people typically do not just adopt the opinion of their neighbor through a single interaction, instead it is more natural that over the course of many interactions can one individual begin to shift their opinion in incremental stages.
- Like the Deffuant model, we do not assume that ones opinion on a particular topic can be adequately captured with just a binary set like $\{-1, 1\}$ representing two extremes. Instead we assume that each individual has an opinion existing on a broader spectrum to better capture the nuances of the sentiment of individuals.

Our model seeks to capture the nuanced mechanisms of persuasion and repulsion through gradual opinion changes during interactions. By examining these dynamics, we aim to provide insights into how a population’s openness to persuasion impacts the long-term distribution of opinions, and under what conditions consensus or

polarization occurs. The next section is dedicated to rigorously defining the model at hand and deriving a system of nonlinear and autonomous ordinary differential equations (ODEs) to describe its (distributional) behavior in the mean-field region when the number of agents becomes sufficiently large.

2 Iterative persuasion-polarization (IPP) model

Consider a population of individuals of size N . At any given time, each individual is characterized by her opinion (on a given topic) which is an element in the discrete set of admissible opinions

$$K = \{-k, -k + 1, \dots, k - 1, k\}. \quad (2.1)$$

The dynamics of the IPP model are as follows:

- At a constant rate, pairs of individuals (x, y) interact within the population. In each interaction, x acts as the “persuader” and y as the “persuaded”, indicating that x attempts to influence y ’s opinion.
- With probability α , the interaction is of the “persuade” type, and with probability $\beta = 1 - \alpha$, the interaction is of the “repel” type.
- If the interaction is of the “persuade” type, and x and y do not already share the same opinion, y will adjust her opinion to be one unit closer to x ’s opinion (i.e. the model moves towards *consensus*).
- If the interaction is of the “repel” type, and y does not already hold the most extreme opinion, she will adjust her opinion to be one unit further from x ’s opinion (i.e. the model moves towards *polarization*).
- In the case where x and y already share the same opinion, no update is made.

We assume that $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ is a measure of the receptiveness or openness of the population to persuasion. We can interpret $\alpha \ll 1$ to indicate that the population is very antagonistic where most interactions result in a polarizing result. On the other hand, $\alpha \approx 1$ indicates that the population is highly receptive and thus most interactions lead to persuasion.

Letting v_\star and v denote the pre-interaction opinions of x and y respectively, and letting v'_\star and v' denote the post-interaction opinions, at the microscopic level, we can describe an interaction in our model by the following rules:

$$v' = \begin{cases} v + a & \text{if } v = -k < v_*, \\ v + a - b & \text{if } -k < v < v_*, \\ v - a + b & \text{if } k > v > v_*, \\ v - a & \text{if } v = k > v_*; \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

$$v'_* = v_*. \quad (2.3)$$

We now introduce a set of notations and terminologies used throughout the present paper. If f is the law of a real-valued random variable X , and φ is a generic (smooth) test function, we will denote the expected value of $\varphi(X)$ to be

$$\langle \varphi(X) \rangle = \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(x) f(x) dx & \text{if } X \text{ is a continuous random variable,} \\ \sum_{x:f(x)>0} \varphi(x) f(x) & \text{if } X \text{ is a discrete random variable.} \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

Having origins in kinetic theory, the original Boltzmann equation is a partial integro-differential equation meant to describe the particle density of (dilute) gases [50]. As of the early 2000s, the Boltzmann equation has been a popular tool for studying interacting particle systems with applications in economics, sociology and biology [17, 27, 49]. A clear analogy can be made between a gas composed of colliding molecules resulting in velocity changes on a microscopic level and a population of agents whose interactions can result in a change of opinion or exchange of wealth in the cases of sociology and economics respectively. For a more detailed historical account of the Boltzmann equation and its various applications to interacting particle systems, we refer the reader to [41]. The weak form of the Boltzmann-type equation provided in [22] given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_V \varphi(v) f(t, v) dv \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \int_V \int_V B(v, v_*) (\varphi(v') + \varphi(v'_*) - \varphi(v) - \varphi(v_*)) f(t, v) f(t, v_*) dv dv_* \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where $B = B(v, v_*)$ is the rate of interaction, $f(v, t)$ is the distribution of opinions $v \in V$ (a set of admissible opinions) at time $t \geq 0$, and φ is an arbitrary test function, is often used as a starting point to describe various opinion dynamics models in the mean-field region. However, the set K of opinions in our model is discrete and so as the basis for our model we will use

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{v \in K} \varphi(v) f(t, v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \sum_{v \in K} \sum_{v_* \in K} B(v, v_*) (\varphi(v') + \varphi(v'_*) - \varphi(v) - \varphi(v_*)) f(t, v) f(t, v_*) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

In broader models, it can be assumed that the interaction rate between pairs of individuals, denoted as $B = B(v, v_*)$, may vary based on the opinions of the individuals involved. For convenience, we shall assume individuals always interact at twice the unit rate thus rendering $B \equiv 2$. We are ultimately interested the fraction of individuals with opinion i at time t , and we shall denote this quantity to be $p_i(t)$. This allows us the write $f(t, v)$ in terms of $p_i(t)$ for $i \in K$ by

$$f(t, v) = \sum_{i=-k}^k p_i(t) \mathbb{1}\{v = i\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Given our interaction rules prescribed via (2.2), it follows that for any test function φ on V , we must have that

$$\varphi(v') = \begin{cases} \varphi(v) b + \varphi(v+1) a & \text{if } v = -k < v_*, \\ \varphi(v-1) b + \varphi(v+1) a & \text{if } -k < v < v_*, \\ \varphi(v-1) a + \varphi(v+1) b & \text{if } k > v > v_*, \\ \varphi(v) b + \varphi(v-1) a & \text{if } v = k > v_*. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

Combining (2.7) and (2.8) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i=-k}^k \varphi(i) p_i \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{v_*=-k}^k \sum_{v=-k}^k (\varphi(v') + \varphi(v'_*) - \varphi(v) - \varphi(v_*)) p_v p_{v_*} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{v_*=-k+1}^k a (\varphi(-k+1) - \varphi(-k)) p_{v_*} p_{-k} \right\rangle + \left\langle \sum_{v_*=-k}^{k-1} a (\varphi(k-1) - \varphi(k)) p_{v_*} p_k \right\rangle \\ & \quad + \left\langle \sum_{v_*=-k}^k \sum_{v=-k+1}^{v_*-1} (b \varphi(v-1) + a \varphi(v+1) - \varphi(v)) p_v p_{v_*} \right\rangle \\ & \quad + \left\langle \sum_{v_*=-k}^k \sum_{v=v_*+1}^{k-1} (a \varphi(v-1) + b \varphi(v+1) - \varphi(v)) p_v p_{v_*} \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{v_*=-k+1}^k \alpha (\varphi(-k+1) - \varphi(-k)) p_{v_*} p_{-k} + \sum_{v_*=-k}^{k-1} \alpha (\varphi(k-1) - \varphi(k)) p_{v_*} p_k \\ & \quad + \sum_{v_*=-k}^k \sum_{v=-k+1}^{v_*-1} (\beta \varphi(v-1) + \alpha \varphi(v+1) - \varphi(v)) p_v p_{v_*} \\ & \quad + \sum_{v_*=-k}^k \sum_{v=v_*+1}^{k-1} (\alpha \varphi(v-1) + \beta \varphi(v+1) - \varphi(v)) p_v p_{v_*}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Now for each $v \in K$ we take $\varphi_v(i) = \mathbb{1}\{i = v\}$ and then insert φ_v in place of φ in (2.9) which gives rise to the following system of nonlinear Boltzmann-type ODEs:

$$\begin{cases} p'_{-k} = \alpha p_{-k} p_{-k+1} + \beta (1 - p_{-k} - p_{-k+1}) p_{-k+1} - \alpha p_{-k} (1 - p_{-k}), \\ p'_i = p_{i-1} \left(\alpha \sum_{j=i}^k p_j + \beta \sum_{j=-k}^{i-2} p_j \right) + p_{i+1} \left(\alpha \sum_{j=-k}^i p_j + \beta \sum_{j=i+2}^k p_j \right) - p_i (1 - p_i), \quad -k < i < k \\ p'_k = \alpha p_k p_{k-1} + \beta (1 - p_k - p_{k-1}) p_{k-1} - \alpha p_k (1 - p_k). \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

In the next section, we provide an analysis of the ODE model (2.10) in the cases where $\alpha = 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\alpha = 0$.

3 Large time analysis

In this section, we take on the task of analyzing the long time behavior of solutions to the nonlinear ODE system (2.10). First, we perform a harmless relabeling, i.e., we will set

$$q_n = p_{-k+n} \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq n \leq 2k \quad (3.1)$$

and thus identifying $\mathbf{p} := (p_{-k}, p_{-k+1}, \dots, p_{k-1}, p_k)$ with $\mathbf{q} := (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{2k-1}, q_{2k})$. In a nutshell, we simply shift the space of admissible opinions K (2.1) from $\{-k, -k+1, \dots, k-1, k\}$ to $\{0, 1, \dots, 2k-1, 2k\}$ so that all allowable values of opinions belong to \mathbb{N} . After such simple relabeling of the solution vector and shifting of the opinion space, the ODE system (2.10) now reads as

$$\begin{cases} q'_0 = \alpha q_0 q_1 + \beta (1 - q_0 - q_1) q_1 - \alpha q_0 (1 - q_0) \\ q'_n = q_{n-1} \left(\alpha \sum_{j=n}^{2k} q_j + \beta \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} q_j \right) + q_{n+1} \left(\alpha \sum_{j=0}^n q_j + \beta \sum_{j=n+2}^{2k} q_j \right) - q_n (1 - q_n), \quad 0 < n < 2k \\ q'_{2k} = \alpha q_{2k} q_{2k-1} + \beta (1 - q_{2k} - q_{2k-1}) q_{2k-1} - \alpha q_{2k} (1 - q_{2k}) \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

We split our results on the large time convergence behavior of the solution to (3.2) into several subsections as the analysis depends heavily on the choice of the parameter α (or equivalently $\beta = 1 - \alpha$) within the unit interval $[0, 1]$, which measures the openness/persuasiveness of the entire society. In section 3.1 we prove that for $\alpha = 1$, the solution of (3.2) converges to a two-point Bernoulli-type distribution which implies that only two nearby opinions around the average opinion survive in the long run. Section 3.2 is devoted to the analysis of the system (3.2) when $\alpha = 0$, in which only two extreme opinions (represented by 0 and $2k$) remain after large times. Lastly, we show in section 3.3 that the solution to (3.2) converges to

a uniform distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 2k - 1, 2k\}$ when $\alpha = 1/2$. We emphasize that our main tool for the analysis of the long time behavior of the system (3.2) relies on the careful design of a α -dependent Lyapunov functional, whose choice and design originate from our physical intuition regarding the ODE dynamics.

3.1 Convergence to “almost consensus” for $\alpha = 1$

When $\alpha = 1$ and hence $\beta = 0$, the nonlinear ODE system (3.2) boils down to

$$\begin{cases} q'_0 = q_0 q_1 - q_0 (1 - q_0) \\ q'_n = q_{n-1} \sum_{j=n}^{2k} q_j + q_{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n q_j - q_n (1 - q_n), \quad 0 < n < 2k \\ q'_{2k} = q_{2k} q_{2k-1} - q_{2k} (1 - q_{2k}) \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

With the convention that $q_{-1} \equiv 0$ and $q_{2k+1} \equiv 0$, we can recast the system (3.3) into a more compact form

$$q'_n = q_{n-1} \sum_{j=n}^{2k} q_j + q_{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n q_j - q_n (1 - q_n) \quad (3.4)$$

holding for all $0 \leq n \leq 2k$. We now encapsulate several elementary observations regarding the solution of (3.3) into the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *Assume that $\mathbf{q} = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{2k-1}, q_{2k})$ is a classical solution to the nonlinear system of ODEs (3.3) with $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\})$, and denote $\mu := \sum_{n=0}^{2k} n q_n(0) \in [0, 2k]$. Then we have*

$$\mathbf{q}(t) \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{2k} n q_n(t) = \mu$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Moreover, the unique equilibrium distribution $\mathbf{q}^* = (q_0^*, q_1^*, \dots, q_{2k-1}^*, q_{2k}^*)$ associated to the ODE dynamics (3.3) is given by

$$q_{\lfloor \mu \rfloor}^* = 1 - \mu + \lfloor \mu \rfloor, \quad q_{\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1}^* = \mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor, \quad \text{and} \quad q_n^* = 0 \quad \text{for } n \notin \{\lfloor \mu \rfloor, \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1\}, \quad (3.5)$$

in which $\lfloor \mu \rfloor$ represents the integer part of μ .

The proof of this elementary lemma can be found in a very recent work [42] and hence will be omitted here. It is also worth mentioning that the authors of [42] also established a qualitative pointwise convergence result of the form $\mathbf{q}(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{q}^*$ in the very special case when $\alpha = 1$ and $k = 1$, in which scenario the ODE system (3.3) becomes explicit solvable. Our main goal lies in the designation of a suitable Lyapunov functional in order to capture certain quantitative aspects of the solution trajectory, for purpose we recall the definition of the so-called Gini index:

Definition 1 (Gini index) For a given probability mass function $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ with mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the Gini index of the distribution \mathbf{q} (whose value belongs to $[0, 1]$) is defined by

$$G[\mathbf{q}] = \frac{1}{2\mu} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |i - j| q_i q_j. \quad (3.6)$$

The Gini index G is a widely used concept in socio-economical context which serves as a measurement of (wealth) distributional inequality among a given society and ranges from 0 to 1. We will prove that the Gini index is a Lyapunov functional along the solution of the system (3.3) for all $t \geq 0$, the main motivation behind the choice of the Gini index as appropriate Lyapunov functional for the evolution (3.3) resides in the following variational characterization of the Bernoulli-type equilibrium distribution \mathbf{q}^* (3.5):

Lemma 3.2 The Gini index is minimized at \mathbf{q}^* among probabilities on $\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\}$ with fixed mean value $\mu \in [0, 2k]$. In other words, let

$$\mathcal{S}_\mu := \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\}) \mid \sum_{n=0}^{2k} n q_n = \mu \right\}. \quad (3.7)$$

Then

$$\mathbf{q}^* = \underset{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_\mu}{\operatorname{argmin}} G[\mathbf{q}]. \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. For the sake of notational simplicity, we introduce

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} |i - j| q_i q_j \quad (3.9)$$

as the re-scaled version of the Gini index. In other words, $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] = \mu G[\mathbf{q}]$ where μ is the mean of the distribution \mathbf{q} . A straightforward computation yields that

$$G[\mathbf{q}^*] = \frac{1}{\mu} q_{\lfloor \mu \rfloor}^* q_{\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1}^* = \frac{1}{\mu} (1 - \mu + \lfloor \mu \rfloor) (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor),$$

hence $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] = (1 - \mu + \lfloor \mu \rfloor) (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor)$. Our goal is to show that if $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$ satisfies $q_m > 0$ for some $m \notin \{\lfloor \mu \rfloor, 1 + \lfloor \mu \rfloor\}$, then $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] > \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]$. Without loss of generality, we work with the scenario that $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \mu \rfloor - 1\}$. We first prove the following preliminary result valid for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$:

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} |i - j| q_i q_j \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i. \quad (3.10)$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] &\geq \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} \sum_{j \geq \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1} (j - i) q_i q_j = \sum_{j \geq \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1} \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (j - i) q_i q_j \\
 &= \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} q_i \cdot \sum_{j \geq \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1} j q_j - \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} i q_i \cdot \sum_{j \geq \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1} q_j \\
 &= \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} q_i \cdot \left(\mu - \sum_{j \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} j q_j \right) - \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} i q_i \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{j \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} q_j \right) \\
 &= \mu \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} q_i - \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} i q_i = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now it suffices to prove that $\sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i > (1 - \mu + \lfloor \mu \rfloor) (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor)$. We divide the proof into two sub-cases depending on how large q_m is (recall that $q_m > 0$ by our assumption).

Case i): If $(\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1)(1 - q_m) \leq \mu - m q_m$ or equivalently if $q_m \geq \frac{\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu}{\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - m}$. Then

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i \geq (\mu - m) q_m = (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu) \frac{\mu - m}{\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - m} > (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu) (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor),$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that the function $x \mapsto \frac{\mu - x}{\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - x}$ is strictly decreasing for all $x \in [0, \mu]$.

Case ii): If $(\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1)(1 - q_m) > \mu - m q_m$. In this case, there exist $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_\ell \in$

$\{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \mu \rfloor\} \setminus \{m\}$ with $q_{m_i} > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \ell \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor$ such that

$$(\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1)(1 - q_m - q_{m_1} - \dots - q_{m_\ell}) \leq \mu - m q_m - m_1 q_{m_1} - \dots - m_\ell q_{m_\ell}.$$

Therefore, on the on hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i &\geq (\mu - m) q_m + (\mu - m_1) q_{m_1} + \dots + (\mu - m_\ell) q_{m_\ell} \\
 &> (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor) (q_m + q_{m_1} + \dots + q_{m_\ell}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i &\geq (\mu - m) q_m + (\mu - m_1) q_{m_1} + \dots + (\mu - m_\ell) q_{m_\ell} \\
 &= \mu (q_m + q_{m_1} + \dots + q_{m_\ell}) - (m q_m + m_1 q_{m_1} + \dots + m_\ell q_{m_\ell}) \\
 &\geq \mu (q_m + q_{m_1} + \dots + q_{m_\ell}) - [\mu - (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1)(1 - q_m - q_{m_1} - \dots - q_{m_\ell})] \\
 &= \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu + (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor - 1) (q_m + q_{m_1} + \dots + q_{m_\ell}) \\
 &= (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu) (1 - q_m - q_{m_1} - \dots - q_{m_\ell}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Assembling (3.11) and (3.12) together we deduce that

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i > (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor) (q_m + q_{m_1} + \cdots + q_{m_\ell}) \geq (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor) (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu)$$

if $q_m + q_{m_1} + \cdots + q_{m_\ell} \geq \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu$, and that

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i \geq (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu) (1 - q_m - q_{m_1} - \cdots - q_{m_\ell}) > (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu) (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor)$$

if $q_m + q_{m_1} + \cdots + q_{m_\ell} < \lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu$. Finally, we conclude that

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] \geq \sum_{i \leq \lfloor \mu \rfloor} (\mu - i) q_i > (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu) (\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor) = \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]$$

and the proof is completed. \square

Remark. The content of Lemma (3.2) conveys a very clear intuition from an economic point of view: if we interpret q_n as the fraction of individuals/agents with n dollars in a closed economical system, where the average amount of dollars per agent equals to $\mu \in [0, 2k]$, then heuristically it makes a perfect sense that the “most egalitarian” way of distributing a very large bulk of money among the agents (under the constraint that each agent must have integer-valued wealth ranging from 0 to $2k$) is to set a proportion of $\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1 - \mu$ agents to have $\lfloor \mu \rfloor$ dollars and a proportion of $\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor$ agents to have $\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1$ dollars. In fact, this economic intuition, partially inspired from many works in econophysics [9, 11, 14, 15], is the main reason that motivates us to perform the innocent shifting and relabeling (3.1) at the beginning of this section.

We are now ready to state the main convergence result in this section.

Theorem 1 *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, if $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is a solution of the nonlinear system of ODEs (3.3) with $\mathbf{q}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$ and $\mu \in (0, 2k)$, then for all $t \geq 0$ we have*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] = \mu \frac{d}{dt} G[\mathbf{q}] = -2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell \leq 0. \quad (3.13)$$

Consequently, the Gini index serves an Lyapunov functional along the solution trajectory of the system (3.3), and $\mathbf{q}(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{q}^*$.

Proof. We denote $F_{-1} = 0$ and $F_n = \sum_{i=0}^n q_i$ for $0 \leq n \leq 2k$ as the cumulative distribution function associated to the probability mass function \mathbf{q} . Now we compute the time derivative of the re-scaled Gini index $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}]$ along the solution of (3.3)

as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu \frac{d}{dt} G[\mathbf{q}] &= \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=0}^{2k} |i-j| q_i q_j \right] = \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i,j=0}^{2k} |i-j| q'_i q_j \\
&= \sum_{i,j=0}^{2k} |i-j| q_j \left[q_{i-1} \sum_{\ell=i}^{2k} q_\ell + q_{i+1} \sum_{\ell=0}^i q_\ell - q_i (1 - q_i) \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} |i-j| q_{i-1} \sum_{\ell=i}^{2k} q_\ell q_j + \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} |i-j| q_{i+1} \sum_{\ell=0}^i q_\ell q_j - \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} |i-j| q_i (1 - q_i) q_j \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \left\{ |i+1-j| \sum_{\ell=i+1}^{2k} q_\ell + |i-1-j| \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} q_\ell - |i-j| (1 - q_i) \right\} q_i q_j \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \left(|i+1-j| (1 - q_i) + |i-1-j| \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} (|i-1-j| - |i+1-j|) q_\ell \right. \\
&\quad \left. - |i-j| (1 - q_i) \right) q_i q_j \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} q_j q_i (1 - q_i) (|i+1-j| - |i-j|) + \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} q_j q_i (|i-1-j| - |i+1-j|) F_{i-1} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i (1 - q_i) \left(\sum_{j \leq i} q_j - \sum_{j > i} q_j \right) - \sum_{i=0}^{2k} F_{i-1} q_i \left(-2 \sum_{j \leq i-1} q_j + 2 \sum_{j \geq i+1} q_j \right) \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i (1 - q_i) F_i - \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i (1 - q_i) - \sum_{i=0}^{2k} F_{i-1} q_i (2 - 2 F_{i-1} - 2 F_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i [2(1 - q_i) F_i - (1 - q_i) + F_{i-1} (2 - 2 q_i - 4 F_{i-1})] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i [2(1 - q_i) F_i - (1 - q_i) + 2(1 - q_i) F_{i-1} 4 F_{i-1}^2] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i [4 F_{i-1} (1 - F_i) + 2(1 - q_i) q_i - (1 - q_i)].
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we compute

$$4 \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i F_{i-1} (1 - F_i) = 4 \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} q_j \sum_{\ell=i+1}^{2k} q_\ell = 4 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell$$

and notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \left(2(1 - q_i) q_i^2 - (1 - q_i) q_i \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} (3 q_i^2 - 2 q_i^3) - \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i \\
& = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} (3 - 2 q_i) q_i^2 - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i \right)^2 \\
& = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \left(1 + 2 \sum_{j \neq i} q_j \right) q_i^2 - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \neq i} q_j q_i \right) \\
& = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \neq i} q_j q_i^2 - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \neq i} q_j q_i \cdot \sum_{\ell=0}^k q_\ell \right) \\
& = 2 \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \neq i} q_j q_i^2 - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \neq i} q_j q_i^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i \sum_{j \neq i} q_j \sum_{\ell \neq i} q_\ell \right) \\
& = 2 \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \neq i} q_j q_i^2 - \left(2 \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \neq i} q_j q_i^2 + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i, j, \ell \leq 2k \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} q_i q_j q_\ell \right) \\
& = -3! \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell = -6 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] &= \mu \frac{d}{dt} G[\mathbf{q}] = 4 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell - 6 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell \leq 0 \\
&= -2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell
\end{aligned}$$

and the desired (pointwise) convergence $\mathbf{q}(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{q}^*$ follows from the variational characterization (3.8) (see [6] for the use of a similar strategy employed here). \square

To illustrate the dissipation of the Gini index numerically, we use $k = 2$, $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.25, 0.2, 0.35, 0.2, 0)$, and the standard Runge-Kutta fourth-order algorithm to solve the ODE system (3.3) with time step $\Delta t = 0.001$. We plot in figure 1-left and figure 1-right the evolution of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ and the solution vector $\mathbf{q}(t)$ with respect to time.

Although we managed to show that the monotonicity of the Gini index is the underlying mechanism which drives the solution of (3.3) to its unique equilibrium distribution \mathbf{q}^* , it is a very challenging task to search for a quantitative decay of the Gini index (along the solution of (3.3)) with respect to time, which amounts to establishing a explicit differential inequality satisfied by the time derivative of $G[\mathbf{q}]$.




Figure 1: **Left:** Decay of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ along the solution of (3.3). **Right:** Evolution of the solution vector $\mathbf{q}(t)$ with respect to time.

Fortunately, in the simplest case where $k = 1$ we can indeed prove a quantitative bound on $G[\mathbf{q}]$, to which we now turn:

Theorem 2 *If $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is a solution of the nonlinear system of ODEs (3.3) with $k = 1$, $\mathbf{q}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$ and $\mu \in (0, 2)$, then there exist some $\delta > 0$ and some explicitly computable $t^* > 0$ such that the following estimates are valid for all $t \geq t^*$:*

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t)] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\frac{\delta}{2}(t - t^*) + \frac{1}{\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t^*)]}} & \text{if } \mu = 1, \\ \left(\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t^*)] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] \right) e^{-\frac{|\mu-1|}{\min\{\mu, 2-\mu\}} \delta (t-t^*)} & \text{if } \mu \neq 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. In the special case $k = 1$, the equilibrium distribution \mathbf{q}^* boils down to

$$q_0^* = \max\{1 - \mu, 0\}, \quad q_1^* = \min\{2 - \mu, \mu\}, \quad q_2^* = \max\{\mu - 1, 0\}$$

and

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] = (1 - \mu + \lfloor \mu \rfloor)(\mu - \lfloor \mu \rfloor) = \begin{cases} \mu(1 - \mu), & \text{if } 0 < \mu \leq 1, \\ 3\mu - 2 - \mu^2, & \text{if } 1 \leq \mu < 2. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, the re-scaled Gini index simplifies to

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^2 \sum_{j=0}^2 |i - j| q_i q_j = q_0 q_1 + q_1 q_2 + 2 q_0 q_2.$$

Now since $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$, $q_0 + q_1 + q_2 = 1$ and $q_1 + 2q_2 = \mu$, whence $q_2 = \frac{\mu - q_1}{2}$ and $q_0 = \frac{2 - \mu - q_1}{2}$. Consequently, $q_1 \leq \min\{\mu, 2 - \mu\}$ and we can express the re-scaled Gini index $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] = \mu G[\mathbf{q}]$ in terms of q_1 solely:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] &= q_0 q_1 + q_1 q_2 + 2 q_0 q_2 = \frac{2 - \mu - q_1}{2} q_1 + \frac{\mu - q_1}{2} q_1 + 2 \frac{2 - \mu - q_1}{2} \frac{\mu - q_1}{2} \\ &= \frac{2\mu - \mu^2 - q_1^2}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we arrive at

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] = \frac{(\min\{\mu, 2 - \mu\})^2 - q_1^2}{2} \geq 0.$$

In order to derive a differential inequality for $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]$, the goal becomes bounding $q_0 q_1 q_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}]$ from below by some function of $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]$. We notice that in the case $k = 1$, the ODE system (3.4) implies that q_1 is increasing with respect to time, and since $q_1(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} q_1^* > 0$, for a small enough $\delta > 0$ (for instance, one may take $\delta = q_1^*/2$) we can always find some finite time t^* (depending only on the initial datum and δ) such that $q_1(t) \geq \delta$ for all $t \geq t^*$. In the sequel, all the differential inequalities we obtain below will be valid when time t is larger than δ . We divide the derivation of the relevant differential inequalities below into three sub-cases depending on the range of $\mu \in (0, 2)$.

Case i): If $0 < \mu < 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] &= -\frac{d}{dt} (\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]) = 2 q_0 q_1 q_2 \\ &= 2 q_1 \frac{2 - \mu - q_1}{2} \frac{\mu - q_1}{2} = \frac{q_1}{2} (2 - \mu - q_1) (\mu - q_1) \geq \frac{q_1}{2} (2 - 2\mu) (\mu - q_1) \\ &= \frac{q_1}{2} \frac{2 - 2\mu}{2\mu} 2\mu (\mu - q_1) \geq \frac{q_1}{2} \frac{2 - 2\mu}{2\mu} (\mu - q_1) (\mu + q_1) \\ &\geq \delta \frac{2 - 2\mu}{2\mu} (G[\mathbf{q}] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]), \end{aligned}$$

from which Gronwall's lemma leads us to

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t)] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] \leq (\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t^*)] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]) e^{-\frac{1-\mu}{\mu} \delta (t-t^*)}$$

for all $t \geq t^*$.

Case ii): If $1 < \mu < 2$. We use the fact that $q_1 \leq 2 - \mu$ to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] &= -\frac{d}{dt}\left(\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]\right) = \frac{q_1}{2}(2 - \mu - q_1)(\mu - q_1) \\
 &\geq \frac{q_1}{2}(2 - \mu - q_1)(2\mu - 2) = \frac{q_1}{2}(2 - \mu - q_1)\frac{2\mu - 2}{2(2 - \mu)}2(2 - \mu) \\
 &\geq \frac{q_1}{2}(2 - \mu - q_1)\frac{2\mu - 2}{2(2 - \mu)}(2 - \mu + q_1) \geq \frac{2\mu - 2}{2(2 - \mu)}\delta\left(\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]\right),
 \end{aligned}$$

from which Gronwall's lemma gives rise to

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t)] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] \leq \left(\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t^*)] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]\right) e^{-\frac{\mu-1}{2-\mu}\delta(t-t^*)}$$

for all $t \geq t^*$.

Case iii): If $\mu = 1$. Then on the one hand,

$$-\frac{d}{dt}\left(\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]\right) = \frac{q_1}{2}(2 - \mu - q_1)(\mu - q_1) = \frac{q_1}{2}(1 - q_1)^2.$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\left(\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]\right)^2 = \left(\frac{1 - q_1^2}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{(1 + q_1)^2}{4}(1 - q_1)^2.$$

As a result, $-\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] \geq \frac{\delta}{2}\left(\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*]\right)^2$ for all $t \geq t^*$ and Gronwall's inequality yields that

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t)] = \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t)] - \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}^*] \leq \frac{1}{\frac{\delta}{2}(t - t^*) + \frac{1}{\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t^*)]}}$$

for all $t \geq t^*$. □

To illustrate the quantitative convergence guarantees reported in Theorem 2 (with $k = 1$). We use two sets of the initial datum: $\mathbf{q}^{(1)}(t = 0) = (0.2, 0.3, 0.5)$ and $\mathbf{q}^{(2)}(t = 0) = (0.5, 0, 0.5)$ respectively. We plot in figure 2-left and figure 2-right the evolution of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ in the normal scale and the semi-logy scale, starting from $\mathbf{q}^{(1)}(t = 0)$. Similarly, we show in figure 3-left and figure 3-right the evolution of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ in the normal scale and the log-log scale, starting from $\mathbf{q}^{(2)}(t = 0)$.

3.2 Emergence of polarized society for $\alpha = 0$

In the case where $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 1$, the nonlinear ODE system (3.2) simplifies to

$$\begin{cases}
 q'_0 = (1 - q_0 - q_1)q_1 \\
 q'_n = q_{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} q_j + q_{n+1} \sum_{j=n+2}^{2k} q_j - q_n(1 - q_n), \quad 0 < n < 2k \\
 q'_{2k} = (1 - q_{2k-1} - q_{2k})q_{2k-1}
 \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$




Figure 2: **Left:** Decay of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ along the solution of (3.3) with $k = 1$ and $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.2, 0.3, 0.5)$. **Right:** Decay of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ in the semi-log scale. The decay is exponentially fast with respect to time, as predicted by Theorem 2.




Figure 3: **Left:** Decay of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ along the solution of (3.3) with $k = 1$ and $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.5, 0, 0.5)$. **Right:** Decay of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)] - G[\mathbf{q}^*]$ in the log-log scale. The decay is inversely proportional to time, as justified by Theorem 2.

We assume as usual that $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$ for some $\mu \in [0, 2k]$, and observe that the evolution (3.15) preserves the total probability mass again since $\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{n=0}^{2k} q_n = 0$. However, the average opinion defined by $\mu(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{2k} n q_n(t)$ will no longer be

conserved at time evolves due to simple computation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mu(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{2k} n q'_n(t) = (q_0(t) - q_{2k}(t)) (1 - q_0(t) - q_{2k}(t)).$$

Therefore, the re-scaled Gini index of the distribution $\mathbf{q}(t)$ now reads as

$$\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t)] = \mu(t) G[\mathbf{q}(t)] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{2k} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} |i - j| q_i(t) q_j(t). \quad (3.16)$$

Moreover, the dynamics admits a one-parameter family of equilibrium distributions supported only on two extreme opinions 0 and $2k$:

$$\mathcal{A}_\gamma := \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\}) \mid \mathbf{q} = \gamma \delta_0 + (1 - \gamma) \delta_{2k}, \quad \gamma \in [0, 1]\}. \quad (3.17)$$

We now prove that the re-scaled Gini index still serves as a Lyapunov functional for the nonlinear system of ODEs (3.15).

Proposition 3.3 *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, if $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is a solution of the nonlinear system of ODEs (3.3) with $\mathbf{q}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$ and $\mu \in (0, 2k)$, then for all $t \geq 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] &= (q_0 - q_{2k})^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell^2 (1 - q_\ell) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell^2 (1 - q_\ell - q_0 - q_{2k}) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k-1} q_i q_j q_\ell \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. A similar lengthy computations as provided in the proof of Theorem 1 allow us to arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i [1 + 3q_i - 4F_i(1 - F_{i-1})] - q_0(1 - q_0) - q_{2k}(1 - q_{2k}).$$

Now we recall that the proof of Theorem 1 also yields the following (generic) relation:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i 4F_{i-1}(1 - F_i) + \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i (3q_i - 2q_i^2 - 1) = -2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} q_i 4F_i(1 - F_{i-1}) &= 4q_i(F_{i-1} + q_i)(1 - F_i + q_i) \\ &= 4q_i F_{i-1}(1 - F_i) + 4q_i(F_{i-1}q_i + q_i(1 - F_i) + q_i^2) \\ &= 4q_i F_{i-1}(1 - F_i) + 4q_i^2, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i 4 F_{i-1} (1 - F_i) &= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} 4 q_i F_{i-1} (1 - F_i) + \sum_{i=0}^{2k} 4 q_i^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{2k} 4 q_i^2 - 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell - \sum_{i=0}^{2k} q_i (3 q_i - 2 q_i^2 - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} 2 q_i^2 (1 - q_i) + 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k} q_i q_j q_\ell - q_0 (1 - q_0) - q_{2k} (1 - q_{2k}).$$

We also notice that

$$\begin{aligned} q_0 (1 - q_0) &= q_0^2 (1 - q_0) + q_0 (1 - q_0)^2 = q_0^2 (1 - q_0) + q_0 (q_1 + \cdots + q_{2k})^2 \\ &= q_0^2 (1 - q_0) + 2 q_0 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 2k} q_i q_j + q_0 (q_1^2 + \cdots + q_{2k}^2) \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} q_{2k} (1 - q_{2k}) &= q_{2k}^2 (1 - q_{2k}) + q_{2k} (1 - q_{2k})^2 = q_{2k}^2 (1 - q_{2k}) + q_{2k} (q_0 + \cdots + q_{2k-1})^2 \\ &= q_{2k}^2 (1 - q_{2k}) + 2 q_{2k} \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq 2k-1} q_i q_j + q_{2k} (q_0^2 + \cdots + q_{2k-1}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}] &= 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell^2 (1 - q_\ell) + 2 \left[\sum_{1 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k-1} q_i q_j q_\ell - q_0 q_{2k} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2k-1} q_\ell \right] \\ &\quad + q_0^2 (1 - q_0) + q_{2k}^2 (1 - q_{2k}) - q_0 (q_1^2 + \cdots + q_{2k}^2) - q_{2k} (q_0^2 + \cdots + q_{2k-1}^2) \\ &= q_0^2 q_{2k} + q_0^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell + q_{2k}^2 q_0 + q_{2k}^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2k-1} q_\ell^2 (q_0 + q_{2k}) - q_0^2 q_{2k} - q_{2k}^2 q_0 \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell^2 (1 - q_\ell) + 2 \left[\sum_{1 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k-1} q_i q_j q_\ell - q_0 q_{2k} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2k-1} q_\ell \right] \\ &= (q_0 - q_{2k})^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell^2 (1 - q_\ell) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2k-1} q_\ell^2 (1 - q_\ell - q_0 - q_{2k}) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j < \ell \leq 2k-1} q_i q_j q_\ell \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed. \square

Remark. In virtue of the content of Proposition 3.3, one naturally expects that the solution of (3.15) will converge (as $t \rightarrow \infty$) to a unique equilibrium (denoted by $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$) which belongs to \mathcal{A}_γ , hence the terminal opinion distribution will be polarized at two extreme opinions 0 and $2k$. However, the dynamics (3.15) does not have any obvious invariants allowing us to link $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ with the initial datum $\mathbf{q}(0)$. In some sense, the long time behavior of the ODE system (3.15) resembles the large time behavior of a self-organized dynamics from mathematical biology [39], since the equilibrium distribution $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ is encoded in the underlying system (3.15) and depends on the initial condition as well. Whether $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ can be expressed explicitly in terms of $\mathbf{q}(0)$ is a challenging open problem for future work.

In order to demonstrate the production of the re-scaled Gini index numerically, we employ again $k = 2$ and $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.25, 0.2, 0.35, 0.2, 0)$, maintaining the same set-up as used in the generation of figure 1. We plot in figure 4-left and figure 4-right the evolution of $G[\mathbf{q}(t)]$ and the solution vector $\mathbf{q}(t)$ with respect to time.




Figure 4: **Left:** Production of $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}(t)]$ along the solution of (3.15). **Right:** Evolution of the solution vector $\mathbf{q}(t)$ with respect to time.

Remark. In the special case where $k = 1$, the system (3.15) is amenable to explicit solution, leading us to

$$q_1(t) = \frac{C}{C + e^t}, \quad q_2(t) = \frac{C + e^t}{e^t} \left[\frac{C}{2} \frac{(C + 2)e^{2t} - 2e^t - C}{(1 + C)^2(e^t + C)^2} + \frac{q_2(0)}{1 + C} \right],$$

and $q_0(t) = 1 - q_1(t) - q_2(t)$, in which $C_1 = \frac{q_1(0)}{1 - q_1(0)}$. Consequently, we deduce that

$\mathbf{q}(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbf{q}}$ where $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ is given by

$$\bar{q}_0 = \frac{1}{2} (1 + q_0^2(0) - q_2^2(0)), \quad \bar{q}_1 = 0, \quad \bar{q}_2 = \frac{1}{2} (1 - q_0^2(0) + q_2^2(0)). \quad (3.19)$$

It is worth mentioning that even in the simplest case where $k = 1$, the equilibrium distribution $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ (3.19) already exhibits a nontrivial dependence on the initial datum. Finally, we remark that when $k = 1$ the standard Gini index $G[\mathbf{q}]$ also enjoys a monotonicity property similar to its re-scaled version $\tilde{G}[\mathbf{q}]$, since we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} G[\mathbf{q}] = \frac{q_1^3 (1 - q_1) + 4 q_1^2 q_2^2 + 2 q_1 q_2^3}{(q_1 + 2 q_2)^2} \geq 0.$$

However, in general the standard Gini index will no longer serve as a Lyapunov functional for the evolution system (3.15) when $k \geq 2$.

3.3 Relaxation to uniformly mixed opinions when $\alpha = 1/2$

When $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{2}$, the nonlinear ODE system (3.2) becomes

$$\begin{cases} q'_0 = \frac{1}{2} (1 - q_1) q_1 - \frac{1}{2} (1 - q_0) q_0 \\ q'_n = \frac{1}{2} q_{n-1} (1 - q_{n-1}) + \frac{1}{2} q_{n+1} (1 - q_{n+1}) - q_n (1 - q_n), \quad 0 < n < 2k \\ q'_{2k} = \frac{1}{2} (1 - q_{2k-1}) q_{2k-1} - \frac{1}{2} (1 - q_{2k}) q_{2k} \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

Starting from any $\mathbf{q}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$ with $\mu \in (0, 2k)$, we easily see that the unique equilibrium solution of (3.20), denoted by $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, is given by the uniform distribution over $\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\}$:

$$\hat{q}_n = \frac{1}{2k + 1}, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq n \leq 2k. \quad (3.21)$$

In this case, we demonstrate that the relative entropy serves as a Lyapunov functional along the solution of (3.20). We recall that for a given $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\})$, the relative entropy from \mathbf{q} to $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ is defined by

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q} \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}}) := \sum_{n=0}^{2k} q_n \log \frac{q_n}{\hat{q}_n} = \sum_{n=0}^{2k} \hat{q}_n \frac{q_n}{\hat{q}_n} \log \frac{q_n}{\hat{q}_n}.$$

We aim to show that the relative entropy $D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q} \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ will decay exponentially fast to zero (at least after some finite time) along the solution of system (3.2). The key tool towards such exponential decay in relative entropy relies on a logarithmic Sobolev inequality (LSI) for the discrete uniform distribution.

Lemma 3.4 *Assume that $2k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is given and denote by $\hat{\mathbf{q}} = (\hat{q}_0, \dots, \hat{q}_{2k})$ the uniform distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\}$. Then there exists some universal constant $C = C(k) \propto k^2$ depending only on k such that*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{2k} \hat{q}_n f_n^2 \log f_n^2 \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} \hat{q}_n (f_{n+1} - f_n)^2 \quad (3.22)$$

for all $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, \dots, f_{2k}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2k+1}$ satisfying $\sum_{n=0}^{2k} \hat{q}_n f_n^2 = 1$.

The proof of this classical result can be found in [18, 38], and we remark here that the LSI (3.22) is merely a discrete analog of the LSI for the uniform measure on a one-dimensional compact interval, which takes the following form [24]:

$$\int_0^{2k} f^2(x) \log f^2(x) \mu(x) dx \leq C \int_0^{2k} |f'(x)|^2 \mu(x) dx, \quad (3.23)$$

where $C = C(k) \propto k^2$, $\mu(x)$ is the uniform distribution on $[0, 2k]$, and $f: [0, 2k] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is any smooth function satisfying the constraint that $\int_0^{2k} f^2(x) \mu(x) dx = 1$.

Theorem 3 (Entropy dissipation) *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, if $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is a solution of the nonlinear system of ODEs (3.20) with $\mathbf{q}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_\mu$ and $\mu \in (0, 2k)$, then there exist some $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and some finite time $t_* > 0$ for which*

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q}(t) \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}}) \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q}(t_*) \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}}) e^{-\frac{2\delta}{C}(t-t_*)}, \quad \forall t \geq t_*, \quad (3.24)$$

where $C = C(k) \propto k^2$.

Proof. We notice that the relative entropy is dissipating along the solution of (3.20) since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q} \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}}) &= \sum_{n=0}^{2k} q'_n \log q_n = q'_0 \log q_0 + q'_{2k} \log q_{2k} + \sum_{n=1}^{2k-1} q'_n \log q_n \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [(1 - q_1) q_1 - (1 - q_0) q_0] \log q_0 + \frac{1}{2} [(1 - q_{2k-1}) q_{2k-1} - (1 - q_{2k}) q_{2k}] \log q_{2k} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{2k-1} (q_{n+1} (1 - q_{n+1}) - q_n (1 - q_n)) \log q_n - \sum_{n=1}^{2k-1} (q_n (1 - q_n) - q_{n-1} (1 - q_{n-1})) \log q_n \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} (q_{n+1} (1 - q_{n+1}) - q_n (1 - q_n)) \log q_n - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{2k} (q_n (1 - q_n) - q_{n-1} (1 - q_{n-1})) \log q_n \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} (q_{n+1} (1 - q_{n+1}) - q_n (1 - q_n)) \log \frac{q_n}{q_{n+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} (1 - q_n - q_{n+1}) (q_{n+1} - q_n) (\log q_{n+1} - \log q_n) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequence, the relative entropy is a Lyapunov functional for the finite-dimensional system of nonlinear ODEs (3.20), and we obtain the pointwise convergence guarantee $\mathbf{q}(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{q}}$ (using a similar argument as in [9]). In particular, the aforementioned qualitative convergence ensures the existence of some $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and some finite $t_* > 0$ such that

$$\max_{0 \leq n \leq 2k-1} (q_n(t) + q_{n+1}(t)) \leq 1 - \delta \quad \forall t \geq t_*$$

or equivalently that

$$\min_{0 \leq n \leq 2k-1} (1 - q_n(t) - q_{n+1}(t)) \geq \delta \quad \forall t \geq t_*. \quad (3.25)$$

Now we observe for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ that

$$(a - b)(\log a - \log b) = \int_b^a 1 \, dt \cdot \int_b^a \frac{1}{t} \, dt \geq \left(\int_b^a \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \, dt \right)^2 = 4(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b})^2.$$

Therefore we can invoke Lemma 3.4 with $f_n = \sqrt{\frac{q_n}{\hat{q}_n}}$ to deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q} \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}}) \leq -2\delta \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} \hat{q}_n \left(\sqrt{\frac{q_{n+1}}{\hat{q}_{n+1}}} - \sqrt{\frac{q_n}{\hat{q}_n}} \right)^2 \leq -\frac{2\delta}{C} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q} \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}}) \quad (3.26)$$

for all $t \geq t_*$, where $C = C(k) \propto k^2$. Thanks to Gronwall's inequality, we reach the advertised bound (3.27). \square

To illustrate the quantitative convergence result proved in Theorem 3 (with $k = 2$), we use $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.25, 0.2, 0.35, 0.2, 0)$ as the initial datum, with the same set-up as used in the generation of figures 1 and 4. We plot in figure 5-left and figure 5-right the evolution of $D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q}(t) \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ in the normal scale and the semi-log scale, starting from $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.25, 0.2, 0.35, 0.2, 0)$.

Next, we show that an estimate similar to (3.27) for the relative entropy can also be established for another ‘‘pseudo-metric’’ known as the chi-squared distance, defined via

$$\chi^2(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) = \sum_{n=0}^{2k} \frac{(f_n - g_n)^2}{g_n}$$

whenever $\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1, \dots, 2k\})$ such that $g_n > 0$ for all $0 \leq n \leq 2k$.

Theorem 4 *Under the settings and notations of Theorem 3, for some $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(k)$ we have*

$$\chi^2(\mathbf{q}(t), \hat{\mathbf{q}}) \leq \chi^2(\mathbf{q}(t_*), \hat{\mathbf{q}}) e^{-\frac{\delta}{\tilde{C}}(t-t_*)}, \quad \forall t \geq t_*. \quad (3.27)$$




Figure 5: **Left:** Decay of $D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q}(t) \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ along the solution of (3.20) with $k = 2$. **Right:** Decay of $D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{q}(t) \parallel \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ in the semi-log scale. The decay is exponentially fast with respect to time, as predicted by Theorem 3.

Proof. We observe that the chi-squared distance $\chi^2(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ also serves as a Lyapunov functional for the ODE system (3.20) due to the following computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{dt} \chi^2(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}}) &= 2(2k+1) \sum_{n=0}^{2k} (q_n - \hat{q}_n) q'_n \\
 &= 2(2k+1) \left[q_0 q'_0 + q_{2k} q'_{2k} + \sum_{n=1}^{2k-1} q_n q'_n \right] \\
 &= -(2k+1) \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} (q_{n+1} - q_n) [q_{n+1} (1 - q_{n+1}) - q_n (1 - q_n)] \\
 &= -(2k+1) \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} (1 - q_n - q_{n+1}) (q_{n+1} - q_n)^2 \\
 &= - \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} (1 - q_n - q_{n+1}) \hat{q}_n \left(\frac{q_{n+1}}{\hat{q}_{n+1}} - \frac{q_n}{\hat{q}_n} \right)^2 \leq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the previous estimate (3.25) and the Poincaré inequality satisfied by the uniform distribution $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ [5], we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \chi^2(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}}) \leq -\delta \sum_{n=0}^{2k-1} \hat{q}_n \left(\frac{q_{n+1}}{\hat{q}_{n+1}} - \frac{q_n}{\hat{q}_n} \right)^2 \leq -\frac{\delta}{\tilde{C}} \chi^2(\mathbf{q}, \hat{\mathbf{q}}) \quad \forall t \geq t_* \quad (3.28)$$

for some $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(k) > 0$. Finally, a routine application of Grownall's lemma leads us to the claimed bound. \square

To demonstrate the quantitative bound established in Theorem 4 (with $k = 2$), we use the same set-up as used in the generation of figures 1, 4 and 5. We plot in figure 6-left and figure 6-right the evolution of $\chi^2(\mathbf{q}(t), \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ in the normal scale and the semi-log scale, starting from $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.25, 0.2, 0.35, 0.2, 0)$.




Figure 6: **Left:** Decay of $\chi^2(\mathbf{q}(t), \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ along the solution of (3.20) with $k = 2$. **Right:** Decay of $\chi^2(\mathbf{q}(t), \hat{\mathbf{q}})$ in the semi-log scale. The decay is exponentially fast with respect to time, as shown by Theorem 4.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we proposed and analyzed the Iterative Persuasion-Polarization (IPP) opinion model in the mean field region as the number of agents tends to infinity. Our model contributes to the growing list of opinion dynamics among the sociophysics literature and contains a parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ measuring the tendency that each agent will align his/her opinion with another agent's opinion during an interaction process. We provided analytical and quantitative results regarding the large time behavior of the mean-field IPP ODE system (3.2) under three particular choices of the parameter α . In particular, we proved that the steady state opinion distribution is a two-point distribution supported near the average initial opinion when $\alpha = 1$, indicating the formation of a "almost consensus" opinion profile. On the other hand, we showed when $\alpha = 0$ that the opinion distribution converges to a polarized state in which only two extreme opinions survive in the long run. Lastly, in the case where $\alpha = 1/2$, we established the convergence to a uniform distribution for solutions of the mean-field system of ODEs (3.2) under the large time limit. The present paper also leaves many important unsolved problems suitable for further research activities in the future. First, is it possible analyze the large time behaviour of the

nonlinear ODE system (3.2) when $\alpha \in [0, 1] \setminus \{0, 1/2, 1\}$? If so, can we determine the equilibrium distribution of opinions? Numerical solutions of the ODE system in this case suggest that the system will converge to a unique equilibrium regardless of initial datum that depends only on α and k (as it does with $\alpha = 1/2$) as illustrated in figure 7.




Figure 7: Distribution of opinions at equilibrium (with $k = 5$) for varying values of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, starting from the initial datum $\mathbf{q}(t = 0)$ given by $\mathbf{q}(t = 0) = (0.25, 0.15, 0.05, 0.05, 0.15, 0, 0.10, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 0.10)$.

Second, in the case of $\alpha = 0$, how can we link the equilibrium polarized opinion profile with the initial opinion distribution so that a more explicit form of the equilibrium distribution can be identified? A proper theoretical treatment of these questions allows us have a better understanding about the roles played by the persuasion parameter α and (possibly) the initial datum on the shape of the steady state distribution of opinions.

References

- [1] Robert P. Ableson. Mathematical models of the distribution of attitudes under controversy. *Contributions to Mathematical Psychology*, 1964. Publisher: Holt,

- Rinehart & Winston.
- [2] Robert P. Ableson. Mathematical models in social psychology. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 3:1–54, 1967.
 - [3] Robert Axelrod. The dissemination of culture: A model with local convergence and global polarization. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 41(2):203–226, 1997.
 - [4] Eli Ben-Naim. Opinion dynamics: Rise and fall of political parties. *Europhysics Letters*, 69(5):671–677, 2005.
 - [5] Sergej G. Bobkov, and Friedrich Götze. Discrete isoperimetric and Poincaré-type inequalities. *Probability theory and Related Fields*, 114:245–277, 1999.
 - [6] Bruce M. Boghosian, Merek Johnson, and Jeremy A. Marcq. An H Theorem for Boltzmann’s Equation for the Yard-Sale Model of Asset Exchange: The Gini Coefficient as an H Functional. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 161:1339–1350, 2015.
 - [7] Fei Cao, and Stephanie Reed. A biased dollar exchange model involving bank and debt with discontinuous equilibrium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07851*, 2023.
 - [8] Fei Cao, and Nicholas F. Marshall. From the binomial reshuffling model to Poisson distribution of money. *Networks and Heterogeneous Media*, 19(1):24–43, 2024.
 - [9] Fei Cao, and Sebastien Motsch. Derivation of wealth distributions from biased exchange of money. *Kinetic & Related Models*, 16(5):764–794, 2023.
 - [10] Fei Cao, Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin, and Sebastien Motsch. Entropy dissipation and propagation of chaos for the uniform reshuffling model. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 33(4):829–875, 2023.
 - [11] Fei Cao. Explicit decay rate for the Gini index in the repeated averaging model. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 46(4):3583–3596, 2023.
 - [12] Fei Cao, and Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin. From interacting agents to Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution of money. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05629*, 2022.
 - [13] Fei Cao, and Jincheng Yang. Quantitative convergence guarantees for the mean-field dispersion process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05043*, 2024.
 - [14] Fei Cao, and Sebastien Motsch. Sticky dispersion on the complete graph: a kinetic approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08868*, 2024.

-
- [15] Fei Cao, and Sebastien Motsch. Uncovering a two-phase dynamics from a dollar exchange model with bank and debt. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 83(5):1872–1891, 2023.
- [16] Fei Cao, and Roberto Cortez. Uniform propagation of chaos for a dollar exchange econophysics model. *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 1–13, 2024.
- [17] Stephanie Cordier, Lorenzo Pareschi, and Giuseppe Toscani. On a kinetic model for a simple market economy. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 120:253–277, 2005.
- [18] Persi Diaconis, and Laurent Saloff-Coste. Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for finite Markov chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 6(3):695–750, 1996.
- [19] Jan Christian Dittmer. Consensus formation under bounded confidence. *Non-linear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 47(7):4615–4621, 2001.
- [20] Guillaume Deffuant, David Neau, Frédéric Amblard, and Gérard Weisbuch. Mixing beliefs among interacting agents. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 3(01n04):87–98, 2000.
- [21] Guillaume Deffuant, Frédéric Amblard, and Gérard Weisbuch, and Thierry Faure. How can extremism prevail? A study based on the relative agreement interaction model. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 5(4):27, 2002.
- [22] Martina Fraia, and Andrea Tosin. The Boltzmann legacy revisited: kinetic models of social interactions. *MATEMATICA, CULTURA E SOCIETÀ*, 5(2):93–109, 2020.
- [23] Serge Galam, Yuval Gefen, and Yonathan Shapir. Sociophysics: A new approach of sociological collective behavior. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 9:1–13, 1982.
- [24] Whan Ghang, Zane Martin, and Steven Waruhiu. The sharp log-Sobolev inequality on a compact interval. *Involve*, 7:181–186, 2014.
- [25] Rainer Hegselmann, and Ulrich Krause. Opinion dynamics and bounded confidence: Models, analysis, and simulation. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 5(3):1–33, 2002.
- [26] Ernst Ising. Beitrag zur Theorie des Ferromagnetismus. *Zeitschrift für Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei*, 31(1):253–258, 1925.

-
- [27] Eugene Kashdan, and Lorenzo Pareschi. Mean field mutation dynamics and the continuous Luria-Delbrück distribution *Mathematical Biosciences*, 240(2):223–230, 2012.
- [28] Ulrich Krause. A discrete nonlinear and non-autonomous model of consensus formation. *Communications in Difference Equations*, 2000:227–236, 2000.
- [29] Nicolas Lanchier. The critical value of the Deffuant model equals one half. *Latin American Journal of Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 9(2):383–402, 2020. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [30] Nicolas Lanchier, and Hsin-Lun Li. Probability of consensus in the multivariate Deffuant model on finite connected graphs. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 25:1–12, 2020.
- [31] Nicolas Lanchier, and Max Mercer. Deffuant opinion dynamics with attraction and repulsion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19073*, 2023.
- [32] Nicolas Lanchier, and Jason Schweinsberg. Consensus in the two-state Axelrod model. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 122(11):3701–3717, 2012. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [33] Nicolas Lanchier, and Stephanie Reed. Rigorous results for the distribution of money on connected graphs. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 171(4):727–743, 2018.
- [34] Nicolas Lanchier, and Stephanie Reed. Rigorous results for the distribution of money on connected graphs (models with debts). *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 176(5):1115–1137, 2019.
- [35] Nicolas Lanchier, and Stephanie Reed. The role of cooperation in spatially explicit economical systems. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 50(3):743–758, 2018.
- [36] Nicolas Lanchier, and Stephanie Reed. Distribution of Money on Connected Graphs with Multiple Banks. *Mathematical Modelling of Natural Phenomena*, 19(10), 2024.
- [37] Nadia Loy, Matteo Raviola, and Andrea Tosin. Opinion polarisation in social networks. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 380(224):1–15, 2022.
- [38] Daniel Matthes, Eva-Maria Rott, Giuseppe Savaré, and André Schlichting. A structure preserving discretization for the Derrida-Lebowitz-Speer-Spohn equation based on diffusive transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13284*, 2023.

-
- [39] Sebastien Motsch, and Eitan Tadmor. A new model for self-organized dynamics and its flocking behavior. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 144:923–947, 2011.
- [40] René Ochrombel. Simulation of Sznajd sociophysics model with convincing single opinions. *International Journal of Modern Physics C: Computational Physics & Physical Computation*, 12(7):1091–1092, 2001.
- [41] Lorenzo Pareschi, and Giuseppe Toscani. Interacting multiagent systems: kinetic equations and Monte Carlo methods. *Oxford University Press*, 2013.
- [42] Milka Perez Cazarez, and Stephanie Reed. Long-term opinion distributions of an opinion formation model with averaging behavior. *The PUMP Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 6:354–370, 2023.
- [43] Frantisek Slanina, and Hynek Lavicka. Analytical results for the Sznajd model of opinion formation. *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, 35:279–288, 2003.
- [44] Dietrich Stauffer, and Paulo Murilo C. de Oliveira. Persistence of opinion in the Sznajd consensus model, computer simulation. *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, 30:587–592, 2002.
- [45] Dietrich Stauffer, and Hildegard Meyer-Ortmanns. Simulation of consensus model of Deffuant et al. on a Barabasi–Albert network. *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 15(2):241–246, 2004.
- [46] Katarzyna Sznajd-Weron, and Józef Sznajd. Opinion evolution in closed community. *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 11(6):1157–1165, 2000.
- [47] Katarzyna Sznajd-Weron, Józef Sznajd, and Tomasz Weron. A review on the Sznajd model - 20 years after. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 565:1–12, 2021.
- [48] Katarzyna Sznajd-Weron, M. Tabiszewski, and André M. Timpanaro. Phase transition in the Sznajd model with independence. *Europhysics Letters*, 96(4):1–6, 2011.
- [49] Giuseppe Toscani. Kinetic Models of Opinion Formation. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 4(3): 481–496, 2006.
- [50] Cédric Villani. A review of mathematical topics in collisional kinetic theory. *Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics*, 1(71-305):3–8, 2002.
- [51] Gérard Weisbuch, Guillaume Deffuant, Frédéric Amblard, and Jean-Pierre Nadal. Meet, discuss and segregate! *Complexity*, 7(3):55–63, 2002.