

Modification of Social Dominance in Social Networks by Selective Adjustment of Interpersonal Weights

Mengbin Ye¹, Ji Liu⁴, Brian D.O. Anderson^{1,2,3}, Changbin Yu^{1,2}, and Tamer Başar⁴

Abstract—According to the DeGroot-Friedkin model of a social network, an individual’s social power evolves as the network discusses individual opinions over a sequence of issues. Under mild assumptions on the connectivity of the network, the social power of every individual converges to a constant strictly positive value as the number of issues discussed increases. If the network has a special topology, termed “star topology”, then all social power accumulates with the individual at the centre of the star. This paper studies the strategic introduction of new individuals and/or interpersonal relationships into a social network with star topology to reduce the social power of the centre individual. In fact, several strategies are proposed. For each strategy, we derive necessary and sufficient conditions on the strength of the new interpersonal relationships, based on local information, which ensures that the centre individual no longer has the greatest social power within the social network. Interpretations of these conditions show that the strategies are remarkably intuitive and that certain strategies are favourable compared to others, all of which is sociologically expected.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the systems and control community has turned to study of networked systems and multi-agent systems in the context of social sciences. Of particular interest are social networks, where groups of people interact with acquaintances through *interpersonal relationships*.

One problem of “opinion dynamics” has been of particular interest; how do the opinions of individuals for a given issue evolve as they discuss this issue in a social network? A recent survey on opinion dynamics is presented in [1]. An important aspect of opinion dynamics is *social power*, which in one sense can be considered as the weight/power/influence an individual has on the opinion discussion, relative to the weight/power/influence of the other individuals in the social network. This relativity arises due to interpersonal relationships and their strengths (which may be unidirectional). This concept is studied in the seminal works [2], [3]. The evolution of social power is studied in [4]. The paper [5] studies the case where multiple, interdependent issues are simultaneously discussed. Selecting the most influential individual in social diffusion models is studied in [6]. A social network with stubborn individuals who remain attached to

their initial opinions is studied in [7], [8]. The centralised DeGroot-Friedkin model for the evolution of social power is proposed and analysed in [9]. Distributed discrete- and continuous-time DeGroot-Friedkin models are studied in [10] and [11] respectively.

According to French Jr. and Snyder in [12], “*leadership* is the potential social influence of one part of the group over another.” From the perspective of opinion dynamics, a leader can therefore be seen as an individual or a group of individuals that has a disproportionate amount of control over the opinion discussion process. In the context of social power, one can therefore refer to a leader/leader group as the *socially dominant* individual/group of individuals. The fact that social power tends to accumulate with one individual or a subgroup of individuals in a social network is reported empirically in [4] and theoretically in [9]. This individual or subgroup is defined explicitly by the interpersonal relationships in the social network. Motivated by this concept of social dominance/leadership, and using the DeGroot-Friedkin model to describe the social network, we begin with network topologies which have a single socially dominant individual, and seek to study *control strategies, including introduction of new individuals into the network and/or establishment of new interpersonal relationships, that will cause the social dominance to shift to another individual*. We now introduce the DeGroot-Friedkin model to better motivate the formal problem statement which follows in the sequel. In order to allow readers to quickly grasp the concepts of the new model and understand the motivations, in the following subsection, where possible we leave out definitions and exact mathematical results; these will be included in Section II. The terms “self-weight”, “individual social power” and “social power” will be used interchangeably.

A. The DeGroot-Friedkin Model

The discrete-time DeGroot-Friedkin model comprises a consensus model for describing the opinion dynamics (details are given below) and a mechanism for updating self-weights (the weight an individual applies to its own opinion value in the consensus process). We define $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ to be the set of indices of sequential issues which are being discussed by the social network. For a given issue s , the social network discusses the issue using the discrete-time DeGroot consensus model (with constant weights throughout the discussion of the issue). At the end of the discussion (i.e. when the DeGroot model has effectively reached steady state), each individual reflects upon, and judges its impact on the discussion. This mechanism is termed reflected self-

¹M. Ye, B. D.O. Anderson and C. Yu are with the Research School of Engineering, Australian National University. ²B. D.O. Anderson and C. Yu are with Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou, China. ³B. D.O. Anderson is also with Data61-CSIRO (formerly NICTA Ltd.) in Canberra, A.C.T., Australia. ⁴J. Liu and T. Başar are with the Coordinated Science Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. This work was supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) under grants DP-130103610 and DP-160104500, by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant 61375072), and by Data61-CSIRO.

{Mengbin.Ye, Brian.Anderson, Brad.Yu}@anu.edu.au
{jiliu, basar1}@illinois.edu

appraisal, with “reflection” referring to the fact that adjustments to weights are made after discussion on an issue. The individual then updates its own self-weight and discussion begins on the next issue $s + 1$ (using the same consensus model but now with adjusted weights). We now explain the mathematical modelling of the mechanism for updating opinions within an issue, and the updating of self-weights from one issue to the next.

1) *DeGroot Consensus of Opinions*: For each issue $s \in \mathcal{S}$, each individual updates its opinion $y_i(s, \cdot) \in \mathbb{R}$ at time $t + 1$ as

$$y_i(s, t + 1) = w_{ii}(s)y_i(s, t) + \sum_{j \neq i}^n w_{ij}(s)y_j(s, t) \quad (1)$$

where $w_{ii}(s)$ is the self-weight individual i places on its own opinion and w_{ij} is the weight given by agent i to the opinion of its neighbour individual j . As will be made apparent in the sequel, $\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} = 1$, which implies that individual i 's new opinion value $y_i(s, t + 1)$ is a convex combination of its own opinion, and the opinions of its neighbours at the current time instant. The opinion dynamics for the entire social network may be expressed as

$$\mathbf{y}(s, t + 1) = \mathbf{W}(s)\mathbf{y}(s, t) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{y}(s, t) = [y_1(s, t) \ \cdots \ y_n(s, t)]^\top$ is the vector of opinions of the $n + 1$ agents in the network at time instant t . This model was studied in [3] with $\mathcal{S} = \{0\}$ (i.e. only one issue was discussed). The dynamics of (2), and the graphical conditions required for opinions to converge, have been well studied. Next, we describe the model for the updating of $\mathbf{W}(s)$ (specifically $w_{ii}(s)$) via a reflected self-appraisal mechanism that occurs at the end of discussion of an issue s . For simplicity, we assume that each individual's opinion, $y_i(s, t)$, is a scalar. Kronecker products may be used if each individual's opinion state is a vector $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $p \geq 2$.

2) *Friedkin's Self-Appraisal Model for Determining Self-Weight*: The Friedkin component of the model proposes a method for updating the self-weight (individual social power, self-confidence or self-esteem) of individual i , which is denoted by $x_i(s) = w_{ii}(s) \in [0, 1]$ (the i^{th} diagonal term of $\mathbf{W}(s)$) [9]. Define the vector $\mathbf{x}(s) = [x_1(s) \ \cdots \ x_n(s)]^\top$ as the vector of self-weights for the individuals of the social network, with starting self-weight $0 \leq x_i(0) \leq 1$ satisfying $\sum_i x_i(0) = 1$. The self-weight vector $\mathbf{x}(s)$ is updated at the end of issue s as

$$\mathbf{x}(s + 1) = \boldsymbol{\zeta}(s) \quad (3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}(s)^\top$ is the unique nonnegative left eigenvector of $\mathbf{W}(s)$ associated with the eigenvalue 1, normalised such that $\mathbf{1}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}(s) = 1$, see [9]. When individual i adjusts its value of $w_{ii}(s) = x_i(s)$, it necessarily must adjust the weights $w_{ij}(s)$, $j \neq i$ to maintain $\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} = 1$. The precise structure of $\mathbf{W}(s)$, and its properties giving rise to the existence of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}(s)^\top$, will be provided in the sequel. See Remark 1 in Section II-B for comments on the motivation for this update mechanism. Convergence properties will be

presented in the sequel, but under mild assumptions on the social network topology, it is shown that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \boldsymbol{\zeta}(s)^\top = \mathbf{x}^*$ where \mathbf{x}^* is the constant vector of *social power at equilibrium*.

B. Contributions

In order to simplify the problem of achieving change of a socially dominant leader, we will only consider *social power at equilibrium* \mathbf{x}^* in this paper. It was shown in [9] that if the social network has a specific topology termed the star topology, all social power at equilibrium accumulates with a single individual k as issues are sequentially discussed, in an “autocratic configuration”. In this paper, we show that by *strategic* introduction of new individuals and/or new interpersonal relationships into the social network, not only is the autocratic configuration broken but *if the new relationship is sufficiently strong, other identifiable individual(s) will have social power at equilibrium* greater than individual k . Specifically, we derive necessary and sufficient conditions *based on local information* for the relationship strength. This is in contrast to many control strategies on networked systems which rely on global information [13], [14]. In fact, a number of different strategies are considered. We also propose a strategy whereby two socially dominant individuals in separate networks can combine their networks and together remain socially dominant.

While the results are initially presented mathematically as inequalities, we provide detailed analysis and interpretation. In doing so, we show that the strategies are remarkably intuitive and precisely what one would expect when considered from a sociological context. The fact that the strategies affect the *social power of individuals* in a social network which is sequentially discussing issues implies that we have developed control strategies for *affecting/influencing the opinion dynamics process*.

C. Paper Structure

In Section II, we provide notations, an introduction to graph theory, and convergence results for the DeGroot-Friedkin model. At the same time, a formal problem statement is given. The main results are presented in Section III. Simulations are presented in Section IV and conclusions are drawn in Section V.

II. BACKGROUND AND FORMAL PROBLEM STATEMENT

We begin by introducing some mathematical notations used in the paper. Let $\mathbf{1}_n$ and $\mathbf{0}_n$ denote, respectively, the $n \times 1$ column vectors of all ones and all zeros. For a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $0 \preceq \mathbf{x}$ and $0 \prec \mathbf{x}$ indicate component-wise inequalities, i.e., for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $0 \leq x_i$ and $0 < x_i$, respectively. Let Δ_n denote the n -simplex, the set which satisfies $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \preceq \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{x} = 1\}$. The canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^n is given by $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$. Define $\Delta_n = \Delta_n \setminus \{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$ and $\text{int}(\Delta_n) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \prec \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{x} = 1\}$. For the rest of the paper, we shall use the terms “node”, “agent”, and “individual” interchangeably.

A. Graph Theory

The interaction between individuals in a social network is modelled using a weighted directed graph, denoted as $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. Each individual agent is a node in the finite, nonempty set of nodes $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. The set of ordered edges is $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$. We denote an ordered edge as $e_{ij} = (v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$, and because the graph is directed, in general e_{ij} and e_{ji} may not both exist. An edge e_{ij} is said to be outgoing with respect to v_i and incoming with respect to v_j . The presence of an edge e_{ij} connotes that individual j learns of, and takes into account, the opinion value of individual i when updating its own opinion. The incoming and outgoing neighbour set of v_i are respectively defined as $\mathcal{N}_i^+ = \{v_j \in \mathcal{V} : e_{ji} \in \mathcal{E}\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_i^- = \{v_j \in \mathcal{V} : e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}\}$. The relative interaction matrix $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ associated with \mathcal{G} has nonnegative entries c_{ij} , termed ‘‘relative interpersonal weights’’ in [9]. The entries of \mathbf{C} have properties such that $0 < c_{ij} \leq 1 \Leftrightarrow e_{ji} \in \mathcal{E}$ and $c_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. It is assumed that $c_{ii} = 0$ (i.e. with no self-loops), and we impose the restriction that $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^+} c_{ij} = 1$ (i.e. that \mathbf{C} is a row-stochastic matrix).

A directed path is a sequence of edges of the form $(v_{p_1}, v_{p_2}), (v_{p_2}, v_{p_3}), \dots$ where $v_{p_i} \in \mathcal{V}, e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}$. Node i is reachable from node j if there exists a directed path from v_j to v_i . A graph is said to be strongly connected if every node is reachable from every other node. The relative interaction matrix \mathbf{C} is irreducible if and only if the associated graph \mathcal{G} is strongly connected (\mathbf{C} is known in some literature as the weighted adjacency matrix). If \mathbf{C} is irreducible then it has a unique (up to a scaling) left eigenvector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top$, with all entries strictly positive, associated with the eigenvalue 1 (Perron-Frobenius Theorem, see [15]). Henceforth, we shall call this left eigenvector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top$ the *dominant left eigenvector of \mathbf{C}* and assume that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top$ has been normalised such that it has the property $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \mathbf{1}_n = 1$.

B. Convergence Results for the DeGroot-Friedkin Model

We now provide additional, specific details on the model. For a given issue, the influence matrix $\mathbf{W}(s)$ is defined as follows

$$\mathbf{W}(s) = \mathbf{X}(s) + (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}(s))\mathbf{C} \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{C} is the relative interaction matrix associated with the graph \mathcal{G} , and the matrix $\mathbf{X}(s) \doteq \text{diag}[\mathbf{x}(s)]$. From the fact that \mathbf{C} is row-stochastic with zero diagonal entries, (4) implies that $\mathbf{W}(s)$ is a row-stochastic matrix. Note that $\boldsymbol{\zeta}(s)^\top \mathbf{1}_n = 1$ implies that $\mathbf{x}(s) \in \Delta_n$ for all s . From (4) and the fact that \mathbf{C} is constant, it is apparent that by adjusting $w_{ii}(s+1) = \zeta_i(s)$, individual i also scales $w_{ij}(s+1), j \neq i$ by $(1 - w_{ii}(s+1))$ in order to maintain the row-stochastic property of $\mathbf{W}(s)$.

Remark 1 (Social Power). *The precise motivation behind using (3) as the updating model for $\mathbf{x}(s)$ is detailed in [9], but we provide a brief overview here in the interest of making this paper self-contained. The definition of \mathbf{W} in (4) ensures that, for any given s , there holds $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{y}(s, t) = (\boldsymbol{\zeta}(s)^\top \mathbf{y}(s, 0)) \mathbf{1}_n$. In other words, for any given issue s , the*

opinions of every individual in the social network reach a consensus value $\boldsymbol{\zeta}(s)^\top \mathbf{y}(s, 0)$ equal to a convex combination of their initial opinion values $\mathbf{y}(s, 0)$. The elements of $\boldsymbol{w}(s)^\top$ are the convex combination coefficients, i.e. $\zeta_i(s)$ represents precisely the amount of weight/power that individual i had on the opinion discussion for issue s . For a given issue s , $\zeta_i(s)$ is a manifestation of individual i 's social power in the social network, as it is in effect the ability of individual i to control the outcome of a discussion [16]. The reflected self-appraisal mechanism therefore describes an individual 1) observing how much power it had on the discussion of issue s (the nonnegative quantity $\zeta_i(s)$) and, 2) for the following issue $s+1$, adjusting its self-weight to be equal to this power, i.e. $x_i(s+1) = w_{ii}(s+1) = \zeta_i(s)$. As can be observed from (4) and because \mathbf{C} is constant, adjusting $w_{ii}(s+1)$ also adjusts the interpersonal weights $w_{ij}(s+1)$.

It is shown in [Lemma 2.2, [9]] that the system (3) describing the update of self-weights, is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{x}(s+1) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}(s)) \quad (5)$$

where the nonlinear vector-valued function $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}(s))$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}(s)) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_i & \text{if } x_i(s) = \mathbf{e}_i, \text{ for any } i \\ \alpha(\mathbf{x}(s)) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_1}{1-x_1(s)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{c_n}{1-x_n(s)} \end{bmatrix} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

with $\alpha(\mathbf{x}(s)) = 1 / \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{c_i}{1-x_i(s)}$. Much of this paper will deal with scenarios where the underlying graph has a star topology or its variants, the definition and relevance of which are now given.

Definition 1 (Star topology). *A strongly connected graph¹ \mathcal{G} is said to have star topology if there exists a node i , which is called the centre node, such that every edge of \mathcal{G} is either to or from node i*

Note that the irreducibility of \mathbf{C} implies that the star topology must include edges in both directions between the centre node v_i and every other node $v_j, j \neq i$. We now provide a lemma and a theorem regarding the convergence of $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}(s))$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 1 (Lemma 3.2, [9]). *Suppose that $n \geq 3$, and suppose further that \mathcal{G} has star topology, which without loss of generality has centre node v_1 . Let \mathbf{C} be the row-stochastic and irreducible adjacency matrix, with zero diagonal entries, associated with \mathcal{G} . Then for all initial conditions $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \hat{\Delta}_n$, the self-weights $\mathbf{x}(s)$ converge to the fixed point $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{e}_1$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$.*

¹While it is indeed possible to have a star graph that is not strongly connected, this paper similarly to [9] deals only with graphs which are strongly connected.

Theorem 1 (Theorem 4.1, [9]). *For $n \geq 3$, consider the DeGroot-Friedkin dynamical system (5) with a relative interaction matrix \mathbf{C} that is row-stochastic, irreducible, and has zero diagonal entries. Assume that the digraph \mathcal{G} associated with \mathbf{C} does not have star topology and define γ^\top as the dominant left eigenvector of \mathbf{C} . Then,*

- (i) *For all initial conditions $\mathbf{x}(1) \in \tilde{\Delta}_n$, the self-weights $\mathbf{x}(s)$ converge to \mathbf{x}^* as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Here, $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Delta_n$ is the unique fixed point satisfying $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*)$.*
- (ii) *There holds $x_i^* < x_j^*$ if and only if $\gamma_i < \gamma_j$, for any i, j , where γ_i is the i^{th} entry of the dominant left eigenvector γ . There holds $x_i^* = x_j^*$ if and only if $\gamma_i = \gamma_j$.*
- (iii) *The unique fixed point \mathbf{x}^* is determined only by γ^\top , and is independent of the initial conditions.*

An interpretation of Lemma 1 and Theorem 1 is given in below in Remark 2.

C. Formal Problem Statement

In this paper, we investigate *how additional nodes and/or edges strategically connected to a star topology can change the social power at equilibrium, \mathbf{x}^** . To that end, we begin first by providing definitions which will aid in describing our problem and discussing results obtained. Moreover, we are interested in comparing the social power of individuals within the network at equilibrium, i.e. when $s \rightarrow \infty$. We will therefore refer to the equilibrium value x_i^* as the social power of individual i when there is no ambiguity (as opposed to the evolving $x_i(s)$ when $s < \infty$).

To simplify the problem, we do not study the evolution of the opinions $\mathbf{y}(s, t)$. Under the assumption that \mathbf{C} is irreducible, it is shown in [9] that, for any issue s , the opinions always converge as $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{y}(s, t) = (\zeta(s)^\top \mathbf{y}(s, 0)) \mathbf{1}_n$. As discussed above, we are interested in individual social power of the network.

Definition 2 (Autocratic Network). *A social network is said to be an autocratic configuration, with node v_i being the autocrat, if $\mathbf{x}(s) = \mathbf{e}_i$.*

Definition 3 (Social dominance/leadership). *Node v_i is said to be the socially dominant/leader node in the network if $x_i^* > x_j^*$ for all $j \neq i$. In other words, at equilibrium, the social power of individual i is greater than the social power of any other individual in the social network.*

Remark 2 (Autocratic tendency). *Lemma 1 has an important social connotation. One can consider $x_i(0)$ as individual i 's estimate of its social power when the social network is first formed, before any issue discussion. For any initial estimate $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \tilde{\Delta}_n$ (that is, no individual i believes $x_i(0) = 1$), the star topology network tends to an autocratic configuration at equilibrium, $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{e}_1$. This implies that, for the first few issues, opinion discussion will occur with everyone contributing to the final consensus value. However, as more issues are discussed, the centre individual increasingly guides the outcome of discussions until, for $s = \infty$, only the centre individual's opinion value matters.*

Remark 3. *In [9], the constant entries c_{ij} of \mathbf{C} are termed “relative interpersonal weights”, and we will keep with this terminology. However, one can also consider c_{ij} as the amount of “trust” individual i has for individual j or the strength of “influence” individual j has on individual i . In other words, c_{ij} captures the strength of a unidirectional relationship (unidirectional since $c_{ij} \neq c_{ji}$ in general).*

For a given graph \mathcal{G} with star topology, with centre node v_1 , let us call the other nodes *subject nodes* in the sense that they are subjects to the autocrat centre node. In Fig. 1, these are nodes $v_i, i = 2, \dots, 7$. We are going to study how the autocracy can be disrupted by introduction of a perturbation to the star graph. This leads us to define a new type of node. An *attacker node* is a node v_j which forms edges e_{ji}, e_{ij} with some node $v_i, i \neq 1$, i.e. a subject node. In doing so, we modify the graph \mathcal{G} to become $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ which is no longer a star. In Fig. 2, node v_8 is the attacker node, forming edges with node v_7 . We call node v_j an attacker node because, as will become apparent in the sequel, the weights c_{ji} and c_{ij} determine the social power x_1^* of the autocrat node v_1 . In other words, v_j attacks the social dominance of v_1 . Note that two edges, e_{ji}, e_{ij} must be formed to ensure that $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ remains strongly connected. Actually, there are a number of interesting ways to attack the social dominance of v_1 , and we list some of the most important/fundamental methods. For each topology variation we list below, we provide an example in the Figures 2-6.

Topology Variation 1 (Single Attack). *Suppose that $n \geq 4$. Suppose further that \mathcal{G} has star topology, with v_1 being the centre node, and with $n-2$ subject nodes, $v_i, i = 2, \dots, n-1$. A single attacker node v_n attaches to subject node v_{n-1} by forming edges $e_{n-1,n}$ and $e_{n,n-1}$. This forms the modified graph $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$*

Topology Variation 2 (Coordinated Double Attack). *Suppose that $n \geq 5$. Suppose further that \mathcal{G} has star topology, with v_1 being the centre node, and with $n-3$ subject nodes, $v_i, i = 2, \dots, n-2$. Two attacker nodes v_{n-1} and v_n attach to subject node v_{n-2} by forming the set of edges $\{e_{n-2,n-1}, e_{n-1,n-2}, e_{n-2,n}, e_{n,n-2}\}$. This forms $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$.*

Topology Variation 3 (Uncoordinated Double Attack). *Suppose that $n \geq 5$. Suppose further that \mathcal{G} has star topology, with v_1 being the centre node, and with $n-3$ subject nodes, $v_i, i = 2, \dots, n-2$. One attacker node v_{n-1} attaches to subject node v_{n-3} with edges $e_{n-3,n-1}, e_{n-1,n-3}$. A second attacker node v_n attaches to subject node v_{n-2} with edges $e_{n-2,n}, e_{n,n-2}$. This forms $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$.*

Topology Variation 4 (Two Dissenting Subjects). *Suppose that $n \geq 4$. Suppose further that \mathcal{G} has star topology, with v_1 being the centre node, and with $n-1$ subject nodes, $v_i, i = 2, \dots, n$. There are no attacker nodes. Subject nodes v_{n-1} and v_n form edges $e_{n,n-1}, e_{n-1,n}$, forming $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$.*

The following topology variation is motivated by the concept of a *leadership group* where two leaders exist, and seek to maintain their collective social dominance.

Topology Variation 5 (Leadership group). Suppose that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 respectively have $n \geq 3$ and $m \geq 3$ nodes, with node set $\mathcal{V}_1 = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_2 = \{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$ respectively. Both \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 have star topology; the centre nodes for \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are v_1 and v_{n+1} respectively. Let $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ be the graph formed by merging \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 by insertion of the edges $e_{1,n+1}$ and $e_{n+1,1}$. Nodes v_1, v_{n+1} form a leadership group with subjects $v_2, \dots, v_n, v_{n+2}, \dots, v_{n+m}$.

In the next section, we investigate the above topological variations of the star graph. Note that Topology Variations 1-5 have modified graphs $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ which *do not have star topology*. From the properties of $F(x(s))$ established in [9] and detailed in Lemma 1 and Theorem 1, it immediately follows that $x_1^* < 1$ for all Topology Variations. In other words, v_1 is no longer the autocrat but if the perturbation from star topology (caused by the new edges) is small, one expects that v_1 remains *socially dominant*. What will we show is that if the interpersonal weights associated with these new edges exceed a given threshold, the socially dominant node changes from v_1 to some other node. It is worth emphasising at this stage that, in Variations 1-3, it is useless for an attacker node v_n to attach to the centre node v_1 instead of a subject node; the topology remains a strongly connected star, and there is no change in the autocratic nature of v_1 's social dominance.

Note that when new edges are introduced, we assume each individual i adjusts its weights c_{ij} to ensure that the new C is row-stochastic. Take Topology Variation 5 as an example. Separately, the relative interaction matrix C_1 (respectively C_2) associated with \mathcal{G}_1 (respectively \mathcal{G}_2) is assumed to be row-stochastic. The relative interaction matrix \bar{C} associated with $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ is also implicitly assumed to be row-stochastic with zero diagonal. That is, we assume that after the addition of edges $e_{1,n+1}$ and $e_{n+1,1}$, adjustments are made to the original weights $c_{1,j}$ and $c_{n+1,k}$ to ensure \bar{C} is row-stochastic.

Remark 4 (Ordering of Social Power). Although Theorem 1 states that x^* is uniquely determined by γ^\top , there are no results available which allow one to analytically compute the value of x^* given γ^\top . What is available is Statement (ii) of Theorem 1, which states that the ordering x_i^* is consistent with the ordering of γ_i . In this paper, we are therefore interested in the ordering of individual social power, as opposed to the precise values of social power. This is reflected in Definition 3.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In order to maintain the flow of this paper, and to place focus on discussion of the *social connotations* of each result, we place all proofs in the appendix. We firstly present theorems and corollaries for each topological variation, and then discuss their social implications.

A. Topology Variation 1: Single Attacker

Now, firstly consider Topology Variation 1. The relative interaction matrix $C(\beta)$ associated with $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ can be expressed

as

$$C(\beta) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & c_{12} & c_{13} & \dots & c_{1,n-1} & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1-\beta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

where $\beta = c_{n-1,n} \in (0, 1)$ is the influence exerted by the attacker node v_n on subject node v_{n-1} . The following theorem details how the social power of each individual changes as β changes.

Theorem 2 (Single Attack). For a social network with Topology Variation 1, with initial conditions $x(0) \in \tilde{\Delta}_n$, and described by the DeGroot-Friedkin model, the following statements are true:

- (i) For all values of $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there holds $x_i^* < x_1^*$, for all $i \neq 1, n-1, n$ and $x_n^* < x_{n-1}^*$
- (ii) There holds 1) $x_1^* > x_i^*, \forall i \neq 1$ if and only if $\beta < 1 - c_{1,n-1} = \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$, or 2) $x_{n-1}^* > x_i^*, \forall i \neq n-1$ if and only if $\beta > 1 - c_{1,n-1}$. There holds $x_1^* = x_{n-1}^* > x_i^*, \forall i \neq 1, n-1$ if and only if $\beta_1 = 1 - c_{1,n-1}$
- (iii) There holds $x_n^* > x_1^*$ if and only if $\beta > 1/(1 + c_{1,n-1})$.

Corollary 1 (Generalised Placement of Single Attacking Node). Suppose that instead of attaching to subject node v_{n-1} , attacker node v_n can attach to any subject node $v_i, i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$ by forming edges $e_{n,i}, e_{i,n}$. The lower bound on $\beta = c_{n,i}$ required to have $x_{n-1}^* > x_1^*$ is minimised if v_n attaches to v_k where $k = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}} c_{1,j}$.

The above mathematical results can be interpreted in the following social context. From Statement (i), we conclude that individuals 2 to $n-2$, i.e. subject nodes $v_i, i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$ will never have greater social power at equilibrium, x_i^* than the centre individual v_1 with x_1^* , regardless of how β changes. In addition, the attacker node will never have greater social power than the subject node v_{n-1} which it is attached to.

Recall from Remark 3 that c_{ij} can be considered the trust level accorded to individual j by individual i . Then according to Statement (ii), centre individual v_1 remains the *socially dominant individual in the social network* only if subject v_{n-1} trusts attacker v_n less than the total sum of trust accorded to subjects $v_i, i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$ by centre node v_1 . In order to become *socially dominant*, and to undermine the authority of the centre node v_1 , individual v_{n-1} must trust the attacker v_n .

Lastly, Statement (iii) reveals that the attacker can also obtain social power greater the centre individual v_1 if β , i.e. the trust accorded to the attacker v_n by subject node v_{n-1} , is sufficiently large. We therefore conclude that the leadership/social dominance within a social network with Topology Variation 1 can be shifted from the original leader (centre node) to a subject via introduction of a single attacker and strengthening of the newly formed interpersonal relationships.




Fig. 1. Star Topology with red Centre Node v_1 , and blue subject nodes, $n = 7$.




Fig. 2. Topology Variation 1 (Single Attacker) with $n = 8$, attacker nodes are green.




Fig. 3. Topology Variation 2 (Coordinated Double Attacker) with $n = 9$, attacker nodes are green.




Fig. 4. Topology Variation 3 (Uncoordinated Double Attacker) with $n = 9$.




Fig. 5. Topology Variation 4 (Two Dissenting Subjects) with $n = 7$.




Fig. 6. Topology Variation 5 (Leadership Group) with $n = m = 4$.

Corollary 1 delivers an intuitive and powerful, socially relevant result. It states that the single attacker node v_n should seek to form an interpersonal relationship with the subject node v_k that centre node v_1 trusts the most. This will minimise the required amount of trust subject v_k accords attacker v_n before centre node v_1 loses social dominance.

B. Topology Variation 2: Coordinated Double Attack

Consider now Topology Variation 2. Firstly, define $\beta_1 = c_{n-2,n-1} \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_2 = c_{n-2,n} \in (0, 1)$ as the two adjustable interpersonal weights. Note that because \mathbf{C} is assumed to be row-stochastic, it is implied that $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + c_{n-2,1} = 1$ which in turn implies $\beta_1 + \beta_2 < 1$ because $c_{n-2,1} > 0$. We omit displaying the exact form of $\mathbf{C}(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ due to spatial limitations.

Theorem 3 (Coordinated Double Attack). *For a social network with Topology Variation 2, with initial conditions $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \tilde{\Delta}_n$, and described by the DeGroot-Friedkin model, the following statements are true:*

- (i) For all $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, 1)$, there holds $x_i^* < x_1^*$ for all $i \neq 1, n-2, n-1, n$, and $x_n^*, x_{n-1}^* < x_{n-2}^*$.
- (ii) There holds 1) $x_1^* > x_i^*, \forall i \neq 1$ if and only if $\beta_1 + \beta_2 < 1 - c_{1,n-2} = \sum_{i=2}^{n-3} c_{1,i}$, or 2) $x_{n-2}^* > x_i^*, \forall i \neq n-2$ if and only if $\beta_1 + \beta_2 > 1 - c_{1,n-2}$. There holds $x_1^* = x_{n-2}^*$ if and only if $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1 - c_{1,n-2}$.
- (iii) There holds $x_n^* > x_1^*$ (respectively $x_{n-1}^* > x_1^*$) if and only if $\beta_2 > (1 - \beta_1)/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$ (respectively $\beta_1 > (1 - \beta_2)/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$).
- (iv) There holds $x_{n-1}^* < x_n^*$ or $x_{n-1}^* > x_n^*$ if and only if $\beta_1 < \beta_2$ or $\beta_1 > \beta_2$ respectively. If $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, then $x_{n-1}^* = x_n^*$.

Corollary 2 (Generalised Placement of Coordinated Double Attack). *Suppose that instead of attaching to subject node v_{n-2} , attacker nodes v_{n-1}, v_n can attach to any subject node $v_i, i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$ by forming the set of edges $\{e_{n-1,i}, e_{i,n-1}, e_{n,i}, e_{i,n}\}$. The lower bound on $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = c_{n-1,i} + c_{n,i}$ required to have $x_{n-2}^* > x_1^*$ is minimised if v_{n-1} and v_n attach to v_k where $k = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}} c_{1,j}$.*

Due to spatial limitations, we discuss social implications of Theorem 3 only if the conclusions differ significantly from the discussion in the previous subsection.

The key result is Statement (ii), which indicates that the combined trust given to attackers v_{n-1} and v_n by subject node v_{n-2} must exceed the combined trust given to subjects v_2, \dots, v_{n-3} by centre node v_1 , in order for centre node v_1 to lose social dominance (and thus subject v_{n-2} becomes the socially dominant individual). It is most interesting to note that it is only the sum of the trust/influence $\beta_1 + \beta_2$ that is relevant, and there is no requirement on the individual magnitudes of β_1, β_2 .

Regarding Statement (iii), we observe that the inequality, which if satisfied ensures that attacker v_n has social power greater than centre v_1 , is a function of β_1, β_2 and $c_{1,n-2}$. As detailed in the proof in Appendix B, there always exists a β_1, β_2 satisfying $\beta_1 + \beta_2 < 1$ which ensures both attacker nodes v_{n-1}, v_n have social power greater than the centre v_1 .

C. Topology Variation 3: Uncoordinated Double Attack

Define $\beta_1 = c_{n-3,n-1} \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_2 = c_{n-2,n} \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 4. *For a social network with Topology Variation 3, with initial conditions $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \tilde{\Delta}_n$, and described by the DeGroot-Friedkin model, the following statements are true:*

- (i) For all values of $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, 1)$, there holds $x_i^* < x_1^*$ for all $i \in \{2, \dots, n-4\}$, and $x_{n-1}^* < x_{n-3}^*$ and $x_n^* < x_{n-2}^*$.
- (ii) There holds $x_1^* > x_i^*$ for all $i \neq 1$ if and only if $\beta_1 < 1 - c_{1,n-3}$ and $\beta_2 < 1 - c_{1,n-2}$. If $\beta_1 > 1 - c_{1,n-3}$ (respectively $\beta_2 > 1 - c_{1,n-2}$), then $x_{n-3}^* > x_1^*$ (respectively $x_{n-2}^* > x_1^*$).
- (iii) For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there holds $x_{n-2+i}^* > x_1^*$ if and only if $\beta_i > 1/(1 + c_{1,n-4+i})$.
- (iv) There holds $x_{n-3}^* > x_{n-2}^*$ if and only if $\frac{1-\beta_2}{1-\beta_1} > \frac{c_{1,n-2}}{c_{1,n-3}}$. Equivalently, $x_{n-3}^* > x_{n-2}^*$ if and only if $\frac{c_{1,n-3}}{c_{n-3,1}} > \frac{c_{1,n-2}}{c_{n-2,1}}$.

The most interesting conclusion drawn from Theorem 4 is when we compare to Theorem 3 which concerns Topology Variation 2. With Topology Variation 2, for the centre individual v_1 to lose its social dominance we require the sum of the trust values $\beta_1 + \beta_2$ to exceed a lower bound, and there are no separate lower bounding inequalities for β_1 or β_2 . With Topology Variation 3, centre individual v_1 loses social dominance if and only if either β_1 or β_2 exceed their respective lower bounding inequalities. Importantly, these two lower bounding inequalities are independent of each other. This clearly points to the fact that a **coordinated attack** on the social dominance of the centre node is more desirable, an idea which is socially intuitive.

From Statement (iii), both attacker nodes have larger social power than the centre node if and only if $\beta_1 > 1/(1 + c_{1,n-3})$ and $\beta_2 > 1/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$, which implies that $\beta_1 + \beta_2 > 1/(1 + c_{1,n-3}) + 1/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$. From Statement (iii) Theorem 3, with Topology Variation 2, both attacker nodes have larger social power than the centre node if and only if $\beta_2 > (1 - \beta_1)/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$ and $\beta_1 > (1 - \beta_2)/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$, which implies that $\beta_1 + \beta_2 > 2/(2 + c_{1,n-2})$. Since both $1 + c_{1,n-2}$ and $1 + c_{1,n-3}$ are smaller than $2 + c_{1,n-2}$, it follows that $1/(1 + c_{1,n-3}) + 1/(1 + c_{1,n-2}) > 2/(2 + c_{1,n-2})$, which implies that a **coordinated attack** on the social dominance of the centre node is also more efficient for the attackers.

D. Topology Variation 4: Two Dissenting Subjects

Topology Variation 4 is different to the ones studied above in the sense that there are no attacker nodes. Instead, one can consider this variation as one where two subjects form a relationship in *dissent* from the leader. Firstly, let $\beta_1 = c_{n-1,n} \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_2 = c_{n,n-1} \in (0, 1)$. Analysis yields the following result.

Theorem 5 (Two Dissenting Subjects). *For a social network with Topology Variation 4, with initial conditions $\mathbf{x}(s) \in \tilde{\Delta}_n$, and described by the DeGroot-Friedkin model, the following statements are true:*

- (i) For all $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, 1)$, there holds $x_i^* < x_1^*$ for all $i \neq 1, n-1, n$.
- (ii) There holds $x_n^* > x_1^*$ if and only if $\beta_1 > (1 - c_{1,n})/(c_{1,n-1} + \beta_2)$ with $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$. There exists such a $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ only if $\beta_2 > \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$.

- (iii) There holds $x_{n-1}^* > x_1^*$ if and only if $\beta_2 > (1 - c_{1,n-1})/(c_{1,n} + \beta_1)$ with $\beta_2 \in (0, 1)$. There exists such a $\beta_2 \in (0, 1)$ only if $\beta_1 > \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$.
- (iv) There holds $x_n^* < x_{n-1}^*$ if and only if $\beta_2 > \beta_1 c_{1,n} + c_{1,n-1}(c_{1,n} - 1)$ or equivalently $\beta_1 < (\beta_2 + c_{n-1}(1 - c_{1,n}))$.

Note that the inequality in statement (ii) can be rewritten as $\beta_2 > (1 - c_{1,n} - \beta_1 c_{1,n-1})/\beta_1$ with $\beta_2 \in (0, 1)$ which is satisfiable only if $\beta_1 > (1 - c_{1,n})/(1 + c_{1,n-1})$. Similarly, the inequality in statement (iii) is equivalent to $\beta_1 > (1 - c_{1,n-1} - \beta_2 c_{1,n})/\beta_2$ with $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ which is satisfiable only if $\beta_2 > (1 - c_{1,n-1})/(1 + c_{1,n})$.

We now interpret Statement (ii), which we believe is the key result of the theorem. A similar conclusion can be drawn for Statement (iii) but we omit this due to spatial limitations. In order to make centre node v_1 lose social dominance, the dissent subject nodes v_{n-1} and v_n must adopt a *cooperative strategy*. From their definitions, we can interpret β_1 as the trust given by v_{n-1} to v_n while β_2 is the trust given by v_n to v_{n-1} . A necessary condition for individual v_n to have social power greater than centre node v_1 is that $\beta_2 > \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$. This means that not only must v_{n-1} trust v_n sufficiently (as given by the inequality $\beta_1 > (1 - c_{1,n})/(c_{1,n-1} + \beta_2)$), but individual v_n must *reciprocate* by ensuring that it trusts v_{n-1} sufficiently ($\beta_1 > \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$). Unless the two dissenting nodes build a cooperative and sufficiently strong bilateral relationship, centre node v_1 will remain socially dominant.

E. Topology Variation 5: Leadership Group

With $\beta_1 = c_{1,n+1} \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_2 = c_{n+1,1} \in (0, 1)$, the following result is obtained

Theorem 6. *For a social network with Topology Variation 5, with initial conditions $\mathbf{x}(s) \in \tilde{\Delta}_{n+m}$, and described by the DeGroot-Friedkin model, the following statements are true:*

- (i) For all $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ and for all $\beta_2 \in (0, 1)$ there holds $x_i^* < x_1^*$ and $x_k^* < x_{n+1}^*$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{n+2, \dots, n+m\}$.
- (ii) There holds $x_1^* < x_{n+1}^*$ or $x_1^* > x_{n+1}^*$ if and only if $\beta_2 < \beta_1$ or $\beta_2 > \beta_1$ respectively. If $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, then $x_1^* = x_{n+1}^*$.
- (iii) For $k \in \{n+2, \dots, n+m\}$ there holds $x_k^* > x_1^*$ if and only if $c_{n+1,k}(\beta_1/\beta_2) > 1$. For $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, holds $x_i^* > x_{n+1}^*$ if and only if $c_{1,i}(\beta_2/\beta_1) > 1$.

Statement (ii) shows that the ratio of β_1/β_2 determines whether centre node v_1 or centre node v_{n+1} is socially dominant. Statement (iii) delivers a surprising and interesting result on how leaders can *cooperatively* protect themselves and maintain collective social dominance. Let $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$. Consider from centre individual v_1 's point of view. While $x_i^* < x_1^*$ is guaranteed, in order to ensure that v_1 has greater social power than subject v_k (i.e. subjects of centre individual v_{n+1}), individual v_1 must ensure that $c_{n+1,k}(\beta_1/\beta_2) < 1$. This inequality always holds, regardless of the value of $c_{n+1,k} < 1$, if $\beta_1 = \beta_2$. I.e. if the trust level v_1 accords to v_{n+1} is equal to the trust level v_{n+1}




Fig. 7. Simulation of Topology Variation 1 with $n = 8$.

accords to v_1 , regardless of the magnitude of $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, v_1 has greater social power than *all* subject nodes *including the subjects of* v_{n+1} . It can appear to be surprising because this holds even if $c_{n+1,k} \gg \beta_1, \beta_2$. Yet such a result is intuitive if we consider β_1/β_2 as the ratio of the trust v_1 places on v_{n+1} (and indirectly the trust v_1 places on subject v_k) versus the trust v_{n+1} places on v_1 (and indirectly the trust v_k places on v_1).

IV. SIMULATIONS

In this section, we provide 2 short simulations to highlight some of our most interesting results. We do not provide comprehensive simulations for each Topology Variation due to spatial limitations.

Firstly, we simulate Topology Variation 1 as it is the fundamental strategy, with $n = 8$. The top row of the matrix C is given by $[0, 0.15, 0.15, 0.2, 0.05, 0.15, 0.3, 0]$. Figure 7 shows the social power at equilibrium x_i^* , for selected individuals, as a function of $\beta = c_{78}$. Centre v_1 loses social dominance when $\beta > 0.7$ as stated in Theorem 2.

Next, we simulate Topology Variation 4 to show the need for cooperation between two dissenting individuals in order to displace the centre node. The top row of C is $[0, 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.05, 0.05, 0.2, 0.3]$. Figure 8 shows the social power at equilibrium x_i^* , for selected individuals as a function of $\beta_1 = c_{78}$ when $\beta_2 = 0.49$ (i.e. when $\beta_2 < \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$). In accordance with Theorem 5, Statement (ii), dissent subject v_8 never achieves social power greater than centre v_1 because there does not exist a $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ satisfying the required inequality. Figure 9 shows the same simulation scenario but now with $\beta_2 = 0.55 > \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$. In accordance with Statement (ii) of Theorem 5, $x_8^* > x_1^*$ when $\beta_1 > 0.93$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Social networks with a star topology converge to an autocratic configuration, with the centre individual holding all the social power, as the number of issues discussed tend towards infinity. This paper proposed a number of different strategies, involving introduction of new individuals and/or new interpersonal relationships into the social network, in order to move social dominance from the centre individual to a subject individual. Necessary and sufficient conditions




Fig. 8. Simulation of Topology Variation 4 with $n = 8$, when $\beta_2 < \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$.




Fig. 9. Simulation of Topology Variation 4 with $n = 8$, when $\beta_2 > \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$.

are developed, and interpretation of these conditions showed the strategies are sociologically intuitive. Numerous future directions exist. Firstly, we wish to generalise the results on uncoordinated attack and coordinated attack to arbitrary numbers of attacker nodes. Different leadership groups, and dissent topologies will also be explored. We also wish to investigate whether such straightforward strategies exist for more general topologies, and lastly we shall study strategies concerning social power for a subgroup of individuals.

APPENDIX

PROOFS FOR SECTION III

In the following proofs, we make extensive use of Theorem 1, and in particular Statement (ii), which states that $x_i^* > x_j^* \Leftrightarrow \gamma_i > \gamma_j$ and that $x_i^* = x_j^* \Leftrightarrow \gamma_i = \gamma_j$.

A. Theorem 2 and Corollary 1

The expression $\gamma^\top = \gamma^\top C$, where C is given in (7), allows us to obtain

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} \gamma_i + (1 - \beta)\gamma_{n-1} \quad (8a)$$

$$\gamma_i = c_{1i}\gamma_1, \quad \forall i \neq 1, n-1, n \quad (8b)$$

$$\gamma_{n-1} = c_{1,n-1}\gamma_1 + \gamma_n \quad (8c)$$

$$\gamma_n = \beta\gamma_{n-1} \quad (8d)$$

Statement (i) is obtained from (8b), where we conclude $\gamma_i < \gamma_1$ because $c_{1i} < 1$ for all $i \neq 1, n-1, n$, and from (8d),

which allows us to conclude that $\gamma_n < \gamma_{n-1}$ for all $\beta \in (0, 1)$. For Statement (ii), begin by substituting γ_n from (8d) into (8c), which yields $\gamma_{n-1} = c_{1,n-1}\gamma_1 + \beta\gamma_{n-1}$. This is rearranged to obtain

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{1 - \beta}{c_{1,n-1}}\gamma_{n-1} \quad (9)$$

Recalling that $0 < c_{1,n-1}$ and $0 < \beta < 1$, it follows that $\gamma_1 < \gamma_{n-1}$ if and only if $\beta > 1 - c_{1,n-1}$. Similarly, one can obtain that $\gamma_1 > \gamma_n$ if and only if $\beta < 1/(1 + c_{1,n-1})$, which proves Statement (iii). Corollary 1 is a generalisation of Statement (ii) obtained by observing that $\operatorname{argmin}_j(1 - c_{1,j}) = \operatorname{argmax}_j c_{1,j}$. \square

B. Theorem 3 and Corollary 2

For Topology Variation 2, the relative interaction matrix \mathbf{C} is given by

$$\mathbf{C}(\beta) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & c_{12} & c_{13} & \dots & c_{1,n-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 - (\beta_1 + \beta_2) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \beta_1 & \beta_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

From $\gamma^\top \mathbf{C} = \gamma^\top$, we obtain

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{i=2}^{n-3} \gamma_i + (1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)\gamma_{n-2} \quad (11a)$$

$$\gamma_i = c_{1i}\gamma_1, \quad \forall i \neq 1, n-2, n-1, n \quad (11b)$$

$$\gamma_{n-2} = c_{1,n-2}\gamma_1 + \gamma_{n-1} + \gamma_n \quad (11c)$$

$$\gamma_{n-1} = \beta_1\gamma_{n-2} \quad (11d)$$

$$\gamma_n = \beta_2\gamma_{n-2} \quad (11e)$$

Statement (i) is obtained from (11a) and (11d) and (11e), using the same arguments as the proof for Theorem 2. Regarding Statement (ii), substitute (11d) and (11e) into (11c) and rearrange to obtain $\gamma_{n-2} = c_{1,n-2}\gamma_1/(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)$. The statement is then straightforwardly obtained. For Statement (iii), in regards to γ_n , substitute $\gamma_{n-2} = c_{1,n-2}\gamma_1/(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)$ into the right hand side of (11e) to obtain $\gamma_n = \beta_2 c_{1,n-2}\gamma_1/(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)$. It is straightforward to verify that $\beta_2 > (1 - \beta_1)/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$ implies $\beta_2 c_{1,n-2}/(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) > 1$, which in turn implies $\gamma_n > \gamma_1$. The inequality that ensures $\gamma_{n-1} > \gamma_1$ can be similarly found. Observe that $1 - \beta_1 < 1$, $1 - \beta_2 < 1$ and $1 < 1 + c_{1,n-2}$. There must also hold $\beta_1 + \beta_2 < 1$. This implies that for any value $c_{1,n-2}$, there always exist β_1, β_2 which ensures $\gamma_{n-1} > \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_n > \gamma_1$. Regarding Statement (iv), from (11d) and (11e), we have $\gamma_{n-1}/\gamma_n = \beta_1/\beta_2$. The statement is then straightforwardly obtained. Corollary 2 is a generalisation of Statement (ii) by observing that $\operatorname{argmin}_j(1 - c_{1,j}) = \operatorname{argmax}_j c_{1,j}$.

C. Theorem 4

The relative interaction matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{C}(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & c_{1,2} & \dots & c_{1,n-3} & c_{1,n-2} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 - \beta_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \beta_1 & 0 \\ 1 - \beta_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

and the equation $\gamma^\top \mathbf{C} = \gamma^\top$ yields the following equalities:

$$\gamma_1 = (1 - \beta_1)\gamma_{n-3} + (1 - \beta_2)\gamma_{n-2} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-4} \gamma_i \quad (13a)$$

$$\gamma_i = c_i\gamma_1, \quad i \in \{2, \dots, n-4\} \quad (13b)$$

$$\gamma_{n-3} = c_{1,n-3}\gamma_1 + \gamma_{n-1} \quad (13c)$$

$$\gamma_{n-2} = c_{1,n-2}\gamma_1 + \gamma_n \quad (13d)$$

$$\gamma_{n-1} = \beta_1\gamma_{n-3} \quad (13e)$$

$$\gamma_n = \beta_2\gamma_{n-2} \quad (13f)$$

From (13b), since $c_{1,i} \in (0, 1)$ for all $i \in \{2, \dots, n-4\}$, it follows that $\gamma_i < \gamma_0$ for all $i \in \{2, \dots, n-4\}$. From (13e) and (13f), since $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, 1)$, it follows that $\gamma_{n-1} < \gamma_{n-3}$ and $\gamma_n < \gamma_{n-2}$. Thus, statement (i) is true.

From (13c) and (13e), we have $\frac{\gamma_{n-3}}{\gamma_1} = \frac{c_{1,n-3}}{1 - \beta_1}$, which implies that $\gamma_1 > \gamma_{n-3}$ if and only if $\beta_1 < 1 - c_{1,n-3}$. Similarly, from (13d) and (13f), we have $\gamma_1 > \gamma_{n-2}$ if and only if $\beta_2 < 1 - c_{1,n-2}$. It is then straightforward to conclude that for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, if $\beta_i > 1 - c_{1,n-4+i}$, then $x_{n-4+i}^* > x_1^*$. Therefore, statement (ii) is true.

From (13c) and (13e), we have $\frac{\gamma_{n-1}}{\gamma_1} = \frac{\beta_1 c_{1,n-3}}{1 - \beta_1}$. It follows that $\gamma_{n-1} > \gamma_1$ if and only if $\beta_1 > 1/(1 + c_{1,n-3})$. Similarly, from (13d) and (13f), we have $\gamma_n > \gamma_1$ if and only if $\beta_2 > 1/(1 + c_{1,n-2})$. Thus, statement (iii) is true.

Since $\frac{\gamma_{n-3}}{\gamma_1} = \frac{c_{1,n-3}}{1 - \beta_1}$ and $\frac{\gamma_{n-2}}{\gamma_1} = \frac{c_{1,n-2}}{1 - \beta_2}$, it follows that $\gamma_{n-3}(1 - \beta_1)/c_{1,n-3} = \gamma_{n-2}(1 - \beta_2)/c_{1,n-2}$, which implies that $\frac{\gamma_{n-3}}{\gamma_{n-2}} = \frac{c_{1,n-3}(1 - \beta_2)}{c_{1,n-2}(1 - \beta_1)}$. Then, $\gamma_{n-3} > \gamma_{n-2}$ if and only if $\frac{1 - \beta_2}{1 - \beta_1} > \frac{c_{1,n-2}}{c_{1,n-3}}$. Therefore, statement (iv) is true. \square

D. Theorem 5

For Topology Variation 4, the relative interaction matrix \mathbf{C} is expressed as

$$\mathbf{C}(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & c_{12} & c_{13} & \dots & c_{1,n-1} & c_{1,n} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 - \beta_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \beta_1 \\ 1 - \beta_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

where $\beta_1 = c_{n-1,n}$ and $\beta_2 = c_{n,n-1}$. The expression $\gamma^\top \mathbf{C} = \gamma^\top$ yields the following equalities

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} \gamma_i + (1 - \beta_1)\gamma_{n-1} + (1 - \beta_2)\gamma_n \quad (15a)$$

$$\gamma_i = c_{1i}\gamma_1, \quad \forall i \neq 1, n-1, n \quad (15b)$$

$$\gamma_{n-1} = c_{1,n-1}\gamma_1 + \beta_2\gamma_n \quad (15c)$$

$$\gamma_n = c_{1,n}\gamma_1 + \beta_1\gamma_{n-1} \quad (15d)$$

Again, Statement (i) is obtained trivially from (15b). Substitute (15c) into (15d) and rearrange for γ_n to obtain

$$\gamma_n = \left(\frac{c_{1,n} + \beta_1 c_{1,n-1}}{1 - \beta_1 \beta_2} \right) \gamma_1 \quad (16)$$

and it follows that $\gamma_n > \gamma_1$ is implied by

$$c_{1,n} + \beta_1 c_{1,n-1} > 1 - \beta_1 \beta_2 \quad (17)$$

$$\beta_1 > \frac{1 - c_{1,n}}{c_{1,n-1} + \beta_2} \quad (18)$$

$$\beta_2 > \frac{1 - c_{1,n} - c_{1,n-1}\beta_1}{\beta_1} \quad (19)$$

Consider (18). Observe that $(1 - c_{1,n})/(c_{1,n-1} + \beta_2) \geq 1 \Leftrightarrow 1 - c_{1,n} - c_{1,n-1} \geq \beta_2 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i} \geq \beta_2$. Recalling that $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$, we conclude $\gamma_n > \gamma_1$ is possible only if $\beta_2 > \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} c_{1,i}$. Alternatively, one can consider (19) and similarly derive that $\gamma_n > \gamma_1$ if $\beta_2 > (1 - c_{1,n} - \beta_1 c_{1,n-1})/\beta_1$ and $\beta_1 > (1 - c_{1,n})/(1 + c_{1,n-1})$. The inequality conditions for ensuring $\gamma_{n-1} > \gamma_1$ are also derived in similar manner and omitted due to spatial limitations.

E. Theorem 6

The relative interaction matrix for Topology Variation 5 is given by

$$\mathbf{C}(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & c_{12} & c_{13} & \dots & \beta_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \beta_2 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & c_{n+1,n+2} & \dots & c_{n+1,n} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

And the expression $\gamma^\top \mathbf{C} = \gamma^\top$ yields the following equalities

$$\gamma_1 = \sum_{1 < i \leq n} \gamma_i + \beta_2 \gamma_{n+1} \quad (21a)$$

$$\gamma_i = c_{1,i}\gamma_1, \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \quad (21b)$$

$$\gamma_{n+1} = \sum_{n+1 < i \leq n+m} \gamma_i + \beta_1 \gamma_1 \quad (21c)$$

$$\gamma_i = c_{n+1,i}\gamma_{n+1}, \quad \forall i \in \{n+2, \dots, n+m\} \quad (21d)$$

Statement (i) is obtained trivially from (21b) and (21d). In regards to Statement (ii), first substitute (21b) into (21a) to

obtain $\gamma_1 = \beta_2 \gamma_{n+1} + \sum_{1 < i \leq n} c_{1,i} \gamma_1$ which is rearranged to yield $\gamma_1 (1 - \sum_{1 < i \leq n} c_{1,i}) = \beta_2 \gamma_{n+1}$ which is equivalent to $\beta_1 \gamma_1 = \beta_2 \gamma_{n+1}$ because $1 - \sum_{1 < i \leq n} c_{1,i} = \beta_1$. Statement (iii) is obtained by substituting $\gamma_1 = \beta_2 \gamma_{n+1} / \beta_1$ into (21d).

REFERENCES

- [1] N. E. Friedkin, "The Problem of Social Control and Coordination of Complex Systems in Sociology: A Look at the Community Cleavage Problem," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 40–51, 2015.
- [2] J. R. P. F. Jr., "A Formal Theory of Social Power," *Psychological Review*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 181–194, 1956.
- [3] M. H. DeGroot, "Reaching a consensus," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 69, no. 345, pp. 118–121, 1974.
- [4] N. E. Friedkin, "A Formal Theory of Reflected Appraisals in the Evolution of Power," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 501–529, 2011.
- [5] S. E. Parsegov, A. V. Proskurnikov, R. Tempo, and N. E. Friedkin, "Novel Multidimensional Models of Opinion Dynamics in Social Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, to appear.
- [6] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and E. Tardos, "Maximizing the Spread of Influence through a Social Network," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2003, pp. 137–146.
- [7] N. E. Friedkin and E. C. Johnsen, "Social Influence and Opinions," *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, vol. 15, no. 3-4, pp. 193–206, 1990.
- [8] J. Ghaderi and R. Srikant, "Opinion dynamics in social networks with stubborn agents: Equilibrium and convergence rate," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3209–3215, 2014.
- [9] P. Jia, A. MirTabatabaei, N. E. Friedkin, and F. Bullo, "Opinion Dynamics and the Evolution of Social Power in Influence Networks," *SIAM Review*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 367–397, 2015.
- [10] Z. Xu, J. Liu, and T. Başar, "On a Modified DeGroot-Friedkin Model of Opinion Dynamics," in *American Control Conference (ACC), Chicago, USA*, July 2015, pp. 1047–1052.
- [11] X. Chen, J. Liu, M.-A. Belabbas, Z. Xu, and T. Başar, "Distributed Evaluation and Convergence of Self-Appraisals in Social Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 291–304, 2017.
- [12] J. R. P. French Jr and R. Snyder, "Leadership and Interpersonal Power," in *Studies in Social Power*, D. Cartwright, Ed. Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1959, ch. 8, pp. 118–149.
- [13] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and E. Tardos, "Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2003, pp. 137–146.
- [14] V. S. Borkar, A. Karnik, J. Nair, and S. Nalli, "Manufacturing consent," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 104–117, 2015.
- [15] C. D. Godsil, G. Royle, and C. Godsil, *Algebraic graph theory*. Springer New York, 2001, vol. 207.
- [16] D. Cartwright, *Studies in Social Power*, ser. Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research. University of Michigan, 1959.