

Patterns of Nonlinear Opinion Formation on Networks

Anastasia Bizyaeva, Ayanna Matthews, Alessio Franci, and Naomi Ehrlich Leonard

Abstract—When communicating agents form opinions about a set of possible options, agreement and disagreement are both possible outcomes. Depending on the context, either can be desirable or undesirable. We show that for nonlinear opinion dynamics on networks, and a variety of network structures, the spectral properties of the underlying adjacency matrix fully characterize the occurrence of either agreement or disagreement. We further show how the corresponding eigenvector centrality, as well as any symmetry in the network, informs the resulting patterns of opinion formation and agent sensitivity to input that triggers opinion cascades.

Index Terms—Multi-agent systems, decision making, opinion dynamics, consensus, algebraic graph theory, spectral graph theory

I. INTRODUCTION

Multi-agent systems that perform distributed control tasks in uncertain or dynamic contexts benefit when agents use network communications to form and change opinions about context-dependent options. For example, network communications can help autonomous multi-robot teams that navigate space make better choices about alternative routes and smart networks do better at dynamically distributing tasks among nodes. Mathematical models of opinion dynamics over networks are often used to bring a group to a desired opinion configuration. In a task-allocation context, agreement is not necessarily the only desirable opinion configuration, as sometimes agents are better off doing different tasks or exploring different routes.

A general model of opinion dynamics for distributed agents on a network was recently introduced in [1], [2]. In this multi-agent multi-option model, real-valued opinions evolve in continuous time according to a nonlinear update rule that saturates network exchanges. A key feature of the model is the emergence of consensus and dissensus as equilibrium opinion configurations, even when agents are homogeneous, unbiased, and communicate over an all-to-all network. The emergence of consensus and dissensus depends on a small number of parameters that distinguish the interactions between agents as cooperative or competitive.

Supported by NSF grant CMMI-1635056, ONR grant N00014-19-1-2556, ARO grant W911NF-18-1-0325, DGAPA-UNAM PAPIIT grant IN102420, and Conacyt grant A1-S-10610, and by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship grant number DGE-2039656. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

A. Bizyaeva, A. Matthews and N.E. Leonard are with the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, 08544 USA; e-mail: bizyaeva@princeton.edu, naomi@princeton.edu.

A. Franci is with the National Autonomous University of Mexico, 04510 Mexico City, Mexico. e-mail: afranci@ciencias.unam.mx

In [1] the behavior of the general model is examined with particular attention to all-to-all and vertex-transitive cycle network topologies. In this paper we take first steps to extend analysis of the model to understand opinion formation on other classes of networks. We consider opinion formation for two options and homogeneous agents that communicate over network graphs, including K -regular, bipartite, and strongly connected directed graphs. We examine how network structure influences the group-level outcome of the opinion formation process, and we prove that, generically, agreement and disagreement arise on these networks. We show that the parameter regimes associated with consensus and dissensus for complete graphs in [1] correspond precisely to agreement and disagreement regimes for more general networks.

The engineering literature on distributed opinion dynamics typically associates formation of opinions to the spectral properties of the Laplacian matrix of the network graph. In linear consensus protocols the governing equations take on the structure of the graph Laplacian, and consensus is achieved as the group's opinions converge to its kernel [3]. Analogous distributed Laplacian schemes are considered with antagonistic (i.e., signed) interconnections in, e.g., [4]–[6]. When graphs are structurally balanced, i.e., when the signed graph Laplacian has a zero eigenvalue [4], such schemes give rise to clustered disagreement on the network. A nonlinear model of distributed consensus formation with saturated network interactions studied in [7]–[9] also relies on Laplacian-like structure of the governing equations, with each agent weighting its opinion state based on its in-degree on the network graph. In fact, linearization of this model about the unopinionated zero equilibrium yields a linear Laplacian consensus dynamic.

In contrast to this body of work, we study opinion dynamics of homogeneous agents with governing equations that do not in general follow a Laplacian structure. We show how spectral properties of the *adjacency matrix* of the underlying graph, rather than those of its Laplacian, play a key role in characterizing the opinion formation process. The greatest and smallest eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix determine if nonzero opinions form, and their associated eigenspaces select the sign and relative magnitude of resultant opinions on the network. With the addition of dynamics on an attention parameter, the eigenvectors of the adjacency matrix determine which agents in the group are maximally sensitive to external inputs. We show how this sensitivity can be used to trigger

opinion cascades on a network.

In Section II we recall the opinion dynamics model of [1]. In Section III we prove that agreement and disagreement equilibria, of which consensus and dissensus are special cases, arise on networks as bifurcations from an unopinionated equilibrium. In Sections IV and V we prove relationships between the magnitude of an agent's equilibrium opinion and its centrality on the network, as well as the symmetry properties of the network graph. In Section VI we introduce attention feedback dynamics and demonstrate how the group's sensitivity to input relates to the adjacency eigenvectors. Finally in Section VII we conclude and discuss future directions of this work.

II. OPINION DYNAMICS MODEL

We study a nonlinear model of N_a agents forming opinions about two options, which is an instance of the general multi-option model introduced in [1], [2]. The *opinion of each agent i* is captured by a real-valued variable $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$. When $x_i = 0$ agent i has a *neutral opinion*, and when $x_i > 0$ (< 0) agent i *favors* option A (option B). A greater magnitude $|x_i|$ corresponds to a stronger commitment of agent i to one of the options. We call an agent *opinionated* when $|x_i| > \vartheta > 0$ for some threshold ϑ , and *unopinionated* otherwise.

Interactions between agents, i.e. which agents can communicate with or sense which other agents, are encoded in a *directed* graph $G = (V, E)$. The set of vertices $V = \{1, \dots, N_a\}$ represents the set of N_a agents, and the edges $E \subset V \times V$ represent interactions between agents. If edge $e_{ik} \in E$, then agent k is a *neighbor* of agent i . In this paper we assume each agent has a self-loop, so for all $i \in V$, $e_{ii} \in E$. When communication between agents is bidirectional, G is an *undirected* graph: if $e_{ik} \in E$, then $e_{ki} \in E$. The graph adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N_a \times N_a}$ is a matrix of interaction weights with element $a_{ik} \neq 0$ if and only if $e_{ik} \in E$. We assume the self-weights $a_{ii} > 0$ for all $i \in V$, which means the opinions are *self-reinforcing*. The sign of the network weights determines whether interactions between agents are *cooperative* ($a_{ik} > 0$) or *competitive* ($a_{ik} < 0$).

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N_a}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_a}$ be the *opinion state of the group*. When all agents are unopinionated, the group is in an *unopinionated state*. When $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, the group is in the *neutral state*. A pair of agents i, k *agree* if both are opinionated and share the same qualitative opinion state, i.e., $\text{sign}(x_i) = \text{sign}(x_k)$. When all agents agree, the group is an *agreement state*. The *consensus state* is a special type of agreement state in which opinions are close in value, i.e. $|x_i - x_k| < \vartheta$ for all $i, k \in V$. A pair of agents *disagrees* if each has a different qualitative opinion state. If at least one pair of agents disagrees, then the group is in a *disagreement state*. The *dissensus state* is a special type of disagreement state in which individual agents may be opinionated but the group is unopinionated on average, i.e., $|\sum_{i=1}^{N_a} x_i| < \vartheta N_a$.

Each agent's opinion is updated in continuous time as a function of three key terms: a linear resistance term, a non-

linear social influence term that includes self-reinforcement, and an additive input or bias term:

$$\dot{x}_i = -d_i x_i + u_i S \left(\sum_{k=1}^{N_a} a_{ik} x_k \right) + b_i. \quad (1)$$

$S : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an odd saturating function satisfying $S(0) = 0$, $S'(0) = 1$, $\text{sign}(S''(z)) = -\text{sign}(z)$. That network interactions are saturated with S in (1) means the opinion dynamics of agent i are proportionally sensitive to changes in its neighbors' opinions when their opinion magnitudes are small, but that the neighbors' influence levels off when their opinion magnitudes become large. In all simulations we let $S = \tanh$.

The parameter $d_i > 0$ is an agent's *resistance* to becoming opinionated. In the absence of network interactions, agent i 's opinion will exponentially converge to the opinion state $x_i = b_i/d_i$ at a rate determined by d_i . The control parameter $u_i > 0$ is the *attention* of agent i to social influence. Attention u_i governs the strength of influence the saturated network interactions have on the opinion dynamics of agent i relative to its resistance. When u_i is above a critical threshold, the magnitude of the opinion state grows nonlinearly to a value much larger than b_i/d_i . Attention u_i can be fixed, time-varying, or it can evolve according to state-dependent (closed-loop) dynamics. The *input* or *bias* $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an agent's predisposition towards one of the options, which can reflect an external signal or a property of the agent. When $b_i > 0$ (< 0), agent i is predisposed to favor option A (option B).

Assume that agents are homogeneous (governed by the same internal dynamics) except for their attention u_i , input b_i , and set of neighbors, and that existing edge weights are homogeneous. We can then specialize the coefficients of (1) to $d_i := d > 0$, $a_{ii} := \alpha > 0$, $a_{ik} := \gamma \bar{a}_{ik}$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{a}_{ik} \in \{0, 1\}$. The general opinion dynamics (1) become

$$\dot{x}_i = -d x_i + u_i S \left(\alpha x_i + \gamma \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^{N_a} \bar{a}_{ik} x_k \right) + b_i := h_i(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2)$$

\bar{A} with elements \bar{a}_{ik} is the unweighted adjacency matrix of the graph $\bar{G} = (V, \bar{E})$ where \bar{E} contains the same edges as E , without the self-loops e_{ii} . Let $W(\lambda_i)$ be the generalized eigenspace of \bar{A} relative to its eigenvalue λ_i . Let λ_{max} and λ_{min} be the eigenvalues of \bar{A} with greatest and smallest real parts. In the following lemma we state several useful properties of λ_{min} , λ_{max} , and their associated eigenspaces.

Lemma 1. A. *When \bar{G} is strongly connected (directed), $\lambda_{max} > 0$ is real with multiplicity 1, and for any nonzero vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{N_a}) \in W(\lambda_{max})$, $v_i \neq 0$ and $\text{sign}(v_i) = \text{sign}(v_k)$ for all $i, k \in V$;*

B. *When \bar{G} is connected (undirected), $\lambda_{min} < 0$ is real and for any nonzero vector $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{N_a}) \in W(\lambda_{min})$, $\text{sign}(w_i) = -\text{sign}(w_k)$ for at least one pair of $i, k \in V$.*

Proof. Observe that $\text{tr } \bar{A} = 0$ and so $\text{Re}(\lambda_{\min}) < 0$; when \bar{G} is undirected, \bar{A} is symmetric and λ_{\min} is real. Furthermore \bar{A} is a Metzler matrix, and parts A and B follow from [10, Theorem 11]. \square

III. AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT

In this section we study opinion dynamics (2) with static $u_i := u \geq 0$ for all $i \in V$ and show how cooperative agents ($\gamma > 0$) give rise to agreement, whereas competitive agents ($\gamma < 0$) give rise to disagreement. In the following theorem, we expand upon the result in [1, Theorem IV.1] for two-option networks, and describe the steady-state solutions that arise from the opinion dynamics (1) in different parameter regimes.

Theorem 1. *The following hold true for (2) with $u_i := u \geq 0$ and $b_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N_a$:*

A. Cooperation leads to agreement: *Let \bar{G} be a strongly connected directed graph. If $\gamma > 0$, the neutral state $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is a locally exponentially stable equilibrium for $0 < u < u_a$ and unstable for $u > u_a$, with*

$$u_a = \frac{d}{\alpha + \gamma \lambda_{\max}}. \quad (3)$$

At $u = u_a$ branches of agreement equilibria, $x_i \neq 0$, $\text{sign}(x_i) = \text{sign}(x_k)$ for all $i, k \in V$, emerge in a steady-state bifurcation off of $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ along $W(\lambda_{\max})$;

B. Competition leads to disagreement: *Let \bar{G} be a connected undirected graph. If $\gamma < 0$ the neutral state $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is a locally exponentially stable equilibrium for $0 < u < u_d$ and unstable for $u > u_d$, with*

$$u_d = \frac{d}{\alpha + \gamma \lambda_{\min}}. \quad (4)$$

At $u = u_d$ branches of disagreement equilibria, $\text{sign}(x_i) = -\text{sign}(x_k)$ for at least one pair $i, k \in V$, $i \neq k$, emerge in a steady-state bifurcation off of $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ along $W(\lambda_{\min})$.

Proof. The Jacobian of (2) evaluated at the neutral equilibrium $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is $J(\mathbf{0}) = (u\alpha - d)\mathcal{I} + u\gamma\bar{A}$ where $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_a \times N_a}$ is the identity matrix. The eigenvalues of $J(\mathbf{0})$ are $\mu_i = u(\alpha + \gamma\lambda_i) - d$ where λ_i is an eigenvalue of \bar{A} . When $0 \leq u < \min_i \frac{d}{\alpha + \gamma \text{Re}(\lambda_i)}$, $\text{Re}(\mu_i)$ are negative for all $i \in V$ and the neutral equilibrium is locally exponentially stable. For values of u above this bound the origin is unstable. When $\gamma > 0$ this bound corresponds to $\lambda_i = \lambda_{\max}$ and the critical value of u is given by (3). Analogously, with $\gamma < 0$ it corresponds to $\lambda_i = \lambda_{\min}$ and the critical value of u is given by (4). It follows that when $\gamma > 0$ ($\gamma < 0$) a steady-state bifurcation happens along at $u = u_a$ ($u = u_d$) along $W(\lambda_{\max})$ ($W(\lambda_{\min})$). The rest follows from Lemma 1. \square

Remark 1. *Due to space constraints, we defer to a future publication a detailed analysis of stability of the agreement and disagreement equilibria emerging at agreement and disagreement opinion-forming bifurcation. For one-dimensional kernels, in particular, we expect these equilibria to be*




Fig. 1: Patterns of agreement (left) and disagreement (right) solutions from simulation of opinion dynamics (2) for four undirected graph types, where $\gamma = 1.3$ (left) and $\gamma = -1.3$ (right). Node color represents opinion x_i at $t = 500$. All nodes have $b_i = 0$ and randomized initial opinions drawn from $U(-1, 1)$. Parameters: $d = 1$, $\alpha = 1.2$, $u = 0.31$ for path and cycle, $u = 0.26$ for star and wheel.

generically stable, as easily verifiable using center-manifold reduction arguments.

One of the main takeaways of Theorem 1 is that the spectral properties of \bar{A} inform the opinion formation outcomes on the network. Characterizing the eigenvalues λ_{\min} , λ_{\max} along with their associated eigenspaces $W(\lambda_{\min})$, $W(\lambda_{\max})$ is equivalent to characterizing the primary branches of opinionated steady-state solutions of (2) emerging at bifurcations from the neutral state. Throughout this paper we use this approach to systematically classify the opinion patterns that arise for various networks with spectral properties that are well known or easily established. For larger and less structured networks these quantities can be easily computed numerically. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate agreement and disagreement equilibria of (2) on a variety of graphs, with the value of attention u selected to be slightly above the appropriate bifurcation point.

Network consensus and dissensus are special cases of agreement and disagreement described in Theorem 1. To study their occurrence, let the *consensus space* be $W_c := \text{span}\{\mathbf{1}\}$ and the *dissensus space* be $W_d := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_a} : \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} x_i = 0\}$. Observe that W_c and W_d are orthogonal complements in \mathbb{R}^{N_a} . Outside a ϑ -neighborhood of the origin, the ϑ -neighborhood of W_c is made of consensus solutions, whereas the ϑ -neighborhood of W_d is made of dissensus solutions. We show next that for graphs in which all agents have the same number of neighbors, the agreement and disagreement equilibria of Theorem 1 correspond to consensus and dissensus.

Definition 1. $\hat{G} = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ is a K -regular graph if every vertex $i \in \hat{V}$ has exactly K neighbors.

Lemma 2. *If \bar{G} is undirected, connected, and K -regular, all vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N_a}) \in W(\lambda_{\min})$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{N_a} x_i = 0$.*

Proof. Observe that for a connected, K -regular graph, $\lambda_{\max} = K$ and $W(\lambda_{\max}) = W_a$. Because \bar{A} is symmetric,




Fig. 2: Disagreement patterns on odd cycle (A), 3-regular (B) and randomly generated (C) graphs. Parameters are $d = 1$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $\gamma = -0.5$, $u = u_d + 0.01$. All else is as in Fig. 1.

all its generalized eigenspaces are orthogonal and, thus, $W(\lambda_{min}) \subseteq W_d$. The statement of the lemma follows. \square

Theorem 2 (Consensus and Dissensus). *If \bar{G} is undirected, connected, and K -regular, the agreement bifurcations at $u = u_a$ with $\gamma > 0$ give rise to consensus solutions $|x_i - x_k| < \vartheta$ for all $i, k \in V$, and the disagreement bifurcations at $u = u_d$ with $\gamma < 0$ give rise to dissensus solutions $|\sum_{i=1}^{N_a} x_i| < \vartheta N_a$.*

Proof. Given the assumptions, from Theorem 1 and Lemma 2, an opinion-forming bifurcation emerges along the consensus space for $\gamma > 0$ and dissensus space for $\gamma < 0$. This means that the resulting equilibrium solutions are arbitrarily close to the consensus (dissensus) space as $u \searrow u_a$ ($u \searrow u_d$). \square

Figure 1B and Figure 2A,B are examples of consensus and dissensus on 2-regular graphs (a cycle with an even and odd number of nodes) and a 3-regular graph.

IV. AGENT CENTRALITY

In this section we examine how equilibrium opinions of agents depend on their location in the graph. We show that at an opinion-forming bifurcation, an agent's opinion strength is often determined by its relative location in the network as quantified by a suitable centrality measure.

A *centrality measure* ranks how central each node is in a network, i.e., measures its influence over some emergent network property. We recall the definition of a well known network centrality measure originally proposed in [11]:

Definition 2 (Eigenvector Centrality). *The entries of the normalized positive left eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_{max} of \hat{A} for a (directed or undirected) graph \hat{G} provide a centrality measure for the nodes of the graph.*

It is shown in [12] that eigenvector centrality, deriving from the adjacency matrix and not the Laplacian, is particularly useful for graphs on which agents with high in-degree have many neighbors of low in-degree, and is related to several other common graph centrality measures. Let $\mathbf{v}^c = (v_1^c, \dots, v_{N_a}^c)$ be the centrality eigenvector for \bar{A} , as defined above. For undirected networks, this centrality measure determines the opinion strength of each agent at

an agreement equilibrium predicted by Theorem 1A, i.e., the larger an agent's centrality, the stronger its opinion at an agreement equilibrium.

Theorem 3. *Consider opinion dynamics (2) with undirected, connected \bar{G} , $u_i := u \geq 0$, $b_i = 0$, and $\alpha > 0$. Agreement equilibria $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N_a})$ described in Theorem 1.A satisfy $|x_i| < |x_k|$ if $v_i^c < v_k^c$ and $|x_i| = |x_k|$ if $v_i^c = v_k^c$ for all $i, k = 1, \dots, N_a$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{N_a})$ be the normalized right λ_{max} -eigenvector of \bar{A} . By symmetry of \bar{A} , $v_i = v_i^c$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N_a$ and the theorem follows from Theorem 1.A. \square

We next state an analogous result for disagreement equilibria on a common class of graphs called *bipartite graphs*.

Definition 3. *Undirected $\hat{G} = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ is a bipartite graph if \hat{V} can be subdivided into disjoint subsets \hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2 such that every edge $\hat{e}_{ik} \in \hat{E}$ connects a vertex in \hat{V}_1 to one in \hat{V}_2 .*

In the following, we show that for disagreement on bipartite graphs, an agent's partition membership determines the sign of its equilibrium opinion and an agent's centrality in the network determines the strength of its equilibrium opinion.

Lemma 3 (λ_{min} -Eigenvector of Bipartite Graph). *Suppose \bar{G} is a bipartite graph and let \hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2 be the two vertex subsets of V from Definition 3. Let $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{N_a})$ be the eigenvector corresponding to λ_{min} of \bar{A} . Then $w_i, w_k \neq 0$ and $\text{sign}(w_i) = -\text{sign}(w_k)$ for all $i \in \hat{V}_1, k \in \hat{V}_2$. Moreover, $|w_i| = v_i^c$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N_a$.*

Proof. By symmetry of \bar{A} , the λ_{max} -eigenvector is equal to \mathbf{v}^c . The lemma then follows from [13, Theorem 1.2], which states that the terms of the λ_{min} -eigenvector are equal in magnitude to the terms of the λ_{max} -eigenvector, with the sign structure reflecting the bipartition. \square

Theorem 4 (Disagreement Opinion Strength Reflects Agent Centrality on Bipartite Graphs). *Consider (2) with undirected bipartite \bar{G} , $u_i := u \geq 0$, $b_i = 0$, $\alpha > 0$, and $\gamma < 0$. Let \hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2 be the two subsets of V from Definition 3. Disagreement equilibria $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N_a})$ described in Theorem 1.B satisfy $|x_i| < |x_k|$ if $v_i^c < v_k^c$ and $|x_i| = |x_k|$ if $v_i^c = v_k^c$ for all $i, k = 1, \dots, N_a$. Moreover, $\text{sign}(x_i) = -\text{sign}(x_k)$ for all $i \in \hat{V}_1, k \in \hat{V}_2$.*

Proof. This follows by Theorem 1B and Lemma 3. \square

All graphs shown in Figure 1 have a simple λ_{min} . Further, the cycle, path, and star are bipartite graphs and the sign distribution of nodes across options reflects their bipartition. Observe that the magnitude of opinions reflects relative centrality on all the shown graphs in both the agreement and disagreement parameter regimes, including the wheel which is not bipartite. This suggests that the λ_{min} -eigenvector can sometimes be related to a notion of agent centrality even when it does not precisely equal \mathbf{v}^c . In contrast, graphs in Figure 2 are not bipartite, and graphs A, B have a

two-dimensional $W(\lambda_{min})$. The distribution of disagreement opinions on these graphs is more heterogeneous in magnitude, despite the first two graphs being regular and all agents being equally central.

V. GRAPH SYMMETRY

In this section we relate the patterns of emergent opinions on solution branches described in Theorem 1 to the symmetry of the underlying graph. We first state several key definitions.

Recall that a *graph automorphism* of \bar{G} is a permutation of vertices that preserves adjacency (i.e., maps edges to edges and non-edges to non-edges). The *automorphism group* $\text{Aut}(\bar{G}) := \Gamma$ is the set of all graph automorphisms of \bar{G} . Define the group of permutations of a set of n symbols $\{1, \dots, n\}$ as S_n . Then for graph \bar{G} with N_a agent vertices, $\Gamma \subseteq S_{N_a}$. The graph automorphism group of \bar{G} can also be interpreted as the group of permutation matrices which commute with its adjacency matrix \bar{A} . Each element $\rho \in \Gamma$ can be represented by a permutation matrix P_ρ which satisfies $P_\rho \bar{A} = \bar{A} P_\rho$ [14, Proposition 3.8.1]. We commonly refer to ρ as a *symmetry* of \bar{G} and Γ as its *symmetry group*.

A connected notion is the *equivariance* of a dynamical system with respect to a symmetry group. Consider the opinion dynamics (2) as a dynamical system $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})$, where the map $\mathbf{h} : \mathbb{R}^{N_a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_a}$ is $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) = (h_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, h_{N_a}(\mathbf{x}))$. Let Σ be a compact Lie group with elements σ that act on \mathbb{R}^{N_a} . Then \mathbf{h} is σ -*equivariant* for some $\sigma \in \Sigma$ if $\sigma \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{h}(\sigma \mathbf{x})$, and \mathbf{h} is Σ -*equivariant* if this holds true for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$ [15, Definition 1.7]. In the following theorem we show that the symmetry group of the graph \bar{G} is also a symmetry group of the opinion dynamics (2) for homogeneous unbiased agents.

Theorem 5 (Γ -equivariance). *Consider opinion dynamics (2) with $b_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N_a$. Let Γ be the automorphism group of \bar{G} . The opinion dynamics are Γ -equivariant.*

Proof. Let ρ be an element of Γ , and define the function $\hat{\mathbf{S}} : \mathbb{R}^{N_a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_a}$ as $\hat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{y}) = (S(y_1), \dots, S(y_{N_a}))$. Every permutation ρ can be decomposed into a product of transpositions ρ_{ik} that interchange elements in positions i and k of a set. For an arbitrary transposition, it is easy to see that $P_{\rho_{ik}} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{\mathbf{S}}(P_{\rho_{ik}} \mathbf{y})$, and by iteratively applying transpositions we see that for all permutations ρ , $P_\rho \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{\mathbf{S}}(P_\rho \mathbf{y})$. Using this and the definition of graph automorphism we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_\rho \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) &= -d P_\rho \mathbf{x} + u \hat{\mathbf{S}}(P_\rho(\alpha \mathcal{I} + \gamma \bar{A}) \mathbf{x}) \\ &= -d P_\rho \mathbf{x} + u \hat{\mathbf{S}}((\alpha \mathcal{I} + \gamma \bar{A}) P_\rho \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{h}(P_\rho \mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

This relation holds for all $\rho \in \Gamma$, and the theorem follows. \square

In the remainder of this section we illustrate how graph symmetry dictates patterns of opinions on the network.

Definition 4. *Let Γ be the automorphism group of \bar{G} , and $i \in V$ a vertex. We define the orbit of i as $O_i = \{k \in V \mid k = \rho i \text{ for some } \rho \in \Gamma\}$. The orbits are equivalence classes*

that partition the set of vertices V through the equivalence relation

$$i \sim k \text{ if } k = \rho i \text{ for some } \rho \in \Gamma. \quad (5)$$

Theorem 6. *Consider opinion dynamics (2) with $u_i := u \geq 0$ and $b_i = 0$ for all $i \in V$. Let Γ be the automorphism group of the undirected graph \bar{G} , and for any two vertices $i, k \in V$ define the equivalence relation $i \sim k$ as in (5).*

A. *Suppose $\gamma > 0$. For the agreement equilibria $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N_a})$ from Theorem 1.A, if $i \sim k$, then $x_i = x_k$;*

B. *Suppose $\gamma < 0$ and λ_{min} has multiplicity 1. For the disagreement equilibria $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N_a})$ from Theorem 1.B, if $i \sim k$, then $|x_i| = |x_k|$.*

Proof. In A and B, the solutions \mathbf{x} appear along the 1-dimensional subspace $\ker J(\mathbf{0})$. For any $\rho \in \Gamma$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \ker J(\mathbf{0})$, $P_\rho \mathbf{v} \in \ker J(\mathbf{0})$ [15, Remark 1.25], and $P_\rho \mathbf{v} = \pm \mathbf{v}$ [14, Lemma 3.8.2]. The only way for this to be true is if for any $i, k \in V$ for which $i \sim k$, $|v_i| = |v_k|$. \square

All graphs shown in Figure 1 have a nontrivial symmetry and a simple λ_{min} . The vertices contained in the same orbit under the action of its symmetry have equal magnitude opinion in both agreement and disagreement parameter regimes (e.g. all the vertices of a cycle, the outer vertices of the star and wheel). The randomly generated graph in Figure 1C also has a simple λ_{min} but only has a trivial symmetry. Therefore each node is its own orbit and the equilibrium opinion magnitude is different at each node. In contrast, both graphs in Figure 2A,B have a nontrivial symmetry but the dimension of $W(\lambda_{min})$ is 2 and the conditions of Theorem 5 are not met. The disagreement opinion magnitudes on these graphs do not reflect the orbit structure of the graph's symmetry group.

VI. AGENT SENSITIVITY AND OPINION CASCADES

In [1, Section VI] a state feedback law is introduced for the attention parameter u_i in (2), which enables the group to become opinionated in response to external input b_i . Each agent's attention parameter u_i tracks a saturated norm of the system state observed by agent i , with dynamics defined by

$$\tau_s \dot{u}_i = -u_i + S_u \left(\sum_{k=1}^{N_a} (\bar{a}_{ik} x_k)^2 \right). \quad (6)$$

Here, $\tau_s > 0$ is the time scale of the integration and the saturation function satisfies $S_u(0) = 0$, $S'_u(0) > 0$, and $S_u(y) > 0$ when $y > 0$. We define S_u as $S_u(y) = u_f (F(g(y - y_m)) - F(-gy_m))$, with $F(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}$, and design parameters $g, u_f, y_m > 0$ tune the system response. The saturation function S_u implicitly defines a threshold. When agent i observes a system state above this threshold, its the attention parameter $u_i(t)$ approaches the upper saturation bound of S_u over time. Let $u_{sat} = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} S_u(y)$.

We define an *opinion cascade* on the network with coupled opinion dynamics (2) and attention dynamics (6) as a transition from an initial state $\|\mathbf{x}(0)\| < \delta_1$, $\|\mathbf{u}(0)\| < \delta_2$ for some $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ to $\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| > u_{sat}/d - \varepsilon_1$, $\|\mathbf{u}(t)\| > u_{sat} - \varepsilon_2$

for some $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ and for all $t > T > 0$. A rigorous analysis of opinion cascade over networks is the subject of ongoing work. Here, we stick to illustrating the main ideas with numerical examples. We show in particular how the spectral properties of the adjacency matrix predict which agents are more likely to trigger a cascade when excited by an external input.

When all inputs b_i on the network are zero, agreement and disagreement solutions of (2) are shown in Theorem 1 to appear along spaces tangent to $W(\lambda_{max})$ and $W(\lambda_{min})$, respectively. The effect of nonzero b_i is twofold. First, they “unfold” the agreement and disagreement bifurcation branches according to *unfolding theory* [16, Chapter III]. Second, they promote opinion cascades as follows. Below the agreement or disagreement bifurcation threshold, a non-zero input moves the neutral equilibrium away from the origin, thus increasing the state norm at this equilibrium. This leads to an increase of the u_i by the attention dynamics (6). If this increase is large enough, the attention threshold defined by S_u is crossed and a cascade is triggered.

A result we are currently formalizing is that the norm of the projection of the vector of inputs \mathbf{b} onto the eigenspaces $W(\lambda_{max})$ or $W(\lambda_{min})$, depending on the cooperative or competitive regime, is directly related to whether or not the opinion cascade gets triggered. To illustrate this, in Figures 3 and 4 we show two examples of a disagreement cascade for graphs with a simple λ_{min} . In Figure 3 the graph is a balanced tree, which is bipartite. Thus, the magnitude of each entry of its λ_{min} -eigenvector corresponds to the corresponding agent’s relative centrality, as proved in Lemma 3. When an input is given to the most central agent an opinion cascade gets triggered, whereas when the same input is given to an agent located on an outer leaf, the group remains neutral.

Analogously, in Figure 4 a cascade is triggered on a randomly generated network when an input is given to the agent with the largest magnitude entry in the λ_{min} -eigenvector, and is not triggered when the same input is given to the agent with the smallest entry. The post-cascade pattern of opinions on this network is very close to the pattern for the solution of the unbiased system shown in Figure 2C. In this way, the spectral properties of \bar{A} can be used not only to predict the patterns of opinion formation for opinion dynamics (2) both with a static $u_i = u$ and coupled with (6), but also to inform which agent should receive a control signal or carry a sensor in order to have maximal likelihood of an informed opinion cascade spreading on the network.

VII. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have shown how patterns of nonlinear opinion formation on two-option networks can be studied systematically using spectral properties of the graph adjacency matrix. Using this approach, we showed that agent centrality and symmetry of the underlying graph select the pattern of opinions in agreement and disagreement for a large set of networks. We further illustrated how the eigenvectors




Fig. 3: On the balanced tree, input $b_i = 0.4$ for agent marked with arrow; $b_i = 0$ for all other agents. Simulations of (2) start from small random initial opinions drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$. Left: time trajectories of the dynamics. Right: final opinion, indicated by color, of simulation at $t = 300$. Parameters: $d = 1$, $\alpha = 1$, $\gamma = -1$, $u_i(0) = 0$ for all $i \in V$, $g = 10$, $y_m = 0.4$, $u_f = 1$, $\tau_s = 10$.




Fig. 4: On randomly generated graph, input $b_i = 0.45$ for agent marked with arrow; $b_i = 0$ for all other agents. Simulations of (2) start from small random initial opinions drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$. Left: time trajectories of the dynamics. Right: final opinion, indicated by color, of simulation at $t = 300$. Parameters: $d = 1$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $\gamma = -0.5$, $u_i(0) = 0$ for all $i \in V$, $g = 10$, $y_m = 0.4$, $u_f = 1$, $\tau_s = 10$.

of the adjacency matrix provide information about sensitivity of individual nodes to input that triggers opinion cascades. The analysis in this paper naturally generalizes to multi-option networks with opinion dynamics defined in [1], of which the system studied in this paper is a special case. The multi-option extension is the subject of ongoing work, along with the development of a full mathematical formalism for opinion cascades such as those discussed in Section VI, for two-option networks and more generally for multi-option networks.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bizyaeva, A. Franci, and N. E. Leonard, “A general model of opinion dynamics with tunable sensitivity,” *arXiv:2009.04332 [math.OC]*, Sep. 2020.
- [2] A. Franci, M. Golubitsky, A. Bizyaeva, and N. E. Leonard, “A model-independent theory of consensus and dissensus decision making,” *arXiv:1909.05765 [math.OC]*, Sep. 2020.

- [3] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1520–1533, 2004.
- [4] C. Altafini, "Consensus problems on networks with antagonistic interactions," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 935–946, 2013.
- [5] J. Liu, X. Chen, T. Baar, and M. A. Belabbas, "Exponential convergence of the discrete- and continuous-time altafini models," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 6168–6182, 2017.
- [6] G. Shi, C. Altafini, and J. S. Baras, "Dynamics over signed networks," *SIAM Review*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 229–257, 2019.
- [7] A. Franci, V. Srivastava, and N. E. Leonard, "A realization theory for bio-inspired collective decision making," *arXiv:1503.08526 [math.OC]*, Mar. 2015.
- [8] R. Gray, A. Franci, V. Srivastava, and N. E. Leonard, "Multiagent decision-making dynamics inspired by honeybees," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 793–806, 2018.
- [9] A. Fontan and C. Altafini, "Achieving a decision in antagonistic multi agent networks: frustration determines commitment strength*," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2018, pp. 109–114.
- [10] L. Farina and S. Rinaldi, *Positive linear systems: theory and applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011, vol. 50.
- [11] P. Bonacich, "Factoring and weighting approaches to status scores and clique identification," *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 113–120, 1972.
- [12] —, "Some unique properties of eigenvector centrality," *Social Networks*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 555–564, 2007.
- [13] D. Stevanovic, *Spectral radius of graphs*. Academic Press, 2014.
- [14] D. Cvetkovic, S. Simic, and P. Rowlinson, *An Introduction to the Theory of Graph Spectra*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [15] M. Golubitsky and I. Stewart, *The Symmetry Perspective*, 1st ed., ser. Progress in Mathematics. New-York: Birkhäuser Basel, 2002, vol. 200.
- [16] M. Golubitsky and D. G. Schaeffer, *Singularities and Groups in Bifurcation Theory*, ser. Applied Mathematical Sciences. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag, 1985, vol. 51.