

Class formation in a social network with asset exchange.

Christian H. Sanabria Montaña* and Rodrigo Huerta-Quintanilla.†
Centro de Investigaciones y de Estudios Avanzados del Instituto Politécnico Nacional
Unidad Mérida, Departamento de Física Aplicada.
Km 6 carretera antigua a progreso, Mérida, Yucatán.

Manuel Rodríguez-Achach.‡
Universidad Veracruzana, Departamento de Física, Facultad de Física e Inteligencia Artificial
Circuito G. Aguirre Beltran s/n, Zona Universitaria Xalapa, Veracruz.
(Dated: August 17, 2021)

We study two kinds of economic exchange, additive and multiplicative, in a system of N agents. The work is divided in two parts, in the first one, the agents are free to interact with each other. The system evolves to a Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution with additive exchange and condenses with a multiplicative one. If bankruptcy is introduced, both types of exchange lead to condensation. Condensation times have been studied. In the second part, the agents are placed in a social network. We analyze the behavior of wealth distributions in time, and the formation of economic classes was observed for certain values of network connectivity.

PACS numbers: 87.23.Ge, 89.65.-s, 89.65.Gh, 89.75-k, 89.75.Fb

I. INTRODUCTION

We have had in the past years a large amount of literature dealing with the study of the distribution of wealth in agent based models with various kinds of interaction rules [1–3]. Several distributions such as *Boltzmann - Gibbs*, *Gamma*, or *Pareto* can be obtained according to the different conditions of the models [4–6]. It is well known that real data analysis from several countries [7] yield a *Boltzmann-Gibbs* distribution for that sector of the population with lowest wealth, who are the majority, and a *Pareto* distribution for the minority of the population with the highest values of wealth (see Figure 1 for an example).




Figure 1: Cumulative probability distribution of US individual income for 1997 (Figure (6) from [1]).

This particular behavior has been reproduced, to some extent, using different kinds of assumptions [8, 9].

In this article we describe a model where this behavior is obtained and the appearance of social classes is observed. The model is agent-based, with agents arranged into a social network, and we define very simple rules for wealth exchange. We analyze the conditions under which the different types of distributions are obtained and also the conditions for the social classes to appear.

In the next section of the paper we describe the interacting model for several cases under study. We focus the analysis on the behavior of entropy, poverty (defined as the minimum of wealth, where the amount of money is less than the minimum allowed exchange) and wealth distributions in sections III and IV.

In section III the dynamics of the model with and without bankruptcy (defined as the impossibility to participate in a trade due to the wealth is less than the minimum allowed exchange) is investigated. The agents are not placed in a network, which is equivalent to a system where the agents are placed in a fully connected network. In section IV we study the effect of a non-fully connected network. Finally in the last section we give our conclusions.

II. INTERACTING MODEL

A. Wealth exchange models

The kind of wealth exchange models that we have considered in the present work are those in which the total amount of wealth before and after the interaction is conserved, also known as elastic collision models. That is, if (i, j) are the labels of the two agents involved, and their

*Electronic address: sanabria@mda.cinvestav.mx

†Electronic address: rhuerta@mda.cinvestav.mx

‡Electronic address: achachm@gmail.com

wealths are (w_i, w_j) respectively, then we can write

$$w_i(t + \Delta t) = w_i(t) + \Delta w, \quad (1)$$

$$w_j(t + \Delta t) = w_j(t) - \Delta w. \quad (2)$$

Since wealth is preserved in the interaction, we have that $w_i(t + \Delta t) + w_j(t + \Delta t) = w_i(t) + w_j(t)$. It is important to remark that agents are not allowed to have negative wealth. Also is necessary to mention that agent i has a probability p to lose Δw , while agent j has a probability $1 - p$. In our model the agents have the same probability to win or to lose, then the value of p is 0.5. Furthermore the agents have only integer values of wealth, hence, Δw must be an integer value.

According to which amount we choose for Δw , we can have two distinct processes: additive or multiplicative exchange. In the additive exchange we have

$$\Delta w = \text{const},$$

this means that the exchange money is fixed in time and is independent of wealth [10]. In the multiplicative case, also known as *Yard-Sale* model [11], we have taken Δw as

$$\Delta w = \text{round}(\nu \cdot \min(w_i(t), w_j(t))),$$

where we used $\text{round}(x)$ as the integer closest to x , and $0 < \nu < 1$. One difference between the multiplicative case and the additive case is the dependence on time for Δw , which in the latter case it is not shown.

B. Interacting model with no network, or undirected fully connected network

We have considered a closed population composed of N agents, where each of them has the possibility to exchange her wealth through the exchange rules mentioned above, with any other agent in the population. Based on the aforementioned we can establish the equivalence between a population with no network and a population embedded in an undirected fully connected network, where each agent i has a connectivity Z^i [12] equal to $N - 1$. Therefore equations (1) and (2) are valid for all (i, j) that belongs to the population.

C. Interacting model with a undirected non-fully connected network

We introduce an undirected network in the population, in which every agent i has k_i links to other agents, such that $1 \leq k_i \leq k_{max}$, where k_{max} is the highest possible number of links allowed in the dynamics. In other words we have used a random network with an arbitrary degree distribution such that $p(k)$ is given by:

$$p(k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k_{max}}; & k \in [1, k_{max}] \\ 0; & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

We used this distribution because we want to have control over the maximum number of links for each agent, and therefore see the effect that this parameter has on the wealth distribution.

The average number of links $\langle k \rangle$ (or the connectivity mean value $\langle Z \rangle$) in the network is given by

$$\langle Z \rangle = \langle k \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N k_i = \sum_{k=1}^{k_{max}} p(k) \cdot k = \frac{k_{max} + 1}{2}. \quad (4)$$

With this in mind the dynamics in the network is of course different from case II B, since agent i will only interact with her k_i links through equations (1) and (2).

One big difference between the fully connected network and the non-fully connected network is the connectivity. In a fully connected network the connectivity Z^i is the same for all agents and is equal to $N - 1$, meanwhile in a non-fully connected network the connectivity Z^i is in the $[1, k_{max}]$ interval.

D. Computer simulations

The simulation begins with a population of N agents. Every agent has the same initial amount of wealth $\langle w \rangle$. To simulate an undirected fully connected network every agent has been linked with the other $N - 1$ agents having in total $N(N - 1)/2$ links on the network. To simulate an undirected non-fully connected network, we build it in the following way:

1. A number of links k is given randomly to every agent, using a uniform distribution at the interval $[1, k_{max}]$. In such a way that we reproduce $p(k)$ as in equation (3).
2. An agent i chooses randomly other agent j , and they will establish a link as long as the agent j has not completed its k_j links assigned; otherwise the agent i will choose other agent to connect. This is repeated until agent i has completed his k_i links.
3. The step 2 is repeated for every agent in the network.

Once the network has been built, the next part is to consider temporal evolution of system by Monte Carlo steps (MCS).

In a Monte Carlo step (MCS or time step), two agents (i, j) are chosen. In the case of undirected fully connected network, both agents are chosen randomly from the whole population; whereas in an undirected non-fully connected network, the first agent i is chosen randomly, but the second agent j is only chosen randomly from the links that agent i has.

The agents interact through a fair bet, that is, the probability to win is $p = 0.5$. An amount of wealth Δw is transferred from the loser to the winner. If the wealth of the loser is less than Δw , the transaction is not done.

In all simulations we have used $N = 500$, $\langle w \rangle = 100$ and 10^2 realizations during 4×10^5 MCS. In the additive exchange the value of c is 20, in the multiplicative exchange $\nu = 0.2$. Within a network, the average number of links (connectivity mean value) obtained by the computer simulations were 1.468, 1.952, 2.428 and 10.06 (these values correspond to values of $k_{max} = 2, 3, 4$ and 20, respectively).

III. DYNAMICS WITH UNDIRECTED FULLY CONNECTED NETWORK

A. Exchange without bankruptcy




Figure 2: Time evolution of wealth distribution for additive exchange. Different symbols show the wealth distribution at different time steps. A Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution is apparent at 399500 (MCS). In the inset we can see the fit to an exponential function.

The time evolution of the wealth distribution for both the additive and multiplicative exchange cases has been studied. In Figure 2 we display the results, which are not normalized, for the additive case, where the system evolves to a stationary state and the distribution is of the *Boltzmann-Gibbs* type (remark inside). These results are already reported [13, 14]. In Figure 3, for the multiplicative case, we can see that the system undergoes different phases including the *Gamma* distribution and the *power law* (remark inside). Again these results are already reported [7, 15, 16]. For a sufficiently long time, as already noted in previous works [11], the system ends in a condensed state, where $N - 1$ agents belong to the poverty state, which is defined as the minimum state of wealth where the amount of money is less than Δw , and a single agent who is in the maximum state of wealth.




Figure 3: Same as figure 2 but for the case of multiplicative exchange. Here we get a power law distribution at 399500 (MCS). The inset shows the fit to a power law.

We have also studied the Shannon entropy, defined by

$$S = - \sum_k P_k \ln P_k, \quad (5)$$

where $P_k = n_k/N$, that is, the probability for the agent to be in the state k , with wealth w_k . In Figure 4(a) and 4(b) we display the behavior of the Shannon entropy as well of the poverty for the additive and multiplicative exchanges. In the multiplicative case the entropy reaches a maximum before decreasing monotonically, therefore the number of states available to the system is minimum at the condensed state, S_c [19]. In our case, with the parameters given for the system, this value is $S_c = 0.01442$




Figure 4: Time evolution of entropy (a) and poverty (b) for both cases of exchange, additive and multiplicative, in a log-normal scale.

B. Exchange with bankruptcy

We define that an agent is bankrupt, in the additive case, when it ends up with no money to make more bets ($w < \Delta w$). In the multiplicative case, an agent is bankrupt when the closest integer of $\nu \cdot w$ is zero. Hence if the agent is bankrupt, it is not allowed to participate in the dynamics anymore. As expected, the condensation point is reached faster than in the previous cases when bankruptcy was not included. In those cases, the agents who have reached the absolute poverty were still allowed to participate in the game, and in principle they could become rich, even though this situation is very unlikely.




Figure 5: Time evolution of entropy (a) and poverty (b) for both cases of exchange, additive and multiplicative, using the bankruptcy concept, in a log-log scale.

Figure 5 shows the results with bankruptcy. It is important to notice that in both cases, additive and multiplicative, the system reaches the condensed phase. Poverty reaches its maximum value, $N - 1$ or 499, and entropy ends up at the S_c value previously given. Since in both cases we obtain condensation, we study the time it takes to reach this point when we vary parameters such as N , the number of agents, and Δw , the fraction of the wealth exchange. In Figure 6 we show this variation with respect to N and found a different behavior depending on the exchange case. In the additive case the dependence of the condensation time with respect to N goes like $t_c^{add} \propto N^{1.899}$ whereas in the multiplicative case we get a linear dependence $N t_c^{mul} \propto N$.

The dependence of the condensation time with Δw is depicted in Figure 7. In the additive case there is a discrete behavior due to the fact that the condensation time has a well defined value for the different ranges of Δw . This can be explained if we consider the condensation time as being proportional to the minimum number of exchanges min_{ex} that two agents can make before one of




Figure 6: Time of condensation vs number of agents for both cases of exchange, additive and multiplicative using the bankruptcy concept, in a log-log scale. Note that the relation between time of condensation and number of individuals is different for each case of wealth exchange.




Figure 7: Time of condensation vs Δw for both cases of exchange, additive and multiplicative using bankruptcy concept, in a log-log scale. Again the relation between time of condensation and Δw is different depending on the exchange case.

them reaches poverty. Hence we write min_{ex} as

$$min_{ex} = \left\lceil \frac{\langle w \rangle}{\Delta w} \right\rceil.$$

For instance if we considered $\langle w \rangle = 100$ and $\Delta w = 50$, two agents (i, j) will have a minimum number of exchanges $min_{ex} = 2$, that means that there are 2 exchanges at least, before one agent reaches poverty. If we have $\langle w \rangle = 100$ and $\Delta w = 51$, the minimum number of exchanges is now $min_{ex} = 1$, and only one bet can be made. Therefore the time of condensation depends of the minimum of exchange.

In a multiplicative exchange the behavior of the condensation time t_c^{mul} do not shows the discrete situation of the additive case since the bet is not constant. One would expect that if we increase the amount of the wealth exchange in each transaction, the time it takes to condense gets lower, and that we can see in Figure 7.

IV. DYNAMICS OF THE EXCHANGE IN A SOCIAL NETWORK

In this section we consider a system composed of N agents placed in an undirected non-fully connected network with a degree distribution given by equation (3). It is clear that the agents cannot interact freely, but instead they do it through relations that form a social network. One would expect that the dynamics shows some differences with respect to the urn case.

Since the number of links varies among the agents, we will consider the average value, or connectivity $\langle k \rangle$ (see section II), for a given network. We consider again the additive and multiplicative cases, without taking bankruptcy into account since, as we have seen, its main effect is to drive the system into the condensed state. Therefore if we introduce it in the undirected non-fully connected network, we are going to have local condensations, due to the presence of several components, obtaining as a result wealth distributions similar to multiplicative exchange which is going to study in section IV B.

A. Additive exchange




Figure 8: Time evolution of entropy (a) and poverty (b) in the additive exchange case for different values of $\langle k \rangle$. In the inset we appreciate that for $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$ the asymptotic entropy is the lowest. The same behavior occur to the poverty value.

In Figure 8 we display the temporal evolution of entropy and poverty for the additive case and for different values

of $\langle k \rangle$. The temporal evolution of entropy is very similar in all cases, and furthermore, always lead to a stationary distribution of wealth, no matter the average connectivity value $\langle k \rangle$. The entropy, as well as the poverty, reaches a maximum value. An interesting thing to notice is that the connectivity value of 1.468 leads to lower values of entropy and poverty than those with other connectivities (see insets in Figure 8). In order to understand this, we will examine the component size distribution $\chi(s)$, which gives the probability to find a component with size s in the network.




Figure 9: Component size distribution in the network for different values of connectivity $\langle k \rangle$. One can see that for $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$ there is no giant component, as opposed to the other three cases (see inset).

In Figure 9 we display the component size distribution in the network, for each average connectivity value $\langle k \rangle$. The distribution is not normalized since this makes no difference to the discussion. For $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$, we observe that components with sizes of 2, 3 and 4 are predominant in network. Therefore in the network are present groups of linked agents that are isolated from the rest of the network. The exchange becomes isolated from the rest of the system, and the effect of this situation is to produce economic classes as the system evolves. This effect is more easily obtained when $\langle k \rangle$ is lower, as one would expect. Therefore, the isolated agents that form the component are decoupled from the system's dynamics, and they never reach absolute poverty. The more components we get the less poverty we obtain.

Figure 10 shows the wealth distribution for additive exchange at time step ($t = 399000$ MCS), for the lower value of $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$. We notice two social classes, one where the wealth of the agents is below $2\langle w \rangle$ and with a *Boltzmann - Gibbs* distribution (continuous line Figure 10) of the form

$$P(w) = C e^{-\frac{w}{b\langle w \rangle}}, \quad (6)$$




Figure 10: Wealth distribution in the additive exchange case, in time step 399000 MCS for $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$. The solid curve fits an exponential function (see inset for a log-normal scale), while the dashed curve fits to a power law function. Two different regimes are clearly seen separated at $2\langle w \rangle$: a Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution for values below to $2\langle w \rangle$, and a Pareto distribution for those above to $2\langle w \rangle$. This behavior is similar to Figure 1.




Figure 11: Wealth distribution in the additive exchange case, at time step 399000 MCS for values of $\langle k \rangle$ other than 1.468. The data for each value of $\langle k \rangle$ can be fitted to the exponential function adjusting the value of parameter b (see table I).

where b is equal to 2. The other class, with wealth above $2\langle w \rangle$ behaves like a Pareto distribution (dashed line) of the form

$$P(w) = \frac{C}{w^{1+\alpha}}, \quad (7)$$

with $\alpha = 2.5$. This particular behavior, the coexistence

of two different wealth distributions, has been observed in real economic data (see Figure 1). It is important to mention that these two classes coexist, and these two distributions are joint at a wealth value of $w = 2\langle w \rangle$. This value arises due to the large number of components of size of 2 in the network, allowing to each agent obtain a maximum wealth of $2\langle w \rangle$.

Other authors [9, 17] had found both distributions in coexistence, but using a more sophisticated model, and with a different network topology.

This formation of two classes arises from the fact that at a value of $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$, most of the components are formed by two agents (see Figure 9). Therefore, the poor sector of the system is formed mostly by groups of 2 agents, while the rich sector have to the possibility to be formed by components of 3 or more agents, which allows an agent to have a wealth higher than $2\langle w \rangle$.

When $\langle k \rangle$ increase, the components formed by two agents start to decrease (see Figure 9 around $s = 2$), and as a consequence, the two wealth distributions observed in Figure 10 disappear. We end up only with a *Boltzmann - Gibbs* distribution for each $\langle k \rangle$ value, as we can see in Figure 11. These *B-G* distributions of Figure 11 are obtain adjusting a parameter b (see eq 6) for each value $\langle k \rangle$. This is shown in table I.

$\langle k \rangle$	b
1.952	1.15
2.428	1.1
10.06	1.05

Table I: Values of parameter b (eq 6) for different average connectivities $\langle k \rangle$ in the additive exchange case.

Note that the systems reach the equilibrium at temperatures higher than temperature in the undirected fully connected network case. That means the value of b is greater than 1, and therefore the product $b\langle w \rangle$ (that can be considered like a temperature) is higher than $\langle w \rangle$ (equilibrium temperature in an undirected fully connected network). Also, as $\langle k \rangle$ increases, the value of b tends to 1, which makes sense since a very large value of $\langle k \rangle \rightarrow N - 1$ goes to an undirected fully connected network.

It is important to remark that the formation of the components in the network allows the exchange transactions to occur in a local way, and that prevents a population of agents to become poor. The agents are in a *Boltzmann - Gibbs* distribution, since in the component the maximum possible wealth is $2\langle w \rangle$. Therefore these components prevent agents from becoming poor, but also rich.

B. Multiplicative exchange

In Figure 12 we show the temporal evolution of entropy and poverty for the multiplicative case. One can see that

entropy goes through a maximum before decreasing and reaching a constant value that is different for each value of $\langle k \rangle$. The system with larger parameter $\langle k \rangle = 10.06$ is the one with more possibilities to condense, as in the undirected fully connected network case, because this has a component size of 500. We can also notice that its entropy is the lowest and its poverty the highest. However we expect that condensation occurs later than in the undirected fully connected network case.




Figure 12: Time evolution of entropy (a) and poverty (b) in the multiplicative exchange case for different values of $\langle k \rangle$. Note that, when there is a giant component, the entropy and poverty are inversely proportional ($\langle k \rangle \neq 1.468$). In the absence of a giant component, that is not the case.




Figure 13: Wealth distribution in the multiplicative exchange case, at time step 399000 MCS for an average connectivity value of $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$. We can see in this case the presence of various well defined wealth classes, that appear because there is no giant component.




Figure 14: Wealth distribution in the multiplicative exchange case, at time step 399000 MCS for values of $\langle k \rangle$ different to 1.468. We observe that as $\langle k \rangle$ increases, the classes tend to disappear. At the end a bimodal behavior is obtained.

Figure 13 shows the wealth distribution for a multiplicative exchange, in time step ($t = 399000$ MCS) for the lower value of $\langle k \rangle = 1.468$. A very interesting phenomenon can be observed. The appearance of four well defined classes with wealth of zero, $1.8 \langle w \rangle$, $2.8 \langle w \rangle$ and $3.8 \langle w \rangle$ respectively (isolated points in the figure). These classes of wealth will eventually become 0, $2 \langle w \rangle$, $3 \langle w \rangle$ and $4 \langle w \rangle$ when the system reaches the stationary state at later times. The isolated point of wealth $1.8 \langle w \rangle$ corresponds to the presence of groups of two agents in the system, because, if two agents interact only with each other, the maximum value of wealth that a agent will have is $2 \langle w \rangle$. Similarly, the points with wealths of $2.8 \langle w \rangle$ and $3.8 \langle w \rangle$ correspond to the presence of closed groups of three and four agents respectively. This is in agreement with Figure 9, where the most prevailing component sizes are those of values 2, 3 and 4 respectively. In addition to these classes, we observe a background of agents with variable wealths. These background arises from agents that belong to components of sizes larger than 4. In this case there is a larger flux of money among many agents in the network.

It is clear that classes appear due to the formation of components with different sizes. A local condensation occurs in each one, and this gives us a hint about the way the system behaves when the value $\langle k \rangle$ decreases: the entropy of the system should reach a minimum which is stationary and in this point half of the agents are poor and the other half has a wealth of $2 \langle w \rangle$. As soon as $\langle k \rangle$ starts to increase, the separation between the classes begins to disappear, until we are left with a class of agents with wealth 0, and another class on non-zero wealth agents, as seen in Figure (14a - 14c). A Similar bimodal behavior has been obtained in Ref [5].

C. Class formation and transition to the giant component

From previous discussions, we observed an interesting phenomenon (appearance of wealth classes) in the case of an undirected non-fully connected network, which has a maximum connectivity equal to 2. We shall see in more detail the transition to the giant component. Starting from generating function proposed in [18], but considering that in our case the sum is finite and begins in $k = 1$, we can write

$$G_0(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{k_{max}} p(k)x^k. \quad (8)$$

This function allows us to know if a giant component is present in the network. The average number of links, or connectivity mean value $\langle k \rangle$, is given by

$$z_1 = \langle k \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{k_{max}} kp(k) = G'_0(1), \quad (9)$$

thus the average number z_2 of second neighbors will be

$$z_2 = G''_0(1). \quad (10)$$

In the network there is a giant component if the condition $z_2 > z_1$ is satisfied.

Using the value of $p(k)$ from equation (3), we can write $G_0(x)$ as

$$G_0(x) = \frac{x}{k_{max}} \left[\frac{1 - x^{k_{max}}}{1 - x} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Now we can calculate the values of z_1 and z_2 for each value of k_{max} . These values are shown in table II.

k_{max}	z_1	z_2
2	1.5	1
3	2.0	2.66
4	2.5	5.0
20	10.5	133

Table II: Values of z_1 and z_2 for each value of k_{max} used in this work. We can see that only for $k_{max} = 2$, we get $z_1 > z_2$, which means there is no giant component present.

As we can see, the only value of k_{max} that does not led to a giant component is $k_{max} = 2$. This means that in this case, the system has more components than for other values of connectivity, mostly with size of 2. Consequently, the wealth flow is local and therefore the classes arise. Another important point is the transition to a giant component, which happens from $k_{max} = 2$ to $k_{max} = 3$. When the network has a giant component the wealth flow is not local as in the case of $k_{max} = 2$, and the classes start to disappear.

To see that in the case with $k_{max} = 2$ there are more components of size 2 than other sizes, we calculate P_s and $\chi(s)$. P_s is the probability distribution of cluster sizes, which is the probability of an agent to belong to a size s component. $\chi(s)$ is the component size distribution, which gives the probability to find a component with size s in the network. For P_s , we using the following equation

$$P_s = \frac{1}{s!} \left. \frac{d^s H_0}{dx^s} \right|_{x=0}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$H_0(x) = xG_0(H_1(x)). \quad (13)$$

$H_1(x)$ is the generating function for the distribution of the sizes of components which can be written as

$$H_1(x) = xG_1(H_1(x)), \quad (14)$$

with

$$G_1(x) = \frac{1}{z} G'_0(x), \quad \text{where } z = \langle k \rangle. \quad (15)$$

The component size distribution $\chi(s)$ is given by the equation

$$\chi(s) = \frac{1}{\chi_T} \frac{P_s}{s}, \quad \text{for } s > 1. \quad (16)$$

χ_T is the normalization factor and is given by

$$\chi_T = \sum_s \frac{P_s}{s}. \quad (17)$$

Using equation (11), we calculate $G_1(x)$, and obtain

$$G_1(x) = \frac{1}{zk_{max}} \left[\frac{1 - 2zx^{k_{max}} + k_{max}x^{k_{max}+1}}{(1-x)^2} \right]. \quad (18)$$

In our case we are taking $k_{max} = 2$, and obtain that $H_1(x)$ is

$$H_1(x) = \frac{x}{3-2x}, \quad (19)$$

and $H_0(x)$ is

$$H_0(x) = \left(\frac{x^2}{2} \right) \frac{3-x}{(3-2x)^2}. \quad (20)$$

With these functions, we calculate for instance the first seven values of P_s and $\chi_T\chi(s)$, which are showed in the table III

From this table we can see that an agent has the same probability of being in a size 2 or 3 component, and these probabilities are larger than for other components. In the other hand, the probability to find in the network a component of 2 agents ($s = 2$) is the highest, this agrees with Figure 9. For example, suppose that N , the number

s	P_s	$\chi_T\chi(s)$
1	0	0
2	1/6	1/12
3	1/6	1/18
4	4/27	1/27
5	10/81	2/81
6	8/81	4/243
7	56/729	8/729

Table III: First seven values of P_s and $\chi_T\chi(s)$, in the case of $k_{max} = 2$. We can see that the probability to find components with size of 2 in the network is highest. This result is agree with the Figure 9.

of agents, is 36 and $k_{max} = 2$. From table III we know that in the network there will be 3 components with size 2, meanwhile there will be 2 components with size 3.

To show how the number of components is decrease when the k_{max} value is increase, we calculate the mean component size, $\langle s \rangle$, using the following equation

$$\langle s \rangle = 1 + \frac{zu^2}{[1 - S][1 - G'_1(u)]}. \quad (21)$$

S is the fraction of network occupied by the giant component and is given by

$$S = 1 - G_0(u), \quad (22)$$

while u is the smallest non-negative real solution of

$$u = G_1(u), \quad (23)$$

which is a transcendental equation.

From equation (18), we can see that $G_1(u)$ is a polynomial equation of $(k_{max} - 1)$ degree. Therefore the first intersection between u and this polynomial equation (the intersection is just the solution of equation (23)), goes to zero if k_{max} increase, and the mean component size, $\langle s \rangle$, in equation (12) becomes one. It this means that the components in the network are disappearing when k_{max} is increased, just as observed in Figure 9.

k_{max}	u	$\langle s \rangle$
2	1	5.5
3	0.33	5.15
4	0.13	2.63

Table IV: Values of u and $\langle s \rangle$ for values of $k_{max} = 2, 3$ and 4. We can see u goes to zero, and $\langle s \rangle$ tend to one if k_{max} increase, which means the components are disappearing when k_{max} is increased as observed in Figure 9.

In table IV we show some values of u and $\langle s \rangle$ calculated for k_{max} values of 2, 3 and 4. Where we can see how the mean component size and the u value decrease, which means that components in the network are vanishing.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this work we studied an asset exchange model with additive or multiplicative exchanges. We consider the cases when bankruptcy is introduced and also the interaction of agents through a social network. In the undirected fully connected network, is already known the additive case leads to a *Boltzmann - Gibbs* distribution, while in the multiplicative case, the system evolves to a condensed state where a single agent gets all the money. When we allow for bankruptcy, condensation is obtained for both types of exchange. We studied these condensation times, finding that the in the multiplicative exchange the system condenses faster than in the additive case. The time of condensation is proportional to the number of agents. In the additive case the proportionality goes as $t_c^{add} \propto N^{1.899}$. For the multiplicative case the condensation time goes as $t_c^{mul} \propto N$.

When we introduce the social network we obtain stationary distributions in the additive case with a clear formation of coexisting classes, the poor sector of the system following a Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution until a value of wealth $2\langle w \rangle$ and a Pareto distribution from there on.

In the multiplicative case, there is also formation of four well defined classes that arise from the presence of components in the network. These components begin to disappear when the parameter $\langle k \rangle$ is increased, since the connectivity of the network is higher. In this later case we expect a global condensation to occur at a very long times.

Component formation and the absence of a giant component allows the presence of social classes, since they prevent the money to flow in the entire network. This has as a consequence that in some parts of the system the wealth can not be larger than a maximum amount fixed by the number of members in the component, effectively preventing global condensation. The number of components increases as $\langle k \rangle$ diminishes. In a real society, the flow of money is affected by a myriad of processes that cannot be accounted for in simple model like this. However, it is interesting to notice that despite its simplicity, the model can give some insights about the origin of economic classes. As a conclusion, the isolation of agents in a social network can lead to economic stratification, as observed in the analysis of the present dynamics. For future work, it would be of interest to analyze the same phenomena using different kinds of networks.

Acknowledgments

This work has been partially supported by CONACyT-México and PROMEP-México under grant NPTC-256.

-
- [1] V. M. Yakovenko and J. J. Barkley Rosser, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1703 (2009).
- [2] A. Gupta (2006), arXiv:physics/0604161v2 [physics.soc-ph].
- [3] M. Rodríguez-Achach and R. Huerta-Quintanilla, *Physica A* **361**, 309 (2005).
- [4] A. Chatterjee and B. Chakrabarti, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **60**, 135 (2007).
- [5] A. Gupta, *Physica A* **359**, 634 (2006).
- [6] M. Patriarca, A. Chakraborti, and K. Kaski, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 016104 (2004).
- [7] A. Chatterjee, S. Yarlagadda, and B. k. Chakrabarti, *Econophysics of Wealth Distributions* (Springer, Milan, 2005).
- [8] J. González-Estévez, M. Cosenza, R. López-Ruiz, and J. Sánchez, *Physica A* **387**, 4637 (2008).
- [9] I. Wright, *Physica A* **346**, 589 (2005).
- [10] S. Ispolatov, P. Krapivsky, and S. Redner, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **2**, 267 (1998).
- [11] C. Moukarzel, S. Gonçalves, J. Iglesias, M. Rodríguez-Achach, and R. Huerta-Quintanilla, *Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics* **143**, 75 (2007).
- [12] F. Vega-Redondo, *Complex Social Networks* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [13] A. Drăgulescu and V. Yakovenko (2003), arXiv:cond-mat/0211175v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [14] V. Yakovenko (2007), arXiv:0709.3662v3 [physics.soc-ph].
- [15] Y. Brenner, J. Reijnders, et al., *The theory of income and wealth distribution* (Martin's Press, 1988).
- [16] M. Patriarca, A. Chakraborti, and K. Kaski, *Physica A* **340**, 334 (2004).
- [17] R. Coelho, Z. Néda, J. J. Ramasco, and M. A. Santos, *Physica A* **353**, 515 (2005).
- [18] M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 026118 (2001).
- [19] The entropy of condensation S_c is calculated as:

$$S_c = - \left(\frac{N-1}{N} \ln \frac{N-1}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \ln \frac{1}{N} \right)$$