

Double transition in kinetic exchange opinion models with activation dynamics

Marcelo A. Pires^{1*} and Nuno Crokidakis^{2†}

¹*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza/CE, Brazil*

²*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói/RJ, Brazil*

(Dated: November 19, 2021)

In this work we study a model of opinion dynamics considering activation/deactivation of agents. In other words, individuals are not static and can become inactive and drop out from the discussion. A probability w governs the deactivation dynamics, whereas social interactions are ruled by kinetic exchanges, considering competitive positive/negative interactions. Inactive agents can become active due to interactions with active agents. Our analytical and numerical results show the existence of two distinct nonequilibrium phase transitions, with the occurrence of three phases, namely ordered (ferromagnetic-like), disordered (paramagnetic-like) and absorbing phases. The absorbing phase represents a collective state where all agents are inactive, i.e., they do not participate on the dynamics, inducing a frozen state. We determine the critical value w_c above which the system is in the absorbing phase independently of the other parameters. We also verify a distinct critical behavior for the transitions among different phases.

I. INTRODUCTION

Opinion dynamics is one of the hottest topics of research in statistical physics of complex systems [1–6]. One of the reasons for this interest is that even simple models can exhibit a complex collective behavior that emerges from the interactions among individuals. Usually, those models exhibit phase transitions and rich critical phenomena, which justifies the theoretical interest of physicists in the study of opinion dynamics.

In most opinion dynamics' models all agents are permanently active and have chances to interact with other agents [7–10]. However, many social environments especially online communities are not static in a way that agents can become inactive and withdraw from the discussion. In other words, social users do not concentrate on the discussion all the time, and they may lose interest and drop out of it [11, 12]. However, these dormant agents can become active again following peers [13]. Some works have verified that the final average opinion depends significantly on the external influence and internal actions. Small external activation drives the initially inactive system to total consensus quickly, but large external deactivation is required to freeze the active dynamics [14]. This kind of activation dynamics leads to interesting results. The authors in [11] verified that if dissipation stays below a threshold value, the system evolves to a balance (paramagnetic) state where the average concentration of one opinion is equal to that of the other. On the other hand, it was verified that, in activation-like opinion dynamics that evolves on the top of complex networks, the topology of network also evolves in time [13]. The authors verified that the model has power-law degree distribution, and clustering coefficients stay higher than results in Barabási-Albert networks. Another study revealed that under the impact of external circumstances, the population can evolve to distinct stationary states. On one hand, one opinion can finally be made dominant when the internal motivation is sufficiently large. On the other hand, without external activation, consensus is hardly reached in the system with interest decay [13].

On the other hand, we have the kinetic exchange opinion models (KEOM), that have been subject of study since the work of Lallouache-Chakrabarti-Chakraborti-Chakrabarti (LCCC) [15]. The LCCC model introduced a dynamic rule for opinion dynamics based on models of wealth exchange. The model considered continuous opinions in the range $[-1.0, 1.0]$, but discrete opinions were also considered in [16]. Several extensions for discrete and continuous opinions were also studied, considering for example the impact of agents' convictions [17], social temperature [18], inflexibility [19], nonconformist behaviors [20], dynamic individual influence [21], the presence of contrarian individuals [22], influencing ability of individuals [23, 24], the relation between coarsening and consensus [25], competition between noise and disorder [26], the analysis of noise-induced absorbing phase transitions [27] and the presence of distinct interaction rules [28]. The model was also considered in finite dimensional lattices [29] (including applications to the 2016 presidential election in USA [30]), in triangular, honeycomb, and Kagome lattices [31], in quasiperiodic lattices [32], in modular networks [33] and in other complex networks [34].

Take into account those two subjects, namely activation dynamics in opinion formation and kinetic exchange opinion models, we propose the inclusion of activation dynamics considering the KEOM social interaction rules. Coevolution

* piresma@cbpf.br

† nuno@mail.if.uff.br

spreading were considered in other works [35–44]. Here we consider that the activation dynamics follows a contact-like process [45], and the social interactions are ruled by the KEOM discussed in [24].

This work is organized as follows. In section 2 we discuss our coevolution dynamics, and present the microscopic rules that govern our model. The analytical and numerical results are discussed in section 3. Finally, the conclusion and final remarks are presented in section 4.

II. MODEL

We consider a fully-connected population with N agents. The agents can be classified as follows:

- (I) Opinion: $o_i = +1$ if an agent i supports opinion $+1$, $o_i = -1$ if i supports opinion -1 , $o_i = 0$ if i is undecided/neutral.
- (II) Activation status: $s_i = 1$ if an agent i is active or $s_i = 0$ if i is inactive.

Considering the social interactions, as explained below, we will follow the Biswas-Chatterjee-Sen (BCS) model [24]. In the BCS model, two agents i and j are randomly chosen, and they interact through the following rule:

$$o_i(t+1) = o_i(t) + \mu_{ij} o_j(t) . \quad (1)$$

This expression shows how the opinion of a given agent i in a given time step $t+1$ is updated due to an interaction with another agent j . The first term in the right side of the equation indicates the tendency of agent i to keep his/her current opinion in the time step t , but the opinion can be influenced by another agent j . The coupling μ_{ij} represents the strength of the pairwise interaction. Pairwise interaction strengths are annealed random variables distributed according to the binary probability density function (PDF)

$$F(\mu_{ij}) = p \delta(\mu_{ij} + 1) + (1 - p) \delta(\mu_{ij} - 1) . \quad (2)$$

In other words, the agents can exchange opinions with positive ($+1$) or negative (-1) influences, and p quantifies the mean fraction of negative ones. Notice that, in Eq. (1), if the value of the opinion exceeds (falls below) the value 1 (-1), then it adopts the extreme value 1 (-1) [15]. The model defined by Eqs. (1) and (2) presents only one parameter, p , and it undergoes an order-disorder phase transition at a critical value $p_c = 1/4$, i.e., the competitive positive/negative interactions are responsible for such ferromagnetic-paramagnetic transition [24].

In this work we propose the inclusion of the above-mentioned activation state of agents (see above rule II) in the BCS model. In such a case, at each time step the following rules govern the dynamics of our model:

- Select two agents i and j ;
- If i is active:
 - with probability w apply the deactivation process: $s_i = 1 \rightarrow s_i = 0$. (**Rule 1**).
 - with probability $1 - w$, the agents i and j follow the BCS model: $o_i(t+1) = o_i(t) + \mu_{ij} o_j(t)$, where μ_{ij} follows the PDF of Eq. (2) (**Rule 2**).
- If i is inactive:
 - if i and j have the same opinion ($o_i = o_j$) and j is active: apply the activation process $s_i = 0 \rightarrow s_i = 1$ with probability $(1 - p)g$. (**Rule 3**).

As discussed in the Introduction, during a public debate there are people that are not active/open for discussion. But they can become active due to peers influence. As discussed in [11, 14], active agents may gradually lose their interests in the discussion and drop out of it, which is related to our above **Rule 1**. In addition, our above **Rule 2** is based on the fact that only active agents participate in the opinion dynamics. Finally, as also discussed in [11, 14], active agents can motivate their inactive like-minded peers. If an inert agent holds the same opinion of an active neighbor and they have a positive interaction (with takes place with probability $1 - p$) then, the inert agent is driven to be active with probability $(1 - p)g$. In other words, in order to have an activation with probability g , we considered as a necessary condition that the randomly chosen agents i and j have to interact positively, which occurs with probability $1 - p$, leading to the final probability $(1 - p)g$. These last sentences justify our above **Rule 3**.

III. RESULTS

In a given time step t , let $x_{+1}(t)$, $x_0(t)$ and $x_{-1}(t)$ be the proportion of **inactive** agents with opinions +1, 0 and -1, respectively. Also, let $f_{+1}(t)$, $f_0(t)$ and $f_{-1}(t)$ be the proportion of **active** agents with opinions +1, 0 and -1, respectively. Following the analytical procedure of refs. [16, 17, 24] and the rules defined in the previous section (**Rules 1, 2 and 3**), we can write the master equations for the evolution of the fractions of inactive agents as follows:

$$\text{(Inactive with opinion +1)} \quad \frac{dx_{+1}}{dt} = wf_{+1} - (1-p)gx_{+1}f_{+1} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{(Inactive with opinion 0)} \quad \frac{dx_0}{dt} = wf_0 - (1-p)gx_0f_0 \quad (4)$$

$$\text{(Inactive with opinion -1)} \quad \frac{dx_{-1}}{dt} = wf_{-1} - (1-p)gx_{-1}f_{-1} \quad (5)$$

In addition, we have the following master equations for the evolution of the fractions of active agents with opinions $o = +1$ and $o = -1$:

$$\frac{df_{+1}}{dt} = -wf_{+1} + (1-p)gx_{+1}f_{+1} + (1-w) [-pf_{+1}^2 - (1-p)f_{+1}f_{-1} + (1-p)f_{+1}f_0 + pf_{-1}f_0] \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{df_{-1}}{dt} = wf_{-1} - (1-p)gx_{-1}f_{-1} + (1-w) [-pf_{-1}^2 - (1-p)f_{-1}f_{+1} + (1-p)f_{-1}f_0 + pf_{+1}f_0] \quad (7)$$

Additionally, we have the normalization condition:

$$x_{+1} + x_0 + x_{-1} + f_{+1} + f_0 + f_{-1} = 1 \quad (8)$$

In the steady state, we have for Eqs. (3), (4) and (5):

$$0 = \frac{dx_{+1}}{dt} = wf_{+1} - (1-p)gx_{+1}f_{+1} \Rightarrow f_{+1} = 0 \text{ or } x_{+1} = \frac{w}{(1-p)g} \quad (9)$$

$$0 = \frac{dx_0}{dt} = wf_0 - (1-p)gx_0f_0 \Rightarrow f_0 = 0 \text{ or } x_0 = \frac{w}{(1-p)g} \quad (10)$$

$$0 = \frac{dx_{-1}}{dt} = wf_{-1} - (1-p)gx_{-1}f_{-1} \Rightarrow f_{-1} = 0 \text{ or } x_{-1} = \frac{w}{(1-p)g} \quad (11)$$

Thus the fraction of active agents, $\rho = f_{+1} + f_0 + f_{-1}$, in the steady state is obtained from the normalization condition Eq. (8) written in the form $f_{+1} + f_0 + f_{-1} = 1 - (x_{+1} + x_0 + x_{-1})$. Considering the results (9), (10) and (11) for x_{+1} , x_0 and x_{-1} , respectively, we have

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{3w}{(1-p)g} \quad (12)$$

The importance of such fraction ρ will be discussed in the following.

We are interested in the critical behavior of the model. Thus, let us discuss about the order parameter, m . It is sensitive to the unbalance between extreme opinions +1 and -1. Notice that m plays the role of the ‘‘magnetization per spin’’ in magnetic systems [17]. Since the order parameter can be defined as $m = |f_{+1} - f_{-1}|$, we have

$$0 = \frac{dm}{dt} \Rightarrow \frac{df_{+1}}{dt} = \frac{df_{-1}}{dt} \Rightarrow (f_{+1} - f_{-1}) [p(f_{+1} + f_{-1}) + (1-2p)f_0] = 0 \quad (13)$$

Then

$$f_{+1} = f_{-1} \Rightarrow m = 0 \quad (14)$$

which represents a disordered state solution, or

$$f_{+1} + f_{-1} = \frac{1-2p}{p} f_0 \quad (15)$$

Using that $f_{+1} + f_{-1} = \rho - f_0$ we get

$$f_0 = \frac{p}{1-p} \rho \quad (16)$$

Inserting Eq. (16) into Eq. (6) and using Eq. (9) we obtain

$$f_{+1}^2 - \rho \frac{1-2p}{1-p} f_{+1} + \rho^2 \frac{p^2}{(1-p)^2} = 0 \quad (17)$$

Thus,

$$f_{+1} = \frac{\rho}{2(1-p)} \left(1 - 2p \pm \sqrt{1-4p} \right) \quad (18)$$

Using that $f_{-1} = \rho - f_0 - f_{+1}$ and Eqs. (12) and (16) we arrive at

$$m = |f_{+1} - f_{-1}| = \left(1 - \frac{3w}{(1-p)g} \right) \frac{\sqrt{1-4p}}{1-p} \quad (19)$$

In the language of critical phenomena [45], one can rewrite Eq. (19) as

$$m \sim (p_{ca} - p)^{\beta_{cp}} (p_{ci} - p)^{\beta_{ising}} \quad (20)$$

where $\beta_{cp} = 1$ and $\beta_{ising} = 1/2$ and

$$p_{ci} = \frac{1}{4} \quad p_{ca} = 1 - \frac{3w}{g} \quad (21)$$

Eq. (20) predicts the occurrence of two distinct nonequilibrium phase transitions. The critical point p_{ci} is the same for the BCS model, i.e., $p_{ci} = 1/4$. For this first critical point, the critical behavior suggests an Ising-like exponent $\beta = \beta_{ising} = 1/2$, as in the BCS model [24]. On the other hand, the second critical point is related to the activation dynamics, and it depends on the parameters g and w , $p_{ca} = 1 - \frac{3w}{g}$. For this second transition, the critical behavior suggests a contact process-like exponent $\beta = \beta_{cp} = 1$. Another form to see this second transition is also considering as another order parameter the fraction of active agents, Eq. (12), written in the form $\rho \sim (p_{ca} - p)^{\beta_{cp}}$. We will discuss those points in more details in the following.

Based on the rules defined in section 2, we performed Monte Carlo simulations of the model, in order to confirm our analytical predictions. From the simulations, we can obtain m through the definition

$$m = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N o_i \right| \right\rangle, \quad (22)$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes average over disorder or configurations, computed at the steady states. Usually in opinion dynamics models, m is called collective opinion. In Fig. 1 we exhibit numerical results for $w = 0.0, g = 1.0$ (left side) and $w = 0.1, g = 0.8$ (right side). The lines for the order parameter m were obtained from our analytical result, Eq. (19), whereas the symbols were obtained from the simulations. In addition to the order parameter m , obtained numerically from Eq. (22) (black symbols in Fig. 1), we also measured in the simulations the fraction of active agents (red symbols in Fig. 1). This last result is compared with the analytical result obtained from Eq. (12).

First of all, we exhibit in Fig. 1 (left side) the behavior of m and ρ for the special case $w = 0$, for which we have no deactivation and thus we have to recover the results of Ref. [24]. In such a case, for the order parameter m we observed the nonequilibrium phase transition at $p_c = 1/4$ studied in [24], and the fraction of active individuals is $\rho = 1$ for all values of p , as expected since we have no deactivation. On the other hand, in Fig. 1 (right side) we exhibit the case $w = 0.1$ and $g = 0.8$. In such a case, we observed the abovementioned two distinct transitions: one for the order parameter m and another for the fraction of active agents ρ . The critical points are obtained from Eq. (21), i.e., the




FIG. 1. Stationary order parameters m (collective opinion) and ρ (fraction of active agents). (a) $w = 0$ (the limiting case of the BCS model [24]). (b) $w = 0.1$, $g = 0.8$. Lines from Eqs. (19) and (12), and the vertical dashed lines are $p_{ci} = 1/4$ and $p_{ca} = 1 - \frac{3w}{g}$. Symbols come from Monte Carlo simulations following an agent-based protocol described in the section 2. The population size is $N = 10^4$ agents, and the initial fraction of active agents is $\rho(0) = 1$.

first critical point is not modified by the deactivation process and we have $p_{ci} = \frac{1}{4}$. However, due to the dynamics of activation/deactivation, the maximum value of the order parameters is less than 1, as previous indicated by our analytical results, Eq. (19). This is due to the presence of deactivated agents, i.e., we have now $x_{+1} > 0, x_{-1} > 0$ and $x_0 > 0$, which leads to smaller values of the active fractions f_{+1} and f_{-1} and consequently we have lower values of the collective ordering measure m , even for $p = 0$. On the other hand, the process of deactivation induces a second critical point that depends on w and g , given by $p_{ca} = 1 - \frac{3w}{g}$. For the parameters we considered for Fig. 1, we have $p_{ca} = 0.625$. The two nonequilibrium critical points are indicated by vertical lines in Fig. 1.

Notice that the two transitions are of distinct nature. The analytical results of Eqs. (12), (20) and (21) suggest two distinct critical exponents β . One of them is related to the behavior of the magnetization near the critical point $p_{ci} = 1/4$, i.e., we have $\beta = \beta_{ising} = 1/2$. This transition is a usual ferromagnetic-paramagnetic transition. Indeed, we obtained a paramagnetic (disordered state) solution, Eq. (14). In addition, we can observe Fig. 1 the usual finite-size effects for numerical results regarding ferromagnetic-paramagnetic phase transitions for values of m near $p = p_{ci}$. On the other hand, for the second phase transition observed for ρ at $p = p_{ca} = 1 - 3w/g$, the analytical results suggest an active-absorbing phase transition, since the critical exponent is $\beta = \beta_{cp} = 1$ [45]. Indeed, we also obtained an analytical result $f_{+1} = f_0 = f_{-1} = 0$, see Eqs. (9), (10) and (11), i.e., it is the absorbing state where $\rho = 0$. In this case, the fraction of active agents needs to be zero even in the computer simulations, which in fact we observed (see the red points in Fig. 1, right side).

In Fig. 2 it is shown additional results for m and ρ for $g = 1$ and typical values of the deactivation probability w . In Fig. 2 (upper figure, left side) we exhibit the curves for m and ρ for $w = 0.2$. As previous discussed, the maximum value of the magnetization decreases for increasing values of w , as predicted by Eq. (19). In addition, the second critical point p_{ca} decreases its value and becomes near the first critical point p_{ci} . One can also see from Eq. (21) that both critical points, p_{ci} and p_{ca} coalesce for a given value of w . Taking $p_{ci} = p_{ca}$, we obtain that such value of w is given by $w = \frac{1}{4}g$. For the special case $g = 1$, this equation gives us $w = 0.25$. For this value we have $p_{ci} = p_{ca} = 1/4$, which is exhibited in Fig. 2 (upper figure, right side). The other result, $w = 0.3$ suggests that there is a critical value of the deactivation dynamics above which there is no phase transition, and the system is in an absorbing state for all values of p . This critical value w_c can be obtained from Eq. (21), considering $p_{ca}(w_c) = 0$. In this case, we obtain

$$w_c = \frac{1}{3}g \quad (23)$$

For the special case $g = 1$, Eq. (23) gives us $w \approx 0.33$. In Fig. 2 (lower figure) we exhibit results for a value near such critical value w_c , namely $w = 0.3$. We yet observe a transition, but the values of the order parameters m and ρ are quite small, indicating the proximity of the limiting case of occurrence of phase transitions, in agreement with Eq. (23).

To summarize the results, we exhibit in Fig. 3 the phase diagram of the steady states of the model in the plane p versus w , for $g = 1$. Notice the critical value $w_c \approx 0.33$, above which the system is in the absorbing state for all values




FIG. 2. Stationary order parameters m (collective opinion) and ρ (fraction of active agents), for $w = \{0.20, 0.25, 0.30\}$. Solid lines are the analytical results (Eqs. (19) and (12)). Symbols come from Monte Carlo simulations. The vertical dashed lines are $p_{ci} = 1/4$ and $p_{ca} = 1 - \frac{3w}{g}$. The population size is $N = 10^4$ agents, and the initial fraction of active agents is $\rho(0) = 1$.

of p . It is also shown the Ordered (**O**) and Disordered (**D**) phases, and the transition between such phases is observed for the constant value $p_{ci} = 1/4$. The other boundary is obtained by the second critical point $p_{ca} = 1 - 3w/g$.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

During a public debate, individuals may abandon the discussion while others may become interested in an ongoing discussion by the influence of peers. To model such a situation we consider an activation dynamics coupled to opinion dynamics. The activation/deactivation dynamics is ruled by a contact-like process, whereas the social interactions are governed by kinetic exchanges. The results show that such coupled dynamics undergoes multiple transitions, namely: (a) from an ordered state to a disordered state; (b) from a disordered state to an absorbing state; (c) from an ordered state straight to an absorbing state. Our mean-field results suggest that the transition (a) takes place in the Ising universality class, whereas (b-c) occurs in the universality class of the contact process. The absorbing state means that all the individuals stop participating in the discussion, so the debate fade out. Our results point out that even with a small interest decay rate w the dynamics can be trapped in the absorbing state if the disagreement rate p is too high. On the other hand, for sufficient high values of the deactivation rate w the system is always in the absorbing phase, independently of the values of the other parameters. In future works it would be interesting to




FIG. 3. Phase diagram of the model in the plane $p \times w$. Lines were obtained from Eq. (21) with the activation rate $g = 1$. Acronyms: O=Ordered phase, D=Disordered phase, A=Absorbing phase. We see the presence of multiple transitions: $O \rightarrow D \rightarrow A$ as well as $O \rightarrow A$. For $w > w_c \approx 0.33$ there is no transition, as discussed in the text. Even with a small interest decay rate w the dynamics can enter in the absorbing state if the disagreement rate p is high enough.

consider a networked extension of the model studied here as well as additional social features such as plurality and polarization[10].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge financial support from the Brazilian funding agencies Fundação Cearense de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (FUNCAP), Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq, grant number 310893/2020-8) and Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (FAPERJ, grant number 203.217/2017).

-
- [1] Castellano, Claudio and Fortunato, Santo and Loreto, Vittorio, *Statistical physics of social dynamics*, Reviews of Modern Physics 81, 591 (2009).
 - [2] Galam, Serge, *Sociophysics: A review of Galam models*, International Journal of Modern Physics C 19, 409 (2008).
 - [3] Sirbu, Alina and Loreto, Vittorio and Servedio, Vito DP and Tria, Francesca, *Opinion dynamics: models, extensions and external effects*, Participatory sensing, opinions and collective awareness 363 (2017).
 - [4] Sznajd-Weron, Katarzyna and Sznajd, Józef and Weron, Tomasz, *A review on the sznajd model—20 years after*, Physica A 565, 125537 (2021).
 - [5] Noorazar, Hossein, *Recent advances in opinion propagation dynamics: a 2020 survey*, The European Physical Journal Plus 135, 1 (2020).
 - [6] Conte, Rosaria and Gilbert, Nigel and Bonelli, Giulia and Cioffi-Revilla, Claudio and Deffuant, Guillaume and Kertesz, Janos and Loreto, Vittorio and Moat, Suzy and Nadal, J-P and Sanchez, Anxo and others, *Manifesto of computational social science*, The European Physical Journal Special Topics 214, 325 (2012).
 - [7] Vazquez, Federico and Saintier, Nicolas and Pinasco, Juan Pablo, *Role of voting intention in public opinion polarization*, Physical Review E 101, 012101 (2020).
 - [8] Pérez-Llanos, Mayte and Pinasco, Juan Pablo and Saintier, Nicolas, *Role of voting intention in public opinion polarization*, Physica A 559, 125017 (2020).

- [9] Crokidakis, Nuno, *Emergence of moderate opinions as a consequence of group pressure*, International Journal of Modern Physics C 30, 1950091 (2019).
- [10] Oestereich, André L and Pires, Marcelo A and Queirós, SM Duarte and Crokidakis, Nuno, *Hysteresis and disorder-induced order in continuous kinetic-like opinion dynamics in complex networks*, Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 137, 109893 (2020).
- [11] Xiong, Fei and Liu, Yun and Zhang, Zhen-jiang and Si, Xia-meng and Ding, Fei, *An opinion formation model with dissipative structure*, Physica A 390, 2504 (2011).
- [12] Toscani, Giuseppe. *Kinetic models of opinion formation*, Communications in Mathematical Sciences 4, 481 (2006).
- [13] Xiong, Fei and Liu, Yun and Zhu, Jiang and Zhang, Zhen Jiang and Zhang, Yan Chao and Zhang, Ying, *A dissipative network model with neighboring activation*, The European Physical Journal B 84, 115 (2011).
- [14] Liu, Yun and Xiong, Fei and Zhu, Jiang and Zhang, Ying, *External activation promoting consensus formation in the opinion model with interest decay*, Physics Letters A 377, 362 (2013).
- [15] Lallouache, Mehdi and Chakrabarti, Anindya S. and Chakraborti, Anirban and Chakrabarti, Bikas K., *Opinion formation in kinetic exchange models: Spontaneous symmetry-breaking transition*, Physical Review E 82, 056112 (2010).
- [16] Biswas, Soumyajyoti, *Mean-field solutions of kinetic-exchange opinion models*, Physical Review E 056106 (2011).
- [17] Crokidakis, Nuno and Anteneodo, Celia, *Role of conviction in nonequilibrium models of opinion formation*, Physical Review E 86, 061127 (2012).
- [18] Anteneodo, Celia and Crokidakis, Nuno, *Symmetry breaking by heating in a continuous opinion model*, Physical Review E 95, 042308 (2017).
- [19] Crokidakis, Nuno and Blanco, Victor H and Anteneodo, Celia, *Impact of contrarians and intransigents in a kinetic model of opinion dynamics*, Physical Review E 89, 013310 (2014).
- [20] Vieira, Allan R and Anteneodo, Celia and Crokidakis, Nuno, *Consequences of nonconformist behaviors in a continuous opinion model*, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2016, 023204 (2016).
- [21] Xiong, Fei and Liu, Yun and Wang, Xing and Jia, Fan, *Kinetic exchange opinion model with dynamic individual influence*, Advanced Computer Control 59, 25 (2014).
- [22] Gambaro, Joao P and Crokidakis, Nuno, *The influence of contrarians in the dynamics of opinion formation*, Physica A 486, 465 (2017).
- [23] Sen, Parongama, *Phase transitions in a two-parameter model of opinion dynamics with random kinetic exchanges*, Physical Review E 83, 016108 (2011).
- [24] Biswas, Soumyajyoti and Chatterjee, Arnab and Sen, Parongama, *Disorder induced phase transition in kinetic models of opinion dynamics*, Physica A 391, 3257 (2012).
- [25] Mukherjee, Sudip and Biswas, Soumyajyoti and Sen, Parongama, *Long route to consensus: Two-stage coarsening in a binary choice voting model*, Physical Review E 102, 012316 (2020).
- [26] Crokidakis, Nuno, *Noise and disorder: Phase transitions and universality in a model of opinion formation*, International Journal of Modern Physics C 27, 1650060 (2016).
- [27] Vieira, Allan R and Crokidakis, Nuno, *Noise-induced absorbing phase transition in a model of opinion formation*, Physics Letters A 380, 2632 (2016).
- [28] Biswas, Soumyajyoti and Chandra, Anjan Kumar and Chatterjee, Arnab and Chakrabarti, Bikas K, *Phase transitions and non-equilibrium relaxation in kinetic models of opinion formation*, Journal of physics: conference series 297, 012004 (2011).
- [29] Mukherjee, Sudip and Chatterjee, Arnab, *Disorder-induced phase transition in an opinion dynamics model: Results in two and three dimensions*, Physical Review E 94, 062317 (2016).
- [30] Biswas, Soumyajyoti and Sen, Parongama, *Critical noise can make the minority candidate win: The US presidential election cases*, Physical Review E 96, 032303 (2017).
- [31] Lima, FWS and Crokidakis, N, *Nonequilibrium opinion dynamics on triangular, honeycomb, and Kagome lattices*, International Journal of Modern Physics C 28, 1750123 (2017).
- [32] Alves, TFA and Lima, FWS and Macedo-Filho, A and Alves, GA, *Consensus formation in continuous opinion dynamics on quasiperiodic lattices*, International Journal of Modern Physics C 31, 2050012 (2020).
- [33] Oestereich, Andre L and Pires, Marcelo A and Crokidakis, Nuno, *Three-state opinion dynamics in modular networks*, Physical Review E 100, 032312 (2019).
- [34] Liu, Xu-Sheng and Wu, Zhi-Xi and Guan, Jian-Yue, *Kinetic-exchange-like opinion dynamics in complex networks: roles of the dimensionality and local interaction topology*, The European Physical Journal B 91, 1 (2018).
- [35] Wang, Wei and Liu, Quan-Hui and Liang, Junhao and Hu, Yanqing and Zhou, Tao, *Coevolution spreading in complex networks*, Physics Reports 820, 1 (2019).
- [36] Pires, Marcelo A and Crokidakis, Nuno, *Dynamics of epidemic spreading with vaccination: impact of social pressure and engagement*, Physica A 467, 167 (2017).
- [37] Pires, Marcelo A and Oestereich, Andre L and Crokidakis, Nuno, *Sudden transitions in coupled opinion and epidemic dynamics with vaccination*, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2018, 053407 (2018).
- [38] Pires, Marcelo A. and Oestereich, Andre L. and Crokidakis, Nuno and Duarte Queirós, Sílvia M., *Antivax movement and epidemic spreading in the era of social networks: Nonmonotonic effects, bistability, and network segregation*, Physical Review E 104, 034302 (2021).
- [39] Ferrari, Carlo Giombiagi and Pinasco, Juan Pablo and Saintier, Nicolas, *Coupling Epidemiological Models with Social Dynamics*, Bulletin of Mathematical Biology 83, 1 (2021).
- [40] Wang, Zhen and Andrews, Michael A and Wu, Zhi-Xi and Wang, Lin and Bauch, Chris T, *Coupled disease-behavior dynamics on complex networks: A review*, Physics of life reviews 15, 1 (2015).

- [41] Fu, Feng and Christakis, Nicholas A. and Fowler, James H., *Dueling biological and social contagions*, Scientific Reports 7, 43634 (2017).
- [42] Ding, Fei and Liu, Yun and Li, Yong, *CO-EVOLUTION OF OPINION AND STRATEGY IN PERSUASION DYNAMICS: AN EVOLUTIONARY GAME THEORETICAL APPROACH*, International Journal of Modern Physics C 20, 479 (2009).
- [43] Fei Ding and Yun Liu and Bo Shen and Xia-Meng Si, *An evolutionary game theory model of binary opinion formation*, Physica A 389, 1745 (2010).
- [44] Jing Liu and Ying Fan and Jiang Zhang and Zengru Di, *Coevolution of agent's behavior and noise parameters in majority vote game on multilayer networks*, New Journal of Physics 21, 015007 (2019).
- [45] Marro, Joaquín and Dickman, Ronald, *Nonequilibrium phase transitions in lattice models* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).