

Emergence of echo chambers in a noisy adaptive voter model

André M. Timpanaro*

Universidade Federal do ABC, 09210-580 Santo André, Brazil

(Dated: September 20, 2024)

Belief perseverance is the widely documented tendency of holding to a belief, even in the presence of contradicting evidence. In online environments, this tendency leads to heated arguments with users “blocking” each other. Introducing this element to opinion modelling in a social network, leads to an adaptive network where agents tend to connect preferentially to like-minded peers. In this work we study how this type of dynamics behaves in the voter model with the addition of a noise that makes agents change opinion at random. As the intensity of the noise and the propensity of users blocking each other is changed, we observe a transition between 2 phases. One in which there is only one community in the whole network and another where communities arise and in each of them there is a very clear majority opinion, mimicking the phenomenon of echo chambers. These results are obtained with simulations and with a mean-field theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the rise of social media as one of the main ways people interact with each other has raised concerns about their effects on the diversity of opinions in our society and on the popularization of extremist points of view [8, 16]. In this context, the emergence of echo chambers has been particularly worrisome [2, 5]. An echo chamber is a situation where a person is disproportionately exposed to points of view that align with their own, creating the illusion that their point of view is more common than it actually is and in some cases reinforcing these views due to confirmation biases.

In the case of social media, the ability of users to decide what content they consume (like deciding which other users to follow or block) might be an important ingredient in this phenomenon, if we assume that users prefer to be exposed to content aligned to their views. In this work we test this idea in a noisy adaptive voter model [10, 11, 14], where besides the extra follow/block dynamic we consider a probability for agents to change their opinion at random. The main idea is that users will be connected in a symmetric way and connections between agents having different opinions may be rewired to become a connection between agreeing agents. We will implement the idea of following and blocking by connection rewiring and differentiate between 2 types of dynamic:

Active rewires: When 2 agents interact, if their opinions are different, there is a probability that instead of the interaction taking place, their connection is rewired.

Reactive rewires: Whenever an agent changes opinion, there is a chance that its neighbours rewire their connections to it.

From a mathematical point of view, this means that we are using an adaptive network for our model [9].

* a.timpanaro@ufabc.edu.br

Adaptive networks are networks that change in accordance with the interactions between the agents inside them and they have garnered considerable attention in works studying the fragmentation of networks. In particular, there have been some works studying adaptive versions of the voter model (both using a copying rule and a majority rule) and in most of them a transition between complete fragmentation and consensus is found [3, 4, 6, 11–14]. Our goal studying a noisy adaptive voter model was to see if the addition of noise would be sufficient to prevent fragmentation, which would be characterized by the formation of communities that are each close to a consensus. Ref [4] did study a similar model, but no analysis of the network structure and its possible fragmentation was done and ref [17] studied a noisy adaptive Deffuant model, observing community formation. The study of the community structure is essential to understand if fragmentation is present or not, because the addition of the noise by itself is already enough to prevent the voter model from reaching consensus, even if the network is fixed. For this analysis we used the stochastic block model of community detection implemented in ref [15].

This work is organized as follows. In section II we define the active and reactive versions of our noisy adaptive voter model. In section III we present the simulation results, where we see a transition between a regime where the network has only one community and another where the different opinions fragment into different communities. In section IV a mean field theory is presented to try to explain the simulation results. Finally we summarize our conclusions in section V

II. MODEL DESCRIPTIONS

We will be using a variant of the voter model [10]. In this model our social network is represented by a graph, where each of the nodes represent an agent and each of the edges represent a social connection between the corresponding agents. Each agent has an opinion, modeled by an integer, but there is no deeper meaning for these

values besides mere labels. Self connections are not allowed, but we allow multiple connections between the same pair of agents (representing stronger connections), however for simplicity each of these connections is treated by the model as being different neighbours that happen to have the same opinion. Comparing with the usual voter model, we'll be adding 2 extra ingredients: The possibility of random opinion changes and the possibility of rewiring a connection between 2 agents, depending on their opinions. We discuss in this work two ways the rewiring can be implemented (active and reactive). The two versions will be studied separately and are described in the next sections.

Both models have 5 parameters: The number of sites N and the average connectivity q , that parameterize the network (as it turns out, all other network details will be irrelevant); and the number of opinions M , the probability of a random opinion change (noise) p_N and the probability of a rewiring happening p_R , that parameterize the dynamics between the agents. To avoid excessive repetition in the model descriptions, we define that:

- **When we say an agent i is affected by the noise**, it changes its opinion at random to one of the possible opinions $(1, \dots, M)$, chosen with equal probability.
- **When we say an agent i attempts to rewire a connection to one of its neighbours j** , the following happens:
 1. If i is the only agent holding its opinion, then nothing happens.
 2. Otherwise, we remove one of the connections between i and j and we create a new connection between i and some agent $k \neq i$, where k is chosen at random uniformly among all the agents having the same opinion as i (excluding i itself).

A. Active rewiring version

In this version, a rewiring can happen when 2 agents holding different opinions interact. The detailed time evolution is as follows (all possibilities are illustrated in figure 1):

1. At each time step, an agent i is uniformly chosen at random (Fig 1a).
2. With probability p_N , i is affected by the noise and we move on to the next time step (Fig 1b).
3. If i wasn't affected by the noise and if i has at least one neighbour, then we uniformly choose at random one of its connections. Let j be the corresponding neighbour. If i has no neighbours we move on to the next time step (Fig 1c). Note that this way of choosing the neighbour gives greater weight to

neighbours that have multiple connections between them.

4. If i and j have the same opinion, nothing happens and we move on to the next time step.
5. However, if i and j have different opinions, then with probability p_R , agent i tries to rewire its connection to j (Fig 1d). Otherwise (probability $1 - p_R$) we follow the usual voter model. That is, i copies the opinion of agent j (Fig 1e).




FIG. 1: Possible dynamics with active rewiring. (a) Firstly an agent F is chosen. (b) F might be affected by noise and change its opinion. (c) Otherwise we choose one of F 's connections (the chosen connection is dashed) and F interacts with the corresponding neighbour D (note that since we draw a connection, more strongly connected neighbours have a higher change of being drawn). Finally, since D and F have different opinions, then either (d) the chosen connection is rewired to another agent with the same opinion as F (E in this case) or (e) F copies D 's opinion.

B. Reactive rewiring version

In this version, rewires can happen whenever an agent changes opinion. The detailed time evolution is as follows (all possibilities are illustrated in figure 2):

1. At each time step, an agent i is uniformly chosen at random (Fig 2a).
2. With probability p_N , i is affected by the noise. If i retains the same opinion, nothing happens, but if this changes i 's opinion to σ (Fig 2b), then each of its neighbours that have an opinion different from σ attempt to rewire their connections to i (if a neighbour has more than one connection, it attempts to rewire each one of them independently, so it's possible that they remain connected even if some rewires take place). We move on to the next time step (Fig 2c).

3. If i wasn't affected by the noise and if i has at least one neighbour, then we uniformly choose at random one of its connections. Let j be the corresponding neighbour. If i has no neighbours or if i and j have the same opinion, we move on to the next time step (Fig 2d).
4. We follow the usual voter model and i copies the opinion of agent j . If this changes the opinion of i to σ , then just like in step 2, each of its neighbours that have an opinion different from σ attempt to rewire their connections to i (Figs 2e and 2f).

Note that if the opinion changes leave i with its original opinion, then no rewires take place.




FIG. 2: Possible dynamics with reactive rewiring. (a) Firstly an agent F is chosen. (b) F might be affected by noise and change its opinion. F 's neighbours that do not share its new opinion will then attempt to rewire their connections with F (the connections that may be rewired are dashed) (c) In this case one of the connections with A gets rewired to E , while the other remains intact and the connection with B gets rewired to A . Note that in this case the neighbours are the ones doing the rewiring. (d) If F is not affected by the noise we choose one of F 's connections (the chosen connection is dashed). (e) F interacts with the corresponding neighbour D , copying D 's opinion. The opinion change once again causes A and B to attempt to rewire their connections with F . (f) Here the connection with B and one of the connections with A gets rewired to E .

III. SIMULATION RESULTS

The dynamics we are introducing creates a competition between 2 different mechanisms:

Rewiring: The main effect of the rewires is to move the network towards a fragmented state, where connections are highly assortative. As will be seen in the simulations, if this is the only mechanism present, then depending on the intensity of the rewiring the

network may reach consensus before fragmenting or end up in a situation where each opinion has its own component.

Noise: The noise prevents any community that arises in the network from being entirely composed of a single opinion. Furthermore, in conjunction with the rewiring dynamics, this means that any agent that changes to a new opinion inside of a community might end up being responsible for reintroducing connections with different communities (see figure 3). So the noise should act in the sense of keeping the communities from separating into different components of the network. Finally, the noise keeps the system in a state where each opinion is held by about the same number of agents (which is a feature already present in the usual voter model with noise).




FIG. 3: The presence of noise and rewires can reconnect different components. Here we have an example using active rewires: In a given time step an agent changes its opinion from red to blue due to noise. In a later time step this same agent might rewire a connection after interacting with an agent holding opinion red. A similar process reintroduces connections when using reactive rewires.

A. Irrelevance of the starting network

An important question when studying any opinion propagation model is the influence of the network topology in the dynamics. In our case, it turns out that the rewiring interaction destroys the original network structures and leads the network to a stationary state after a while. This is illustrated in figure 4 for the degree distributions

This means that the only aspects of the network that are relevant are the number of agents N and the average coordination q , since these are invariant under the dynamics. Intuitively, this situation can be understood by noticing that after some time, all of the original edges will have been rewired, so the final network will reflect the fact that these new connections are being chosen according to the dynamics, which should have some stationary state.




FIG. 4: Comparison between the degree distribution of an Erdős-Rényi graph [7] and the final networks for different simulations. The full black line is the degree distribution for a realization of an Erdos-Rényi graph, the dotted lines are the final networks for simulations starting with a square network (with periodic conditions) and the dash-dotted lines are the final networks for simulations starting with a Barabási-Albert network [1]. The red curves are simulations with active rewires and the blue ones are simulations with reactive rewires. In all cases the average coordination was 4 and the network size was 1024. The simulations also used $M = 4$, $p_N = 0.4$ and $p_R = 0.7$. The active rewire statistics seems to be well replicated by the Erdős-Rényi model (implying the connections are essentially random), while the reactive rewires lead to a slightly heavier tail.

B. Community formation and detection

The main structure that interests us in the final networks are the presence or absence of communities and how this depends with the different parameters. As previously discussed, the noise will keep the network from fragmenting, so we need a way to tell communities apart inside of a same component. The approach we used was to try to detect communities using only the information of which agents connected with each other (no information about their opinions was used). To this end we used the Stochastic Block Model algorithm of community detection (SBM) implemented in ref [15]. Some snapshots of the final network in different situations, together with the communities detected by the SBM in them can be found in figure 5 for the case with noise, while figure 6 shows some noiseless examples.

The SBM can be thought of as a stochastic model for the creation of networks with a predetermined community structure (defined by parameters of the model). From this point of view, SBM community detection works by performing inference to find which parameters would be most likely to output the network we are studying and returning the corresponding community structure. A side effect of this randomness is that the communities that are detected change slightly for different runs of the




FIG. 5: Snapshots of different simulations in the presence of noise, showing the possible behaviours as well as some artifacts that can happen with SBM detection (all simulation use $N = 10^3$). In (a) and (d) we have situations where there was no community formation, however the SBM run we chose incorrectly detects a second community in (a). This type of community splitting is an artifact of the algorithm that needs to be dealt with in the analysis and can also be seen in a smaller degree in (f). Comparing (b) and (c) we can see that in the regime where communities are formed, we must have M communities due to symmetry (since the noise leads all opinions to show up in about the same proportion). Finally, the sequence (d-f) shows how abrupt community formation can be in the case of reactive rewires, as p_R is increased. Also, comparing the active and reactive cases, we can see a trend where a smaller p_R is enough for communities to form in the reactive case.




FIG. 6: Snapshots of the final network using active rewires, $N = 10^3$, $q = 10$, $M = 4$, $p_N = 0$ and varying p_R . In (a) we see a simulation that reached consensus before fragmenting, but the rewire dynamics still created a structure the SBM algorithm recognized as a separate community. Increasing p_R , we see in (b) a simulation where the different opinions fragmented into components with a very uneven size. Increasing p_R further in (c), the fragmentation happens fast enough that the opinions still hold roughly the same amount of agents

algorithm, even for the same network. So care must be taken during the analysis to sample multiple runs of the SBM for the same network, besides sampling multiple simulations.

C. Echo chambers

In order to find out if the dynamics is creating echo chambers we need to cross the information of the communities detected by the SBM with the information of which opinion each agent holds. Suppose we have some community C . Define $N(C)$ as the number of agents in this community and $N_\sigma(C)$ the number of agents holding opinion σ in C . We can identify if C has a strong majority opinion by many different metrics, for example:

$$Q_C = \sum_{\sigma} \frac{N_\sigma(C)^2}{N(C)^2} \quad (1)$$

or

$$M_C = \max_{\sigma} \left\{ \frac{N_\sigma(C)}{N(C)} \right\} \quad (2)$$

which can be thought of as proxies for the collision entropy and the min-entropy respectively. It turns out that the results are extremely similar using both metrics, so we only present the results using Q . The point is that Q_C is minimum if all opinions appear in C in equal proportions (implying $Q_C = 1/M$) and Q_C is maximum if the community contains only one opinion (implying $Q_C = 1$). To extend this to a metric for the whole network we take a weighted average over all communities, using their sizes as weights:

$$Q = \sum_C \frac{Q_C N(C)}{N} \quad (3)$$

There's two purposes behind using community sizes as weights:

- We want to minimize the effect that unconnected agents have. The model dynamics leads naturally to a proportion of sites that are not connected to any other, as can be seen in figure 5. This situation is temporary as other agents might rewire and connect with them, but there's no good way for the SBM detection to lump these isolated sites with the other communities (since no opinion information is used for the detection) and they are often categorized into small, separated communities.
- We want to minimize the effect of the SBM detection erroneously splitting a community in two (as seen in some examples in figure 5). Since each run of the SBM produces similar, but different communities, it is possible that a community ends up split in two in some SBM runs. If we combine the data using the sizes as weights, the contributions are roughly the same, whether the split happens or not.




FIG. 7: The average Q taken over the communities and averaged over different simulations as a function of the rewiring probability p_R (x axis) and the noise intensity p_N (y axis in natural log for a better view) for different values of q and M . Simulations done with active rewiring.




FIG. 8: The average Q taken over the communities and averaged over different simulations as a function of the rewiring probability p_R (x axis) and the noise intensity p_N (y axis in natural log for a better view) for different values of q and M . Simulations done with reactive rewiring.

The graphs of Q for some parameter values, as a function of p_N and p_R can be found in figures 7 (active rewiring) and 8 (reactive rewiring). In these graphs we can see a clear transition between regimes where there is a formation of echo chambers (lighter colors) and situations where there is no clear community formation (darker colors). In both cases there's a trend where higher p_N leads to less fragmentation, whereas higher p_R increases fragmentation (corroborating patterns observed in the selected examples of fig 5). Interestingly, the number of opinions doesn't seem to play a role in the emergence of not of fragmentation, as the contours in the graphs remain largely the same once we adjust for the different minimum values of Q . In the case of active rewiring a larger q seems to prevent fragmentation better, however this trend seems to be reversed for reactive rewires.

IV. MEAN FIELD THEORY

Since we are concerned with the community structure, then if we want to do a mean field treatment of this problem we'd need to keep this information about the networks while throwing away the rest of the information. We will achieve this through the following approximations:

- All opinions are held by the same amount of agents at all times. This is justified on grounds that the noise will keep the system with all opinions being held by about the same amount of agents. So this is akin to neglecting the fluctuations in time.
- The probability $P_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ that an edge connects agents with opinions σ and σ' is

$$P_{\sigma,\sigma'} = \begin{cases} p_{\text{same}} & \text{if } \sigma = \sigma' \\ p_{\text{different}} & \text{if } \sigma \neq \sigma' \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

With p_{same} and $p_{\text{different}}$ independent of the specific opinions involved.

- As seen in figure 4 the degree distribution converges after a long time. The information from these distributions we will need for our calculations are the average q and the probability P_0 of finding an isolated agent. We will assume P_0 is a known parameter of our mean field theory.

With these approximations in place, then the community structure is entirely given by the parameters N , M , q , P_0 and the probability p_{same} ($p_{\text{different}}$ can be obtained as a function of p_{same} with the equation $Mp_{\text{same}} + M(M-1)p_{\text{different}} = 1$). It will be more convenient to use the probability that a pair of neighbouring agents have the same opinion, which we will denote simply by S ($S = Mp_{\text{same}}$). This is a quantity that can also be measured in the regular simulations and also gives us a proxy to the formation of echo chambers, as exemplified by figure 9

Our goal with the mean field treatment is to understand how S evolves in time (under the assumption that our approximations are valid at all times) to obtain

$$S_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} S(t) \quad (5)$$

and compare the structure that this implies with our simulation results.




FIG. 9: A graph of S_∞ obtained from simulations with active rewiring, $q = 5$ and $M = 2$ (compare with the graph for Q of the same simulations in fig 7c)

A. Mean field evolution

The idea of the mean field evolution is to make a time step using our approximations and seeing how this timestep changes S . Following the model descriptions in sections II A and II B, the mean field timesteps look like:

- Check if the agent i to be chosen will be affected by the noise.
- Draw from the appropriate distributions the number of neighbours of i and how many of these neighbours agree with i .
- If i is not isolated, choose a neighbour j for i to interact with.
- Do the appropriate rewires along the evolution.

However, instead of making a simulation, we analytically find how S would change after this timestep by adding together all possible outcomes with the appropriate weights. The detailed calculations of these averages can be found in appendix A. In the interest of making the final expressions more compact we define the quantities: $p_N^{\text{C}} = 1 - p_N$, $p_R^{\text{C}} = 1 - p_R$, $P_0^{\text{C}} = 1 - P_0$ and $S^{\text{C}} = 1 - S$

1. Active rewires

The detailed timestep for active rewires is as follows:

- With probability p_N (agent i is affected by the noise):
 - With probability $1/M$ (the noise doesn't change the opinion of i):
 - * Nothing happens
 - Otherwise (probability $(M-1)/M$):
 - * We draw the number of neighbours k from the degree distribution
 - * We draw $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$, the number of neighbours agreeing with the agent's previous opinion.
 - * We draw $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I, p = 1/(M-1))$, the number of neighbours that agree with the agent's new opinion.
 - * S changes by $(n-I)/E$, where $E = Nq/2$ is the number of edges in the network. On average, this contribution is

$$\Delta S_1^{(a)} = \frac{p_N q (1 - MS)}{EM} \quad (6)$$

- Otherwise (probability $1 - p_N$), if agent i is not affected by the noise:
 - We draw the number of neighbours k from the degree distribution
 - We draw $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$, the number of neighbours agreeing with the agent's current opinion.
 - If $k = 0$ or otherwise with probability I/k (agent i is either isolated or interacts with a neighbour that it agrees with):
 - * Nothing happens
 - Otherwise (agent i interacts with a neighbour j it doesn't agree with):
 - * With probability p_R (a rewire happens):

$$\Delta S_2^{(a)} = \frac{p_R p_N^{\mathbb{C}} S^{\mathbb{C}} P_0^{\mathbb{C}}}{E} \quad (7)$$

- * Otherwise (probability $1 - p_R$) the agent copies its neighbour:
 - We draw $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I - 1, p = 1/(M-1))$ the number of neighbours of agent i , besides j that agree with the agent's new opinion.

• S changes by $(n+1-I)/E$. On average this contribution is

$$\Delta S_3^{(a)} = \frac{p_R^{\mathbb{C}} p_N^{\mathbb{C}} S^{\mathbb{C}} ((MS + M - 2)P_0^{\mathbb{C}} + q(1 - MS))}{E(M - 1)} \quad (8)$$

So the mean field time evolution is given by (measuring time in Monte Carlo timesteps)

$$S \left(t + \frac{1}{N} \right) = S(t) + \Delta S_1^{(a)} + \Delta S_2^{(a)} + \Delta S_3^{(a)} \quad (9)$$

that becomes an ODE in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.

2. Reactive rewires

The detailed timestep for reactive rewires is as follows:

- With probability p_N (agent i is affected by the noise):
 - With probability $1/M$ (the noise doesn't change the opinion of i):
 - * Nothing happens
 - Otherwise (probability $(M-1)/M$):
 - * We draw the number of neighbours k from the degree distribution
 - * We draw $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$, the number of neighbours agreeing with the agent's previous opinion.
 - * We draw $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I, p = 1/(M-1))$, the number of neighbours that agree with the agent's new opinion.
 - * We draw $r \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - n, p = p_R)$, the number of neighbours that rewire their connection with i .
 - * S changes by $(n+r-I)/E$. On average, this contribution is

$$\Delta S_1^{(r)} = \frac{p_N q (M p_R - MS + S p_R - 2 p_R + 1)}{EM} \quad (10)$$

- Otherwise (probability $1 - p_N$), if agent i is not affected by the noise:
 - We draw the number of neighbours k from the degree distribution
 - We draw $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$, the number of neighbours agreeing with the agent's current opinion.
 - If $k = 0$ or otherwise with probability I/k (agent i is either isolated or interacts with a neighbour that it agrees with):

* Nothing happens

– Otherwise (agent i interacts with a neighbour j it doesn't agree with):

* i copies j 's opinion.

* We draw $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I - 1, p = 1/(M-1))$ the number of neighbours of agent i , besides j that agree with the agent's new opinion.

* We draw $r \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - n - 1, p = p_R)$, the number of neighbours that rewired their connection with i .

* S changes by $(n+r+1-I)/E$. On average this contribution is

$$\Delta S_2^{(r)} = \left((M(p_R^{\mathbb{C}} + S) - 2p_R^{\mathbb{C}} - Sp_R)(P_0^{\mathbb{C}} - q) + q(M-1) \right) \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}} S^{\mathbb{C}}}{E(M-1)} \quad (11)$$

So the mean field time evolution is given by (measuring time in Monte Carlo timesteps)

$$S \left(t + \frac{1}{N} \right) = S(t) + \Delta S_1^{(r)} + \Delta S_2^{(r)} \quad (12)$$

that also becomes an ODE in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.

B. Long time behaviour

1. Qualitative analysis

Both equations (9) and (12) reduce when $N \rightarrow \infty$ to an ODE with form

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{2\theta_{a(r)}(S)}{q} \quad (13)$$

where θ_a and θ_r (for active and reactive rewires respectively) are quadratic. As such (13) can have at most 2 fixed points.

Examining θ for $S = 0, 1$ and assuming $M \geq 2$, $q > 0$, $p_N > 0$ and $p_R > 0$, we get the following inequalities:

$$\theta_a(0) = p_R P_0^{\mathbb{C}} p_N^{\mathbb{C}} + \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}} p_R^{\mathbb{C}} ((M-2)P_0^{\mathbb{C}} + q)}{M-1} + \frac{p_N q}{M} > 0 \quad (14)$$

$$\theta_a(1) = \frac{-p_N q (M-1)}{M} < 0 \quad (15)$$

$$\theta_r(0) = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}} (P_0^{\mathbb{C}} (M-2) p_R^{\mathbb{C}} + q((M-2)p_R + 1))}{M-1} + \frac{p_N q (p_R (M-2) + 1)}{M} > 0 \quad (16)$$

$$\theta_r(1) = \frac{-p_N q p_R^{\mathbb{C}} (M-1)}{M} < 0 \quad (17)$$

where the inequality in equation (17) further assumes $p_R \neq 1$. Equations (14) to (17) imply that there is exactly one fixed point of (13) with $0 \leq S \leq 1$ and it must be attractive, so the long time behaviour of S , S_∞ (defined in equation (5)) can be obtained simply solving $\theta(S) = 0$ with S being a valid probability.

2. Comparison with simulations

In order to compare the mean field calculations with S measured from the simulations, note that the mean field results will still depend on the network geometry, since P_0 is still a parameter. In the case of active rewiring, the similarities between the stationary degree distribution and the degree distribution of an Erdős-Rényi network (as evidenced by figure 4) suggest that a Poisson distribution might be a good approximation, which would lead to $P_0 \sim e^{-q}$. However, since no such approximation is clear in the reactive case, we opted for using a value of P_0 obtained from simulations in both cases.

A comparison between mean field and simulations can be found in figure 10. We can see that the values predicted for the mean field approximation match the simulation results for higher values of p_N , while for low values discrepancies appear. These differences seem to be stronger for higher values of M and in the reactive case. One possible explanation is that for lower values of p_N , even though every opinion holds the same number of sites when we consider averages over long times, most of the time is spent with an imbalance between the opinions, which violates the hypothesis of our mean field calculations.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we studied the effects of the addition of noise in an adaptive voter model. Our main conclusion is that this change prevents the network where the model is being run from breaking into different components where each component holds only one opinion, as happens in the adaptive voter model without noise. Investigating the network structure reveals that what happens instead is that the network organizes itself into communities where there is a majority opinion. These communities can be identified using the stochastic block model.









(a) Mean Field with active rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 2$ (b) Simulations with active rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 2$ (c) Mean Field with active rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 4$ (d) Simulations with active rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 4$ (e) Mean Field with reactive rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 2$ (f) Simulations with reactive rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 2$ (g) Mean Field with reactive rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 4$ (h) Simulations with reactive rewiring, $q = 4$ and $M = 4$

FIG. 10: Comparison between S_∞ calculated by the mean field approximation (graphs to the left) and the value measured from the simulations (graphs to the right).

Investigating how intense this fragmentation is, some broad trends can be observed. We see that increasing the rewiring probability increases fragmentation and that increasing the noise intensity decreases fragmentation. While these are not surprising, the quantitative interplay between the two mechanisms is not entirely obvious. We also see that the number of opinions doesn't play a prominent role and that increasing q prevents fragmentation in

the active case, but promotes it in the reactive case.

In order to try to get some analytical results, a mean field treatment was developed, where a symmetry between all communities in the network is assumed. Comparing with the simulations we see that the analytical results roughly reproduce the qualitative behaviour of the simulations and for the case of high noise intensity they have a decent quantitative match.

Appendix A: Details of the Mean Field calculations

In this appendix we will do the detailed derivation of equations (6) to (12). We recall that in our mean field treatment we make the following approximation that the following holds at all times:

- All opinions are held by the same amount of agents at all times.
- The probability $P_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ that an edge connects agents with opinions σ and σ' is

$$P_{\sigma,\sigma'} = \begin{cases} p_{\text{same}} & \text{if } \sigma = \sigma' \\ p_{\text{different}} & \text{if } \sigma \neq \sigma' \end{cases} \quad (\text{A1})$$

With p_{same} and $p_{\text{different}}$ independent of the specific opinions involved.

- The degree distribution P_q does not change over time.

We also recall that a timestep of the mean field model consists of:

- Pick an agent i at random.
- With probability p_N , its opinion is changed at random (noise).
- Otherwise, we draw the number of neighbours of i (using the degree distribution) and how many of these neighbours agree with i (using p_{same}).
- If i is not isolated (that is, if the number of neighbours drawn in the last step is not 0), choose a neighbour j and change i 's opinion to j 's opinion.
- Do the appropriate rewires along the evolution (using p_R for the probability).

Our objective is to find how a single timestep changes the probability S that a pair of neighbouring agents have the same opinion, (note that $S = Mp_{\text{same}}$). Equations (6), (7) and (8) give the contributions of different processes to the change in S for active rewiring, while (10) and (11) give the contributions for reactive rewiring.

1. Active rewires

a. First contribution

The first contribution in equation (6) covers the following situation:

- Agent i was affected by the noise and its opinion was changed.
- The total number of neighbours is k , drawn from P_q .
- The number of neighbours holding the agent's previous opinion is $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$.
- The number of neighbours holding the agent's new opinion is $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I, p = 1/(M-1))$.
- The change in S is entirely due to the change of the agent opinion and is given by $(n-I)/E$, where $E = Nq/2$ is the number of edges in the network.

Since the probability that this exact scenario plays out is $\frac{p_N(M-1)}{M}P(k, I, n)$ (affected by the noise and had its opinion changed, together with the drawn variables), then the average contribution to ΔS is given by the expectation over k, I and n :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{p_N(M-1)}{M}\frac{(n-I)}{E}\right) &= \frac{p_N(M-1)}{EM}\mathbb{E}(n-I) = \frac{p_N(M-1)}{EM}\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(n-I|I, k)) = \\ &= \frac{p_N}{EM}\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(k-MI|k)) = \frac{p_N}{EM}\mathbb{E}(k-MkS) = \frac{p_Nq(1-MS)}{EM} \end{aligned}$$

b. Second contribution

The second contribution in equation (7) covers the following situation:

- Agent i was not affected by the noise.
- The total number of neighbours k , drawn from P_q is different from 0.
- The number of neighbours holding the agent's current opinion is $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$.
- The neighbour chosen to interact with i has a different opinion and their connection is rewired.
- The change in S is entirely due to the rewire and given by $1/E$.

The probability that this exact scenario plays out is $p_N^{\mathbb{C}}(1 - \delta_{k,0})\frac{(k-I)}{k}p_R P(k, I)$ (i is not affected by the noise, $k \neq 0$, the chosen neighbour has a different opinion and a rewire takes place, together with the drawn variables). So the average contribution to ΔS is given by the expectation over k and I :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}}(1 - \delta_{k,0})p_R(k-I)}{Ek}\right) &= \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}}p_R}{E}\mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{(1 - \delta_{k,0})(k-I)}{k}\middle|k\right)\right) = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}}p_R}{E}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{(1 - \delta_{k,0})(k-kS)}{k}\right) = \\ &= \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}}p_R}{E}\mathbb{E}((1 - \delta_{k,0})(1 - S)) = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{C}}p_R P_0^{\mathbb{C}} S^{\mathbb{C}}}{E} \end{aligned}$$

c. Third contribution

The third contribution in equation (8) covers the following situation:

- Agent i was not affected by the noise.
- The total number of neighbours k , drawn from P_q is different from 0.
- The number of neighbours holding the agent's current opinion is $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$.
- The neighbour j , chosen to interact with i has a different opinion and i copies its opinion.
- The number of neighbours (besides j) holding the agent's new opinion is $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I - 1, p = 1/(M-1))$.
- The change in S is entirely due to the change in i 's opinion and given by $(n+1-I)/E$ (it now has $n+1$ neighbours agreeing with it, instead of I).

The probability that this exact scenario happens is $p_N^{\mathbb{C}}(1 - \delta_{k,0})\frac{(k-I)}{k}p_R^{\mathbb{C}}P(k, I, n)$ (i is not affected by the noise, $k \neq 0$, the chosen neighbour has a different opinion but a rewire does not happen). So we must compute the expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(p_N^{\mathbb{G}} (1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} p_R^{\mathbb{G}} \frac{(n+1-I)}{E} \right) = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{G}} p_R^{\mathbb{G}}}{E} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} (n+1-I) \mid k, I \right) \right) = \\
& = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{G}} p_R^{\mathbb{G}}}{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} (1-I) \mid k \right) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k(M-1)} (1-I+k) \mid k \right) \right) \right) = \\
& = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{G}} p_R^{\mathbb{G}}}{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \left((S+1)S^{\mathbb{G}} - kSS^{\mathbb{G}} \right) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-1)(S^{\mathbb{G}})^2}{M-1} \right) \right) = \\
& = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{G}} p_R^{\mathbb{G}}}{E} \left(P_0^{\mathbb{G}} (S+1)S^{\mathbb{G}} - qSS^{\mathbb{G}} + \frac{(q - P_0^{\mathbb{G}})(S^{\mathbb{G}})^2}{M-1} \right) = \frac{p_N^{\mathbb{G}} p_R^{\mathbb{G}} S^{\mathbb{G}}}{E(M-1)} \left(P_0^{\mathbb{G}} (MS + M - 2) + q(1 - MS) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

2. Reactive rewires

a. First contribution

The first contribution in equation (10) covers the following situation:

- Agent i was affected by the noise and its opinion was changed.
- The total number of neighbours is k , drawn from P_q .
- The number of neighbours holding the agent's previous opinion is $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$.
- The number of neighbours holding the agent's new opinion is $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I, p = 1/(M-1))$.
- Because of the opinion change, r neighbours among the $k - n$ that disagree with i rewire their connections; with $r \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - n, p = p_R)$.
- The change in S is due to the change of the agent opinion and the subsequent rewires, amounting to $(n+r-I)/E$.

The probability of this scenario is $\frac{p_N(M-1)}{M} P(k, I, n, r)$ (affected by the noise and had its opinion changed). So we must obtain the expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{p_N(M-1)}{M} \frac{(n+r-I)}{E} \right) &= \frac{p_N(M-1)}{EM} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} (n+r-I \mid k, I, n) \right) = \frac{p_N(M-1)}{EM} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} (n-I + p_R(k-n) \mid k, I) \right) = \\
&= \frac{p_N}{EM} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((k-I)p_R^{\mathbb{G}} + (kp_R - I)(M-1) \mid k \right) \right) = \frac{p_N}{EM} \mathbb{E} (k(Mp_R - MS + Sp_R - 2p_R + 1)) = \\
&= \frac{p_N q}{EM} (Mp_R - MS + Sp_R - 2p_R + 1)
\end{aligned}$$

b. Second contribution

The second contribution in equation (11) covers the following situation:

- Agent i was not affected by the noise.

- The total number of neighbours k , drawn from P_q is different from 0.
- The number of neighbours holding the agent's current opinion is $I \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k, p = S)$.
- The neighbour j , chosen to interact with i has a different opinion and i copies its opinion.
- The number of neighbours (besides j) holding the agent's new opinion is $n \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - I - 1, p = 1/(M-1))$.
- This change of opinion causes $r \sim \text{Binomial}(N = k - n - 1, p = p_R)$ rewires (note that $n + 1$ neighbours agree with i 's new opinion because j is not contabilized among the n).
- The change in S is due to the change of the agent opinion and the subsequent rewires, amounting to $(n+1+r-I)/E$.

The probability of this scenario playing out is $p_N^{\mathcal{G}}(1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} P(k, I, n, r)$ (not affected by the noise, $k \neq 0$ and the neighbour has a different opinion). The contribution to ΔS is given by the expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(p_N^{\mathcal{G}}(1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} \frac{(n+1+r-I)}{E} \right) &= \frac{p_N^{\mathcal{G}}}{E} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} (n+1+r-I) \mid k, I, n \right) \right) = \\
&= \frac{p_N^{\mathcal{G}}}{E} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} \left((n+1)p_R^{\mathcal{G}} + kp_R - I \right) \mid k, I \right) \right) = \\
&= \frac{p_N^{\mathcal{G}}}{E} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \frac{(k-I)}{k} \left(kp_R - I + p_R^{\mathcal{G}} \left(1 + \frac{k-I-1}{M-1} \right) \right) \mid k \right) \right) = \\
&= \frac{p_N^{\mathcal{G}} S^{\mathcal{G}}}{E(M-1)} \mathbb{E} \left((1 - \delta_{k,0}) \left((1-k) \left(M \left(S + p_R^{\mathcal{G}} \right) - Sp_R - 2p_R^{\mathcal{G}} \right) + k(M-1) \right) \right) = \\
&= \frac{p_N^{\mathcal{G}} S^{\mathcal{G}}}{E(M-1)} \left(\left(M \left(p_R^{\mathcal{G}} + S \right) - 2p_R^{\mathcal{G}} - Sp_R \right) \left(P_0^{\mathcal{G}} - q \right) + q(M-1) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

-
- [1] Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
- [2] Pablo Barberá, John T. Jost, Jonathan Nagler, Joshua A. Tucker, and Richard Bonneau. Tweeting from left to right: Is online political communication more than an echo chamber? *Psychological Science*, 26(10):1531–1542, 2015.
- [3] E. Burgos, Laura Hernández, H. Ceva, and R. P. J. Perazzo. Entropic determination of the phase transition in a coevolving opinion-formation model. *Phys. Rev. E*, 91:032808, Mar 2015.
- [4] Philip S. Chodrow and Peter J. Mucha. Local symmetry and global structure in adaptive voter models. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 80(1):620–638, 2020.
- [5] Matteo Cinelli, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Alessandro Galeazzi, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Michele Starnini. The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(9):e2023301118, 2021.
- [6] Mario G. Cosenza and José L. Herrera-Diestra. Coevolutionary dynamics with global fields. *Entropy*, 24(9), 2022.
- [7] Paul Erdos and Alfréd Rényi. On random graphs. *Publicationes Mathematicae*, 6:290–297, 1959.
- [8] Matthew Gentzkow and Jesse M Shapiro. Ideological segregation online and offline. Working Paper 15916, National Bureau of Economic Research, April 2010.
- [9] Thilo Gross and Hiroki Sayama. *Adaptive Networks. Theory, Models and Applications*. Springer Verlag, Germany, 2009.
- [10] R. A. Holley and T. M. Liggett. Ergodic theorems for weakly interacting infinite systems and the voter model. *Annals of Probability*, 3(4):643–663, 1975.
- [11] Petter Holme and M. E. J. Newman. Nonequilibrium phase transition in the coevolution of networks and opinions. *Phys. Rev. E*, 74:056108, Nov 2006.
- [12] Arkadiusz Jędrzejewski, Joanna Toruniewska, Krzysztof Suchecki, Oleg Zaikin, and Janusz A. Hołyst. Spontaneous symmetry breaking of active phase in coevolving nonlinear voter model. *Phys. Rev. E*, 102:042313, Oct 2020.

- [13] Pascal P. Klamser, Marc Wiedermann, Jonathan F. Donges, and Reik V. Donner. Zealotry effects on opinion dynamics in the adaptive voter model. *Phys. Rev. E*, 96:052315, Nov 2017.
- [14] Cecilia Nardini, Balázs Kozma, and Alain Barrat. Who's talking first? consensus or lack thereof in coevolving opinion formation models. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100:158701, Apr 2008.
- [15] Tiago P. Peixoto. The graph-tool python library. *figshare*, 2014.
- [16] H. Akin Unver. Digital challenges to democracy: Politics of automation, attention, and engagement. *Journal of International Affairs*, 71(1):127–146, 2017.
- [17] Y. Yu, G. Xiao, G. Li, W. P. Tay, and H. F. Teoh. Opinion diversity and community formation in adaptive networks. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 27(10):103115, 10 2017.