

**Abstract**

We revisit DeGroot learning to examine the robustness of social learning outcomes in *dynamic* networks—networks that evolve *randomly* over time. Randomness stems from multiple sources such as random matching and strategic network formation. Our main contribution is that random dynamics have double-edged effects depending on social structure: while they can foster consensus and *boost* collective intelligence, they can have adverse effects such as slowing down the speed of learning and causing long-term *disagreement*. Collective intelligence in dynamic networks requires *balancing* people’s average influence with their average trust as society grows. We also find that the initial social structure of a dynamic network plays a central role in shaping long-term beliefs. *Keywords*: dynamic social networks, wisdom of crowds, robustness, disagreement.

*The question we have to ask in thinking about collective wisdom, then, is: Can people make collectively intelligent decisions even when they are in constant, if erratic, interaction with each other?*

—Surowiecki (2005, pp. 42–43)

**1 Introduction**

There is substantial evidence that social networks play a central role in people’s lives. They shape people’s aspirations, boost their economic mobility, facilitate job acquisitions, and foster *collective intelligence* (Jackson, 2019). The latter, also known as the “wisdom of crowds” (Surowiecki, 2005), suggests that a large decentralized society composed of heterogeneous agents can learn the true state of the world through mutual communication. This phenomenon dates back to Galton (1907) and now serves as the main justification for collective schemes such as crowdsourcing, prediction markets, opinion polls, and jury/voting systems. There is also growing interest among scientists to design collectively intelligent networks composed of humans and computer systems (e.g., artificial intelligence) (Weld et al., 2015).

Golub and Jackson (2010) find that a large society is collectively intelligent when no agent has disproportionate *influence*. This result builds on the pioneering work of DeGroot (1974) and relies crucially on networks being exogenously fixed over time, which may be

---

\*I am very thankful to Drew Fudenberg and Stephen Morris for their guidance and mentorship. I am also grateful to Abhijit Banerjee, Arun Chandrasekhar, Krishna Dasaratha, Ben Golub, Ani Gosh, Matthew Jackson, Ali Jadbabaie, Philippe Jehiel, M. Ali Khan, Evan Sadler, Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi, Omer Tamuz, and Alex Wolitzky for all their insightful comments and discussions. *JEL codes*: D83, D85.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Economics, MIT, [florianm@mit.edu](mailto:florianm@mit.edu).

plausible in some cases. In most other cases, however, intelligent systems typically rely on environmental feedback and the ability to *dynamically* reorganize, resulting in random evolutionary dynamics (Almaatouq et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2023). Consider, for instance, the social network consisting of the low-income families that participated in the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) experiment in the mid-1990s (Katz et al., 2001). Some of these families were randomly offered housing vouchers to move to lower-poverty neighborhoods. This random treatment assignment played the role of a random matching device because families that relocated had to create new social contacts and friendships at their destinations. In fact, Katz et al. (2001, p. 613) acknowledge that “relocations could [...] disrupt social support networks that are important sources of informal child care, job referrals, and other labor market information.” The introductory quote can therefore be rephrased as follows: what are the effects of random network dynamics on social learning outcomes?

Huang et al. (2019) offer a very negative answer to this question: “Even if the social network does not privilege any agent in terms of influence, a large society almost always fails to converge to the truth” when there are random network dynamics. In contrast, we offer a more complete and nuanced answer by highlighting both positive and negative effects of random dynamics on social learning outcomes. Our main contributions are outlined below.

In Section 4, we show that a large dynamic network is collectively intelligent if and only if the average weight of the most influential agent vanishes as society grows. This relies on the same assumptions as in Golub and Jackson (2010): initial signals are independent and unbiased. We find that achieving collective intelligence in dynamic networks requires striking a *balance* between the average influence agents exert on others and the average level of trust they place in others as society grows. Notably, introducing even very small amounts of random dynamics is often enough to promote consensus and *boost* collective intelligence.

Our technical contribution is a novel framework that enables the analysis of social learning in dynamic networks. In Section 2, we propose a dynamical system that plays the role of an abstract “data generating process” of the random network process. The key assumption on the dynamics is *stationarity*—the joint distribution of the networks does not change over time. This allows us to build directly on random matrix theory. Specifically, we adapt Hennion’s (1997) general results about convergence of products of nonnegative random matrices, which allows us to nest all prominent existing frameworks (DeMarzo et al., 2003; Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie, 2008, 2009; Golub and Jackson, 2010; Banerjee et al., 2021). Then, Section 3 proposes a simple condition that establishes existence of consensus in dynamic networks, which is noteworthy because: (1) it is a natural extension of the well-known “primitive” condition used in deterministic networks. (2) It is easy to verify in many

settings because it can be characterized in terms of the social structure. More generally, this paper is the first to unify social learning theory and random matrix theory in a tractable framework. By leveraging stationarity, our framework serves as a natural intermediary model between the deterministic and iid models, thus enabling us to bridge the gap between the two prominent network models in the literature. This allows us, for example, to ask new questions such as what classes of dynamic networks are most conducive for social learning.

All the results above indicate that the main insights from deterministic networks are *robust* to random dynamics. The rest of the paper provides novel insights that are unique to dynamic networks. In Section 5, we focus on independent and identically distributed (iid) networks to characterize consensus in terms of *early* social structure. We find that the initial *social topology* (or “skeleton”) of an iid network reveals whether consensus exists. Two societies have the same social topology at time  $t$  if the zero entries in their respective interaction matrices are located in the same position at time  $t$ . Thus, whether consensus exists in an iid network can be inferred by simply examining the initial interaction matrix. This also simplifies the computation of agents’ influence weights, which is otherwise an open problem. We then show that the longer agents interact, the narrower their views get—agents have less opportunities to make changes to their beliefs over time. These results therefore suggest that using the DeGroot rule in dynamic networks yields a form of “anchoring bias.” This has policy implications: it highlights the importance of the *timing* of interventions targeted to improve social learning outcomes. Specifically, early interventions can enhance collective intelligence by mitigating anchoring biases. This is reminiscent of [Chetty and Hendren’s \(2015\)](#) findings, showing the improved long-term outcomes of children whose families moved earlier in the MTO experiment. In general, the results from this section can provide guidance to a planner who seeks to design and implement interventions in dynamic social networks.

Section 6 investigates the double-edged effects of random dynamics. While analyzing the medium-run behavior of the learning process, we find that the effect of random dynamics on the speed of convergence is nuanced because it depends on the social structure. Introducing random dynamics in “sparse” networks tends to speed up convergence whereas it has the opposite effect in “well-connected” networks. That is, nudging agents to randomize their weights could be beneficial in networks where many agents are isolated. Thus, in societies where interacting with others is costly, randomizing weights might be a *cheap* alternative to enhance social learning. We then show that convergence speed in stationary networks can be faster than in iid networks when weights evolve with moderate persistence. If a planner wishes to boost social learning outcomes, then designing a stationary network environment might be optimal. Section 6.2 illustrates how random dynamics can cause *disagreement*.

— *Related Work*: Although the literature acknowledges random dynamics, dynamic networks have yet to receive enough attention in economics. This is perhaps due to the mathematical complexities introduced by randomness, and the fact that the tools needed to handle them are buried in random matrix theory. One of our main goals is therefore to gather and apply results from random matrix theory to analyze dynamic networks. In contrast, DeMarzo et al. (2003, Appendix 1.A) circumvent the challenges of random dynamics by assuming that randomness vanishes in the aggregate. More recently, Banerjee and Compte (2024) also avoid random dynamics for technical reasons. Notable exceptions to this literature are Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie (2008, 2009) who study dynamic networks, and their frameworks are special cases of ours (Section 7.3.1)—the same applies to the “gossip” and distributed optimization literature (Yang et al., 2019). In general, this literature focuses only on consensus, whereas we explore when consensus is *correct*, which is very relevant in economics. The main take-away from this literature is that consensus is completely determined by the *average* behavior of the dynamic network. Our generalization reveals that the average no longer suffices for consensus, so we introduce a simple condition that disciplines the *tails* of the dynamic network. Section 8.1 presents a more detailed literature review.

— *Organization*: Section 2 introduces our framework, Section 3 establishes consensus, and Section 4 studies collective intelligence. Then, Section 5 analyzes consensus, Section 6 explores the medium-run behavior, Section 7 contains further analyses, and Section 8 is a conclusion. Appendix B shall serve as a review of some key mathematical concepts.

## 2 Framework

### 2.1 Preliminaries

Our framework consists of a finite set  $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  of agents who interact according to a dynamic social network. The interaction patterns among the agents at time  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  are captured by an  $n \times n$  nonnegative matrix  $\mathbf{X}_t$ , where  $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{i,j \in N} > 0$  indicates that  $i$  pays attention (or listens) to  $j$  at time  $t$ . We refer to  $\mathbf{X}_t$  as the “interaction matrix at time  $t$ ,” which is assumed to be (row) *stochastic*, i.e., each row sums to one. This setup is a dynamic extension of the standard DeGroot learning (e.g., Golub and Jackson, 2010, Section I.A).

Let’s first build some intuition for dynamic networks. Consider two agents (hereafter, Ann and Bob) with fixed interaction matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . This network has no practical value within the standard DeGroot model except that it illustrates failure of consensus. However, this “trivial” network has a dynamic foundation. At each  $t$ , suppose the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{X}_t$

takes value in  $\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1-\epsilon & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & 1-\epsilon \end{pmatrix}\right\}$ , and let Ann and Bob be two neighbors who may encounter each other randomly while walking in their neighborhood. In periods when they do not encounter each other, each agent can only give weight to their own belief. In periods when they encounter each other, each agent gives weight  $\epsilon > 0$  to the other agent’s belief. Thus, the network  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  is the limit of a dynamic network when randomness vanishes  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . This simple example yields two preliminary insights: (1) random dynamics can provide real-life foundations for networks that may otherwise seem pathological, and (2) introducing even very small amounts of randomness may be enough to produce drastically different outcomes.

## 2.2 Network Generating Process

We build on [Hennion \(1997, Section 1.1\)](#) to propose a random process that generates the interaction matrices  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ . Let  $\Sigma$  denote the set of all  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices and  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \theta)$  denote an *ergodic* dynamical system,<sup>1</sup> where a stochastic matrix  $\mathbf{X}_0$  is a random variable on  $\Omega$  taking values in  $\Sigma$ . Elements in  $\Omega$  and  $\Sigma$  are denoted  $\omega$  and  $\sigma$ , respectively. Then,  $\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)$ —the interaction matrix of  $n$  agents at time  $t \geq 0$ —is generated according to

$$\mathbf{X}_t(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_0 \circ \theta^t(\omega), \tag{1}$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega$ . This process assumes *stationarity*, so there exists an invariant probability measure  $\mu$  on the Borel subsets  $B$  of  $\Sigma$ , i.e.,  $\mu(B) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_t(\omega) \in B)$ , for all  $t$ , with support  $\Sigma_\mu \subset \Sigma$ .

— *Interpretation*: The pair  $(\mu, \Sigma_\mu)$  is the main primitive of our model. The set  $\Sigma_\mu$  is a collection of all possible (or feasible) interaction patterns that may realize as a dynamic network evolves, and  $\mu$  describes the frequency with which such patterns emerge over time.

— *Special cases*:  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)\}_{t \geq 1}$  is allowed to be iid but in general there is no restriction on their correlation structure. Other key special cases of our model are [Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie \(2008, 2009\)](#) (see, Section 7.3.1). [Online Appendix C](#) explores a network formation model.

## 2.3 Evolution of Beliefs

In standard DeGroot learning, each agent  $i$  receives, at  $t = 0$ , an initial signal, denoted  $p_i^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}$ —normalized, without loss of generality, to lie in  $[0, 1]$ . Each agent then updates her belief by repeatedly taking the *same* weighted averages of everyone’s beliefs over time, and these weights are captured by an exogenously fixed interaction matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  ([Golub and Jackson,](#)

---

<sup>1</sup>Ergodicity here refers to the property of the “measure-preserving” map  $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ , which is a standard concept in ergodic theory (see, [Appendix B.I](#)). In some special cases, this definition of ergodicity reduces to the definition used in Markov chains. For example, when Conditions (A) and (B) in [Hennion \(1997, Section 1.4\)](#) hold, then the process  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  can be viewed as a finite stationary ergodic Markov chain on  $\Sigma$ . [Appendix B](#) provides a comprehensive review of some key technical details that formalize our framework.

2010, Section I.B). Here, we extend this as follows: the repeated weighted averaging process of all agents at  $t \geq 1$  is captured by a random (left) product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}(\omega)$  defined recursively as

$$\mathbf{X}^{(1)}(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_1(\omega), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X}^{(t+1)}(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_{t+1}(\omega)\mathbf{X}^{(t)}(\omega), \quad (2)$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega$ . This allows the weights that agents put on (themselves and) their neighbors to vary randomly over time. Then, for any vector of initial beliefs  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in [0, 1]^n$ , the agents' updated beliefs at  $t \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ , evolve according to the discrete-time linear dynamical system

$$\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(\omega) = \mathbf{X}^{(t)}(\omega)\mathbf{p}^{(0)}, \quad (3)$$

for  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}(\omega)$  in eq. (2) and  $\omega \in \Omega$ . When each  $\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)$  in eq. (1) is time-invariant/constant, i.e.,  $\mathbf{X}_t(\omega) = \mathbf{T}$  for all  $t$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then eq. (2) degenerates to the power matrix  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}(\omega) = \mathbf{T}^t$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , so beliefs would evolve as  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{T}^t\mathbf{p}^{(0)}$ ,<sup>2</sup> which is the standard DeGroot model. Formally, standard DeGroot arises when  $\mu$  is a unit mass at  $\mathbf{T} \in \Sigma$ , i.e.,  $\Sigma_\mu = \{\mathbf{T}\}$ .

## 3 Consensus

### 3.1 Definitions

A necessary step for collective intelligence is to first establish whether agents' beliefs can converge to a well-defined limit. The next definition presents the convergence used hereafter.

**Definition 1** (Convergence). A sequence of random interaction matrices  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is said to be *convergent* if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  exists almost surely.  $\triangle$

When  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ —the limiting product of random interaction matrices—exists a.s. and has *rank one* (i.e., all its rows are identical), the agents are said to have reached *consensus*.

Now, let  $\hat{\Sigma} \subset \Sigma$  denote the set of stochastic matrices whose entries are all strictly positive. Then, the following is a *tail* condition that will play a central role in our model.

**Definition 2.** A sequence of random interaction matrices  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is said to be *primitive* if

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \{\mathbf{X}^{(t)} \in \hat{\Sigma}\}\right) > 0. \quad (\mathcal{C})$$

This is a natural extension of the “primitive” condition used for deterministic networks (Golub and Jackson, 2010, Definition 8).<sup>3</sup> It holds, for example, if one  $\mathbf{X}_\tau$  is strictly positive at some time  $\tau$ . For each  $t \geq 1$ , let  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t$  and  $\mathbf{r}_t$  be nonzero random vectors in  $[0, 1]^n$  satisfying

$$\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\mathbf{r}_t = \mathbf{r}_t, \quad \boldsymbol{\pi}_t\mathbf{X}^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{\pi}_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\pi}_t\mathbf{r}_t = 1.$$

<sup>2</sup>To ease notation, we will often omit the argument  $\omega$  when referring to  $\mathbf{X}_t$ ,  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ , and  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}$ .

<sup>3</sup>A nonnegative deterministic matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  is said to be primitive if  $\mathbf{T}^t$  is strictly positive for some  $t \geq 1$ .

Since  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  is stochastic, its spectral radius is *one* for each  $t$ , so  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t$  and  $\mathbf{r}_t$  denote, respectively, its left and right eigenvectors corresponding to this eigenvalue. Here,  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t$  is normalized to a *unit* vector, i.e., its entries sum to one, and  $\mathbf{r}_t = \mathbf{1}$ , for all  $t$ , i.e., the  $n$ -vector whose entries are all ones. Thus, the stochastic matrix  $\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\pi}_t$  has rank one—all its rows are identically  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t$ .

## 3.2 Existence of Consensus

Our first result establishes that  $(\mathcal{C})$  is sufficient to ensure consensus in dynamic networks.

**Theorem 1** (Consensus). *Suppose  $(\mathcal{C})$  holds. Then,  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is convergent and*

1.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{X}^{(t)} - \mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\pi}_t) = \mathbf{0}$  a.s.
2.  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t \in [0, 1]^n$  converges a.s., as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , to a strictly positive random unit vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ .

Theorem 1 is a direct extension of Golub and Jackson (2010, Lemma 3). Notice that Theorem 1 allows  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  to be arbitrarily correlated. Thus, despite the introduction of random dynamics, our model preserves the tractable appeal of the standard DeGroot model.

Most importantly, the limit of the left eigenvector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_t$ , denoted  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \in (0, 1)^n$  in Theorem 1.2, is a random vector that collects the long-term *influence* weights of all the agents. Then, for any vector of initial beliefs  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} = (p_1^{(0)}, \dots, p_n^{(0)}) \in [0, 1]^n$ , Theorem 1 reveals that each agent  $i$ 's belief  $p_i^{(t)}$  will converge a.s., as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , to the *same* limit

$$p_i^{(\infty)} = \left( \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)} \mathbf{p}^{(0)} \right)_i = \sum_{j \in N} \pi_j p_j^{(0)}.$$

## 3.3 Some Special Cases and Examples

### 3.3.1 Unique Consensus

Since the influence vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  in dynamic networks is generally random, characterizing when it is unique is important. Let  $\Sigma_\mu^\tau$  denote the set of all  $\tau$ -length products of matrices in  $\Sigma_\mu$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be iid and  $\mathbf{s} \in [0, 1]^n$  be a constant unit vector. Then,  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  converges in probability to  $\mathbf{1}\mathbf{s}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $\mathbf{1}\mathbf{s}$  is the only rank one matrix in*

$$\text{closure} \left( \bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_\mu^t \right).$$

This result is a weak characterization of the uniqueness of consensus that relies solely on our primitives  $(\mu, \Sigma_\mu)$ . Next, we illustrate how to apply this insight in Theorem 1.

**Corollary 1.** *In Theorem 1, let  $\mathbf{s}$  be a strictly positive constant unit vector such that  $\mathbf{s}\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{s}$  holds a.s., for every  $t \geq 1$ . Then,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)} = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{s}$  a.s.*

To predict when all agents have equal influence, Proposition 1 indicates that we can leverage the fact that  $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'$  is the only rank one bistochastic (or doubly stochastic) matrix.

**Corollary 2.** *In Theorem 1, let each  $\mathbf{X}_t$  be a random bistochastic matrix for every  $t \geq 1$ . Then, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , all agents have equal influence, i.e.,  $\pi_i = 1/n$  a.s., for all  $i \in N$ .*

**Example 1.** Consider Ann and Bob from Section 2.1, where  $\Sigma_\mu = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1-\epsilon & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & 1-\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \right\}$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Their encounters can be arbitrarily correlated, e.g., it may be unlikely that Ann and Bob encounter each other two periods in a row. Since these interaction matrices are bistochastic, Corollary 2 applies, so the influence vector becomes  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (1/2, 1/2)$ . Notice that even with very small amounts of randomness, i.e.,  $\epsilon \approx 0$ , Ann and Bob will always reach consensus. As  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , however, the randomness ceases to exist and so does consensus.  $\triangle$

### 3.3.2 Random Consensus

When the influence vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is actually random, deriving its distribution in closed form becomes critical. The next result provides necessary and sufficient conditions for the distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  to be *Dirichlet*. For a strictly positive vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , let  $D_{\mathbf{a}}$  be the Dirichlet distribution with parameter  $\mathbf{a}$ . Also, let  $G_{\mathbf{a}}$  denote the joint distribution of  $n$  independent Gamma random variables each with scale parameter 1 and shape parameter  $a_i$ .

**Corollary 3.** *In Theorem 1, let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be iid. Then,  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \sim D_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$  if and only if  $(\mathcal{C})$  holds and there exists  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  such that  $\mathbf{v}\mathbf{X}_0 \sim G_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$ , where  $\mathbf{v} \sim G_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$  is a vector independent of  $\mathbf{X}_0$ .*

This result is due to McKinlay (2014, Theorem 4). The next result is Chamayou and Letac (1994, Theorem 1.2), which gives more insights into the parameter  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$  in Corollary 3.

**Corollary 4.** *In Corollary 3, suppose each row  $(\mathbf{X}_0)_i \sim D_{(\alpha_{i1}, \dots, \alpha_{in})}$  is independent, where  $r_i = \sum_{j \in N} \alpha_{ij} = \sum_{j \in N} \alpha_{ji}$  holds for all  $i \in N$ , and  $\alpha_{ij} > 0$ . Then,  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$ .*

Corollary 4 is the only known result in the literature that gives conditions for the distribution of agents' weights to be “conjugate” to the distribution of the influence vector.

**Example 2.** Consider a variation of Example 1. Suppose that whether there is an encounter or not, Ann and Bob always choose independently (of each other and over time) their weights from the same Beta distribution,  $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \alpha)$ , with concentration parameter  $2\alpha > 0$ . If  $\alpha = 1$ , then Ann and Bob choose their weights uniformly on  $[0, 1]$ . This setting meets the conditions in Corollary 4, where  $r_1 = r_2 = 2\alpha$ , so  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = (2\alpha, 2\alpha)$ . Thus, the influence vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi, 1-\pi)$  satisfies  $\pi \sim \text{Beta}(2\alpha, 2\alpha)$ . As  $\alpha$  grows,  $\pi$  concentrates around  $1/2$  as in Example 1.  $\triangle$



## 4 Collective Intelligence

### 4.1 Setup and Definition

Let the constant  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  denote the true state of the world. The initial signals  $\{p_i^{(0)}(n)\}_{i \leq n}$  and the dynamic network  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$  are drawn from the following joint distribution.<sup>4</sup> (i)  $\{p_i^{(0)}(n)\}_{i \leq n}$  are independent for each  $n$ . (ii) Each  $p_i^{(0)}(n) \in [0, 1]$  is independent of  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$  with mean  $\gamma$  and variance of at least  $\underline{v}^2 > 0$ . (iii)  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$  is ergodic and satisfies  $(\mathcal{E})$ . Conditions (i) and (ii) are identical to those in Golub and Jackson (2010, Section III.A).<sup>5</sup> Then, agents' beliefs,  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(n)$ , at  $t \geq 1$  evolve according to eq. (3):

$$\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(n) = \mathbf{X}^{(t)}(n)\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(n),$$

where, for each  $n$ ,  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}(n)$  is the random product in eq. (2). Now, a large dynamic social network is said to be collectively intelligent (or “wise” for short) when the agents' limiting beliefs  $\{p_i^{(\infty)}(n)\}_{i \leq n}$  converge jointly in probability to the true state  $\gamma$  as defined below.

**Definition 3.** The sequence  $\{\mathbf{X}_\infty(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$  is *collectively intelligent* if, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \leq n} |p_i^{(\infty)}(n) - \gamma| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0.$$

### 4.2 Analysis

Theorem 2 is a characterization of collective intelligence in terms of eigenvector centrality.

**Theorem 2** (Collective intelligence). *For each  $n$ , let  $\{\boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be any sequence of random influence vectors from Theorem 1.2. Then, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i \leq n} \pi_i(n)p_i^{(0)}(n) - \gamma\right| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In words, Theorem 2 states that, as society grows, the limiting belief of each agent,

$$p_i^{(\infty)}(n) = \sum_{j \leq n} \pi_j(n)p_j^{(0)}(n),$$

converges in probability to the true state  $\gamma$  if and only if the average weight of the most influential agent tends to zero. This is a direct extension of Golub and Jackson (2010, Lemma 1) for dynamic networks. Online Appendix B discusses Huang et al.'s (2019) negative results.

---

<sup>4</sup>In this section, we follow Golub and Jackson (2010) by explicitly indicating the dependence on  $n$ .

<sup>5</sup>These conditions are not necessary in dynamic networks. Thus, we will prove the main result of this section under weaker conditions that allow signals to be correlated to the network and to also be biased.

### 4.2.1 Discussion and Intuition

The next result identifies a large class of dynamic networks that are collectively intelligent.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$  be a dynamic network that satisfies the conditions in Corollary 3. Then,  $\{\mathbf{X}_\infty(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$  is collectively intelligent if and only if  $\sum_{i \leq n} \varphi_i \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

This result is helpful because it clarifies the conditions for collective intelligence in terms of our primitives. In Corollary 3, the influence vector is Dirichlet with parameter  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(n) = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ , i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(n) \sim D_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(n)}$ , where  $\sum_{i \leq n} \varphi_i$  measures the “concentration” around the mean. For the special case in Corollary 4,  $\varphi_i = \sum_{j \leq n} \alpha_{ij} = \sum_{j \leq n} \alpha_{ji}$  and  $(\mathbf{X}_t(n))_i \sim_{\text{iid}} D_{(\alpha_{i1}, \dots, \alpha_{in})}$  for all  $i \leq n$ . Here, Proposition 2 states that collective intelligence requires  $\sum_{i \leq n} \varphi_i = \sum_{i \leq n} \sum_{j \leq n} \alpha_{ij} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Notice that this implies that  $\mu(n)$ —the distribution of each  $\mathbf{X}_t(n)$ —must concentrate around its mean as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . To see this, define  $\mathbf{A}(n) = (\alpha_{ij})_{i,j \leq n}$ , where  $D_{\mathbf{A}(n)}$  denotes a Dirichlet distribution on  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices. Here, we have  $\mathbf{X}_t(n) \sim_{\text{iid}} \mu(n) = D_{\mathbf{A}(n)}$ , so requiring the sums of the  $\alpha_{ij}$ ’s to be unbounded as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that  $D_{\mathbf{A}(n)}$  must concentrate around its mean. This together with the *balance* equations above— $\sum_{j \leq n} \alpha_{ij} = \sum_{j \leq n} \alpha_{ji}$  for all  $i \leq n$ —ensure that the limiting distribution of the product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}(n)$  will concentrate around  $\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}'$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

To summarize Theorem 2’s insights, collective intelligence requires dynamic networks to obey the following as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ : (1) the distribution  $\mu(n)$  of each  $\mathbf{X}_t(n)$  should concentrate around its mean  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t(n)]$ , and (2)  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t(n)]$  should behave a lot like a bistochastic matrix.

### 4.2.2 Some Numerical Examples

We start with a simple warm-up example to build intuition for collective intelligence.

**Example 3.** For a constant  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ , consider the following dynamic network

$$\mathbf{X}_t(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}' & \text{with probability } \zeta \\ \mathbf{I}_n & \text{with probability } 1 - \zeta, \end{cases}$$

for all  $t \geq 1$ , where  $\mathbf{I}_n$  is the identity, and  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$  can be arbitrarily correlated. Then,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t(n)] = (1 - \zeta) \mathbf{I}_n + \zeta \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}'$ , and when  $\zeta = 1/2$ , it coincides with the mean in [Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie \(2009, Example 1\)](#). Since each  $\mathbf{X}_t(n)$  is bistochastic, Corollary 2 applies, so  $\pi_i(n) = 1/n$  for all  $i$ . Thus, this dynamic network is collectively intelligent for all  $\zeta \in (0, 1)$  by Theorem 2. Notice that as the randomness vanishes ( $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ ),  $\mathbf{X}_t(n) \rightarrow \mathbf{I}_n$  for all  $t$  and  $n$ , so the network loses the ability to be collectively intelligent.  $\triangle$

The next example shows that the same insights also hold in more complex networks.

**Example 4.** Let  $\mathbf{T}(n)$  be the chain/ring network shown below (e.g., [Touri, 2012](#), Fig. 3.2), where each agent  $i \leq n$  always adopts the belief of agent  $i + 1 \pmod n$ :

$$\mathbf{T}(n) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

When  $n = 2$ , this network is analyzed in [Golub and Jackson \(2010, Example 1\)](#). Since this network does not reach consensus for any  $n$ , it is never collectively intelligent. Let’s now introduce some randomness. At each  $t$ , let’s allow each agent  $i$  to independently give to their own belief a weight  $x_{i,t}$  uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]$ . This yields the interaction matrix

$$\mathbf{X}_t(n) = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,t} & 1 - x_{1,t} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & x_{2,t} & 1 - x_{2,t} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & x_{n-1,t} & 1 - x_{n-1,t} \\ 1 - x_{n,t} & 0 & \dots & 0 & x_{n,t} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid. It is easy to verify that the dynamic network  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies the conditions in [Corollary 4](#) (e.g., [McKinlay, 2014](#), Section 4.1). Since  $\text{Beta}(1, 1)$  is the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ , we have  $r_i = 2$  for all  $i \leq n$ , so  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(n) = (2, \dots, 2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ , and therefore  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(n) \sim D_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}(n)}$  in [Corollary 3](#), i.e., a Dirichlet distribution with parameter  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(n)$ . By [Proposition 2](#), this dynamic network is collectively intelligent because, for all  $i \leq n$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)] = \frac{\varphi_i}{\sum_{j \leq n} \varphi_j} = \frac{2}{2n} = \frac{1}{n} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This example highlights that introducing small random dynamics ( $x_{i,t} \approx 0$ ) can boost collective intelligence.<sup>6</sup> In contrast, when  $x_{i,t} \rightarrow 0$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_t(n)$  approaches  $\mathbf{T}(n)$ , i.e., as random dynamics vanish, the network loses the ability to be collective intelligent.  $\triangle$

These insights are consistent with [Almaatouq et al.’s \(2020\)](#) experimental results, who conclude: “dynamism of the networks has profound effects on the processes taking place on them, allowing networks to become more efficient and enabling them to better adapt to changing environments.” Notice that  $\mathbf{T}(n)$  was sparse in both examples. Thus, these examples (and [Examples 10/13](#)) indicate that randomness tends to be beneficial when many agents are isolated. [Section 6](#) will show that the opposite happens in “well-connected” networks.

---

<sup>6</sup>[Examples 10/13](#) ([Appendix A](#)) show that a more complex dynamic network is also collectively intelligent.

### 4.2.3 Undirected Dynamic Networks

Let  $\mathbf{G}_t(n)$  denote a symmetric connected  $n \times n$  adjacency matrix of an undirected dynamic network, where  $(\mathbf{G}_t(n))_{ij} = 1$  indicates that  $i$  and  $j$  have an undirected link between them at time  $t \geq 1$ , and  $(\mathbf{G}_t(n))_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. Define  $\mathbf{G}(n) = \{\mathbf{G}_t(n)\}_{t \geq 1}$ . Then, let  $d_i(\mathbf{G}(n)) = \sum_{j \leq n} (\mathbf{G}_t(n))_{ij} > 0$  be the (random) *degree*—number of neighbors—of agent  $i$ , for all  $t$ , i.e., degree is assumed to be stationary. Suppose the interaction matrix at  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_t(\mathbf{G}(n))$ , is defined as  $(\mathbf{X}_t(\mathbf{G}(n)))_{ij} = (\mathbf{G}_t(n))_{ij}/d_i(\mathbf{G}(n))$ . Intuitively,  $\mathbf{G}_t(n)$  generates a dynamic network of undirected random connections at time  $t$ , where every agent puts equal weight on all their neighbors at that time. This is a dynamic extension of the deterministic setting studied in Golub and Jackson (2010, Section II.C). For all  $n$ , each entry  $i \leq n$  of the random left eigenvector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(n)$  common to all  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(\mathbf{G}(n))\}_{t \geq 1}$  in Theorem 1.2 takes the simple form

$$\pi_i(n) = \frac{d_i(\mathbf{G}(n))}{\sum_{k \leq n} d_k(\mathbf{G}(n))}.$$

The next result is an extension of Golub and Jackson (2010, Corollary 1), which follows from Theorem 2. It indicates that in undirected networks with random dynamics, the only obstacle to collective intelligence is the disproportionate average popularity of some agents.

**Corollary 5.** *In Theorem 2, let  $\{\mathbf{G}(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of symmetric, connected adjacency matrices. Then, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\{\mathbf{X}_\infty(\mathbf{G}(n))\}_{n \geq 1}$  is collectively intelligent if and only if*

$$\max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{d_i(\mathbf{G}(n))}{\sum_{k \leq n} d_k(\mathbf{G}(n))} \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

## 5 Analysis of Consensus

Since consensus is necessary for collective intelligence, identifying its determinants is critical. We seek to identify novel features of dynamic networks that are most predictive of consensus.

### 5.1 Characterization of Tail Condition

The following characterization of  $(\mathcal{C})$  will play a central role in our ensuing analysis.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid. Then,*

$$\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1} \text{ satisfies } (\mathcal{C}) \text{ if and only if there exists } t \geq 1 \text{ such that } \int_{\Sigma} c(\sigma) d\mu^t(\sigma) < 1.$$

This result is useful because it reveals that determining whether consensus exists in iid networks amounts to examining the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ , which is the *convolution power* of

$\mu$ , denoted  $\mu^t$ , whose description is in Appendices B.II–B.III. The function  $c(\cdot)$  is continuous and satisfies  $c : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$  (Appendix B.IV). The next result simplifies Proposition 3 by indicating that consensus depends only on the support of the initial interaction matrix  $\mathbf{X}_1$ .

**Proposition 4.** *Suppose  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid and  $\mathbb{P}(\min_{ij}(\mathbf{X}_1)_{ij} = 0) < 1$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{C})$  holds.*

Proposition 4 is due to Chamayou and Letac (1994, Proposition 2.2).

**Remark 1.** Unlike the deterministic case, there are several modes of convergence for the random sequence  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  in dynamic cases. Among these modes, the most important one is weak convergence because the quantity of interest is the probability measure of the product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $\psi$ —the weak limit of its probability measure—exists with support  $\Sigma_\psi \subset \Sigma$ . We refer to  $\psi$  as the *limiting distribution* of  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ ; see, Appendix B.III for a characterization of  $(\psi, \Sigma_\psi)$  in the iid case.  $\triangle$

## 5.2 Social Topology and Consensus

We aim to show that easily verifiable features of dynamic networks can help predict consensus. Consider two equal-sized societies, labeled  $X$  and  $Y$ , and their corresponding interaction matrices are  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  and  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ , respectively. When the limiting distributions of their products exist, they are denoted  $\psi_X$  and  $\psi_Y$  with support  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$ , respectively.

**Definition 4** (Social topology). At any time  $t \geq 1$ , two (distinct) equal-sized societies, with  $n \times n$  interaction matrices  $\mathbf{X}_t$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_t$ , respectively, are said to have the same *social topology* when  $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{ij} > 0$  holds if and only if  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{ij} > 0$  holds, for all  $i, j \in N$ .  $\triangle$

Using graph theory terminology, two societies have the same social topology at time  $t$  if their corresponding social networks have the same set of “minimally closed groups” at time  $t$  (Golub and Jackson, 2010, Section A). Alternatively, two social networks have the same social topology at time  $t$  if their interaction matrices  $\mathbf{X}_t$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_t$  have the same “skeleton”—a terminology proposed in Högnäs and Mukherjea (2005). A simple example is the following:  $\mathbf{X}_t = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{1}{t+1} & \frac{1}{t+1} \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{4t} & \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4t} \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  have the same social topology for all  $t \geq 1$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be an iid sequence,  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be another iid sequence, and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ , where  $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathbf{X}_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{Y}_1 \text{ have the same social topology}\}$ . Then,*

(i)  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly if and only if  $\{\mathbf{Y}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly. Moreover, there exist two rank one matrices  $p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $q \in \Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  that have the same social topology.

(ii)  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies  $(\mathcal{C})$  if and only if  $\{\mathbf{Y}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies  $(\mathcal{C})$ .

Theorem 3 shows that within the class of iid networks, the initial social topology completely characterizes consensus. Since satisfying  $(\mathcal{C})$  implies almost sure convergence to consensus (Theorem 1), Theorem 3.(ii) implies Theorem 3.(i), but the converse is not necessarily true. The key to prove Theorem 3.(ii) is the characterization of  $(\mathcal{C})$  in Propositions 3–4. The proof is technical and novel, so a detailed sketch is presented in Appendix B.IV. More generally, Theorem 3 has two novel implications for social learning in dynamic networks:

1. *Predictability*: since consensus is necessary for collective intelligence, the initial interaction matrix can help predict whether a society will be collectively intelligent.
2. *Computation*: we can infer whether consensus exists in an iid network by computing the limiting behavior of a deterministic network that happens to the same initial social topology. This is very convenient because determining whether a product of random stochastic matrices converges is an open problem even when  $n = 2$  (Appendix A.II), whereas it is easy in the deterministic case thanks to Markov chain theory. As Dasaratha (2020) notes, reducing questions about random networks to deterministic calculations is useful for practitioners because they tend to work with random networks.

The next example illustrates the significance of the computation implication above.

**Example 5.** Suppose the interaction matrices of societies  $X$  and  $Y$  at  $t \geq 1$  are, respectively,

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \begin{pmatrix} x_t & 1 - x_t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } \mathbf{Y}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ a.s.,}$$

where  $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is any iid sequence on  $(0, 1)$  and society  $Y$ 's social network is fixed over time as in the standard DeGroot model. Will society  $X$  reach consensus? Without using Theorem 3, it is unclear how to answer this question without computations. We first illustrate that computations are very challenging even though  $n = 2$ , and then will show how Theorem 3 can simplify the analysis. The product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  can be rewritten explicitly as

$$\mathbf{X}^{(t)} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_t & 1 - \alpha_t \\ \beta_t & 1 - \beta_t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_t & 1 - x_t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_{t-1} & 1 - x_{t-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 1 - x_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which can then be written equivalently as the following random difference equation

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_t &= (x_t, 1 - x_t)'(\alpha_{t-1}, \beta_{t-1}) \\ \beta_t &= (0, 1)'(\alpha_{t-1}, \beta_{t-1}), \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \geq 2$ , where  $\alpha_1 = x_1$  and  $\beta_1 = 0$  (Van Assche, 1986, eq. (1.2)). Since this is a  $2 \times 2$  case, we know from Van Assche (1986, Theorem 1) that  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is convergent if and only if  $\mu$  is

not concentrated on  $\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right\}$ , which is not the case here. Thus,  $\alpha_t - \beta_t$  converges almost surely to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and since  $\beta_t = 0$  for all  $t$ , then  $\alpha_t \rightarrow 0$ , so  $p = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

In contrast, we could have inferred the above without computations by noticing that  $\mathbf{X}_1$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_1$  have the same social topology, and noticing that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Y}_1^t = p$ , so  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y} = \{p\}$ . First, Theorem 3.(ii) shows that the limiting matrix in  $X$  is not strictly positive since the limiting matrix  $p$  in  $Y$  is not strictly positive. Second, by Theorem 3.(i),  $\psi_X$  exists because  $\psi_Y$  exists, and moreover,  $\psi_X = \psi_Y = \delta_p$  because  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  is a singleton and  $p^2 = p \in \Sigma_{\psi_Y}$ .  $\triangle$

### 5.3 A Form of Anchoring Bias

Theorem 3 showed that determining whether consensus exists is equivalent to locating the zeros in the initial interaction matrix. This result relied, however, on the interaction matrices being iid. The goal of this section is to show (without assuming iid) that the initial interaction matrix always plays an important role in shaping the beliefs that agents can form over time.

The key object here is the *range* of agents' beliefs defined, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $t \geq 1$ , as

$$\mathcal{I}_t(\omega) = [\min(\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(\omega)), \max(\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(\omega))],$$

where  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(\omega)$  is in eq. (3). Suppose  $\mathbf{X}(\omega) \in \{\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)\}_{t \geq 1}$  is primitive (Golub and Jackson, 2010, Definition 8) and  $t_\epsilon$  denotes the  $\epsilon$ -transient time of  $\mathbf{X}(\omega)$ .<sup>7</sup> Then,  $\mathbf{X}(\omega)$  is said to be *consensus enabling* for  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)\}_{t \geq 1}$  if it happens infinitely many times that  $\mathbf{X}(\omega)$  is chosen at least  $t_\epsilon$  times in a row. This is formalized below (Huang et al., 2019, pp. 4–5).

**Definition 5.** The primitive matrix  $\mathbf{X}(\omega) \in \{\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)\}_{t \geq 1}$  is *consensus enabling* if there exists  $\{\tau_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  such that  $\tau_{k+1} > \tau_k + t_\epsilon$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{\tau_k}(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_{\tau_{k+1}}(\omega) = \dots = \mathbf{X}_{\tau_k + t_\epsilon - 1}(\omega) = \mathbf{X}(\omega)$ .  $\triangle$

Then, the process  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)\}_{t \geq 1}$  is said to be consensus enabling whenever there exists at least one primitive matrix  $\mathbf{X}(\omega) \in \{\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)\}_{t \geq 1}$  that is consensus enabling.

**Proposition 5.** Let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t(\omega)\}_{t \geq 1}$  be consensus enabling. Then, for every  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathcal{I}_{t+1}(\omega) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_t(\omega).$$

We see that the range of possible beliefs shrinks over time. That is, when agents use the DeGroot rule in dynamic networks, their belief adjustments lose flexibility the longer they interact with others. As noted in Huang et al. (2019, Section 7), this is reminiscent of *anchoring bias*, i.e., agents treat their initial opinions of others as “anchors” and then proceed to adjust them over time. Theorem 3 and Proposition 5 therefore highlight that the

---

<sup>7</sup>Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be a primitive stochastic matrix. Then, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $t_\epsilon$  such that for all  $k \geq t_\epsilon$ ,  $\|\mathbf{P}^k - \mathbf{1}\pi_{\mathbf{P}}\| < \epsilon$ , where  $\pi_{\mathbf{P}}$  is the stationary distribution of  $\mathbf{P}$ . Here,  $t_\epsilon$  is called the  $\epsilon$ -transient time of  $\mathbf{P}$ .

initial structure of a dynamic network plays a central role in shaping long-term beliefs. This suggests that *early* interventions are more likely to be effective because they may exploit the flexibility of initial beliefs. Thus, these insights may guide a planner who aims to design and implement policy interventions in dynamic networks (e.g., Banerjee et al., 2019, 2024).

## 6 Medium-Run Analysis

The medium-run is important because as Golub and Sadler (2017) remark: “For practical purposes, consensus is often irrelevant unless it is reached reasonably quickly.” We therefore analyze the medium-run behavior to highlight some adverse effects of random dynamics.

### 6.1 Setup and Examples

To compare deterministic and dynamic networks, let’s parameterize randomness *locally* around a fixed network  $\mathbf{T}$ . Let  $\mathbf{T} = (T_{ij})_{i,j \in N}$ , where  $T_{ij} > 0$  for all  $i, j$ , with influence vector  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ . Now, during the transition  $t - 1 \rightarrow t$ , the network  $\mathbf{T}$  suffers random perturbations such that it is replaced by a random network  $\mathbf{X}_t$ . Formally, define the matrix  $\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon = (\varepsilon s_i T_{ij})_{i,j \in N}$  whose rows and columns are all equal to  $(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \varepsilon(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is a constant. Then, let  $\mathbf{X}_t \sim D_{\mathbf{A}_\varepsilon}$ , i.e., each row  $(\mathbf{X}_t)_i \sim D_{\varepsilon \mathbf{s}}$  is independent across all  $i$  and  $t$ . It follows that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t] = \mathbf{T}$  for all  $t$ , and the parameter  $\varepsilon$  measures the degree of randomness around  $\mathbf{T}$ , i.e., larger values of  $\varepsilon$  lead to smaller fluctuations around  $\mathbf{T}$  (see, Chamayou and Letac, 1994, p. 425). Notably, this model meets the conditions in Corollary 4, where  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = \varepsilon \mathbf{s}$ , so the random influence vector satisfies  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \sim D_{\varepsilon \mathbf{s}}$ . As  $\varepsilon$  grows, this Dirichlet distribution approaches a unit mass on the influence vector  $\mathbf{s}$  of the fixed network  $\mathbf{T}$ . That is,  $D_{\varepsilon \mathbf{s}}$  is a mean-preserving spread of a unit mass on  $\mathbf{s}$ . Thus, for every  $\beta > 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \leq n} |\pi_i - s_i| > \beta\right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon \beta^2} \left(1 - \sum_{i \leq n} s_i^2\right)$$

by Chebyshev’s inequality. Now, suppose the fixed network  $\mathbf{T}$  is collectively intelligent. Then,  $\max_{i \leq n} s_i \rightarrow 0$ , so the upper bound above converges to the constant  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon \beta^2} > 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

— *Interpretation:* Since  $\mathbf{T}$  is a strictly positive matrix, the analysis above highlights that introducing random dynamics may prevent collective intelligence when a network is well-connected. This contrasts the conclusion from Section 4.2.2 where networks were sparse.

**Example 6** (Speed of convergence). We now demonstrate that the effect of random dynamics on the speed of convergence is nuanced even in the simplest case where  $n = 2$ . Here, the random influence vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi, 1 - \pi)$  satisfies  $\pi \sim \text{Beta}(\varepsilon s_i, \varepsilon(1 - s_i))$ . For ease, suppose



$s_i = 1/2$  so that the limiting distribution is symmetric  $\text{Beta}(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ , which happens when  $\mathbf{T}$  is either (i)  $\begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}$  or (ii)  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 1-a \\ 1-a & a \end{pmatrix}$  for any  $a \in (0, 1)$ . Let's analyze cases (i) and (ii) to identify settings where random dynamics can be beneficial or detrimental for social learning.

- (i) Suppose  $\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}$ , i.e., Ann and Bob agree before ever encountering each other. This network is well-connected and hence converges to consensus immediately. Thus, introducing random dynamics  $\varepsilon > 0$  will trivially slow down the speed of convergence, i.e.,  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  always converges to  $\mathbf{1}\pi$  at a slower rate than  $\mathbf{T}^{(t)}$  converges to  $\mathbf{1}\mathbf{s}$ .
- (ii) Suppose  $\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 1-a \\ 1-a & a \end{pmatrix}$ . For values of  $a$  near 0 or 1, this network becomes sparse, so it converges very slowly. In such cases, there exist values of  $\varepsilon < 2$  for which the dynamic network converges at a much faster rate. The upper bound  $\varepsilon = 2$  exists because it yields the *slowest* speed of convergence for the dynamic network (see, Corollary 6).  $\triangle$

### 6.1.1 Speed of Convergence

For any stochastic matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 1-a \\ b & 1-b \end{pmatrix}$ , the second largest eigenvalue is  $\lambda_2(a, b) = a - b$  (see, Jackson, 2008, pp. 244–246). Now, denote the random interaction matrix as  $\mathbf{X}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_t & 1-\alpha_t \\ \beta_t & 1-\beta_t \end{pmatrix}$ , and let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be iid. That is,  $\{(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2), \dots\}$  is an iid sequence with distribution  $\mu(x, y) = \mathbb{P}(\alpha_t \leq x, \beta_t \leq y)$ . Denote the random product as  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)} = \begin{pmatrix} x_t & 1-x_t \\ y_t & 1-y_t \end{pmatrix}$ . For notation, let  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 1-a \\ b & 1-b \end{pmatrix}$  be identified by  $(a, b)$  (Appendix B.III: Example 14). Then, for any  $\phi > 0$ , define

$$t_\phi = \max\{t \in \mathbb{N} : |x_t - y_t| \geq \phi\}$$

as the random variable that counts the number of periods needed to come close to consensus.

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be an iid sequence, where  $n = 2$  and  $\mu$  is not concentrated on  $\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Then, as  $\phi \rightarrow 0$ , (i)  $\frac{1}{\log \phi} t_\phi \rightarrow -I_\mu^{-1}$  a.s., and (ii)  $\frac{1}{\log \phi} \mathbb{E}[t_\phi] \rightarrow -I_\mu^{-1}$ , where*

$$I_\mu = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \log \frac{1}{|\lambda_2(x, y)|} d\mu(x, y).$$

This result is intuitive. It shows that to compute the convergence time in a dynamic network with two agents, it suffices to compute a  $\mu$ -average of the convergence time of a fixed network  $\mathbf{T}$ , which is proportional to  $-1/\log|\lambda_2(\mathbf{T})|$  (Golub and Jackson, 2010, p. 132).<sup>8</sup> Averaging occurs because the second largest eigenvalue in dynamic networks is random.

Suppose we further assume that  $\alpha_t$  and  $\beta_t$  are iid for all  $t$ , i.e., Ann and Bob choose their weights independently from the same distribution given by  $\mu(x, y) = \mu(x)\mu(y)$ . Then,  $I_\mu$  in Proposition 6 is known as the *logarithmic energy* of the distribution  $\mu$ . In this special case, the distribution  $\mu$  that yields the slowest convergence rate to consensus is not degenerate.

<sup>8</sup>Recall that to achieve an error  $\phi > 0$ , the convergence time of  $\mathbf{T}$  is proportional to  $-(\log \phi)/\log|\lambda_2(\mathbf{T})|$ .

**Corollary 6.** *In Proposition 6, suppose  $\alpha_t$  and  $\beta_t$  are iid for all  $t$ . Then, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  converges most slowly to  $\mathbf{1}\pi$  when  $\mu$  is the arcsine distribution on  $[0, 1]$ . Moreover, the influence vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi, 1 - \pi)$  exists a.s., and  $\pi$  is uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]$ .*

Intuitively, the *arcsine* (or Frostman) distribution has the smallest energy on  $[0, 1]$  (Ullman, 1972, Theorem 3.1.(a)), and convergence time is inversely proportional to  $I_\mu$ . Then,  $\pi \sim \text{Beta}(1, 1)$  holds by Corollary 4 since the arcsine distribution is  $\text{Beta}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ , so  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = (1, 1)$ .

## 6.2 Disagreement

To give a simple illustration of how random dynamics can cause disagreement, let's analyze Example 6.(ii), where  $\mathbf{T} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 1-a \\ 1-a & a \end{pmatrix}$  or  $\mathbf{T} = (a, 1 - a)$ . Suppose we introduce the following local randomness around  $\mathbf{T}$ . Let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be an iid network where  $\mu$  puts mass  $a$  on  $(1, 0)$  and  $1 - a$  on  $(0, 1)$ , then  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t] = \mathbf{T}$ . Chakraborty and Rao (1998, Section 2) show that, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\psi$ —the limiting distribution of  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ —exists and puts equal mass on  $(1, 0)$  and  $(0, 1)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}_\psi[\mathbf{X}^{(\infty)}] = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}' = \mathbf{T}^\infty$ . Thus, in the long-run, Ann and Bob agree on average as in network  $\mathbf{T}$  but disagree almost surely due to randomness. A more formal analysis of disagreement requires more technical details, so it is relegated to Online Appendix A.

## 6.3 Comparative Statics: deterministic, stationary, iid networks

We now want to compare different types of dynamic networks. At one extreme, (1) there is the class of iid networks (Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie, 2008). At the other extreme, (2) there is the class of deterministic networks (Golub and Jackson, 2010). (3) Our stationary networks therefore serve as an intermediate class of networks between these two extremes. As the interaction matrices become more correlated, our framework approaches (2), whereas when they become less correlated, our framework approaches (1). Thus, our framework bridges the gap between the two most prominent models in the literature. The rest of this section offers some new comparative statics by interpolating between these two extremes.

- (1) For any deterministic network  $\mathbf{T}$ , convergence time is proportional to  $-1/\log|\lambda_2(\mathbf{T})|$ .
- (2) For any iid network  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  that satisfies the technical conditions in Assumption 1, convergence time is roughly proportional to  $-1/\log|\lambda_2(\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t])|$  (see, Corollary 7). This indicates that iid networks will typically converge faster than deterministic networks—the mean matrix  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t]$  has fewer zero entries than any  $\mathbf{X}_t$  because it averages non-negative values and hence more mixing will occur, which then boots convergence speed.

- (3) For stationary networks, it is perhaps natural to guess that their convergence time will more or less lie somewhere between  $-1/\log|\lambda_2(\mathbf{T})|$  and  $-1/\log|\lambda_2(\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t])|$ . As the next example shows, this intuition is not incorrect—there are natural settings where the speed of convergence in stationary networks is faster than in iid networks.

**Example 7.** At each  $t \geq 1$ , suppose every agent receives a revision opportunity with probability  $\xi \in [0, 1]$ . When an agent receives a revision opportunity, she samples some of her neighbors, re-evaluates the weights that she assigned to them in the past, and updates these weights according to a random procedure.<sup>9</sup> All such revisions form an iid sequence of random stochastic matrices  $\{\mathbf{\Xi}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ , and therefore the interaction matrices evolve according to

$$\mathbf{X}_t = (1 - \xi)\mathbf{X}_{t-1} + \xi\mathbf{\Xi}_t, \quad (4)$$

for  $t \geq 1$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{T}$ . This is reminiscent of an autoregressive process of order 1. (1) At one extreme, if  $\xi = 1$ , then  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid (because  $\{\mathbf{\Xi}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid). (2) At the other extreme, if  $\xi = 0$ , then  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{T}$  for all  $t \geq 0$  as in the standard DeGroot model. (3) For any  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is stationary. Here,  $\xi$  measures the *persistence* (or stickiness) of weights over time, which allows us to interpolate between the two extreme networks. Notice that, by construction (eq. (4)), the matrices in  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  are  $\xi$ -mixtures of  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\{\mathbf{\Xi}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ . Thus, for moderate values of  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ , the speed of convergence in the stationary process  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  in eq. (4) is faster than in the deterministic network  $\mathbf{T}$  and iid network  $\{\mathbf{\Xi}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ .  $\triangle$

To summarize, this section has demonstrated that stationary networks are more flexible than both deterministic and iid networks, which makes them more conducive for social learning.

## 7 Discussions: some intuitions and other details

This section discusses key aspects of our model that may provide insights for future research. Sections 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3, discuss, respectively, our framework, consensus, and stationarity.

### 7.1 Framework

Our dynamical system approach is consistent with the social psychology literature (e.g., Vallacher and Nowak, 1994), which also relies on dynamical systems to study social processes. The fact that we allow the interaction matrices to keep changing over time is natural and captures many real-life phenomena. For example, it captures one of the key distortions

---

<sup>9</sup>This example can be interpreted as an evolutionary extension of the standard DeGroot learning inspired by the “sampling best-response dynamics” literature (e.g., Oyama et al., 2015).

caused by relocation in the MTO experiment because, as [Katz et al. \(2001, p. 638\)](#) remark, “It may take a significant amount of time in new neighborhoods to develop new networks.”

The key to our framework is stationarity, which implies that  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  are identically distributed according to  $\mu$ . [Section 7.3](#) shows that stationarity holds in very general settings, which justifies its prevalence in random matrix theory (e.g., [Hennion, 1997](#)). More importantly, our generating process allows arbitrary dependence among the interaction matrices. Such dependence may reflect *endogenous* processes capturing feedback mechanisms that are well suited for settings where social networks vary over time due to strategic considerations ([Almaatouq et al., 2020](#)). However, for tractability, we often follow the existing literature by assuming iid networks. This is not very restrictive practically because a prominent source of iid dynamics is random matching such as the random treatment assignment in MTO.

Even in the absence of external sources of randomness such as strategic motives (e.g., competition for influence), random matching, and infrequent communications, random dynamics would still arise in social networks due to internal factors such as [Kahneman et al.’s \(2021\) occasion noise](#). [Kahneman et al. \(2021, Chapter 7\)](#) report that people’s judgments are subject to behavioral biases, which lead people to random mistakes when repeating the same task over time—here the task is to assign weights to neighbors’ opinions.<sup>10</sup>

## 7.2 Consensus

The tail condition ( $\mathcal{C}$ ) is intuitive—it requires that all agents eventually pay attention to their own and others’ opinions. Interestingly, ( $\mathcal{C}$ ) has yet to be relaxed in the literature on products of random matrices. [Hennion \(1997, Section 1.6\)](#) anticipated this by noting: “As far as I know, stationarity and ( $\mathcal{C}$ ) are the weakest conditions that have been considered when dealing with random products of positive matrices in order to establish limit theorems.” Hence, ( $\mathcal{C}$ ) has become the standard assumption, e.g., [Kesten and Spitzer \(1984, H<sub>1</sub>\)](#), [Cohn et al. \(1993, Proposition 2\)](#), [Hennion and Hervé \(2008\)](#), and [McKinlay \(2014, \(C2\)\)](#).

Computing the distribution of the influence vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  in closed form remains an open problem in the literature (see, [Appendix A.II](#)). Even in the simplest case where  $n = 2$  and the network is iid, all that is known is that the distribution of  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is a solution to an integral equation ([Van Assche, 1986, Theorem 1, eq. \(2.1\)](#)), which is only solvable in very few cases.

**Remark 2.** [Hennion \(1997\)](#) assumes  $\Sigma$  is the set of *allowable* nonnegative matrices ([Seneta, 1981, Definition 3.1](#)), i.e., every row and column contains at least one strictly positive entry.

---

<sup>10</sup>They note: “The variability we observe in judgments of the same problem by the same person is not a fluke observed in a few highly specialized problems: occasion noise affects all our judgments, all the time.”

For stochastic matrices, only the column constraint is restrictive. The proof of [Cohn et al. \(1993, Proposition 2\)](#) shows that stationarity and  $(\mathcal{C})$  imply that  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  are allowable almost surely. This is not practically restrictive, however, because it only rules out networks containing “isolated” nodes—agents that nobody (including themselves) listens to.  $\triangle$

### 7.2.1 Convergence to Consensus

There exist settings where the speed of convergence in dynamic networks depends on the second largest eigenvalue of the mean. This section imposes assumptions to capture this.

**Assumption 1.** Set  $\Sigma$  and  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \theta)$ , respectively, equal to  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  and  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\theta})$  where:

1.  $\tilde{\Sigma} = \{\text{set of stochastic matrices with strictly positive } \textit{diagonal} \text{ entries}\};$
2.  $\tilde{\Omega} = \{\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) : \omega_j \in \tilde{\Sigma} \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{N}\};$
3.  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \times \dots$ , where  $\mathcal{B}$  is the Borel sigma-algebra on  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ ;
4.  $\tilde{\theta} : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$  is the *shift map*, i.e., the ergodic map  $\tilde{\theta}(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \dots)$ .  $\triangle$

This assumption is discussed in Section 7.3.1. Let  $\lambda_k(\sigma)$  denote the  $k$ -th (largest) eigenvalue of any  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{X}} := \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{X}_t]$  denote the average interaction matrix, which is time-invariant by stationarity. Define  $\bar{\lambda}_k := \lambda_k(\bar{\mathbf{X}})$  and  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  as the supremum norm.

**Proposition 7.** *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is convergent and the limiting random product  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  has rank one a.s.
- $|\bar{\lambda}_2| < 1$ .

Proposition 7 is due to [Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie \(2009, Theorem 3\)](#). It characterizes the long-run behavior of beliefs in terms of average dynamics—captured by the average interaction matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ . This is very convenient because it indicates that we can analyze the medium-run behavior of a subclass of dynamic networks by applying insights from deterministic networks, where the second largest eigenvalue plays a central role. It is easier to understand this when the interaction matrices are iid ([Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie, 2008, Theorem 3](#)). Define the average belief dynamics as  $\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)} := \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbf{p}^{(t)}]$ .

**Corollary 7.** *In Proposition 7, let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be iid. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is convergent and the limiting random product  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  has rank one a.s.

- $\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}^t \mathbf{p}^{(0)}$  converges to a consensus limit for all values of  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}$ .
- $|\bar{\lambda}_2| < 1$ .

We notice from this result that analyzing the random dynamics  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{X}^{(t)} \mathbf{p}^{(0)}$  in eq. (3) is equivalent to analyzing the average dynamics  $\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}^t \mathbf{p}^{(0)}$ , which is a deterministic process. The medium-run behavior can therefore be analyzed using a simple result.

**Corollary 8.** *In Corollary 7, consider the average belief dynamics  $\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}^t \mathbf{p}^{(0)}$ . Then,*

$$\frac{1}{2} |\bar{\lambda}_2|^t - (n-2) |\bar{\lambda}_3|^t \leq \sup_{\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in [0,1]^n} \|\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(\infty)}\|_{\infty} \leq (n-1) |\bar{\lambda}_2|^t.$$

This result is well-known in the standard DeGroot literature (Golub and Sadler, 2017, Proposition 8 and footnote 23). In words, it shows that  $|\bar{\lambda}_2|^t$  is an accurate estimate of how much deviation from consensus some iid networks permit at time  $t$ . Then, the next result shows that, in iid networks, the speed of convergence is *uniform* across all initial signals.

**Proposition 8.** *Assume  $(\mathcal{C})$ ,  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid, and  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)} \in [0,1]^n$  is any unit vector. Then, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{X}^{(t)} \mathbf{p}^{(0)}$  converges a.s. to a random unit vector  $\mathbf{p}^{(\infty)}$ , uniformly in  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}$ .*

### 7.3 Stationarity

Thus far, we have assumed that the dynamical system that generates the interaction matrices is stationary. The next result shows that stationarity is not very restrictive—a unique invariant probability measure exists in a more abstract space under mild assumptions.

**Proposition 9.** *Let  $S$  be a compact metric space, and  $\{C_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be a countable collection of contraction maps from  $S$  to itself. Then, there exists a unique invariant probability measure  $\mu$  on the Borel subsets of  $S$  that satisfies the following fixed-point equation*

$$\mu(B) = \sum_{t \geq 1} \beta_t \mu(C_t^{-1}(B)),$$

for any Borel set  $B \subset \Sigma$ , where  $\sum_{t \geq 1} \beta_t = 1$  and  $\beta_t \geq 0$ , for all  $t$ . Moreover, the support of  $\mu$  is the unique compact set  $S_{\mu} \subset S$  that satisfies  $S_{\mu} = \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t \geq 1} C_t(S_{\mu}))$ .

Intuitively,  $C_t$  can be interpreted as the agents’ “joint best-response” function at time  $t$  and  $S$  as the strategy space. In our context, the agents best-respond at each  $t$  by choosing the weights to assign to one another, which, when collected all together, results in  $C_t$ —the interaction matrix at time  $t$ . Then, when each joint best-response function  $C_t$  is a

contraction, Proposition 9 states that there exists a unique “equilibrium” distribution on the strategy space.<sup>11</sup> The next example illustrates how to apply Proposition 9 in our framework.

**Example 8.** Set  $S = \Sigma$ . Then, let  $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots$  be an iid sequence of random stochastic matrices taking values in the set of contraction maps  $\{C_t\}_{t \leq \tau}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_1 = C_t) = \beta_t \geq 0$ , for  $t = 1, \dots, \tau$ ,  $\sum_{t \leq \tau} \beta_t = 1$ , and any  $\tau \geq 1$ . The support  $S_\mu = \Sigma_\mu$  in Proposition 9 becomes

$$\Sigma_\mu = \left\{ \sigma \in \Sigma : \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{(\tau)} \in \mathcal{O}(\sigma) \text{ i.o.}) = 1, \forall \text{ open set } \mathcal{O}(\sigma) \ni \sigma \right\},$$

which is often referred to as the *attractor* of the contracting system  $\{C_t\}_{t \leq \tau}$  and “i.o.” stands for “infinitely often.” That is,  $\Sigma_\mu$  is the smallest closed subset of  $\Sigma$  such that  $\mu(\Sigma_\mu) = 1$ .  $\triangle$

### 7.3.1 A Special Case of Stationarity

Assumption 1 (due to Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie (2009)) will be useful in this section. Under this assumption, eq. (1) becomes  $\mathbf{X}_t(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_0 \circ \tilde{\theta}^t(\omega) = \omega_{t+1}$ , for  $t \geq 0$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_0 : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$  is the first-coordinate map  $\mathbf{X}_0(\omega) = \omega_1$ , for any  $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) \in \tilde{\Omega}$ , and the the state space  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is now a bit more intuitive because it is now the set of all paths. Thus, Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie’s (2009) framework is a special case of our framework when Assumption 1 is imposed. In this special case, consensus has a simple graph theoretic interpretation: it is equivalent to the expected graph of the network containing a directed spanning tree. That is, when  $|\bar{\lambda}_2| < 1$ , there exists a sequence  $\{t_j : j \geq 1\}$  such that the graphs  $\{\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}_{t_j+1}), \dots, \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}_{t_{j+1}})\}$  are infinitely often jointly connected almost surely.<sup>12</sup>

The most restrictive condition in Assumption 1 is 1.1 (see, Remark 3). It rules out the standard DeGroot model which allows zeros on the diagonal (e.g., Golub and Jackson, 2010, Example 2). It also rules out a large class of settings where it is important to allow matrices to have zeros on the diagonal. Popular instances arise when networks are modeled using *directed acyclic graphs* (DAGs), which are graphs that do not contain self-loops (e.g., citation graphs), so their interaction matrices have zero diagonal entries. Thus, our more general framework (Section 2.2) and consensus result (Theorem 1) complement Tahbaz-Salehi and Jadbabaie’s (2009) framework in applied settings where the latter is silent.<sup>13</sup> As summarized by Proposition 7, the main take-away of their framework is that consensus is completely determined by the average behavior of the dynamic network. Our framework shows that when their as-

---

<sup>11</sup>This intuition is somewhat reminiscent of the global games studied in Mathevet (2010), where contraction of the joint best-response function also yields a unique equilibrium.

<sup>12</sup>Let  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{X}_t)$  denote the graph corresponding to  $\mathbf{X}_t$ , which is a weighted directed graph on  $N$ .

<sup>13</sup>The gossip and distributed optimization literature constitute special cases of our framework because they assume iid and bistochastic matrices. There, agents are typically sensors or power systems, so random dynamics arises due to link failures, delays, and packet drops; see, Yang et al. (2019) for a recent survey.

assumptions are relaxed, the average behavior no longer suffices for consensus, so we introduced condition  $(\mathcal{E})$  to discipline the tails of the dynamic network.<sup>14</sup>

**Remark 3.** The assumption that  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  have strictly positive diagonal entries in Proposition 7 is technically restrictive (Assumption 1.1). This is because, in the iid case, it is known that the product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  converges weakly when each  $\mathbf{X}_t$  has at least  $n - 1$  strictly positive entries (Dhar and Mukherjea, 1997, Theorem 1). This condition cannot be relaxed to  $n - 2$ , however, due to the case where  $n = 2$  and  $\mu$  is a unit mass on the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , which is periodic and hence not convergent (Golub and Jackson, 2010, Example 1). Touri and Nedić (2013) show that Assumption 1.1 implies a condition called “strong aperiodicity.”  $\triangle$

## 8 Concluding Remarks

### 8.1 Related Literature

This paper builds on the naïve social learning literature (or *non*-Bayesian learning), which dates back to French (1956). The DeGroot model (DeGroot, 1974), named after the statistician Morris H. DeGroot, is the canonical model of decentralized communication among naïve agents. It consists of agents who acquire noisy signals of the true state of the world and naïvely update their beliefs by repeatedly taking (the *same*) weighted averages of their neighbors’ beliefs, i.e., the network is exogenously fixed over time. Aside from its elegance and simplicity, this model is also popular because there is considerable experimental evidence that it best fits the aggregation rules of most people in practice (e.g., Corazzini et al., 2012; Brandts et al., 2015; Grimm and Mengel, 2020; Chandrasekhar et al., 2020).<sup>15</sup>

DeMarzo et al. (2003) apply the DeGroot model in social networks, where bounded rationality (e.g., persuasion bias) is used to justify why agents use the same weights over time. The more recent literature builds on Golub and Jackson’s (2010) framework. For instance, Molavi et al. (2018) propose an axiomatic foundation of the DeGroot model. Banerjee et al. (2021) extend the DeGroot model to settings where some agents may be initially uniformed. Cerreia-Vioglio et al. (2024) consider applications of updating rules represented by nonlinear opinion aggregators. Dasaratha et al. (2023) study settings where the state of the world

---

<sup>14</sup>Section 6.2 shows a network whose average is strictly positive, but there is no consensus—agents disagree.

<sup>15</sup>In contrast, agents in Bayesian social learning models are Bayesian statisticians (Bala and Goyal, 1998; Acemoglu et al., 2011). These models are considered the “gold standard” for understanding rational learning. However, they assume a lot of rationality on the part of agents, so they are often viewed as models of how people *should* learn rather than how people actually *do* learn. Importantly, these Bayesian models are complex except for simple examples making them prohibitive in real-world applications (Breza et al., 2019).



changes over time. [Polanski and Vega-Redondo \(2023\)](#) allow homophily and influence to co-evolve endogenously. [Banerjee and Compte \(2024\)](#) use the insights of [Friedkin and Johnsen \(1990\)](#) to introduce noisy information transmissions in social networks and study when consensus and disagreement would arise in strategic settings. Notably, all these papers assume that the underlying social network is exogenously fixed over time.

[Huang et al. \(2019\)](#) rely on a stylized framework to obtain the negative answer noted in the Introduction. Online Appendix B shows that their failures of the wisdom of crowds occur for at least one technical reason: they assume the support of the distribution that generates the random interaction matrices is finite. We find that in such cases, there exist examples where even consensus is unlikely to exist. We then show that when this finiteness restriction is relaxed, consensus exists on *average*, irrespective of the network size.

## 8.2 Conclusion

We introduced random network dynamics in DeGroot learning to study the robustness of social learning outcomes. Random dynamics are inevitable in social networks because they originate from both external (e.g., strategic network formation) and internal (e.g., occasion noise) sources. We show that random dynamics have double-edged effects: they can be either beneficial or detrimental depending on the social structure. We obtain all these insights by building on random matrix theory, which allows us to propose a general framework that nests most of the existing models in the literature. Notably, our model offers a spectrum of dynamic networks whose extreme cases are the deterministic and iid networks. This allows us to examine which classes of dynamic networks are most conducive for social learning.

We also show that the initial social structure of a dynamic network plays a key role in determining long-term beliefs. Thus, our results can provide guidance to the literature that relies on insights from the DeGroot model (e.g., centrality measures) to carry out interventions in networks. Our appendices contain further details. Appendix A analyzes many numerical examples of dynamic networks. Online Appendix A shows that the presence of random dynamics suffices to explain both consensus and long-term disagreement within DeGroot learning. Online Appendix C builds on [Mailath and Samuelson \(2020\)](#) and [Ghosh and Khan \(2021\)](#) to illustrate how to introduce network formation in our framework.

## Appendix A: Other Numerical Examples

This appendix illustrates several numerical examples of dynamic networks. Appendix A.I presents the examples and Appendix A.II explores their limiting behavior.

## A.I Setup of Numerical Examples

There are two categories of dynamic/time-dependent interaction matrices: they can either be deterministic or random. We illustrate simple examples in each category.

– *Deterministic setting*: [Chatterjee and Seneta \(1977\)](#) characterize the convergence of products of deterministic time-dependent interaction matrices. This could happen if, for example, all the agents are “open minded” in the sense that they tend to allocate equal weight to all their peers’ opinions (including themselves) over time, i.e.,  $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{ij} \rightarrow 1/n$  deterministically, for all  $i, j \in N$ , as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . A more sophisticated example of deterministic interaction matrices is due to [DeMarzo et al. \(2003, eq. \(5\)\)](#), where for all  $t$

$$\mathbf{X}_t = (1 - \lambda_t)\mathbf{I}_n + \lambda_t\mathbf{T}. \quad (5)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{I}_n$  denotes the  $n \times n$  identity matrix and  $\lambda_t \in (0, 1]$  is deterministic for all  $t$ . When  $\lambda_t = 1$  for all  $t$ , we recover the standard DeGroot model where  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{T}$  for all  $t$ . When  $\lambda_t = (1 + \frac{k}{1+k}t)^{-1}$ , for a constant  $k$ , [DeMarzo et al. \(2003, footnote 19\)](#) interpret this as capturing the agents having “increased self-confidence”.

– *Random setting*. We start with simple  $2 \times 2$  examples, then move to the  $n \times n$  case.

**Example 9** ( $2 \times 2$ ). Consider two dynamic networks: (1) when the matrix  $\mathbf{X}_0$  is either

$$\begin{pmatrix} x & 1-x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1-x & x \end{pmatrix}$$

with equal probability for a constant  $x \in (0, 1)$  and the  $\mathbf{X}_t$ ’s are iid with  $\mathbf{X}_0$  for  $t \geq 1$ , and an interpretation is given shortly below. (2) For each  $t \geq 1$ , let the matrix  $\mathbf{X}_t$  be

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \begin{pmatrix} a_t & 1-a_t \\ b_t & 1-b_t \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $x^{-1}a_t \sim \text{Bern}(p_a)$  and  $x^{-1}b_t \sim \text{Bern}(p_b)$  are Bernoulli random variables with (distinct) parameters  $p_a, p_b \in (0, 1)$  for all  $t$  and a constant  $x \in (0, 1/2]$ .<sup>16</sup>  $\triangle$

**Example 10** ( $n \times n$ ). The following example is due to [McKinlay \(2014, Section 4.1\)](#). It is similar to the dynamic network in Section 4.2.2 but allows correlations across rows:

$$\mathbf{X}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} x & 1-x & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1}_{x \geq \frac{1}{2}} & 1 - \mathbb{1}_{x \geq \frac{1}{2}} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \mathbb{1}_{x \geq \frac{1}{2}} & 1 - \mathbb{1}_{x \geq \frac{1}{2}} \\ 1 - \mathbb{1}_{x \geq \frac{1}{2}} & 0 & \dots & 0 & \mathbb{1}_{x \geq \frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix},$$

<sup>16</sup>That is,  $a_t \sim p_a\delta_x + (1 - p_a)\delta_0$  and  $b_t \sim p_b\delta_x + (1 - p_b)\delta_0$ , for all  $t$ , where  $\delta_z$  is the unit mass at any  $z$ .

where  $x \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$  and the  $\mathbf{X}_t$ 's are iid with  $\mathbf{X}_0$  for  $t \geq 1$ . This network can be interpreted as follows. At time  $t \geq 0$ , agent 1, acting as a “leader” (or “first mover”), allocates a uniform proportion of her attention to agent 2. If this proportion is greater than  $1/2$ , then all other agents pay no attention to their peers. If instead the proportion is less than or equal to  $1/2$ , then each other agent  $i \neq 1$  pays full attention to her neighboring peer  $i + 1 \pmod{n}$ . This example captures the so-called “two-step communication” process where some agents may operate as “opinion leaders” and others as “opinion followers” (see, [Katz et al., 2017](#)).  $\triangle$

## A.II Analysis of Numerical Examples

This appendix revisits all the numerical examples above to study their limiting properties.

**Example 11.** When  $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{ij} \rightarrow 1/n$  for all  $i, j \in N$ , as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , then it is easy to see that consensus is reached (e.g., [Chatterjee and Seneta, 1977](#), Theorem 5’s Corollary). When instead  $\mathbf{X}_t = (1 - \lambda_t)\mathbf{I}_n + \lambda_t\mathbf{T}$  (eq. (5)), [DeMarzo et al. \(2003, Theorem 1\)](#) show that consensus is reached when  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \lambda_t = \infty$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  is strongly connected.  $\triangle$

**Example 12** ( $2 \times 2$ , revisited). (1) The limiting distribution  $\psi$  exists and  $\pi \sim G$  denotes agent 1’s influence. The distribution  $G$  (with respect to  $\psi$ ) uniquely solves the functional equation  $G(\pi) = \frac{1}{2}G\left(\frac{\pi}{x}\right) + \frac{1}{2}G\left(\frac{\pi - (1-x)}{x}\right)$ , where  $G(0) = 0$ ,  $G(1) = 1$  ([Mukherjea and Nakassis, 2002](#), eq. (1.2)). Solving this equation is an open problem known as Erdős problem ([Erdős, 1939](#)). Some special cases are known. [Solomyak \(1995\)](#) finds that  $G$  is absolutely continuous for almost all  $x \in (1/2, 1)$ . When  $x = 1/2$ ,  $G = \mathcal{U}[0, 1]$ . For  $x < 1/2$ ,  $G$  is continuous singular, e.g., when  $x = 1/3$ ,  $G$  is the Cantor distribution ( $\Sigma_\psi$  is the Cantor set). This shows that it is not even clear when  $G$  is discrete, continuous singular, or absolutely continuous. This remark dates back to [Rosenblatt \(1965, eq. \(47\)\)](#), and yet it remains an open problem.

(2) Here,  $\Sigma_\mu = \{v_{0,0}, v_{0,x}, v_{x,0}, v_{x,x}\}$  and each element has probability (according to  $\mu$ )  $p_{00}, p_{01}, p_{10}, p_{11}$ , respectively, where  $p_{10} + p_{11} = p_a$ ,  $p_{01} + p_{11} = p_b$ ,  $v_{s,r} = \binom{s}{r} \frac{1-s}{1-r}$ , and define  $v_s := v_{s,s}$ . Then,  $\psi$  exists and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)} = \left(\frac{\pi}{\pi} \frac{1-\pi}{1-\pi}\right)$  exists, so if  $x = 1$ ,  $\pi \in \{0, 1\}$ , then  $\psi\{v_0\} = \frac{p_{00}(1-p_{10}) + p_{11}p_{01}}{(1-p_{10})^2 - p_{01}^2}$ . When  $x \in (0, 1/2]$ ,  $\Sigma_\psi \subset \{v_\pi : \pi \in [0, x]\}$ , where for  $\pi \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\psi\{v_0\} = \frac{p_{00}}{1-p_{10}}$ ,  $\psi\{v_x\} = \frac{p_{11}(1-p_{10}) + p_{00}p_{01}}{1-p_{10}}$ , and for  $\pi \in (0, x)$  with  $\psi\{v_\pi\} > 0$ ,  $\psi\{v_\pi\} = p_{10}\psi\{v_{\pi/x}\} + p_{01}\psi\{v_{1-\pi/x}\}$  (see, [Chakraborty and Mukherjea, 2014, Section 2](#)).  $\triangle$

**Example 13** ( $n \times n$ , revisited). In [Example 10](#), notice that [Corollary 4](#) cannot be applied because the rows are correlated. However, this dynamic network surprisingly has the same limiting distribution as the second example in [Section 4.2.2](#) (see, [McKinlay, 2014, Section 4.1, Example 2](#)). It therefore follows by [Corollary 3](#) that the distribution of the influence

vector satisfies  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \sim D_{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$ , i.e., a Dirichlet distribution with parameter  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = (2, \dots, 2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ . Thus, this dynamic network is also collectively intelligent by Proposition 2.  $\triangle$

A unifying theme in all the above examples is that random dynamics in social networks renders the computation of consensus and the limiting distribution of the influence vector very challenging (even when  $n = 2$ ). This is an active research area in random matrix theory.

## Appendix B: Review of Technical Details

This appendix reviews the key mathematical details that are needed to formalize our framework. The key concept will be the multiplicative semigroup structure of nonnegative matrices. Appendix B.I starts with preliminary definitions, followed by algebraic details about the structure and convergence of products of random stochastic matrices in Appendices B.II–B.III. Then, Appendix B.IV builds on these tools to outline a sketch of Theorem 3.

### B.I Preliminaries

Section 2.2 introduces an abstract dynamical system  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \theta)$  and  $\Sigma$  as the set of all  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices. The only restriction on this dynamical system is ergodicity. This might be very abstract, however, so, to build intuition (e.g., Assumption 1),  $\Omega$  can be viewed as a measurable space given by  $\Sigma^\infty$  whose elements  $\omega = \{\omega_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  are infinite sequences of elements in  $\Sigma$ , equipped with the sigma-algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  generated by coordinate mappings  $\omega \mapsto \omega_t$  and the Borel sets of  $\Sigma$ . The map  $\theta$  is often chosen to be an automorphism on  $\Omega$ . The iterates of  $\theta$  are defined by induction as follows  $\theta^0 := \text{Id}$  and  $\theta^t := \theta \circ \theta^{t-1}$ , for  $t \geq 1$ .

The following definitions are based on Cornfeld et al. (1982, Chapter 1). Given a probability measure  $\mu$ , a measurable map  $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is measure-preserving if  $\mu(\theta^{-1}(A)) = \mu(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mu$  is said to be *invariant* to  $\theta$ . A set  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  is invariant if  $\theta^{-1}(A) = A$ . The set of all invariant sets forms a sigma-algebra denoted  $\mathcal{F}_\theta$ . The map  $\theta$  is *ergodic* if  $\mathcal{F}_\theta$  is trivial, i.e., it contains only sets of measure zero and their complements. A simple example of an ergodic map is the shift map:  $\theta(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \dots)$  (Assumption 1.4). A probability measure  $\mu$  invariant with respect to this shift map is said to be *stationary*:

$$\mu(\{\omega : \omega_{i_1+k} \in A_1, \dots, \omega_{i_r+k} \in A_r\}) = \mu(\{\omega : \omega_{i_1} \in A_1, \dots, \omega_{i_r} \in A_r\}),$$

for all  $k \geq 0$ . Another example of an ergodic map is the so-called *circle rotation* defined as  $\theta(\omega) = \omega + \alpha \pmod{1}$ , where  $\Omega = [0, 1)$  is equipped with the Lebesgue measure  $m$  (i.e., here  $\mu = m$ ), and  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  is an irrational number. More generally, if  $f$  is integrable and  $\theta$  is measure-preserving, then it is well-known that  $f \circ \theta$  is integrable and  $\int_\Omega f d\mu = \int_\Omega f \circ \theta d\mu$ .

## B.II Probability Measures on Semigroups

This appendix reviews the semigroup of stochastic matrices. Throughout, we follow the existing literature closely by focusing on the iid case. This is because, as noted earlier, the characterization of the non-iid case remains an open problem in random matrix theory.

Recall that  $\mu$  denotes a probability measure on the Borel subsets of  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices, i.e.,  $\mu(B) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_t \in B)$ , for any Borel set  $B \subset \Sigma$  (with the topology induced by the standard metric on  $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ ), and  $\Sigma_\mu$  denotes its support. Since the  $\mathbf{X}_t$ 's are iid,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{(t)} \in B) = \mu^t(B)$ , where, for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mu^\ell$  denotes the  $\ell$ -th *convolution power* of  $\mu$ . For example, when  $\ell = 2$ , then  $\mu^2 = \mu * \mu$ , where  $*$  denotes the convolution product of any pair of probability measures. Equivalently,  $\mu^t = \overbrace{\mu * \dots * \mu}^{t\text{-times}}$  can be defined recursively for all  $t$  as follows

$$\mu^{t+1}(B) = \int_{\Sigma} \mu^t(B\sigma^{-1}) d\mu(\sigma),$$

where  $B\sigma^{-1} = \{x \in \Sigma : x\sigma \in B\}$ , for any Borel set  $B \subset \Sigma$  (see, [Dhar and Mukherjea, 1997](#), Section 2).<sup>17</sup> The product measure on  $\Omega$  can therefore be denoted as  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ . More importantly, if the starting point of the process— $\mathbf{X}_0$  in eq. (1)—lies in  $\Sigma_\mu$ ,<sup>18</sup> then it is well known that the sequence of random products  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  will  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ -a.s. never leave the *closed multiplicative semigroup* of  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices generated by  $\Sigma_\mu$  defined as

$$\text{closure} \left( \bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_\mu^t \right) = \text{closure} \left( \bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu^t} \right),$$

which holds by independence,<sup>19</sup> where  $\Sigma_{\mu^t} = \text{closure}(\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)} : \mathbf{X}_\ell \in \Sigma_\mu, 1 \leq \ell \leq t\})$  and  $\Sigma_\mu = \{\sigma \in \Sigma : \mu(\mathcal{O}(\sigma)) > 0, \forall \text{ open set } \mathcal{O}(\sigma) \ni \sigma\}$ . It therefore suffices to set

$$\Sigma = \text{closure} \left( \bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_\mu^t \right) \tag{6}$$

(see, [Rosenblatt, 1965](#), eq. (5)), in which case,  $\Sigma$  is said to be *generated* by  $\Sigma_\mu$ . That is, when  $\Sigma$  is defined as in eq. (6),  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{(t)} \notin \Sigma \text{ for some } t \geq 1) = 0$ . The restriction in eq. (6) is standard in the literature on random products of nonnegative matrices (e.g., [Rosenblatt, 1965](#); [Mukherjea, 1987](#); [Lo and Mukherjea, 1991](#); [Dhar and Mukherjea, 1997](#)).

Since we are in the iid case, the product  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  is synonymous to a random walk whose state space is the semigroup  $\Sigma$ . That is, each  $\mu$  on  $\Sigma$  defines a Markov process on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  via random iterations as follows: if we are at a point  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and select a matrix  $\sigma \in \Sigma$

<sup>17</sup>For any two probability measures  $\mu, \nu \in \Delta(\Sigma)$ ,  $\mu * \nu(B) = \int_{\Sigma} \mu(B\sigma^{-1}) d\nu(\sigma) = \int_{\Sigma} \nu(\sigma^{-1}B) d\mu(\sigma)$ , where given the above notation,  $\sigma^{-1}B = \{x \in \Sigma : \sigma x \in B\}$ , for any Borel set  $B \subset \Sigma$ .

<sup>18</sup>A standard assumption is that the process starts at the identity element of  $\Sigma$  (adjoined if need be).

<sup>19</sup>For any two probability measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ ,  $\Sigma_{\mu*\nu} = \text{closure}(\Sigma_\mu \cdot \Sigma_\nu)$ , where  $\cdot$  is matrix multiplication.

according to  $\mu$ , we would move to  $\mathbf{q} = \sigma\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . The set  $\Sigma$  can also be described as the support of the probability measure  $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^t} \mu^t$ , i.e., any open set in  $\Sigma$  has  $\mu^t$ -measure for some  $t$ . Moreover, the subsemigroup  $\hat{\Sigma}$ , the set of strictly positive stochastic matrices, is an ideal of  $\Sigma$ , i.e., for any  $\hat{\sigma} \in \hat{\Sigma}$  and  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ , their product satisfies  $\sigma\hat{\sigma} \in \hat{\Sigma}$ . Consequently,  $\hat{\Sigma}$  is stochastically closed for the random walk  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$ . It also holds that when  $\Sigma_\mu$  is a countable set, then so is  $\Sigma$ . Since the matrices are stochastic,  $\Sigma$  is a compact Hausdorff topological semigroup (with respect to standard matrix multiplication), so the literature typically assumes  $\Sigma$  is second countable (see, Mukherjea, 1987; Lo and Mukherjea, 1991).<sup>20</sup>

### B.III Weak Convergence of Convolutions

We are mainly interested in the convergence properties of the product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This product converges weakly (or in distribution) whenever  $\mu^t$  converges weakly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Specifically,  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  converges weakly if and only if there exists a probability measure  $\psi$  that is the weak limit of the sequence  $\{\bar{\mu}_t\}_t$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\bar{\mu}_t$  denotes the Cesàro average

$$\bar{\mu}_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{\ell=1}^t \mu^\ell,$$

(e.g., Lo and Mukherjea, 1991, Theorem 2.1). Algebraically,  $\psi$  is the unique solution to the convolution equation  $\psi = \psi * \mu = \mu * \psi$  (and  $\psi = \psi * \psi$ ). Let  $\Sigma_\psi$  be the support of  $\psi$ . It is well-known that  $\Sigma_\psi$  coincides with the (completely simple) *kernel* of  $\Sigma$ , denoted  $K$ :<sup>21</sup>

$$K = \left\{ y \in \Sigma : \text{rank}(y) \leq \text{rank}(\sigma), \forall \sigma \in \Sigma \right\}, \quad (7)$$

so  $K = \Sigma_\psi$  is the support of  $\psi$ . Eq. (7) states that the elements in  $\Sigma_\psi$  are all the stochastic matrices in  $\Sigma$  with minimal rank (Clark, 1965; Lo and Mukherjea, 1991, Proposition 2.3). To fix ideas, the next example illustrates how to find the kernel  $K$  in very simple cases.

**Example 14.** Let  $n = 2$ , so the semigroup  $\Sigma$  consists of stochastic matrices of the form  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 1-a \\ b & 1-b \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $a, b \in [0, 1]$ . There is a one-to-one correspondence between such stochastic matrices and the points  $(a, b)$  in the unit square. Then, the product of any two matrices  $(a, b)$  and  $(a', b')$ , respectively, corresponds to the point  $(aa' + b'(1 - a'), ba' + b'(1 - b))$ .<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup>This assumption is not restrictive. For instance, let  $M_n$  denote the set of  $n \times n$  real matrices (i.e., all entries are real numbers). Under matrix multiplication, this set forms a semigroup. If we define a norm on  $M_n$  according to the Euclidean distance on  $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$  (i.e., the Frobenius norm), then  $M_n$  becomes a locally compact second-countable topological space with jointly continuous multiplication.

<sup>21</sup>Suppose  $\Sigma$  contains a rank-one matrix  $\sigma$ . On one hand, since  $\sigma$  is a stochastic matrix and has identical rows, it forms by itself a minimal left ideal  $\{\sigma\} = \Sigma\sigma$ . On the other hand,  $\sigma\Sigma$  is the set of all stochastic matrices of rank one and hence is the minimal two-sided ideal of  $\Sigma$ . This set is by definition the kernel of  $\Sigma$ .

<sup>22</sup>Intuitively, multiplication from the left with  $(a, b)$  always moves a point  $(x, y)$  in the same direction with step length being a multiple of  $x - y$ .

The kernel  $K$  of  $\Sigma$  (eq. (7)) in this case is therefore isomorphic to the diagonal  $a = b$ . If in addition,  $a = 1 - b$ , i.e.,  $\Sigma$  consists of bistochastic matrices, then  $\Sigma$  is a compact abelian semigroup and hence the kernel becomes the singleton  $\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}\right\}$ . Alternatively, suppose  $\mu$  puts all its mass on only two points  $(a, a + d)$  and  $(a', a' + d)$ , where  $d < 1/3$ . Then,  $K$  is a Cantor-like compact subset of the diagonal  $\{(x, x) : \forall x \in [0, 1]\}$ .  $\triangle$

Thus, when the minimal rank of  $\Sigma$  is one, it indicates that the agents reach consensus when their beliefs converge, which is used in Section 5 and Online Appendix B. Since each stochastic matrix in  $\Sigma_\psi$  has identical rows under consensus,  $\Sigma_\psi$  can be viewed as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  (Mukherjea and Nakassis, 2002), and hence the agents' influences  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$  are jointly distributed according to  $\psi$ .

**Remark 4.** A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of  $\psi$  is:  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_\mu^t \neq \emptyset$  (see, Lo and Mukherjea, 1991, Theorem 2.1), where this set is defined as

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_\mu^t = \left\{ \sigma \in \Sigma : \forall \text{ open set } \mathcal{O}(\sigma) \ni \sigma, \exists k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } t \geq k \implies \mathcal{O}(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_\mu^t \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

If  $\Sigma$  does not contain a rank-one matrix,  $\psi$  may not exist (Mukherjea and Nakassis, 2002, Remark 1). When  $\Sigma_\mu$  contains only invertible matrices and  $\Sigma$  contains a rank-one matrix, Dhar and Mukherjea (1997, Theorem 3) shows that  $\psi$  can only be *one* of the following:

1. discrete, i.e.,  $\psi(E) = 1$  for some countable set  $E$ ;
2. continuous and singular with respect to the  $n - 1$  dimensional Lebesgue measure on  $\Sigma_\psi$  (viewed as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ ) denoted  $m_{n-1}$ ;
3. absolutely continuous with respect to  $m_{n-1}$ .  $\triangle$

The remark above has therefore completely characterized  $(\psi, \Sigma_\psi)$  in the iid case. When the rank of the matrices in  $\Sigma_\psi$  (the kernel of  $\Sigma$ ) is  $n$ ,  $\Sigma_\psi$  is said to be *cancellative*, which makes it a group, and therefore,  $\Sigma = \Sigma_\psi$  is a compact group of  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices of *full rank*, hence  $\Sigma$  is also finite (Cureg and Mukherjea, 2007, Section 1). In this case, convergence results of the convolution sequence  $\{\mu^t\}_{t \geq 1}$  are well-known (Lemma 8).

## B.IV Sketch of Theorem 3

The proof of Theorem 3 will rely on the algebraic structure of the kernel  $K$  in eq. (7). As noted earlier, Theorem 3.(ii) implies Theorem 3.(i), so we will prove the former in the main text and the latter in Online Appendix D since the latter is mostly based on the results in Högnäs and Mukherjea (2005). We outline the key steps below.

1. Hennion (1997, Section 9.2: Remarks) presents two equivalent formulations of  $(\mathcal{C})$  in the iid case. Specifically, we focus on the following equivalence (see, Proposition 3)

$$(\mathcal{C}) \text{ holds if and only if there exists } t \geq 1 \text{ such that } \int c(\sigma) d\mu^t(\sigma) < 1, \quad (8)$$

where  $c(\cdot)$  is a continuous function on  $\Sigma$  (Hennion, 1997, Lemma 10.8). By Hennion (1997, Lemma 10.6.(iii)),  $c(\sigma) \leq 1$  for any  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ , and  $c(\sigma) < 1$  for all  $\sigma \in \hat{\Sigma}$ .

2. Eq. (8) indicates that, to understand condition  $(\mathcal{C})$ , we only need to characterize the convolution power  $\mu^t$  and its support for large  $t$ . Specifically, when eq. (8) holds,  $(\mathcal{C})$  is satisfied, so Theorem 1 indicates that  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  converges almost surely, and hence its distribution  $\mu^t$  converges weakly to  $\psi$  with support  $\Sigma_\psi = K$  in eq. (7). As noted earlier,  $K$  is the kernel of  $\Sigma$  in eq. (6), which contains matrices in  $\Sigma$  with the minimal rank. Importantly,  $K$  is a *completely simple* semigroup (e.g., Mukherjea, 1987, Section 2), and therefore it is topologically *isomorphic* to (i.e., can be identified with) the so-called *Rees-Suschkewitsch* (or simply *Rees*) product decomposition

$$K \cong W \times G \times Z, \quad (9)$$

where  $W = \mathbb{I}(K\vartheta)$ ,  $G = \vartheta K\vartheta$ , and  $Z = \mathbb{I}(\vartheta K)$ , with  $\vartheta$  being an *idempotent* element in  $K$ , i.e.,  $\vartheta \in \mathbb{I}(K)$  or  $\vartheta^2 = \vartheta \in K$ , so  $W$  and  $Z$  are the sets of idempotent elements in  $K\vartheta$  and  $\vartheta K$ , respectively. For notation,  $\mathbb{I}(A)$  denotes the set of all idempotents in  $A$ . The multiplication in  $W \times G \times Z$  is given by  $(w, \sigma, z)(\hat{w}, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{z}) = (w, \sigma(z\hat{w})\hat{\sigma}, \hat{z})$ . Importantly, since  $\Sigma$  in eq. (6) is compact, then so is  $K$ , and hence the group factor  $G$  in eq. (9) must be finite (Högnäs and Mukherjea, 2003, Section 4).<sup>23</sup>

3. Since we have two societies, we aim to show that society  $X$  satisfies eq. (8) (i.e.,  $(\mathcal{C})$ ) if and only if society  $Y$  satisfies eq. (8). We therefore need to relate  $\mu_X^t$  and  $\mu_Y^t$  as well as  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  using an *isomorphism*. We will achieve this by using the fact that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . However,  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  are arbitrary large sets (since they are compact), so constructing an isomorphism between them is very challenging. Instead, we will use the fact that  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$ —the group factors in eq. (9), for society  $X$  and  $Y$ —are finite. We will show that Suppose  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . Then, matrices in  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  have the same rank  $\eta$  (Lemma 3), which will help prove that  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$  are isomorphic (Lemma 4). The fact that these two groups are finite means that we can show that they are isomorphic by showing that they are both isomorphic to the same subgroup of permutations on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$ , where  $\eta$  is the rank of the stochastic matrices in  $\Sigma_{\psi_X} \cup \Sigma_{\psi_Y}$ .

---

<sup>23</sup>This follows from the fact that any compact group of  $n \times n$  nonnegative matrices of rank  $\eta$  is isomorphic to a subgroup of permutations  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$  and therefore must be finite (e.g., Mukherjea, 1986).



4. We will then use the isomorphism between  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$  to show that their *maximal homomorphic group images*  $G_X/Q_X$  and  $G_Y/Q_Y$  (Stoll, 1951), respectively, are also isomorphic (Lemma 5). Here,  $Q_X \subset G_X$  denotes the smallest (compact) normal subgroup of  $G_X$  such that  $W_X Z_X \subset Q_X$  and similarly for  $Q_Y$ . Then,  $G_X/Q_X$  denotes the factor group (i.e., quotient group) of  $G_X$  by  $Q_X$ . We can then define a map  $\Phi_X : \Sigma_X \rightarrow G_X/Q_X$  such that  $\Phi_X(x) = pxpQ_X$ , where  $p$  is an idempotent element in  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$ . That is,  $\Phi_X$  maps the element  $x \in \Sigma_X$  onto the coset of  $Q_X$  containing  $pxp$ . Then,  $\Phi_X$  is a (surjective) continuous *homomorphism* (with quotient topology on  $G_X/Q_X$ ) (see, after 5.), which defines a probability measure  $\tilde{\mu}_X$  on  $G_X/Q_X$ :

$$\tilde{\mu}_X(B) = \mu_X(\Phi_X^{-1}(B)),$$

for any Borel set  $B \subset G_X/Q_X$ .<sup>24</sup> Then, the sequence  $\mu_X^t$  on  $\Sigma_X$  converges weakly if and only if the sequence  $\tilde{\mu}_X^t$  on  $G_X/Q_X$  converges weakly (Lemma 7).

5. Finally, we will then use the isomorphism between  $G_X/Q_X$  and  $G_Y/Q_Y$  to show that the supports  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y}$  are also isomorphic (Lemma 6). Since  $G_X/Q_X$  is a finite group,  $\tilde{\mu}_X^t$  converges weakly to the uniform probability measure on the closed subgroup generated by  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X}$  (Lemma 8). Then, under  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}_X^t$  converges weakly if and only if  $\tilde{\mu}_Y^t$  converges weakly (Lemma 9), which combined with Lemma 7 establishes Theorem 3.(i). This equivalence will then be used to show that  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies eq. (8) if and only if  $\{\mathbf{Y}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies eq. (8), which establishes Theorem 3.(ii).

We now show that  $\Phi_j$  is a continuous homomorphism, for each society  $j \in \{X, Y\}$  as noted in part 4. above (see, Högnäs and Mukherjea, 2003, Section 2), so, for ease, we suppress the subscript  $j$  in what follows. For any  $x, y \in \Sigma$ , let  $\vartheta x = a\sigma b$  and  $y\vartheta = \hat{a}\hat{\sigma}\hat{b}$ , where  $\vartheta^2 = \vartheta \in K$ ,  $a, \hat{a} \in W$ ,  $b, \hat{b} \in Z$ , and  $\sigma, \hat{\sigma} \in G$ , for  $K \cong W \times G \times Z$  in eq. (9). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta(xy)\vartheta &= \vartheta(\sigma(b\hat{a})\hat{\sigma})\hat{b}\vartheta = \vartheta a(\sigma(b\hat{a})\hat{\sigma})\vartheta \\ &= \sigma(b\hat{a})\hat{\sigma} \in \sigma Q.Q.\hat{\sigma} Q \\ &= (\vartheta x\vartheta)Q.(y\vartheta)Q, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\Phi(xy) = (\vartheta xy\vartheta)Q = (\vartheta x\vartheta)Q.(y\vartheta)Q = \Phi(x)\Phi(y)$  using the normality of  $Q$ , and hence  $\Phi$  is a homomorphism. With the quotient topology on  $G/Q$ , the continuity of  $\Phi$  follows since it is the composition of the canonical homomorphism from  $G$  to  $G/Q$  and the continuous map  $s \mapsto \vartheta s\vartheta$  from  $\Sigma$  to  $G$ . We refer to Högnäs and Mukherjea (2003) for further details.

---

<sup>24</sup>That is, if  $U$  is an  $\Sigma_X$ -valued random variable with distribution  $\mu_X$ , then  $\Phi_X(U)$  is a random variable with values in  $G_X/Q_X$  and distribution  $\tilde{\mu}_X$ .

# Appendix C: Proofs

## Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 is a special case of Hennion (1997, Theorem 1.(i)–(ii).(a)) applied to random stochastic matrices. We therefore refer to Hennion (1997, Section 4) for a proof.

## Proof of Proposition 1

Let  $K$  denote the kernel of closure( $\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu}^t$ )—the closed semigroup generated by  $\Sigma_{\mu}$ .  $K$  contains *all* the matrices in this semigroup with the minimal rank (Appendix B.III: eq. (7)).

**Lemma 1.** *When there exists a rank one matrix in closure( $\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu}^t$ ), the convolution sequence  $(\mu^t)_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly to a probability measure with support  $K$ .*

The proof of this lemma relies on well-known results from random matrix theory (Appendix B.III), so it is relegated to Online Appendix D.

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ): Suppose  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  converges in probability to  $\mathbf{1s}$ . Then,  $\mu^t$  converges weakly to a probability measure  $\psi$  with support  $\Sigma_{\psi} = \{\mathbf{1s}\}$ . It is well-known that  $\Sigma_{\psi} = K$ —the kernel of closure( $\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu}^t$ )—which contains *all* the matrices from this semigroup with minimal rank. Thus,  $\Sigma_{\psi} = \{\mathbf{1s}\}$  implies that  $\mathbf{1s}$  must be the *only* rank one matrix in closure( $\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu}^t$ ).

( $\impliedby$ ): Suppose  $\mathbf{1s}$  is a rank one matrix in the closed semigroup closure( $\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu}^t$ ). Then, by Lemma 1,  $\mu^t$  must converge weakly to a probability measure  $\psi$  with support  $\Sigma_{\psi} = K$ . Since  $\mathbf{1s}$  is assumed to be the *only* rank one matrix in closure( $\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu}^t$ ), we have  $K = \{\mathbf{1s}\}$ , so  $\psi$  is a unit mass on  $\mathbf{1s}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$  converges in probability to  $\mathbf{1s}$ .  $\square$

## Proof of Corollary 2

*Proof.* By Theorem 1, the limiting interaction matrix is a strictly positive random stochastic matrix of rank one. Since the  $\mathbf{X}_t$ 's are all bistochastic matrices, the limiting interaction matrix is also bistochastic (because bistochastic matrices are closed under multiplication). Since the only  $n \times n$  bistochastic matrix of rank one is  $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'$ , it must be the limiting interaction matrix because it is strictly positive. Thus, each agent's influence is  $\pi_i = 1/n$  for all  $i$ .  $\square$

## Proof of Theorem 2

Consider the following weakening of assumptions (i) and (ii) stated in Section 4.1.

**Assumption 2.** The joint distribution of  $\{p_i^{(0)}(n)\}_{i \leq n}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(n)$  satisfies the following:

1.  $\sum_{i < j}^n \left| \text{cov}\left(p_i^{(0)}(n), p_j^{(0)}(n) \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\right) \right|$  is uniformly bounded as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
2.  $\mathbb{E}[p_i^{(\infty)}(n) \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)] = \gamma$ , for all  $i$  and  $n$ .  $\triangle$

Let's first check that these assumptions are indeed weaker than those stated in Section 4.1. (i) If all initial signals  $\{p_i^{(0)}(n)\}_{i \leq n}$  are independent and are jointly independent of the dynamic network  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ , then Assumption 2.1 holds because  $\text{cov}(p_i^{(0)}(n), p_j^{(0)}(n) \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)) = \text{cov}(p_i^{(0)}(n), p_j^{(0)}(n)) = 0$  for all  $i \neq j$  and every  $n$ . (ii) If each initial signal is conditionally unbiased for  $\gamma$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[p_i^{(0)}(n)] = \gamma$  for all  $i \leq n$ , and is independent of  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ , then Assumption 2.2 holds because  $\mathbb{E}[p_i^{(\infty)}(n) \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)] = \sum_i \pi_i(n) \mathbb{E}[p_i^{(0)}(n)] = \gamma$  for all  $i$  and  $n$ .

We start with a lemma that will simplify the proof. Let  $Z(n) = \sum_i \pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n)$ , and recall that  $\boldsymbol{\pi}(n) = (\pi_1(n), \dots, \pi_n(n)) \in (0, 1)^n$  for each  $n$  by Theorem 1. Also, recall that for any arbitrary random variables  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $V$ , and arbitrary constants  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , the following holds  $\text{var}(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i Y_i \mid V) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \text{var}(Y_i \mid V) + 2 \sum_{i < j} a_i a_j \text{cov}(Y_i, Y_j \mid V)$ , where  $\text{cov}(Y_i, Y_j \mid V) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i Y_j \mid V] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid V] \mathbb{E}[Y_j \mid V]$ , for all  $i \neq j$ . To ease notation, define  $\pi^*(n) := \max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)]$ , and we suppress the argument  $n$  in the statement and proof of Lemma 2.

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose Assumption 2 holds. Then,*

1.  $\mathbb{E}[Z \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}] = \gamma$ , for all  $n$ ;
2.  $\sum_i \text{var}(\pi_i p_i^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \bar{v}^2 \pi^*$ , for all  $i \neq j$  and  $n$  and some finite constant  $\bar{v}^2 \geq 0$ .
3.  $\sum_{i < j} \text{cov}(\pi_i p_i^{(0)}, \pi_j p_j^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \bar{v} \pi^*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some finite constant  $\bar{v} \geq 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.* To simplify the notation, we omit the argument  $n$  in this proof.

For part 1., it follows by Assumption 2.2 because (by definition)  $p_i^{(\infty)}(n) = Z(n)$ .

For part 2.,

$$\sum_i \text{var}(\pi_i p_i^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_i \pi_i^2 \text{var}(p_i^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \pi^* \sum_i \pi_i \text{var}(p_i^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \bar{v}^2 \pi^* \sum_i \pi_i = \bar{v}^2 \pi^*,$$

where the first inequality holds since  $\pi^* \geq \pi_i$  a.s., for all  $i$  and  $n$ . Here,  $\bar{v}^2$  denotes the uniform upper bound on all the conditional variances  $\{\text{var}(p_i^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi})\}_{i \leq n}$ , which is finite because all the signals are bounded random variables.

For part 3.,

$$\sum_{i < j} \text{cov}(\pi_i p_i^{(0)}, \pi_j p_j^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{i < j} \pi_i \pi_j \text{cov}(p_i^{(0)}, p_j^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \pi^* \sum_{i < j} \pi_j \left| \text{cov}(p_i^{(0)}, p_j^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) \right| \leq \bar{v} \pi^*,$$

where  $\bar{v}$  denotes the uniform upper bound on the sum  $\sum_{i < j} \left| \text{cov}(p_i^{(0)}, p_j^{(0)} \mid \boldsymbol{\pi}) \right|$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which exists almost surely by Assumption 2.1.  $\square$

We can now prove the following generalization of Theorem 2.

**Theorem 4.** *For each  $n$ , let  $\{\boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of arbitrarily random influence vectors from Theorem 1.2, and suppose Assumption 2 holds. Then, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i \leq n} \pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n) - \gamma\right| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* First, suppose  $\max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)] \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(Z(n)) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\text{var}(Z(n)|\boldsymbol{\pi}(n))\right] + \text{var}\left(\underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Z(n)|\boldsymbol{\pi}(n)]}_{=\gamma}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\text{var}\left(\sum_i \pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n) \middle| \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i \text{var}\left(\pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n) \middle| \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\right) + 2 \sum_{i < j} \text{cov}\left(\pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n), \pi_j(n) p_j^{(0)}(n) \middle| \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i \text{var}\left(\pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n) \middle| \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\right)\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i < j} \text{cov}\left(\pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n), \pi_j(n) p_j^{(0)}(n) \middle| \boldsymbol{\pi}(n)\right)\right] \\ &\leq (\bar{v}^2 + 2\bar{v}) \max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)] \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality is the law of total variance. The second equality holds since  $\mathbb{E}[Z(n)|\boldsymbol{\pi}(n)] = \gamma$  for all  $n$  by Lemma 2.1, so  $\text{var}(\gamma) = 0$  since  $\gamma$  is a constant. The third equality is the definition of conditional variance. The inequality holds by applying both Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 for the first and second term, respectively, where  $\bar{v}^2$  and  $\bar{v}$  are nonnegative finite constants (Lemma 2). By the law of iterated expectation, Lemma 2.1 implies that  $\mathbb{E}[Z(n)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i \pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n)\right] = \gamma$  for all  $n$ . Then, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , Chebyshev's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i \leq n} \pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n) - \gamma\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{\text{var}(Z(n))}{\epsilon^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

The converse follows similar steps as in Golub and Jackson (2010, Lemma 1). Suppose (taking a subsequence if necessary)  $\max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)] \rightarrow \hat{\pi} > 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . By Theorem 1.2, each  $\pi_i(n) \in (0, 1)$  is a (nondegenerate) random variable for each  $n$  and  $p_i^{(0)}(n)$  has unconditional variance bounded between  $\underline{v}^2$  and 1, for each  $n$  and all  $i$ . Thus, for every  $i$ , the product  $\pi_i(n) p_i^{(0)}(n)$  has nonzero variance, so there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\text{var}(Z(n)) > \delta$  for all  $n$ , and therefore  $Z(n)$  cannot converge in probability to 0.  $\square$

## Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* By Corollary 3,  $\pi(n) \sim D_\varphi$ , where  $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$  and  $\varphi_i > 0$  for all  $i \leq n$ . Thus,  $\max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i(n)] = \frac{1}{\sum_{j \leq n} \varphi_j} \max_{i \leq n} \varphi_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $\sum_{j \leq n} \varphi_j \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## Proof of Proposition 3

The equivalence in Proposition 3 can be found in Hennion (1997, Section 9.2: Remarks).

## Proof of Theorem 3.(ii)

We recall that under the (surjective) continuous homomorphisms  $\Phi_X$  and  $\Phi_Y$  in Appendix B.IV, the support of  $\tilde{\mu}_X$  is  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X} = \Phi_X(\Sigma_{\mu_X}) = \{pxpQ_X : x \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}\}$ , and the support of  $\tilde{\mu}_Y$  is  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y} = \Phi_Y(\Sigma_{\mu_Y}) = \{qyqQ_Y : y \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}\}$  (Högnäs and Mukherjea, 2003, Section 3). Then, it follows that  $(\tilde{\mu}_X)^t = \tilde{\mu}_X^t$  and  $(\tilde{\mu}_Y)^t = \tilde{\mu}_Y^t$ , for all  $t \geq 1$ .<sup>25</sup> Moreover, the supports of the limiting distributions  $\psi_X$  and  $\psi_Y$  denoted, respectively,  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  are the kernels of the closed semigroups  $\Sigma_X = \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^t)$  and  $\Sigma_Y = \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_Y}^t)$  (see, eq. (6)), respectively, which are compact sets (since they consist of stochastic matrices). Thus,  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  are completely simple semigroups (see, eq. (9)) and therefore

$$\Sigma_{\psi_X} \cong W_X \times G_X \times Z_X \text{ and } \Sigma_{\psi_Y} \cong W_Y \times G_Y \times Z_Y \quad (10)$$

are, respectively, their Rees-Suskevitch product decomposition in eq. (9), where for a fixed idempotent element  $p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$ ,  $W_X = \mathbb{I}(\Sigma_{\psi_X} p)$ ,  $G_X = p \Sigma_{\psi_X} p$ ,  $Z_X = \mathbb{I}(p \Sigma_{\psi_X})$ , and similarly for society  $Y$ , i.e., for a fixed idempotent element  $q \in \Sigma_{\psi_Y}$ ,  $W_Y = \mathbb{I}(\Sigma_{\psi_Y} q)$ ,  $G_Y = q \Sigma_{\psi_Y} q$ ,  $Z_Y = \mathbb{I}(q \Sigma_{\psi_Y})$ . Then, the following lemmas will be useful.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . Then, the minimal rank of the matrices in  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  is the same as that of the matrices in  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$ . Furthermore, there exist rank one matrices  $p$  in  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $q$  in  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  such that  $p$  and  $q$  have the same basis and the same social topology.<sup>26</sup>*

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . Then, the group factors  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$  in the Rees-Suskevitch product representations of  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  are isomorphic.*

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . Then, the maximal homomorphic group images  $G_X/Q_X$  and  $G_Y/Q_Y$  are isomorphic.*

**Lemma 6.** *Suppose  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . Then, the supports  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y}$  are isomorphic.*

<sup>25</sup>If  $V$  and  $P$  are independent random variables with distribution  $\tilde{\mu}_j$ , then  $\tilde{\mu}_j^2$ , the law of  $\Phi_j(VP)$ , is equal to the law  $(\tilde{\mu}_j)^2$  of  $\Phi_j(V)\Phi_j(P)$ , for each society  $j \in \{X, Y\}$  (Högnäs and Mukherjea, 2003, Section 3).

<sup>26</sup>Eq. (18) in Online Appendix D defines the *basis* of a nonnegative matrix.

Lemmas 3–6 will be proved in Online Appendix D by following Högnäs and Mukherjea (2005). The next result is a special case of Högnäs and Mukherjea (2003, Theorem).

**Lemma 7.** *The convolution sequence  $\mu_j^t$  on  $\Sigma_j$  converges weakly if and only if the convolution sequence  $\tilde{\mu}_j^t$  on  $G_j/Q_j$  converges weakly, for each society  $j \in \{X, Y\}$ .*

The next result is well-known (e.g., Chakraborty and Rao, 2001, Remark 3).

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $H$  be a finite group and  $\nu$  be a probability measure on  $H$ . Then, the convolution sequence  $\nu^t$  converges weakly if and only if there exists an integer  $\tau \geq 1$  such that the support of  $\nu^\tau$  is the subgroup generated by the support of  $\nu$ . In this case,  $\nu^t$  converges weakly to the uniform probability measure on the subgroup generated by the support of  $\nu$ .*

If  $\langle \Sigma_\nu \rangle$  denotes the subgroup of a finite group  $H$  generated by the support of  $\nu$ , denoted  $\Sigma_\nu \subset H$ ,<sup>27</sup> then Lemma 8 states that  $\nu^t \rightarrow 1/|\langle \Sigma_\nu \rangle|$  weakly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . A sufficient condition for this is that the greatest common divisor of the orders of the elements in  $\Sigma_\nu$  is one.

The next result together with Lemma 3 constitute a proof of Theorem 3.(i).

**Lemma 9.** *Suppose  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . Then, the convolution sequence  $\mu_X^t$  converges weakly if and only if the convolution sequence  $\mu_Y^t$  converges weakly.*

*Proof of Theorem 3.(ii).* Let  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . We start by showing the “if” part, i.e., if  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies  $(\mathcal{C})$  then so does  $\{\mathbf{Y}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$ . To this end, suppose  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies  $(\mathcal{C})$ . Then, Proposition 3 indicates that we can use the fact that eq. (8) is equivalent to  $(\mathcal{C})$ . More specifically, this means that there exists a  $\tau \geq 1$  such that the inequality below holds

$$\int c_X(\sigma) d\tilde{\mu}_X^\tau(\Phi_X(\sigma)) = \int c_X(\sigma) d\mu_X^\tau(\sigma) < 1. \quad (11)$$

where the equality above follows from the fact that  $\tilde{\mu}_X(B) = \mu_X(\Phi_X^{-1}(B))$ , for any Borel set  $B \subset G_X/Q_X$ , with support  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X} = \Phi_X(\Sigma_{\mu_X}) \subset G_X$  (see, Högnäs and Mukherjea, 2003, Section 3), and recalling from part 4. of the sketch (Appendix B.IV) that  $\Phi_X(x) = pxpQ_X$  is a continuous homomorphism, for any  $x \in \Sigma_X$  and a fixed idempotent element  $p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$ . This means that  $p$  is the identity of  $G_X$ , and by eq. (11),  $p$  is strictly positive.

Since eq. (11) implies a.s. convergence of  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  (Theorem 1), it also implies that its convolution sequence  $\mu_X^t$  converges weakly, and therefore so does  $\tilde{\mu}_X^t$  by Lemma 7. Since the group factor  $G_X$  in the Rees-Suskevitch product representation of  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  in eq. (10) is a finite group (Högnäs and Mukherjea, 2003, Section 4), we know from Lemma 8 that there exists an integer  $s \geq 1$  such that  $\tilde{\mu}_X^s$  is indistinguishable from the uniform probability measure

---

<sup>27</sup>If  $G$  is a group,  $V$  is a subset of  $G$ , and  $\{S_\ell < G : \ell \in I\}$  is the set of all subgroups of  $G$  each one containing  $V$  as a subset, then  $\langle V \rangle := \bigcap_{\ell \in I} S_\ell$  is the subgroup of  $G$  generated by  $V$ .

on the subgroup (of  $G_X/Q_X$ ) generated by  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X} = \Phi_X(\Sigma_{\mu_X})$ . Then,  $\tilde{\mu}_Y^t$  also converges weakly by Lemma 9, so applying Lemma 8 (since  $G_Y/Q_Y$  is a finite group), there exists an integer  $r \geq 1$  such that  $\tilde{\mu}_Y^r$  is indistinguishable from the uniform probability measure on the subgroup (of  $G_Y/Q_Y$ ) generated by  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y} = \Phi_Y(\Sigma_{\mu_Y})$ , denoted  $\langle \Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y} \rangle$ . By Lemma 3, there exists an idempotent matrix  $q \in \Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  with the same social topology as  $p$ , so  $q$  is strictly positive, and since it is the identity of  $G_Y$ ,  $qQ_Y$  is the identity of  $\langle \Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y} \rangle$ , hence  $qQ_Y \in \langle \Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y} \rangle$ . Define  $\tilde{\mu}_Y(D) = \mu_Y(\Phi_Y^{-1}(D))$ , for any Borel set  $D \subset G_Y/Q_Y$ , where  $\Phi_Y(y) = qyqQ_Y$  is a (surjective) continuous homomorphism, for any  $y \in \Sigma_Y$ . This shows that there exists a  $T = \max\{\tau, s, r\}$  such that  $\tilde{\mu}_Y^T(\Phi_Y(q)) = \tilde{\mu}_Y^T(qQ_Y) > 0$ , so the following inequality holds

$$\int c_Y(\sigma) d\mu_Y^T(\sigma) = \int c_Y(\sigma) d\tilde{\mu}_Y^T(\Phi_Y(\sigma)) < 1$$

because  $c_Y(q) < 1$  (since  $q$  is strictly positive). The equality above holds by definition of  $\tilde{\mu}_Y$  and  $\Phi_Y$ . This completes the “if” part, i.e., there exists a  $T \geq 1$  such that  $\int c_Y(\sigma) d\mu_Y^T(\sigma) < 1$  and hence  $\{\mathbf{Y}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  satisfies  $(\mathcal{C})$ . Reversing the role of  $X$  and  $Y$  yields the “only if” part.  $\square$

## Proof of Proposition 5

The proof of Proposition 5 is straightforward, e.g., see [Huang et al. \(2019, Theorem 1.\(i\)\)](#).

## Proofs of Proposition 6 and Corollary 6

A proof of Proposition 6 can be found in [Van Assche \(1986, Theorem 3\)](#) where we recall the definition  $\lambda_2(x, y) = x - y$ . Similarly, Corollary 6 from [Van Assche \(1986, Corollary\)](#).

## Proof of Proposition 8

*Proof.* [Hennion and Hervé \(2008, Theorem 2.1\)](#) establish the result for the right iid product  $\mathbf{Y}^{(t)} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cdots \mathbf{X}_t$  (where “ $\cdot$ ” is standard matrix multiplication). Thus, the same result holds for the left iid product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)} = \mathbf{X}_t \cdots \mathbf{X}_1$  by [Chamayou and Letac \(1991, Proposition 1\)](#).  $\square$

## Proof of Proposition 9

Our proof builds on the techniques in [Edgar \(1998, Chapter 3.3\)](#). For notation, let  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  denote the set of all probability measures on the Borel subsets of  $S$ . Let  $d$  denote a metric associated with the metric space  $S$ , which we denote as the pair  $(S, d)$ . Since each map  $C_t$  is assumed to be a contraction on  $S$ , then for all  $x, y \in S$ ,  $d(C_t(x), C_t(y)) \leq \kappa_t d(x, y)$ , where  $0 < \kappa_t < 1$  for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  and define  $\bar{\kappa} = \sup\{\kappa_t : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$  for a countably infinite index set  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Let  $\{\beta_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$  be a discrete probability measure on  $\mathcal{T}$  and let  $\tau$  be a  $\mathcal{T}$ -valued random variable distributed according to  $\{\beta_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ . Since  $S$  is compact, there exists a  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $d(x, y) < \alpha$  for all  $x, y \in S$ , so define the set

$$\mathcal{F}_\alpha = \left\{ h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : |h(x) - h(y)| < d(x, y), |h(x)| < \alpha, \forall x, y \in S \right\}.$$

Then, for any  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ , define on  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  the so-called *Monge-Kantorovich* metric

$$\nu(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup \left\{ \left| \int h d\mu_1 - \int h d\mu_2 \right| : h \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha \right\},$$

and hence  $(\mathcal{P}(S), \nu)$  is a complete metric space. Moreover, let  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  denote the class of all closed subsets of  $S$ . Then, for any  $A, B \subset S$  define on  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  the *Hausdorff* metric

$$\nu(A, B) = \inf \left\{ s > 0 : A \subseteq Q_s(B) \text{ and } B \subseteq Q_s(A) \right\},$$

where  $Q_s(F) = \{y \in S : \exists x \in F, d(x, y) < s\}$  for any  $F \subset S$ , and hence  $(\mathcal{C}(S), \nu)$  is a complete metric space. Given all the above, we are now ready to prove Proposition 9.

*Proof.* Consider the map  $\Lambda : \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$  defined such that for any Borel subset  $B$  of  $S$ :

$$\Lambda(\mu(B)) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \beta_t \mu(C_t^{-1}(B)). \quad (12)$$

Now, fix a point  $z \in S$ , then for any  $h \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$  and  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\Lambda(\mu_1), \Lambda(\mu_2)) &= \left| \int h d\Lambda(\mu_1) - \int h d\Lambda(\mu_2) \right| \\ &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \beta_t \left( \int [h \circ C_t(x) - h \circ C_t(z)] d\mu_1(x) - \int [h \circ C_t(x) - h \circ C_t(z)] d\mu_2(x) \right) \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \beta_t \kappa_t \left( \int h_t d\mu_1 - \int h_t d\mu_2 \right) \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\kappa_\tau] \nu(\mu_1, \mu_2), \end{aligned}$$

where  $h_t(x) := \frac{1}{\kappa_t} (h \circ C_t(x) - h \circ C_t(z))$  is used to establish the first inequality above, and the fact that  $h_t \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$  for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  is used for the last inequality. Then, since  $\bar{\kappa} < 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\kappa_\tau] < 1$ , and hence  $\Lambda$  is a contraction. Thus, we can apply the contraction mapping theorem to establish that there exists a unique fixed point  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  that satisfied eq. (12).

For the support  $S_\mu$ , consider the function  $\Gamma : \mathcal{C}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(S)$  such that for any  $B \in \mathcal{C}(S)$

$$\Gamma(B) = \text{closure} \left( \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} C_t(B) \right). \quad (13)$$

Then, for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ , it follows that  $\nu(\Gamma(A), \Gamma(B)) \leq \bar{\kappa} \nu(A, B)$ . Since  $\bar{\kappa} < 1$ , the map  $\Gamma$  is a contraction. By the contraction mapping theorem and since  $(\mathcal{C}(S), \nu)$  is complete, there exists a unique compact subset  $V \in \mathcal{C}(S)$  that satisfies eq. (13). The support of any



probability measure  $\mu$  on the Borel subsets of  $S$  is defined as  $S_\mu = \{\sigma \in S : \mu(\mathcal{O}(\sigma)) > 0, \forall \text{open set } \mathcal{O}(\sigma) \ni \sigma\}$ . That is,  $S_\mu$  is the smallest closed subset  $D$  of  $S$  such that  $\mu(D) = 1$ . Given eq. (12), such a set must be a Borel subset of  $S$  that satisfies eq. (13), and since we have shown that there exists a unique set that does so, it must be that  $S_\mu = V$ .  $\square$

## References

- Acemoglu, D., Dahleh, M. A., Lobel, I., and Ozdaglar, A. (2011). Bayesian learning in social networks. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 78(4):1201–1236.
- Almaatouq, A., Noriega-Campero, A., Alotaibi, A., Krafft, P., Moussaid, M., and Pentland, A. (2020). Adaptive social networks promote the wisdom of crowds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(21):11379–11386.
- Ba, C. (2024). Robust misspecified models and paradigm shifts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.12727*.
- Bala, V. and Goyal, S. (1998). Learning from neighbours. *The review of economic studies*, 65(3):595–621.
- Banerjee, A., Breza, E., Chandrasekhar, A. G., Duflo, E., Jackson, M. O., and Kinnan, C. (2024). Changes in social network structure in response to exposure to formal credit markets. *Review of Economic Studies*, 91(3):1331–1372.
- Banerjee, A., Breza, E., Chandrasekhar, A. G., and Mobius, M. (2021). Naive learning with uninformed agents. *American Economic Review*, 111(11):3540–74.
- Banerjee, A., Chandrasekhar, A. G., Duflo, E., and Jackson, M. O. (2019). Using gossips to spread information: Theory and evidence from two randomized controlled trials. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(6):2453–2490.
- Banerjee, A. and Compte, O. (2024). Consensus and disagreement: Information aggregation under (not so) naive learning. *forthcoming, Journal of Political Economy*.
- Brandts, J., Giritligil, A. E., and Weber, R. A. (2015). An experimental study of persuasion bias and social influence in networks. *European Economic Review*, 80:214–229.
- Breza, E., Chandrasekhar, A., Golub, B., and Parvathaneni, A. (2019). Networks in economic development. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 35(4):678–721.
- Cerreia-Vioglio, S., Corrao, R., and Lanzani, G. (2024). Dynamic opinion aggregation: long-run stability and disagreement. *Review of Economic Studies*, 91(3):1406–1447.
- Chakraborty, S. and Mukherjea, A. (2014). Limit distributions of random walks on stochastic matrices. *Proceedings-Mathematical Sciences*, 124:603–612.

- Chakraborty, S. and Rao, B. (1998). Covolution powers of probabilities on stochastic matrices of order 3. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 151–170.
- Chakraborty, S. and Rao, B. (2001). Convolution powers of probabilities on stochastic matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 14(2):599–603.
- Chamayou, J.-F. and Letac, G. (1991). Explicit stationary distributions for compositions of random functions and products of random matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 4:3–36.
- Chamayou, J.-F. and Letac, G. (1994). A transient random walk on stochastic matrices with dirichlet distributions. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 424–430.
- Chandrasekhar, A. G., Larreguy, H., and Xandri, J. P. (2020). Testing models of social learning on networks: Evidence from two experiments. *Econometrica*, 88(1):1–32.
- Chatterjee, S. and Seneta, E. (1977). Towards consensus: Some convergence theorems on repeated averaging. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 14(1):89–97.
- Chetty, R. and Hendren, N. (2015). The impacts of neighborhoods on intergenerational mobility: Childhood exposure effects and county-level estimates. *Harvard University and NBER*, 133(3):1–145.
- Clark, W. E. (1965). Remarks on the kernel of a matrix semigroup. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 15(2):305–310.
- Cohn, H., Nerman, O., and Peligrad, M. (1993). Weak ergodicity and products of random matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 6:389–405.
- Corazzini, L., Pavesi, F., Petrovich, B., and Stanca, L. (2012). Influential listeners: An experiment on persuasion bias in social networks. *European Economic Review*, 56(6):1276–1288.
- Cornfeld, I., Fomin, S., and Sinai, Y. G. (1982). *Ergodic Theory*. Springer, New York.
- Cureg, E. and Mukherjea, A. (2007). Convergence of convolution powers of a probability measure on  $d \times d$  stochastic matrices and a cyclicity condition. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics*, pages 289–303.
- Dasaratha, K. (2020). Distributions of centrality on networks. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 122:1–27.
- Dasaratha, K., Golub, B., and Hak, N. (2023). Learning from neighbours about a changing state. *Review of Economic Studies*, 90(5):2326–2369.
- DeGroot, M. H. (1974). Reaching a consensus. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69(345):118–121.

- DeMarzo, P. M., Vayanos, D., and Zwiebel, J. (2003). Persuasion bias, social influence, and unidimensional opinions. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 118(3):909–968.
- Dhar, S. and Mukherjea, A. (1997). Convergence in distribution of products of iid nonnegative matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 10:375–393.
- Edgar, G. A. (1998). *Integral, Probability, and Fractal Measures*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Erdős, P. (1939). On a family of symmetric bernoulli convolutions. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 61(4):974–976.
- French, J. R. (1956). A formal theory of social power. *Psychological review*, 63(3):181.
- Friedkin, N. E. and Johnsen, E. C. (1990). Social influence and opinions. *Journal of mathematical sociology*, 15(3-4):193–206.
- Fudenberg, D. and Lanzani, G. (2023). Which misspecifications persist? *Theoretical Economics*, 18(3):1271–1315.
- Galton, F. (1907). Vox populi. *Nature*, 75(1949):450–451.
- Geanakoplos, J. D. and Polemarchakis, H. M. (1982). We can’t disagree forever. *Journal of Economic theory*, 28(1):192–200.
- Ghosh, A. and Khan, M. A. (2021). On a diversity of perspectives and world views: Learning under bayesian vis-à-vis degroot updating. *Economics Letters*, 202:109839.
- Golub, B. and Jackson, M. O. (2010). Naive learning in social networks and the wisdom of crowds. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2(1):112–49.
- Golub, B. and Sadler, E. (2017). Learning in social networks. *Available at SSRN 2919146*.
- Grimm, V. and Mengel, F. (2020). Experiments on belief formation in networks. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 18(1):49–82.
- Hennion, H. (1997). Limit theorems for products of positive random matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1545–1587.
- Hennion, H. and Hervé, L. (2008). Stable laws and products of positive random matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 21:966–981.
- Högnäs, G. and Mukherjea, A. (2003). Maximal homomorphic group image and convergence of convolution sequences on a semigroup. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 16:847–854.
- Högnäs, G. and Mukherjea, A. (2005). Products of iid random nonnegative matrices: Their skeletons and convergence in distribution. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics*, pages 615–633.

- Hong, H., Stein, J. C., and Yu, J. (2007). Simple forecasts and paradigm shifts. *The Journal of Finance*, 62(3):1207–1242.
- Huang, J.-P., Heidergott, B., and Lindner, I. (2019). Naïve learning in social networks with random communication. *Social Networks*, 58:1–11.
- Jackson, M. (2008). *Social and Economic Networks*. Princeton University Press.
- Jackson, M. O. (2019). *The human network: How your social position determines your power, beliefs, and behaviors*. Vintage.
- Jackson, M. O., Nei, S. M., Snowberg, E., and Yariv, L. (2023). The dynamics of networks and homophily. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., and Sunstein, C. R. (2021). *Noise: A flaw in human judgment*. Hachette UK.
- Katz, E., Lazarsfeld, P. F., and Roper, E. (2017). *Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. Routledge.
- Katz, L. F., Kling, J. R., and Liebman, J. B. (2001). Moving to opportunity in boston: Early results of a randomized mobility experiment. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 116(2):607–654.
- Kesten, H. and Spitzer, F. (1984). Convergence in distribution of products of random matrices. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 67:363–386.
- Lo, C.-C. and Mukherjea, A. (1991). Convergence in distribution of products of  $d \times d$  random matrices. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 162(1):71–91.
- Mailath, G. J. and Samuelson, L. (2020). Learning under diverse world views: Model-based inference. *American Economic Review*, 110(5):1464–1501.
- Mathevet, L. (2010). A contraction principle for finite global games. *Economic Theory*, 42:539–563.
- McKinlay, S. (2014). A characterisation of transient random walks on stochastic matrices with dirichlet distributed limits. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 51(2):542–555.
- Molavi, P., Tahbaz-Salehi, A., and Jadbabaie, A. (2018). A theory of non-bayesian social learning. *Econometrica*, 86(2):445–490.
- Mukherjea, A. (1986). Completely simple semigroups of matrices. In *Semigroup Forum*, volume 33, pages 405–429. Springer.
- Mukherjea, A. (1987). Convergence in distribution of products of random matrices: a semi-group approach. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 303(1):395–411.

- Mukherjea, A. and Nakassis, A. (2002). On the continuous singularity of the limit distribution of products of iid  $d \times d$  stochastic matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 15:903–918.
- Oyama, D., Sandholm, W. H., and Tercieux, O. (2015). Sampling best response dynamics and deterministic equilibrium selection. *Theoretical Economics*, 10(1):243–281.
- Polanski, A. and Vega-Redondo, F. (2023). Homophily and influence. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 207:105576.
- Rosenblatt, M. (1965). Products of independent identically distributed stochastic matrices. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 11:1–10.
- Seneta, E. (1981). Non-negative matrices and markov chains. *Springer Series in Statistics*.
- Solomyak, B. (1995). On the random series  $\sum \pm \lambda^n$  (an erdos problem). *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 611–625.
- Stoll, R. (1951). Homomorphisms of a semigroup onto a group. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 73(2):475–481.
- Surowiecki, J. (2005). *The wisdom of crowds*. Anchor.
- Tahbaz-Salehi, A. and Jadbabaie, A. (2008). A necessary and sufficient condition for consensus over random networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(3):791–795.
- Tahbaz-Salehi, A. and Jadbabaie, A. (2009). Consensus over ergodic stationary graph processes. *IEEE Transactions on automatic Control*, 55(1):225–230.
- Touri, B. (2012). *Product of random stochastic matrices and distributed averaging*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Touri, B. and Nedić, A. (2013). Product of random stochastic matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(2):437–448.
- Ullman, J. (1972). On the regular behaviour of orthogonal polynomials. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 3(1):119–148.
- Vallacher, R. R. and Nowak, A. E. (1994). *Dynamical systems in social psychology*. Academic Press.
- Van Assche, W. (1986). Products of  $2 \times 2$  stochastic matrices with random entries. *Journal of applied probability*, 23(4):1019–1024.
- Weld, D. S., Lin, C. H., and Bragg, J. (2015). Artificial intelligence and collective intelligence. *Handbook of collective intelligence*, pages 89–114.
- Yang, T., Yi, X., Wu, J., Yuan, Y., Wu, D., Meng, Z., Hong, Y., Wang, H., Lin, Z., and Johansson, K. H. (2019). A survey of distributed optimization. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 47:278–305.

# Online Appendix: “Collective Intelligence in Dynamic Networks”

The online appendix is organized as follows. Online Appendix A shows how long-run disagreement can be explained in our framework. Online Appendix B relates our positive results to Huang et al.’s (2019) negative results about wisdom of crowds in dynamic networks. Online Appendix C is an application. Lastly, Online Appendix D collects the omitted proofs.

## Online Appendix A: Disagreement

The main analysis of the paper focused on consensus and social learning. However, the leading criticism of standard DeGroot learning is that it can explain consensus but not *disagreement*. The most popular way to introduce disagreement was pioneered by Friedkin and Johnsen (1990).<sup>28</sup> They assume a very specific source of disagreement: agents are *stubborn*—they keep putting disproportionate weight on their own initial beliefs (e.g., Jackson, 2008, Example 8.3.8). This appendix shows that their insights can also be captured more systematically in our framework. We show that introducing random network dynamics suffices to explain both consensus and (arbitrary forms of) disagreement. To this end, let  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  be iid so that we can build on the tools in Appendix B.III. We start by defining the degree of disagreement in a society as the *minimal rank* of all the interaction matrices in  $\Sigma$ —the closed semigroup generated by the support of  $\mu$ , denoted  $\Sigma_\mu$  (see, Appendix B: eq. (6)).

**Definition 6.** The *degree* of disagreement in a society is  $\eta = \min\{\text{rank}(\sigma) : \forall \sigma \in \Sigma\}$ .  $\triangle$

Importantly, the parameter  $\eta \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  in Definition 6 is also the rank of *all* the matrices in  $\Sigma_\psi$ —the limiting support of the random product  $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ —which coincides with the “kernel” of  $\Sigma$  (Appendix B: eq. (7)). At one extreme,  $\eta = 1$  (first degree) is trivial because it corresponds to consensus. When  $\eta = 2$ , there are two distinct groups of agents whose limiting beliefs agree within each group but disagree with the limiting beliefs of those outside the group. When  $\eta = 3$ , there are three such groups, and so on for  $\eta > 3$ . At the other extreme,  $\eta = n$  ( $n^{\text{th}}$  degree) means total disagreement, i.e., no two agents’ limiting beliefs ever coincide, hence  $\Sigma = \Sigma_\psi$  must be a finite set (Appendix B.III). Thus, as  $\eta$  increases from 1 (consensus) to  $n$  (total disagreement), our framework captures how societies can get *fragmented* into increasingly larger subgroups of agents with disagreeable limiting beliefs.

---

<sup>28</sup>More recently, Banerjee and Compte (2024) build on the Friedkin-Johnsen model to study when agents will choose between the DeGroot rule vs. Friedkin and Johnsen’s (1990) rule.

In general, the characterization of disagreement in random dynamic networks is an open problem. There exists, however, special cases where strong predictions can be made. To see this, we first introduce a useful definition due to [Chakraborty and Rao \(1998, p. 169\)](#).

**Definition 7** (Cyclicity). The support of  $\mu$ , denoted  $\Sigma_\mu$ , is said to be *cyclic* with respect to a set  $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  if, for each  $\sigma \in \Sigma_\mu$ ,  $\sum_{\ell \in A_{s+1}} (\sigma)_{i\ell} = 1$  for  $i \in A_s$  and  $s = 1, \dots, m$ , where the  $A_j$ 's, for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  are all pairwise disjoint subsets of  $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $\bigcup_{j=1}^m A_j$  may or may not equal  $N$  and  $A_{m+j} := A_j$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .  $\triangle$

Intuitively,  $\Sigma_\mu$  is cyclic whenever any interaction matrix in it is (more or less) periodic. For instance, let  $n = 2$ , so if  $\Sigma_\mu$  is cyclic with respect to  $A_1 = \{1\}$  and  $A_2 = \{2\}$  (Definition 7), then it must be that  $\Sigma_\mu = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ , which is periodic (see, Remark 3). Notably, when  $\eta = 2$ , the definition above simplifies to the fact that there exist two disjoint subsets  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  of  $N$  such that  $\sum_{\ell \in A_2} (\sigma)_{i\ell} = 1$  for  $i \in A_1$  and  $\sum_{\ell \in A_1} (\sigma)_{i\ell} = 1$  for  $i \in A_2$ . The next result uses this to characterize *second-degree* disagreement ( $\eta = 2$ ) in terms of the cyclicity of  $\Sigma_\mu$ .

**Proposition 10.** *Suppose  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid and  $\eta = 2$ . Then,  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly if and only if  $\Sigma_\mu$  is not cyclic.*

This result shows that a society reaches second-degree disagreement whenever  $\Sigma_\mu$  is not cyclic, which is due to [Cureg and Mukherjea \(2007, Theorem 2.1\)](#). When  $\eta = 2$  and agents' beliefs  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)} = \mathbf{X}^{(t)} \mathbf{p}^{(0)}$  converges weakly to  $\mathbf{p}^{(\infty)}$ , all matrices in the limiting support  $\Sigma_\psi$  will have rank two, i.e.,  $\text{rank}(\sigma) = \eta = 2$ , for all  $\sigma \in \Sigma_\psi$ . An intuitive example of second-degree disagreement is the two-party divide observed in US Congress, where Republicans tend to agree (i.e., vote on the same side of a bill) with their fellow Republicans but disagree with Democrats, and vice versa (see, [Jackson, 2019, Figure 7.4\(b\)](#)). The next example illustrates how our framework can capture [Friedkin and Johnsen's \(1990\)](#) insights about stubbornness.

**Example 15.** Let  $n = 3$ ,  $\Sigma_\mu = \{h_\kappa, g\}$ , where  $h_\kappa = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \kappa & 1-\kappa & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , for some constant  $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ . Then, when  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  are iid, the limiting distribution  $\psi$  exists with support  $\Sigma_\psi = \{h_\kappa, h_{1-\kappa}, q_\kappa, q_{1-\kappa}\}$ , where  $q_\kappa = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa & 1-\kappa & 0 \\ \kappa & 1-\kappa & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  ([Dhar and Mukherjea, 1997, Section 4](#)). For instance, if  $\kappa = 1/2$ , then  $\Sigma_\psi = \{h_{1/2}, q_{1/2}\}$ , and hence  $\psi\{h_{1/2}\} = 1/2$ . More generally, if  $\mu\{h_\kappa\} = r$ , then  $\psi\{h_\kappa\} + \psi\{h_{1-\kappa}\} = \psi\{q_\kappa\} + \psi\{q_{1-\kappa}\} = 1/2$ , where  $\psi\{h_\kappa\} = \psi\{q_\kappa\} = \frac{1}{2(2-r)}$ , for  $r \in (0, 1)$ . Here,  $(\mathcal{C})$  is not satisfied because  $\Sigma_\psi$  contains matrices that are not strictly positive. Instead,  $\Sigma_\psi$  consists of rank-two matrices, i.e.,  $\eta = 2$ , and it follows that agents 1 and 2 will reach consensus but always disagree with agent 3. It can also be seen (by  $g \in \Sigma_\mu$ ) that long-term disagreement arises here because agent 3 tends to be stubborn.  $\triangle$

Extending Proposition 10 for  $\eta > 2$  will not work—Cureg and Mukherjea (2007, Section 3) show that cyclicity does not characterize weak convergence when  $\eta > 2$ . In the next result, we therefore use a different approach to characterize total disagreement ( $\eta = n$ ).

**Proposition 11.** *Suppose  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$  is iid and  $\eta = n$ . Then,  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly if and only if there exists a  $\tau \geq 1$  such that the support of  $\mathbf{X}^{(\tau)}$  is the finite set  $\Sigma_\psi = \Sigma$ . When the limiting distribution  $\psi$  exists, it is the uniform probability measure on  $\Sigma_\psi$ .*

This result is a special case of Lemma 8 because when  $\eta = n$ ,  $\Sigma_\psi = \Sigma$  is finite (Appendix B.III). It shows that total disagreement is very special: when agents reach total disagreement in the limit, it must be that these agents have totally disagreed at every point in time.

We also consider the predictability of disagreement. The next result follows directly from Theorem 3.(i), so we use the language of societies  $X$  and  $Y$  introduced in Section 5.

**Corollary 9.** *In Theorem 3.(i), choose any  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then, Society  $X$  reaches  $k^{\text{th}}$ -degree disagreement if and only if Society  $Y$  reaches  $k^{\text{th}}$ -degree disagreement.*

A key step to prove Theorem 3.(i) (Lemma 3) shows that the interaction matrices in the limiting supports  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  have the *same* rank, i.e.,  $\eta_X = \eta_Y (= k)$ , when  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ . Thus, the initial social topology (Definition 4) also reveals disagreement in iid networks.

## Online Appendix B: Robustness of Wisdom of Crowds

Huang et al. (2019) show, using examples and simulations, that the wisdom of crowds may fail to hold even when no agent has influence as random networks grow. In particular, they consider the case where there is a finite collection of independent random influence matrices. The examples in their Section 6 focus specifically on the case where the interaction matrix is a weighted average of two non-wise matrices. In what follows, we show that their restriction to a finite collection of matrices dramatically limits the possibility of even reaching consensus.

Suppose the limiting distribution  $\psi$  exists in the sense of Remark 1. We then ask: “What is the probability that the agents reach consensus?” That is, we seek to understand how likely it is that  $n \geq 2$  agents would reach consensus when their beliefs are known to converge. The next result answers this question when the influence matrices are iid and  $\Sigma$  is finite, so that  $\Sigma_\mu$  necessarily contains a finite number of elements as in Huang et al. (2019). Let  $\phi_n := \mathbb{P}(R_{n,m} = 1) \in [0, 1]$ , where  $R_{n,m}$  denotes the rank of the  $m$ -th  $n \times n$  matrix in  $\Sigma$ , for any  $m = 1, \dots, k$ . Also,  $|\cdot|$  stands for cardinality.



**Proposition 12.** *Suppose the limiting distribution  $\psi$  of the iid sequence  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  exists and  $|\Sigma| = k < \infty$ . Then, the probability that  $n$  agents reach consensus is*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} (1 - \phi_n)^j \phi_n^{k-j} \in [0, 1]. \quad (14)$$

The rank of matrices appears in this result for a profound reason, which we elaborate in details in Appendix B.III: when a product of iid random nonnegative matrices converges in distribution, the support  $\Sigma_\psi$  of the limiting distribution  $\psi$  consists of all the matrices in  $\Sigma$  that have *minimal* rank. Then, the next example illustrates that the probability of reaching consensus may vanish as the number of agents  $n$  increases.

**Example 16.** Let  $k = 2$ , then the probability of consensus is  $\phi_n(2 - \phi_n)$  (eq. (14)). Suppose the rank  $R_{n,m}$  of the  $m$ -th matrix in  $\Sigma$  is uniformly distributed on  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , for all  $m = 1, 2$ , so each of its values has probability  $1/n$ . Thus,  $\phi_n = 1/n$  such that consensus is reached with probability  $(2 - 1/n)/n$ , and therefore, this probability vanishes as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\triangle$

Although the above restriction to  $k = 2$  might seem extreme, Huang et al. (2019) assume the same in their examples to show the failure of the wisdom of crowds. We will now consider what happens when the size of the set  $\Sigma$  is unrestricted. The next result shows that when the agents' beliefs converge, consensus can be reached on *average* irrespective of  $n$ .

**Proposition 13.** *Suppose the limiting distribution  $\psi \in \Delta(\Sigma)$  of the iid sequence  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  exists,  $\psi(\hat{\Sigma}) > 0$ , and  $|\Sigma|$  is unrestricted. Then,  $\int_{\Sigma} \sigma d\psi(\sigma)$  has rank one, for all  $n$ .*

This result states that when the size of  $\Sigma$  is unrestricted and agents' beliefs converge, then consensus is reached on average for any  $n$ . Intuitively, this result indicates that the randomness in social networks needs to be sufficiently *rich* to ensure a society can reach consensus. The assumptions in Proposition 13 are easily satisfied, e.g., when there exists an integer  $r \geq 1$  such that the convolution power satisfies  $\mu^r(\hat{\Sigma}) > 0$ , then  $\psi$  exists and  $\psi(\hat{\Sigma}) > 0$  (see, Chakraborty and Mukherjea, 2014, eq. (1)).

## Online Appendix C: Network Formation

This application builds on Mailath and Samuelson (2020) to help illustrate how to analyze a social network with random dynamics based on strategic network formation. We focus specifically on Ghosh and Khan (2021) who modify Mailath and Samuelson's (2020) "model-based inference" by considering agents who learn via DeGroot rule instead of Bayes rule.

Let  $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a finite set of outcomes,  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{N}$  be finite, and  $\Gamma = Y^{\mathcal{M}}$  be the set of states of the world. Nature draws a state  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  according to a prior  $\rho$  on  $\Gamma$ . An event  $F \subset \Gamma$  is represented by the indicator  $\delta_F(\gamma) = 1$  if  $\gamma \in F$  and  $\delta_F(\gamma) = 0$  otherwise. Each agent  $i \in N = \{1, \dots, n\}$  is characterized by a *model*  $M_i \subset \mathcal{M}$ , an information set  $I_i \subset M_i$ , and a *theory* (or description of events)  $f_i : Y^{M_i} \times Y^{\mathcal{M}-M_i} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . Each  $i$  uses the triplet  $(M_i, I_i, f_i)$  to form beliefs about the occurrence of event  $F$ . Intuitively, agent  $i$ 's model  $M_i$  partitions the full space  $Y^{\mathcal{M}}$  into equivalence classes of the form  $\{\gamma_{M_i}\} \times Y^{\mathcal{M}-M_i}$ , which convert  $Y^{\mathcal{M}}$  into agent  $i$ 's (incomplete) *point of view* of the world, for  $\gamma_{M_i} \in Y^{M_i}$ . Then, a key assumption in [Mailath and Samuelson \(2020\)](#) is that the probability agent  $i$ 's theory forms of event  $F$  conditional on the variables in  $M_i$  is

$$f_i(\gamma_{M_i}) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \delta_F(\gamma) \rho(\gamma | \{\gamma_{M_i}\} \times Y^{\mathcal{M}-M_i}),$$

where  $\rho(\gamma | \{\gamma_{M_i}\} \times Y^{\mathcal{M}-M_i})$  is the prior  $\rho$  on  $\Gamma$  conditional on  $\gamma_{M_i}$  with  $\rho(\{\gamma_{M_i}\} \times Y^{\mathcal{M}-M_i}) > 0$ . Each agent  $i$  forms her *interim* belief of event  $F$  by updating her theory  $f_i$  with respect to her information set  $I_i$ . Specifically,  $i$ 's interim belief is the map from  $Y^{I_i} \times Y^{\mathcal{M}-I_i}$  to  $[0, 1]$ :

$$p_i^{(0)}(\gamma_{I_i}) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} f_i(\gamma_{M_i}) \rho(\gamma | \{\gamma_{I_i}\} \times Y^{\mathcal{M}-I_i}). \quad (15)$$

All the interim beliefs are summarized as  $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(\gamma) = (p_1^{(0)}(\gamma_{I_1}), \dots, p_n^{(0)}(\gamma_{I_n})) \in [0, 1]^n$ , which corresponds to what we referred in our framework as the agents' "initial signals." For each state  $\gamma$ ,  $p_i^{(0)}(\gamma_{I_i})$  in eq. (15) may be interpreted as agent  $i$ 's subjective belief about any event  $F$  based on her theory  $f_i$  and the initial information  $I_i$  available to her.

The setup above coincides with [Mailath and Samuelson \(2020\)](#). We depart from their Bayesian framework by allowing the agents to update only by sharing their interim beliefs with one another in the DeGroot sense instead of using Bayes rule.<sup>29</sup> To this end, we assume what [Mailath and Samuelson \(2020\)](#) refer to as "known nonsense," i.e., each agent knows the models of other agents, and they also know the variables in the information sets of other agents but not the realization of those variables ([Ghosh and Khan, 2021](#), Assumption 1). We then follow [Ghosh and Khan \(2021\)](#) by constructing a graph over the set of agents  $N$ . Let  $\mathbf{A}$  represent a symmetric  $n \times n$  (adjacency) matrix with entries in  $\{0, 1\}$  defined as

$$\mathbf{A}(M) = (a_{ij})_{n \times n} = \begin{cases} a_{ij} = 1, & \text{if } M_i \cap M_j \neq \emptyset \\ a_{ij} = 0, & \text{if } M_i \cap M_j = \emptyset, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

([Ghosh and Khan, 2021](#), eq. (8)), where  $M = \{M_1, \dots, M_n\}$ . That is, agents  $i$  and  $j$  form

---

<sup>29</sup>As in [Ghosh and Khan \(2021\)](#), agents simultaneously and truthfully announce their interim beliefs; see also [Geanakoplos and Polemarchakis \(1982\)](#).

a connection (i.e.,  $a_{ij} = 1$ ) whenever their respective models have common components. This means that each agent’s strategy is to befriend those with whom they share at least one common point of view of the world. Intuitively, when  $a_{ij} = 1$ , agents  $i$  and  $j$  may have variables to learn from each other and hence they may wish to listen to each other’s opinion.<sup>30</sup> When their models have nothing in common, agents  $i$  and  $j$  fail to form a connection and hence  $a_{ij} = 0$ . Then, the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  corresponding to  $\mathbf{A}(M)$  is given by

$$\mathbf{T}(M^*) = (x_{ij})_{n \times n} = \begin{cases} \frac{|I_i|}{|M_i^*|}, & \text{if } j = i \\ \left(1 - \frac{|I_i|}{|M_i^*|}\right) \frac{|(M_i^* - I_i) \cap I_j|}{\sum_{k \in N} |(M_i^* - I_i) \cap I_k|}, & \text{if } j \neq i \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

(Ghosh and Khan, 2021, eq. (9)), where  $M^* = \{M_1^*, \dots, M_n^*\}$ , and each  $M_i^*$  is defined shortly below. The interaction matrix  $\mathbf{T}(M^*)$  in eq. (17) is constructed explicitly as follows:

1. agent  $i$  constructs a feasible model space  $M_i^* = M_i \cap (\bigcup_{i \in N} I_i)$ , which is the set containing the variables in  $i$ ’s model about which  $i$  can learn from the  $n$  information sets available. It is assumed that  $M_i^* \neq \emptyset$ , i.e., the agents should be able to learn from each other. If  $M_i = \mathcal{M}$ , then  $M_i^* = \mathcal{M} \cap (\bigcup_{i \in N} I_i) = \bigcup_{i \in N} I_i$  since  $\bigcup_{i \in N} I_i \subset \mathcal{M}$ ;
2. agent  $i$  places weight  $x_{ii} = \frac{|I_i|}{|M_i^*|}$  on her own belief, i.e.,  $i$  computes the number of variables she has in her information set  $I_i$  and normalizes it by the total number of variables in her feasible model space  $M_i^*$ .
3. agent  $i$  allocates the remaining weight  $(1 - \frac{|I_i|}{|M_i^*|})$  to all the other  $n - 1$  agents as follows. For each agent  $j \in N - \{i\}$ ,  $i$  computes the number of variables common between her feasible model space adjusted for her information set and  $j$ ’s information set, normalized by summing over such common variables across all  $j$ ’s. This process is then repeated for all  $n$  agents.

Step 2. above can be easily extended to settings where variables are weighted unequally due to payoff considerations. Ghosh and Khan (2021, Section 5) compares the predictions from the above DeGroot framework with Mailath and Samuelson’s (2020) Bayesian framework.

We now depart from Ghosh and Khan (2021) by allowing each agent  $i$ ’s model  $M_i$  to evolve randomly over time, i.e.,  $M_{it} \subset \mathcal{M}$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ . This means that the agents’ points of view of the world are allowed to change as agents learn from one another over time. This is a natural extension since there is a large literature that considers agents who switch between models over time depending, for example, on predictive or forecasting performance (e.g., Hong et al., 2007; Fudenberg and Lanzani, 2023; Ba, 2024), and it is also encouraged

---

<sup>30</sup>If agent  $i$  is fully informed about his model,  $i$  assigns zero weight to  $j$ ’s belief whether or not they have a common model (see, Ghosh and Khan, 2021).

in Ghosh and Khan (2021, Section 6.(iii)). We hold each agent's information set  $I_i$  fixed over time, however, to focus on the effect of model switching dynamics on social learning. Then, the interaction matrix at time  $t \geq 1$  becomes  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{T}(M_t^*)$ , where  $M_t^* = \{M_{1t}^*, \dots, M_{1t}^*\}$ ,  $M_{1t}^* = M_{1t} \cap (\bigcup_{i \in N} I_i)$ , and the adjacency matrix in eq. (16) becomes  $\mathbf{A}_t = \mathbf{A}(M_t) = (a_{ijt})_{n \times n}$ . These matrices have desirable properties, which are summarized below.

**Proposition 14.** *The random matrices  $\{\mathbf{X}_t = (x_{ijt})_{n \times n}\}_{t \geq 1}$  have the following properties:*

1. *If agents  $i$  and  $j$  have disjoint models at  $t$ , then the weights assigned to each other's beliefs is zero, i.e., if  $a_{ijt} = 0$  a.s., then at time  $t$ ,  $x_{ijt} = x_{jit} = 0$  for all  $i, j \in N$ .*
2. *The entries of  $\mathbf{X}_t$  are between 0 and 1 for all  $t$ , i.e.,  $x_{ijt} \in [0, 1]$  for all  $i, j \in N$ .*
3.  *$\mathbf{X}_t$  is a stochastic matrix for all  $t$ .*
4. *If at time  $t$ , the information sets of all the agents contain the information needed for their feasible model space, i.e.,  $|I_i| = |M_{it}^*|$  for all  $i$ , then  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{I}_n$  a.s. at time  $t$ .*

This result follows by applying Ghosh and Khan (2021, Proposition 1) for each  $t \geq 1$ . Then, agents' beliefs evolve according to  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(\gamma) = \mathbf{X}^{(t)}\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(\gamma)$  as defined in Section 2.2. When agents' models and information sets are fixed over time  $M_{it} = M_i$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ , then  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{T}$  in eq. (17) for all  $t$ , so the beliefs' evolution degenerates to  $\mathbf{p}^{(t)}(\gamma) = \mathbf{T}^t\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(\gamma)$ , which coincides with Ghosh and Khan (2021, eq. (7)). We can therefore apply Theorem 1 to establish consensus in this dynamic network as shown below.

**Proposition 15.** *Assuming  $(\mathcal{C})$  and ergodicity of  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ , each agent  $i$ 's limiting belief*

$$p_i^{(\infty)}(\gamma) = \left( \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{X}^{(t)}\mathbf{p}^{(0)}(\gamma) \right)_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_j p_j^{(0)}(\gamma_{I_j})$$

*exists a.s. for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and  $i \in N$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in (0, 1)^n$  is a strictly positive random unit vector.*

**Example 17.** Consider a network consisting of  $n = 2$  agents. At time  $t$ , suppose each agent  $i$ 's model,  $M_{it} \subset \mathcal{M}$ , and information set  $I_i$ , are such that  $M_{it}^* = M_{it} \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^2 I_i) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ . Then, for any constant  $\beta > 0$ , if  $x_{i1t} = \frac{|I_i|}{|M_{it}^*|} \sim_{\text{iid}} \text{Beta}(\beta, \beta)$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ , then  $\mathbf{X}_t = (x_{ijt})_{2 \times 2} \in \hat{\Sigma}$  holds almost surely for all  $t$  and are iid, and therefore both  $(\mathcal{C})$  and ergodicity hold. By Proposition 15, these agents will reach consensus with a random influence vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi, 1 - \pi) \in (0, 1)^2$ . Moreover,  $\pi \sim \text{Beta}(2\beta, 2\beta)$  by Corollary 4.  $\triangle$

Theorem 3 has an intuitive interpretation in this application: the agents' initial models can be *sticky* in the sense that model switching after  $t = 1$  may require more evidence

and hence becomes stickier. This is consistent with the existing literature documenting the stickiness of models when agents consider switching across competing models (e.g., Ba, 2024).

To define the wisdom of crowds here, where the state of nature  $\gamma$  is random, we follow Mailath and Samuelson (2020) and Ghosh and Khan (2021) by using the definition below.

**Definition 8** (Oracle). An agent, with a state space  $\Gamma$  and prior distribution  $\rho$ , is said to be an *oracle* if the number of variables in her model equals  $\mathcal{M}$ . That is, her theory for an event  $F$  is the indicator function  $\delta_F$  defined earlier. Further, an oracle is said to be an *omniscient* oracle if she also knows the realization of the state, denoted  $\gamma^*$ , so her belief is  $\delta_F(\gamma^*)$ .  $\triangle$

The next result follows from Theorem 2, assuming all conditions in Section 4.1 hold.

**Proposition 16.** *The limiting belief  $p_i^{(\infty)}(\gamma)$  in Proposition 15 converges in probability to the omniscient oracle's belief  $\delta_F(\gamma^*)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $\max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[\pi_i] \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

## Online Appendix D: Proofs

### Proof of Lemma 1

To ease notation in this proof, define  $S := \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} \Sigma_{\mu}^t)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $S$  is compact, the sequence  $(\mu^t)_{t \geq 1}$  is tight, so the sequence  $(\frac{1}{t} \sum_{\ell=1}^t \mu^{\ell})_{t \geq 1}$  of average convolution powers of  $\mu$  converges weakly to a probability measure  $\psi$  with support  $K$  such that  $\mu * \psi = \psi * \mu = \psi$  (Cureg and Mukherjea, 2007, Theorem 1.1).

By Mukherjea (1987, Theorem 2.1),  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu^t(\mathcal{O}) = 1$  holds for any open set  $\mathcal{O} \supset K$ , so if  $\nu$  is ever a weak limit of  $\mu^t$  it must be that  $\Sigma_{\nu} \subset K$ . Then,  $\nu * \psi = \psi * \nu = \psi$  implies that, for any Borel subset  $B \subset S$ ,

$$\psi(B) = \psi * \nu(B) = \int_K \psi(\{x \in S : x\sigma \in B\}) d\nu(\sigma) = \nu(B)$$

because  $x\sigma = \sigma$  holds when the rank in  $K$  is one. Thus,  $(\mu^t)_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly to  $\psi$ .  $\square$

### Proof of Proposition 12

*Proof.* When the limiting distribution  $\psi$  exists, its support satisfies  $\Sigma_{\psi} = K$ , where

$$K = \{y \in \Sigma : \text{rank}(y) \leq \text{rank}(\sigma), \forall \sigma \in \Sigma\}$$

is the kernel of  $\Sigma$ , so its elements are the  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices in  $\Sigma$  with minimal rank (see, eq. (7)). Now, let  $R_{n,m}$  denote the rank of the  $m$ -th  $n \times n$  stochastic matrix in  $\Sigma$ ,

for  $m = 1, \dots, k$ . Then, agents reach consensus when  $\min_m R_{n,m} = 1$  such that the limiting support  $\Sigma_\psi$  contains only rank-one stochastic matrices. Moreover,  $\min_m R_{n,m}$  is a first order statistics that takes values in  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , where zero is excluded because the matrices are stochastic. Since there are  $k < \infty$  such matrices in  $\Sigma$  and these matrices are iid, then so are their ranks  $\{R_{n,m}\}_{m=1}^k$ . Thus, the probability of reaching consensus coincides with the probability that the first order statistics equals 1, i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}(\min_m R_{n,m} = 1)$ , which is given by

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{n}{j} \left[ (1 - \phi_n)^j \phi_n^{k-j} - (1 - \phi_n + p_n)^j (\phi_n - p_n)^{k-j} \right],$$

where  $p_n = \mathbb{P}(R_{n,m} = 1)$  and  $\phi_n = \mathbb{P}(R_{n,m} \leq 1)$ , and since  $R_{n,m}$  cannot take values below 1 (i.e., the matrices are stochastic),  $p_n = \phi_n$ , so the expression above simplifies to eq. (14).  $\square$

### Proof of Proposition 13

This result follows directly by combining Hennion (1997, Lemmas 9.2 and 9.3) for the special case of random stochastic matrices.

### Proof of Theorem 3.(i)

The proof of Theorem 3.(i) is technical and first appeared in Högnäs and Mukherjea (2005). However, Högnäs and Mukherjea (2005) mix results for stochastic matrices with those of nonnegative matrices, so the goal of this appendix is to collect a simplified version of the proof for stochastic matrices. We aim to show that, when  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ ,  $\{\mathbf{X}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly if and only if  $\{\mathbf{Y}^{(t)}\}_{t \geq 1}$  converges weakly, which is equivalent to showing that the corresponding convolution sequence  $\mu_X^t$  converges weakly if and only if  $\mu_Y^t$  converges weakly. As outlined in the sketch (Appendix B.IV), it suffices to prove Lemmas 3–6 respectively.

Let  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$  be probability measures on the Borel subsets of  $n \times n$  stochastic matrices. Let  $\Sigma_X = \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^t)$  and  $\Sigma_Y = \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_Y}^t)$  be, respectively, the compact multiplicative semigroups of stochastic matrices generated by the supports  $\Sigma_{\mu_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\mu_Y}$ , respectively (eq. (6)). For any  $\sigma \in \Sigma_X \cup \Sigma_Y$ , denote by  $\bar{\sigma}$  the idempotent (identity) element in the group of limit points  $\{\sigma^t : t \geq 1\}$ .<sup>31</sup> A useful property that we will need is that any idempotent nonnegative matrix  $p$  uniquely defines a partition

$$\mathcal{B}_\eta = \{T, C_1, \dots, C_\eta\} \tag{18}$$

of the set  $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$  called the *basis* of  $p$  with rank  $\eta$  (see, Mukherjea, 1986). An

---

<sup>31</sup>For any stochastic matrix  $\sigma$ , the set of limit points of the sequence  $\sigma^t$  coincides with the set  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{closure}(\{\sigma^t : t \geq k\})$ , which forms a group. The identity of this group is idempotent, denoted  $\bar{\sigma}$ .

element  $i$  in  $N$  belongs to  $T$  if and only if either the  $i$ -th row of  $p$  is a zero row or  $i$ -th column of  $p$  is a zero column or both. For each  $j = 1, \dots, \eta$ , the  $C_j \times C_j$  block of  $p$  is a matrix of rank one whose entries are all strictly positive. For  $j, k = 1, \dots, \eta$  with  $j \neq k$ , the  $C_j \times C_k$  block of  $p$  is an all zero block. In our context,  $p$  is a stochastic matrix, so each  $C_j \times C_j$  block of  $p$  is a strictly positive stochastic matrix with rank one.

Our definition of *social topology* in Definition 4 is identical to that of *skeleton* in Högnäs and Mukherjea (2005, Assumption 1). We start by following Högnäs and Mukherjea (2005, Remark 1) to show that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{W}) = 1$  extends to  $\Sigma_X$  and  $\Sigma_Y$ , where we recall that

$$\mathscr{W} = \{\mathbf{X}_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{Y}_1 \text{ have the same social topology}\}.$$

To see this, define the event

$$\mathscr{A} = \left\{ \mathbf{X}_1 \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}, \mathbf{Y}_1 \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}, \mathbf{X}_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{Y}_1 \text{ have the same social topology} \right\}$$

then  $\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{A}) = 1$  whenever  $\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{W}) = 1$  holds. Define the sets  $C = \mathbf{X}_1(\mathscr{A})$  and  $D = \mathbf{Y}_1(\mathscr{A})$ . Then,  $\text{closure}(C) \subset \Sigma_{\mu_X}$ ,  $\text{closure}(D) \subset \Sigma_{\mu_Y}$ , and  $\mu_X(\text{closure}(C)) = 1 = \mu_Y(\text{closure}(D))$ . It therefore follows that  $\text{closure}(C) = \Sigma_{\mu_X}$  and  $\text{closure}(D) = \Sigma_{\mu_Y}$ . This then means that for any  $x \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}$ , there exists a sequence  $x_t \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}$  such that  $x_t \rightarrow x$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $y_t \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}$  such that  $y_t$  and  $x_t$  have the same social topology for each  $t$ , and for some  $y \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}$ ,  $y_t \rightarrow y$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . We next show that this property extends to  $\Sigma_X = \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^t)$  and  $\Sigma_Y = \text{closure}(\bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_Y}^t)$ . Let  $x \in \Sigma_X$ , then there exists  $x_{t_k} \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}^{t_k}$ , for some subsequence  $\{t_k\}$ , such that  $x_{t_k} \rightarrow x$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . For a fixed  $k$ , define  $x_{t_k} = z_{t_k} \dots z_2 z_1$ , where  $z_j \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, t_k$ . Then, there exist sequences  $\{u_j \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}\}_{j=1}^{t_k}$  and  $\{v_j \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}\}_{j=1}^{t_k}$ , where  $u_j$  and  $v_j$  have the same social topology for each  $j = 1, \dots, t_k$ , and  $\|z_j - u_j\| < \epsilon_k$ ,<sup>32</sup> for some small enough  $\epsilon_k$  such that  $\|z_{t_k} \dots z_2 z_1 - u_{t_k} \dots u_2 u_1\| < 1/k$ . That is, given any  $x \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}$ , there exists  $x_{t_k} \in \Sigma_X$  and  $y_{t_k} = v_{t_k} \dots v_2 v_1 \in \Sigma_Y$  such that, for each  $k$ ,  $x_{t_k}$  and  $y_{t_k}$  have the same social topology and  $x_{t_k} \rightarrow x$ . The same property continues to hold when we interchange the role of  $X$  and  $Y$  above. We are now ready to prove Lemma 3.

*Proof of Lemma 3.* Let  $p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$  be an idempotent element with basis  $\mathscr{B}_\eta = \{T, C_1, \dots, C_\eta\}$  in eq. (18) such that among all idempotent elements in  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$ ,  $p$  has the minimum number of zero columns. First, suppose  $p \in \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^t$ . Then, there exists some  $q \in \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_Y}^t$  such that  $p$  and  $q$  have the same social topology. Thus, for  $i, j = 1, \dots, \eta$ , each  $C_i \times T$  block, each  $C_i \times C_j$  block for  $i \neq j$ , and the  $T \times T$  block of  $q$  is an all zero block, and each  $C_i \times C_i$  block of  $q$  is a strictly positive stochastic matrix. The same is true for all powers of  $q$  and therefore, for the element  $\bar{q}$ , an idempotent element in  $\Sigma_Y$ . Since  $\bar{q}|_{C_i \times C_i} = \lim [\bar{q}|_{C_i \times C_i}]^t$ ,

---

<sup>32</sup>Here, let  $\|\cdot\|$  denote the Euclidean norm of  $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ .

for  $i = 1, \dots, \eta$ , then  $\bar{q}|_{C_i \times C_i}$  has rank one. It also follows that  $q|_{T \times C_i}$  is strictly positive, for some  $i$ , then the same is true for  $\bar{q}$ . Thus,  $p$  and  $\bar{q}$  have the same basis and also the same social topology.

Now, suppose  $p^2 = p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X} - \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^t$  with basis  $\mathcal{B}_\eta$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that there are elements  $p_t \in \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^t$  such that  $p_t \rightarrow p$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, \eta$ ,  $p_t|_{C_i \times C_i}$  is strictly positive for each  $t$ , for all  $j \in N = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $k \in T$ ,  $(p_t)_{jk} < \frac{1}{2n^2}$ , and  $p_t|_{T \times C_i}$  is strictly positive for each  $t$  whenever  $p|_{T \times C_i}$  is so. For each  $t \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{G}_t$  be the group of limit points of  $\{p_t^m : m \geq 1\}$ . Then,  $\bar{p}_t$  is the identity of  $\mathcal{G}_t$ , so choose  $y_t \in \mathcal{G}_t$  such that  $y_t(p_t \bar{p}_t) = (p_t \bar{p}_t) y_t \bar{p}_t$ . But since  $y_t \bar{p}_t = y_t = \bar{p}_t y_t$  and  $p_t \bar{p}_t = \bar{p}_t p_t$ , we have

$$y_t p_t = p_t y_t = \bar{p}_t. \quad (19)$$

Let  $\mathcal{B}'_s = \{T', C'_1, \dots, C'_s\}$  be the basis of  $\bar{p}_t$ . Note that  $\bar{p}_t \in \Sigma_X$ , but  $p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$ , and hence  $s \geq \eta$ . We aim to show that  $p$  and  $\bar{p}_t$  have the same basis and the same social topology. To see this, let  $j \in C'_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$  and  $k \in T$ . Then,

$$0 = (p_t \bar{p}_t)_{jk} = (\bar{p}_t p_t)_{jk} = \sum_{m \in C'_i} (\bar{p}_t)_{jm} (p_t)_{mk}$$

which implies that  $p_t|_{C'_i \times T'}$  is an all zero block. It is known that for  $y_t$  in eq. (19), there is an associated permutation  $\pi$  of  $\{1, \dots, s\}$  such that the  $C'_i \times C'_j$  of  $y_t$  is a block with all entries strictly positive or zero accordingly as  $\pi(i) = j$  or  $\pi(i) \neq j$ . We may also notice that  $y_t p_t = \bar{p}_t$  and hence, for  $u \in C'_k$ , we have

$$1 = \sum_{j \in C'_k} (\bar{p}_t)_{uj} = \sum_{\ell \in C'_{\pi(k)}} (y_t)_{u\ell} \sum_{j \in C'_k} (p_t)_{\ell j},$$

which implies that  $p_t|_{C'_{\pi(k)} \times C'_k}$  is a stochastic matrix, whenever  $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ , and therefore,  $\sum_{j \in C'_k} (e_t)_{\ell j} = 1$ , for  $\ell \in C'_{\pi(k)}$ . We will now show that the permutation  $\pi$  corresponding to  $y_t$  must be the identity permutation. If this is not the case, then there exists some  $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$  such that  $j \neq \pi(j)$ , and consequently  $\pi(\pi(j)) \neq \pi(j)$ . Let  $\pi(j) = i$  and  $\pi(k) = j$ , so  $i \neq j$  and  $j \neq k$ . It follows that  $p_t|_{C'_i \times C'_i}$  as well as  $p_t|_{C'_j \times C'_j}$  is an all zero block. Thus,  $C'_i \cup C'_j \subset T$ , because of our choice of  $p_t$ , and  $C'_i \times C'_j \subset T \times T$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $p_t|_{C'_i \times C'_j}$  is a stochastic matrix, since for  $k_1, k_2 \in T$ ,  $(p_t)_{k_1 k_2} < \frac{1}{2n^2}$ , because of the way  $p_t$  was chosen. Thus,  $\pi$  must be the identity permutation, and therefore,  $y_t$  must be the element  $\bar{p}_t$  (see, Mukherjea, 1986) and this means that, for  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\bar{p}_t p_t^k = p_t^k \bar{p}_t = \bar{p}_t$ . It follows that for any  $y \in \mathcal{G}_t$ ,  $\bar{p}_t y = y \bar{p}_t = \bar{p}_t$  so that  $\mathcal{G}_t$  is a singleton and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_t^k = \bar{p}_t = \bar{p}_t^2$ . Also, since  $p_t \bar{p}_t = \bar{p}_t p_t = \bar{p}_t$ ,  $p_t$  must be of the form

Recall that  $p_t|_{T \times T}$  is strictly sub-stochastic and thus, no  $C'_i$  can be completely contained in  $T$ , and no  $C_i$  can intersect two different  $C'_j$  (because of the way  $p_t$  was chosen). Thus,



	$T'$	$C'_1$	$C'_2$
$T'$			
$C'_1$	0	stochastic	0
$C'_2$	0	0	stochastic

each  $C'_j$  is completely contained in  $C_i \cup T$ , for some  $i$  ( $i = i(j)$ , i.e.,  $i$  depending on  $j$ ), and  $i(j) \neq i(k)$  for  $j \neq k$ . It follows that the ranks  $r = s$ ,  $T' \subset T$ , and each  $C_i$  is a subset of some  $C'_j$ . Now,  $p$ , by choice, has the minimum number of zero columns among all idempotent elements of  $\Sigma_{\psi_X}$ , which means that  $T' = T$ , and consequently,  $C_i$  is equal to some  $C'_j$ . That is,  $p$  and  $\bar{p}_t$  have the same basis, and also must have the same social topology since  $p_t \bar{p}_t = \bar{p}_t p_t = \bar{p}_t$ .

Now, since  $p_t \in \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^m$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) = 1$ , there must exist  $q_t \in \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_Y}^m$  such that  $q_t$  and  $p_t$  have the same social topology for each  $t$ . Thus,  $q_t$ , for each  $t$ , must be of the form

	$T$	$C_1$	$C_2$
$T$			
$C_1$	0	stochastic (and all entries strictly positive)	0
$C_2$	0	0	stochastic (and all entries strictly positive)

We see that each row in the  $q_t|_{T \times T}$  block is less than 1 since the same is true for  $p_t$ . It follows (using standard Markov chain theory) that since  $q_t|_{C_i \times C_i}$  is a strictly positive stochastic matrix, then  $\bar{q}_t$  must also have the same basis  $\mathcal{B}_\eta = \{T, C_1, \dots, C_\eta\}$  and also have the same social topology as  $p$ . Thus, the minimal rank of the matrices in  $\Sigma_Y$  is at most  $\eta$ . Reversing the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$  yields the same conclusion.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* By Lemma 3, there exist idempotent elements  $p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $q \in \Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  which have the same rank  $\eta$  and the same basis  $\mathcal{B}_\eta = \{T, C_1, \dots, C_\eta\}$ . For any  $x \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$ , there exists  $x_t \in \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^m$  such that  $x_t \rightarrow x$ . Then,  $p x_t p \rightarrow p x p$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, choose  $t$  sufficiently large so that whenever  $(p x p)_{ij} > 0$ , then  $(p x_t p)_{ij} > 0$ . That is, for large  $t$ ,  $p x p$  and  $p x_t p$  (both elements in  $G_X$ ) must correspond to the same permutation  $\pi$  on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$  in the following sense: the block  $p x p|_{C_i \times C_j}$  is strictly positive if and only if  $j = \pi(i)$ .

Since  $G_X$  is finite, the correspondence  $\sigma \mapsto \pi$  from  $G_X$  to the group of permutations on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$  is an isomorphism. This means that there are elements  $y_t \in \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_Y}^m$  such that, for each  $t$ ,  $p x_t p$  and  $q y_t q$  have the same social topology so that the element  $p x p \in \Sigma_{\psi_X}$  and  $q y q \in \Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  (when  $y$  is a limit point of the sequence  $y_t$ ) must correspond to the same permutation  $\pi$  on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$ . Reversing the role of  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$ , it follows that the groups

$G_X$  and  $G_Y$  are isomorphic.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.* Recall the continuous homomorphism  $\Phi_X$  and that  $G_X = p\Sigma_{\psi_X}p$  and  $G_Y = q\Sigma_{\psi_Y}q$  are isomorphic by Lemma 4. Also, recall the Rees–Suskevitch decompositions  $\Sigma_{\psi_X} \cong W_X \times G_X \times Z_X$  and  $\Sigma_{\psi_Y} \cong W_Y \times G_Y \times Z_Y$  in eq. (10). Notice that  $Z_X W_X \subset G_X$  and  $Z_Y W_Y \subset G_Y$ . It therefore suffices to show that  $Z_X W_X$  and  $Z_Y W_Y$  correspond to the same set of permutations under the standard isomorphism from the groups  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$  to the group of permutations on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$ , then it would follow that the factor groups  $G_X/Q_X$  and  $G_Y/Q_Y$  are also isomorphic, where  $Q_X$  and  $Q_Y$  are the smallest normal subgroups containing  $Z_X W_X$  and  $Z_Y W_Y$ , respectively. To show this, let  $x_1 \in Z_X$  and  $x_2 \in W_X$ . Then, exist  $x_{2t}, x_{1t} \in \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_X}^m$  with  $x_{2t} \rightarrow x_2$  and  $x_{1t} \rightarrow x_1$  such that whenever  $(x_2)_{ij} > 0$ ,  $(x_{2t})_{ij} > 0$ , and whenever  $(x_1)_{ij} > 0$ ,  $(x_{1t})_{ij} > 0$ .

Now, choose  $y_{2t}, y_{1t} \in \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \Sigma_{\mu_Y}^m$  such that, for each  $t$ ,  $x_{2t}$  and  $y_{2t}$  have the same social topology, and  $x_{1t}$  and  $y_{1t}$  have the same social topology. Let  $\sigma_t$  be the identity in the group of limit points of  $\{(qy_{1t})^m : m \geq 1\}$ , and  $h_t$  be the identity in the group of limit points of  $\{(qy_{2t})^m : m \geq 1\}$ . Then,  $q\sigma_t = \sigma_t$  and  $h_t q = h_t$ . Choose  $M$  and  $L$  sufficiently large so that  $[(qy_{1t})^M]_{1j} > 0$  whenever  $(\sigma_t)_{ij} > 0$ , and  $[(qy_{2t})^L]_{1j} > 0$  whenever  $(h_t)_{ij} > 0$ .

Note that the elements  $p(px_{2t})^M(x_{1t}p)^Lp$  and  $q(qy_{2t})^M(x_{2t}q)^Lq$  have the same skeleton and, therefore, represent the group elements in  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$  that correspond to the same permutation on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$ . Moreover,  $[p(px_{2t})^M(x_{1t}p)^Lp]_{ij} > 0$  whenever  $[p(px_2)^M(x_1p)^Lp]_{ij} = (x_2x_1)_{ij} > 0$ . Similarly,  $[q(qy_{2t})^M(x_{2t}q)^Lq]_{ij} > 0$  whenever  $[q\sigma_t h_t q]_{ij} = (\sigma_t h_t)_{ij} > 0$ , and thus, both represent the same group element  $\sigma_t h_t$ . Also, we may notice that  $\sigma_t^2 = \sigma_t = q\sigma_t \in q\Sigma_{\psi_Y}$  so that  $\sigma_t \in Z_Y$  and  $h_t^2 = h_t = h_t q \in \Sigma_{\psi_Y} q$  so that  $h_t \in Z_Y$ . Thus, with every element  $x_2x_1 \in Z_X W_X$ , we have associated an element  $\sigma_t h_t \in Z_Y W_Y$  that corresponds to the same permutation on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$ . Reversing the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$ , it follows that the sets  $Z_X W_X$  and  $Z_Y W_Y$  both correspond to the same set of permutation under the standard isomorphism from the groups  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$  to the group of permutations on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 6.* For any Borel set  $B \subset G_X/Q_X$ , we can define the probability measure  $\tilde{\mu}_X$  by  $\tilde{\mu}_X(B) = \mu_X(\Phi_X^{-1}(B))$ , where  $\Phi_X : \Sigma_X \rightarrow G_X/Q_X$  is a continuous homomorphism defined by  $\Phi_X(x) = pxpQ_X$ . We define  $\Phi_Y$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_Y$  similarly. Then, the supports of  $\tilde{\mu}_X$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_Y$  become  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X} = \{pxpQ_X : x \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}\}$  and  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y} = \{qyqQ_Y : y \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}\}$ , respectively.

We may notice that for  $x \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}$ , there exists  $y \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}$  such that  $x$  and  $y$  (and therefore  $pxp$  and  $qyq$ ) have the same social topology. It follows from Lemma 5 that the cosets  $pxpQ_X$  and  $qyqQ_Y$  correspond to the same set of permutations under the isomorphism from the groups  $G_X$  and  $G_Y$  to the group of permutations on  $\{1, \dots, \eta\}$ . Similarly, for each  $y \in \Sigma_{\mu_Y}$ ,

there exists  $x \in \Sigma_{\mu_X}$  such that a similar conclusion is again true for the cosets  $qyqQ_Y$  and  $pxpQ_X$ . It therefore follows that, under the isomorphism from  $G_X/Q_X$  to  $G_Y/Q_Y$  (Lemma 5),  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y}$  is the isomorphic image of  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 9.* By Lemma 7, we know that  $\mu_X^t$  (respectively,  $\mu_Y^t$ ) converges weakly if and only if  $\tilde{\mu}_X^t$  (respectively,  $\tilde{\mu}_Y^t$ ) converges weakly. By Lemma 6, the supports  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_X}$  and  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mu}_Y}$  are isomorphic. Thus,  $\tilde{\mu}_X^t$  converges weakly if and only if  $\tilde{\mu}_Y^t$  converges weakly.  $\square$