

Axelrod's Model in Two Dimensions

by

Junchi Li

Department of Mathematics
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Rick Durrett, Supervisor

Jonathan Mattingly

James Nolen

Mauro Maggioni

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Mathematics
in the Graduate School of Duke University
2014

ABSTRACT

Axelrod's Model in Two Dimensions

by

Junchi Li

Department of Mathematics
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Rick Durrett, Supervisor

Jonathan Mattingly

James Nolen

Mauro Maggioni

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Mathematics
in the Graduate School of Duke University

2014

Copyright © 2014 by Junchi Li
All rights reserved except the rights granted by the
Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial Licence

Abstract

In 1997 R. Axelrod introduced a model in which individuals have one of Q possible opinions about each of F issues and neighbors interact at a rate proportional to the fraction of opinions they share. Thanks to work by Lanchier and collaborators there are now a number of results for the one dimensional model. Here, we consider Axelrod's model on a square subset of the two-dimensional lattice starting from a randomly chosen initial state and simplify things by supposing that Q and F large. If Q/F is large then most neighbors have all opinions different and do not interact, so by a result of Lanchier the system soon reaches a highly disordered absorbing state. In contrast if Q/F is small, then there is a giant component of individuals who share at least one opinion. In this case we show that consensus develops on this cluster.

To my parents

Contents

Abstract	iv
List of Figures	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
1 Voter Model and Axelrod’s Model in One Dimension	1
1.1 Voter model on integer lattices	1
1.2 Axelrod’s model	2
1.2.1 Rigorous results	5
2 Axelrod’s Model on the Two-dimensional Lattice	7
2.1 Main Theorem	7
2.2 Growth phase I	10
2.3 Growth phase II	13
2.3.1 Upper bound on $A_e^+(s)$	13
2.3.2 Lower bound on $A_e(s)$	14
2.4 Growth of tree agreements	17
2.4.1 Upper bound	17
2.4.2 Results up to T_1	20
2.5 Consensus on the giant component	23
3 Surprises	29
3.1 The probability of no surprises before $T_1 F \log F$	29
3.2 One surprise	32

3.2.1	Surprises in single-edge case	33
3.2.2	Surprises occurs in middle of two components	35
3.3	Surprises in general case and proof of Theorem 4	39
	Bibliography	43
	Biography	45

List of Figures

1.1	Illustration of voter model duality	3
-----	---	---

Acknowledgements

At the end of my 5-year journey as a doctorate student at Duke I would like to express my appreciation to all who shared wonderful memories with me.

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude and sincere regards to my academic advisor Dr. Rick Durrett. Having spent my senior year reading Rick's probability textbooks in China, it has been my dream to study probability theory under his guidance. His deep insight into research projects, extraordinary enthusiasm and patient guidance makes him more than a wonderful advisor and collaborator. Working with him is the greatest treasure that a rookie scholar could have at her/his twentieth.

Dr. Jonathan Mattingly, Dr. James Nolen and Dr. Mauro Maggioni deserve special thanks for agreeing to be in my dissertation committee. I have learned so much from frequent communications and academic discussions with them. Conversations with Dr. Jian-Guo Liu and Dr. Arlie Petters also greatly deepened my mathematical understanding. Dr. Tom Witelski, Dr. William Pardon, Prof. Lewis Blake and Dr. Jack Bookman were helpful in the guidance of my graduate student life and college math teaching tasks at Duke. I appreciate all the favors from the Duke Math.

Outside of the math department Dr. David Dunson, Dr. Jia Li, Dr. Jerry Reiter and Dr. Mike West have given me support and suggestions on Bayesian statistics and econometrics, which tremendously helped build up my technical toolbox of real-data analysis.

My academic experience at Peking University of China was by far the most colorful one. Dr. Zhidong Bai, Dr. Dayue Chen, Dr. Xiang Ma, Dr. Yanxia Ren and Dr. Zhengdong Wang were the most influential for my choice of studying mathematics and probability theory. They taught me to fall in love with mathematics and think outside the box when facing obstacles,

which gives me courage as well as solid foundations to pursue studies in mathematics. I also benefit a lot from the experience of giving a seminar talk in Peking University in June 2013. Although decided not going into academia immediately after my PhD, their instructions and care will be what I appreciate forever.

The role of my wonderful colleagues and friends in my journey goes far beyond than what can be reciprocated by a mere thanks. Warm discussions with our Duke/UNC probability group members Chi, David, David, Ivan, Jiang, Kevin, Marc, Sean, Shirshendu, Shishi, Xuan and Yuan were constantly enlightening and inspiring. Also appreciated are my internship mentors and colleagues at DUMAC Inc., Evan, Ian, Jing and Ray, to benefit myself bridging the gap between theory and practices. Lastly my thanks go to my fellow comrades Biyuan, Kai, Kun, Lei, Lynn, Miao, Minyu, Rui, Xia, Xiaoye, Xin, Xinyun, Yichong, Yu, Yuanxi, Yumeng, Zhuo, Zi, Zizhuo and Zoey for frequent and fruitful communications during my anxious times of job hunting. Even though I was miles apart their help was always timely and valuable.

It has been my privilege to be funded by the National Science Foundation for my research work.

Thanks to the organizers of Cornell Probability Summer School (2012), Midwest Probability Colloquium (2011), Northeastern Probability Seminar (2011, 2013), Seminar on Stochastic Processes (2011), Graduate Student Probability Conference (2012), Mathematical Sciences Research Institute (2012), and other conferences that funded my academic conference trips.

Lastly but most importantly, to my family members, thank you for all the support and the love throughout my first twenty-four years of life. I dedicate this work to my dearest parents, Gang and Chunli, who deserves my ultimate admiration and filial piety.

Voter Model and Axelrod's Model in One Dimension

1.1 Voter model on integer lattices

In the basic voter model [19, 6], individuals have one of two opinions about an issue. The prototypical example is what political party they belong to. The voter model on the d -dimensional integer lattice can be defined as follows. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\xi_t(i) \in \{0, 1\}$ represents the binary opinion of voter i at time t . For each directed edge (i, j) only at $t \in \{T_n^{(i,j)}, n \geq 1\}$ of a rate $1/2$ Poisson arrivals i decides to take the opinion of j , i.e. $\xi_t(i) = \xi_{t-}(j)$. Obviously, the dynamics is a pure jump process which takes place on the state space $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. The voter model on integer lattices is a simple model characterizing voting behaviors and there have been a number of results, of which the most classical and important one is

Theorem 1. (a) ***Clustering** occurs when $d \leq 2$: for any ξ_0 and distinct pair $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have*

$$P(\xi_t(i) \neq \xi_t(j)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

(b) ***Coexistence** occurs when $d \geq 3$: let ξ_t^θ denote the process starting from an initial state in which the events $\{\xi_0^\theta(i) = 1\}$ are independent and have probability θ . As $t \rightarrow \infty$ the dynamics ξ_t^θ converges in distribution to ξ_∞^θ , a stationary distribution where $\{\xi_\infty^\theta(i) = 1\}$ has probability θ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.*

Proof of Theorem 1. As illustrated in the case of one dimensions in Figure 1.1, the key to the proof is to use a “dual process” $\{\zeta_s^{t,i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ which traces the opinion of each voter backwards in time to determine the source of the opinions at time t . For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\zeta_s^{t,i}$ simply stays put at i until the first time s that $t - s = T_n^{(i,j)}$ for some n, j , where we set $\zeta_s^{t,i} = j$. By Markov property the process can be defined recursively until the next $T_n^{(i,j)}$. Such process forms the dynamics of *coalescing random walks*, i.e. each voter independently moves as a simple random walk until they hit each other. Afterwards they move together. We have the duality property that

$$\xi_t(i) = \xi_{t-s}(\zeta_s^{t,i}), \quad 0 \leq s \leq t. \quad (*)$$

Coming back to the proof, we note for $d = 1, 2$ using duality property (*)

$$P(\xi_t(i) \neq \xi_t(j)) \leq P(\xi_0(\zeta_t^{t,i}) \neq \xi_0(\zeta_t^{t,j})) \leq P(\zeta_t^{t,i} \neq \zeta_t^{t,j})$$

which tends to 0 since the process is recurrent, completing part (a). For part (b) we refer the readers to Section 2 of [6] so they can persuade themselves that it is enough to prove the convergence of $P(\xi_t^\theta(i) = 0 \text{ for all } i \in B)$ for each $B \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Observe by dual relations

$$P(\xi_t^\theta(i) = 0 \text{ for all } i \in B) = E(1 - \theta)^{|\zeta_t^{B,t}|}$$

where $\zeta_t^{B,t}$ is the bundle version of $\zeta_s^{i,t}, i \in B$. Note that the distribution of $\zeta_t^{B,t}$ is the same as the marginal distribution of coalescing random walk ζ_t^B , which is nonincreasing of t . It hence follows from the bounded convergence theorem that $P(\xi_t^\theta \cap B = \emptyset)$ has a limit and the proof is complete. \square

1.2 Axelrod’s model

In reality, there are many issues that people have opinions about, such as income tax policy, environmental issues, gambling, gun control, gay marriage, etc., and one can have a number of different opinions about each issue. Axelrod [2] formulated a model in which each individual holds one of Q opinions about each of F issues, so the state of the process at time t is





FIGURE 1.1: Illustration of voter model duality

described by giving for each voter x and issue f , $\xi_t(x, f) \in \{1, 2, \dots, Q\}$. Each oriented pair of connected voters (x, y) interacts at times of a Poisson process at rate $1/2$. At these times an issue $f = 1, 2, \dots, F$ is picked at random. If $\xi_t(x, f) \neq \xi_t(y, f)$ then x picks an issue from the ones they disagree on, and changes its opinion to agree with y on that particular issue. If they already agree on all issues no change occurs.

Note that while the motivation may suggest that the Q values are positions that range from strongly in favor to strongly against, individuals act only if their opinions agree exactly on the issue chosen. A number of researchers have studied the variation in which $F = 1$, the state of an individual is a point along a political continuum $[0, 1]$ and only neighboring individuals whose opinions differ by less than $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ will interact. Deffuant et al [5] considered a version in which an interaction opinions a and b results in $a + \mu(b - 1)$ and $b + \mu(a - b)$. If $\varepsilon \geq 1/2$ then the system converges to consensus, but if $\varepsilon < 1/2$ one ends up with roughly $1/2\varepsilon$ opinions. For more on this model see section II.F in Castellano et al [3]. Lanchier [15] has recently studied a version in which when two individuals with opinions that differ by ε interact, one imitates the other.

The tendency for people to interact more frequently with people who are similar to them is called *homophily*. Axelrod did a number of computer experiments and found, for example that if there are 5 features and 10 opinions (which he called traits) then on a 10 by 10 grid one would end up with an average of 3.2 “cultural domains,” clusters of people with the same opinion on all issues. Castellano, Marsili, and Vespignani [4] used simulation to study the model in one dimension. They concluded that if $F > 2$ then on a long line segment Axelrod’s model (a) converges to a monocultural equilibrium when $Q < F$ and (b) fixates at a highly fragmented configuration when $Q > F$. The case $F = 2$ is different. The ending state is disordered for any value of Q . Vilone, Vespignani, and Castellano [22] confirmed these predictions using mean-field theory and more simulation. There has been an extensive study of Axelrod’s model in the physics literature, see chapter IV of Castellano et al [3].

When $F = 2$ and $Q = 2$ Axelrod’s model reduces to the constrained voter model of Vázquez, Krapivsky, and Redner [20]. In that model there are Leftists (1), Centrists (0),

and Rightists (-1) but 1 's and -1 s ignore each other, i.e., a 1 becomes 0 at a rate equal to the fraction of neighbors that are 0 , but we never see changes $1 \rightarrow -1$. To map Axelrod's model into this system: $11 \rightarrow L$, $10, 01 \rightarrow C$, and $00 \rightarrow R$. If we further map the constrained voter model so that $L, R \rightarrow 0$ and $C \rightarrow 1$ then the system becomes an ordinary voter model. From this we see that in $d \leq 2$ one will either get fixation into an all C state or a frozen mixture of L and R . For more on this system, see Vázquez and Redner [21] or Section III.B of Castellano et al [3].

1.2.1 Rigorous results

While Axelrod's model has been studied extensively by simulation and non-rigorous methods such as the pair approximation, the first rigorous results only appeared recently. Lanchier [16] proved

Theorem 2. *The one-dimensional model on \mathbb{Z} with $Q = F = 2$ clusters, that is, for each f and $x \sim y$, $P(\xi_t(x, f) \neq \xi_t(y, f)) \rightarrow 0$.*

Note that this result is different from the convergence to a disordered state seen in simulation on a finite set. The proof helps explain the difference. Lanchier looks at boundaries between the four types. $00, 11$ boundaries are static, while the other possibilities are active and perform simple random walks. When an active boundary hits a static one it may become active and in this way the density of static boundaries is reduced to 0 . However, on a finite set one will eventually run out of active boundaries. This result has recently been generalized by Lanchier and Schweinsberg [18] to show that on \mathbb{Z} if $Q = 2$ then the system clusters for any $F < \infty$.

More interesting and more difficult is Lanchier's result in the other direction. Consider the system on $G = \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ and let K_∞ be the number of cultural domains when the process fixates.

Theorem 3. *If $F < Q$ then*

$$N^{-1}EK_\infty \geq \frac{Q}{Q-F} \left(1 - \frac{1}{Q}\right)^F - \frac{F}{Q-F} \left(1 - \frac{1}{Q}\right)$$

The right-hand side may be ≤ 0 but when it is > 0 , the result implies that the system fixates in a fragmented state, where the number of cultural domains is proportional to the system size. If $F \rightarrow \infty$ and $F/Q \rightarrow c$ then the right hand side converges to

$$\frac{1}{1-c}e^{-c} - \frac{c}{c-1} = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad e^{-c} = c$$

The last equation has a unique solution at $c_0 \approx 0.567$. Lanchier and Scarlatos [17] have recently shown that Axelrod's model on \mathbb{Z} fixates when $F \leq c_0 Q$. In addition they showed that the model on \mathbb{Z} with $F = 2$ and $Q = 3$ fixates.

Axelrod's Model on the Two-dimensional Lattice

2.1 Main Theorem

In this chapter, our goal is to prove a result for Axelrod's model on a large finite two-dimensional lattice $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}^2$ with periodic boundary conditions where the initial condition is a random assignment of opinions. If $Q \rightarrow \infty$ and $F/Q \rightarrow c$ then on each edge $e = \{x, y\}$ the number of agreements $A_e(0) = |\{f : \xi_0(x, f) = \xi_0(y, f)\}|$ has a limiting Poisson distribution with mean c , and the number of agreements on different edges are independent, so the limiting probability of *active edges* that have at least one agreement at time 0 is $1 - e^{-c}$. The critical value for bond percolation on \mathbb{Z}^2 is $1/2$, so when $c > \ln(2)$, $1 - e^{-c} > 1/2$ and we are in the supercritical case. On the graph $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}^2$ this means that there will be a giant component that contains a positive fraction of the N^2 voters and the second largest component will be $O(\log N)$. Let $\mathcal{E}_+ = \{e : A_e(0) > 0\}$ be the edges that are active at time 0. Our goal is to show that

Theorem 4. *If $F/Q \geq \ln(2) + \eta$ and $Q > Q_0(N, \eta)$ then with high probability Axelrod's model reaches consensus on a giant component of $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}^2$.*

It is possible that edges e that have no agreements initially will become active at some point time. We call such events *surprises*. For example if $\xi_0(x - (1, 0), f) = \xi(x + (1, 0), f)$

and $\xi_0(x, f)$ is different then x imitating one of its neighbors will suddenly produce two agreements. However, in the regime we are considering with a fixed graph and large Q and F , these surprise events are rare.

To be precise, the number of issues f for which $\xi_t(x, f) = \xi_t(y, f)$ for some x and y is $O(N^4)$. Since we are considering the limiting behavior as $F, Q \rightarrow \infty$ with N fixed, this number is $O(1)$ as far as limits in Q are concerned. As the reader will see from later arguments, surprises will not occur while the agreements along edges in \mathcal{E}_+ remains $\leq F^{1-\delta}$. Thus we will prove our result by first ignoring surprises and then going back to bound their influence.

Phase I. If $e = \{x, y\}$ we let $I_e(t) = \{f : \xi_0(x, f) = \xi_0(y, f)\}$, and $A_e(s) = |I_e(sF \log F)|$. The first step is to bound $A_e(s)$ by a Yule process $A_e^+(s)$ run at rate $\log F$ and use coupling to show that at all times $s \leq 0.45$, $A_e(s) = A_e^+(s)$. Given edges $e = \{x, y\}$ and $e' = \{y, z\}$, we do not have the worry about an agreement created by y imitating x disturbing one between y and z until A_e and $A_{e'}$ are $O(F^{0.5})$. Since the Yule process $A_e^+(s) \approx W_e F^s$ this is a manifestation of the birthday problem.

Phase IIA. When the number of agreements on edges exceeds $F^{0.5}$ then there will be some loss of agreements on an edge due to creation of agreements on its neighboring edges, but up until time $1 - \delta$, $A_e(s)$ will be close to the branching process. To be precise if we let $W_e = F^{-0.45} A_e^+(0.45)$ then with high probability if $e \in \mathcal{E}_+$

$$|F^{-s} A_e(s) - W_e| \leq F^{-0.2} \quad \text{for } 0.45 \leq s \leq 1 - \delta$$

Phase IIB. Let κ be a small constant. The next step is to show that up until time T_1 which is equal to $\inf\{s : \max_e A_e^+(s) \geq \kappa F\}$ we have if $e \in \mathcal{E}_+$ then

$$F^{-s} A_e(s) \geq W_e - F^{-0.2} - \frac{3\widehat{W}\kappa}{1 - \kappa} \quad \text{for } 1 - \delta \leq s \leq T_1$$

where $\widehat{W} = \max_e W_e + F^{-0.2}$. If κ is small enough then the right-hand side will be positive for all $e \in \mathcal{E}_+$.

Phase IIIA. Let t be a tree that is a subset of the initial giant component χ and let p be the number of edges in the tree. (The somewhat unusual notation comes from the fact that we first wrote this argument for a path.) Let A_t be the number of issues on which all members of the tree agree. Let $\Delta_p = 1 - 1/p$ for $p \geq 2$. As the reader will see this is the time at which p -edge agreements first appear. The first step is show that there is a constant K_t so that if $W_t = K_t(1/p!) \prod_{e \in t} W_e$ then with high probability

$$|F^{-ps+(p-1)}A_t(s) - W_t| \leq F^{-\delta/3} \quad \text{for } \Delta_p + 2\delta/p \leq s \leq 1 - \delta/p$$

Note that $-ps + (p - 1)$ when $s = \Delta_p$ so that is the first time that p edge agreements occur. When $p = 2$, $\Delta_p = 1/2$.

Phase IIIB. We next extend the result in Phase IIIA up to time T_1 . There are constants $k_t > 0$ so that with high probability if $F \geq F_t$ then

$$F^{-ps+(p-1)}A_t(s) \geq k_t \quad \text{for } 1 - \delta/p \leq s \leq T_1$$

If we take t to be a spanning tree then this result tells us that all individual in any connected component (later called *component* for short) $\psi \subset \mathcal{E}_+$ agree on a positive fraction of issues.

Phase IV. If we ignore surprises and shift to running time at rate F after time T_1 , then all edges see agreements being created at a positive rate. If we let $\mathcal{A}_e(t) = |I_e(T_1 F \log F + tF)|$ then comparing with a nonhomogeneous voter model allows us to drive the process to consensus on \mathcal{E}_+ by time $T_1 F \log F + c_N F \log \log F$.

Phase V. Finally we have to worry about surprises getting in the way of consensus. We will show that any edge e created by a surprise has $\leq F^\delta$ agreements up to time T_1 . Even in the process with surprises, the initial giant component χ will again have agreement on a positive fraction of the issues at time T_1 . It will maintain that property until there is agreement on $\chi \cup e$ in the case of one edge surprise, or on $\chi \cup e \cup \chi'$ where e connects to a component χ' . We will define these terms more precisely in Chapter 3.

2.2 Growth phase I

The first step is to construct Axelrod's model using a graphical representation in order to couple the early stages to a branching process. Let $e = \{x, y\}$ be an edge and let $I_e(t) = \{f = 1, \dots, F : \xi_t(x, f) = \xi_t(y, f)\}$ be the set of issues that individuals at the ends of e agree upon at time t and $|I_e(t)|$ be its cardinality. For each $e \in \mathcal{E}$, we define a process $J_e(t)$ with $J_e(0) = I_e(0)$. To couple $I_e(t)$ with $J_e(t)$, we introduce for each oriented edge (x, y)

- (i) A Poisson process $\{U_{(x,y)}^n, n \geq 1\}$ with rate $1/2$,
- (ii) $\{V_{(x,y)}^n(k) : n \geq 1, k \geq 0\}$ an array of independent draws from discrete uniform distribution on $\{1, \dots, F\}$.

Since the graph is finite, the sequence of Poisson arrivals associated with all edges can be ordered. Suppose the process has been constructed until time $t-$ where $t = U_{(x,y)}^n$ and we have $I_e(t-) \subset J_e(t-)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$. Writing x, y for the unoriented edge

- If $|I_{x,y}(t)| = F$ there is nothing to do. If not and $V_{(x,y)}^n(0) \leq |I_{x,y}(t)|$ then we read the independent sequence of choices from $\{1, \dots, F\}$, $V_{(x,y)}^n(k)$, $k \geq 1$ until we find the first $V_{(x,y)}^n(K_I) \notin I_{x,y}(t-)$, then we set $\xi_t(x, V_{(x,y)}^n(K_I)) = \xi_{t-}(y, V_{(x,y)}^n(K_I))$, and do not change any other opinions.
- If $|J_{x,y}(t)| = F$ there is nothing to do. If not and $V_{(x,y)}^n(0) \leq |J_{x,y}(t)|$ then we read the sequence $V_{(x,y)}^n(k)$, $k \geq 1$ until we find the first $V_{(x,y)}^n(K_J) \notin J_{x,y}(t-)$ and add $V_{(x,y)}^n(K_J)$ to $J_{x,y}(t)$.

To check that $I_e(t) \subset J_e(t)$ for all e at time $U_{(x,y)}^n$, it suffices to check that $I_{x,y}(t) \subset J_{x,y}(t)$, since the other J_e don't change, and assuming there are no surprises, the other I_e can only decrease. To check the inequality for $e = x, y$ note that when $I_{x,y}(t-) = J_{x,y}(t-)$, $K_I = K_J$ and the same point will be added to both sets. When $I_{x,y}(t-) \neq J_{x,y}(t-)$, we may have $K_I < K_J$ but in this case the point added to $I_{x,y}(t)$ will be one that is already in $J_{x,y}(t)$.

For calculations it is convenient to extend $|J_{x,y}(t)|$ after the time $T_{x,y}^+$ it becomes absorbed at F . We define $B_e^+(t) = |J_{x,y}(t)|$ for $t \leq T_{x,y}^+$ and extend $B_e^+(t)$ to be a Yule process at rate $1/F$, i.e.

$$B_e^+(t) : k \rightarrow k + 1 \quad \text{at rate } k/F.$$

From the coupling the following is obvious:

Lemma 2.2.1. *For each $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and $t \geq 0$, $|I_e(t)| \leq B_e^+(t)$.*

We are interested in understanding the growth of $|I_e(t)|$ until it gets up to size F , so we speed up time. Let

$$A_e(s) = |I_e(sF \log F)| \quad A_e^+(s) = B_e^+(sF \log F) \quad (2.2.1)$$

Lemma 2.2.1 implies $A_e(s) \leq A_e^+(s)$, for all $s \geq 0$. It is easy to understand the behavior of $A_e^+(t)$

Lemma 2.2.2. *If $s < 1$, $F^{-s}A_e^+(s)$ converges weakly to $\text{Gamma}(|I_e(0)|, 1)$ as $F \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Let $Z(t)$ be the Yule process starting from $Z(0) = 1$. It is well known that, see e.g. [1], that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-t} Z(t) = W \text{ a.s.}$$

where W has an exponential distribution with mean 1. $A_e^+(t)$ is the sum of $|I_e(0)|$ independent Yule processes, so the desired result follows by changing variables $t = s \log F$. \square

Our next step is to show that with high probability the coupling is exact up to time $s = 0.45$. Let

$$\Omega_1 = \{A_e^+(s) = A_e(s) > 0, \forall s \leq 0.45, e \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

Lemma 2.2.3. *As $F \rightarrow \infty$, $P(\Omega_1) \rightarrow 1$.*

Proof. Discrepancies in the coupling, which we call *collisions*, occur when we set $\xi_t(x, f) = \xi_{t-}(y, f)$ and there is an edge $e' = (x, z)$ so that $f \in I_{e'}(t-)$. Let $B(x, y, z, s)$ be the event

that this occurs for fixed $x \sim y$ and $z \sim x$ by time $sF \log F$. Let

$$H = \left\{ \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} A_e^+(0.45) \leq F^{0.49} \right\}.$$

Since \mathcal{E} is finite, Lemma 2.2.2 implies $P(H) \rightarrow 1$. It is easy to see that if one takes $s = 0.45$ then

$$P(B(x, y, z, 0.45)^c | H) \geq \prod_{k=1}^{F^{0.49}} \left(1 - \frac{k}{F - F^{0.49}} \right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{F^{0.49}}{F - F^{0.49}} \right)^{F^{0.49}} \rightarrow 1$$

The equation comes from the fact that in general when the k -th issue is randomly selected it cannot be the same as any of the $k - 1$ preceding issues. Since there are only finitely many x, y, z to consider the desired result follows. \square

2.3 Growth phase II

Let $\kappa > 0$ be a small constant to be determined later. Our goal is to show that $A_e(s)$ is well approximated by $A_e^+(s)$ defined in (2.2.1) up to a time $T_1 = \inf\{s : \max_e A_e^+(s) \geq \kappa F\}$.

2.3.1 Upper bound on $A_e^+(s)$

Let \mathcal{E} be the set of all edges, and let \mathcal{F}_t^+ be the σ -field generated by $(A_e^+(s) : e \in \mathcal{E}, s \leq t)$.

The first order of business is to upper bound the growth of $A_e^+(s)$. Let

$$W_e(0.45) = F^{-0.45} A_e^+(0.45)$$

and recall from the previous section that the $A_e^+(t)$ are independent Yule processes run at rate $\log F$ defined for all time.

Lemma 2.3.1. *For each $e \in \mathcal{E}$,*

$$E^+ \left(\sup_{s \geq 0.45} F^{-s} A_e^+(s) - W_e(0.45) \right)^2 \leq C W_e(0.45) F^{-0.45}$$

where E^+ is shorthand for $E(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{0.45}^+)$.

Proof. $(F^{-s} A_e^+(s) - W_e(0.45) : s \geq 0.45)$ is a martingale under P^+ . Classical theory of branching processes [1] gives for $t \geq 0.45$

$$E^+(A_e^+(t) - e^{(t-0.45)\log F} A_e^+(0.45))^2 \leq C_1 A_e^+(0.45) F^{2(t-0.45)}$$

so multiplying by $e^{-t \log F} = F^{-t}$

$$E^+(F^{-t} A_e^+(t) - W_e(0.45))^2 \leq C_1 W_e(0.45) F^{-0.45}$$

Using the L^2 maximal inequality for martingales

$$E^+ \left(\sup_{0.45 \leq s \leq t} F^{-s} A_e^+(s) - W_e(0.45) \right)^2 \leq C_2 W_e(0.45) F^{-0.45}$$

Since the right-hand side is independent of t the desired result follows. \square

Let $\overline{W} = \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}} W_e(0.45) \in \mathcal{F}_{0.45}$, let $\widehat{W} = \overline{W} + F^{-0.2}$, and we remind the reader that

$$T_1 = \inf\{s : \max_e A_e^+(s) \geq \kappa F\} \quad (2.3.1)$$

It immediately follows from Lemma 2.3.1 along with Chebyshev's inequality that with high probability under measure P^+

$$\sup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} A_e^+(s) \leq \widehat{W} F^s, \quad \forall s \geq 0.45.$$

Set $T_1^o = 1 + \frac{\log(\kappa/\widehat{W})}{\log F}$ to be the approximation of T_1 precisely defined in (2.3.1), then

$$\sup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} A_e^+(T_1^o) \leq \widehat{W} F^{\frac{\kappa}{\widehat{W}}} = \kappa F, \quad \text{indicating that } T_1^o \leq T_1 \quad (2.3.2)$$

2.3.2 Lower bound on $A_e(s)$

A_e changes by

$$\begin{aligned} &+1 && \text{at rate } A_e \log F \\ &-1 && \text{at rate } \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e' \sim e} \frac{A_e - A_{e,e'}}{F - A_{e'}} A_{e'} \log F \end{aligned}$$

where $e' \sim e$ indicates e' and e shares a common voter, and $A_{e,e'}$ is the number of issues for which there is agreement on e and on e' . To get a lower bound on $A_e(t)$, we define the birth-and-death chain A_e^- which changes by

$$\begin{aligned} &+1 && \text{at rate } A_e^- \log F \\ &-1 && \text{at rate } \frac{3\widehat{W}F^s}{F - \widehat{W}F^s} A_e^- \log F \end{aligned}$$

where the 3 comes from the fact that on the two dimensional lattice there are 6 $e' \sim e$ and oriented edges have events at rate 1/2.

Lemma 2.3.2. *We can define our processes on the same probability space so that*

$$A_e^-(s) \leq A_e(s) \leq A_e^+(s), \quad \text{for all } 0.45 \leq s \leq T_1^o.$$

Proof. Since $A_e - A_{e,e'} \leq A_e$ and $A_e, A_{e'} \leq \widehat{W}F^s$ the fraction in the definition of A_e^- is larger than the one in the definition of A_e

$$A_e \frac{A_e - A_{e,e'}}{F - A_e} \leq \widehat{W}F^s \frac{A_e}{F - \widehat{W}F^s}$$

The fact that $A_e^- \leq A_e$ may look like trouble, but these are birth and death chains so it is enough that the rate of jumping by -1 is larger in A_e^- when $A_e^- = A_e$. \square

To analyze A_e^- we begin by computing the infinitesimal mean and variance of $U_e^-(s) = F^{-s}A_e^-(s)$. Note

$$U_e^-(s+h) - U_e^-(s) = F^{-(s+h)}(A_e^-(s+h) - A_e^-(s)) + (F^{-(s+h)} - F^{-s})A_e^-(s) \quad (2.3.3)$$

In terms of stochastic differentials

$$dU_e^-(s) = F^{-s}dA_e^-(s) - (\log F)F^{-s}A_e^-(s)ds. \quad (2.3.4)$$

From this we see that the infinitesimal mean

$$\begin{aligned} b(U_e^-) &= F^{-s} \left(1 - \frac{3\widehat{W}F^s}{F - \widehat{W}F^s} \right) A_e^- \log F - (\log F)F^{-s}A_e^-(s) \\ &= -(\log F)F^{-s} \left(\frac{3\widehat{W}F^s}{F - \widehat{W}F^s} \right) A_e^- \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.5)$$

To compute the infinitesimal variance from first principles, note since A_e^- jumps by ± 1 , as $h \rightarrow 0$ the second moment of the first difference in (2.3.3) is

$$\sim hF^{-2s} \left(1 + \frac{3\widehat{W}F^s}{F - \widehat{W}F^s} \right) A_e^- \log F$$

while the second moment of the second difference is $h^2((\log F)F^{-s}A_e^-(s))^2$. Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies that the cross term in $(U_e^-(s+h) - U_e^-(s))^2$ is $O(h^{3/2})$, so the infinitesimal variance is

$$v_s(U_e^-) = F^{-s} \left(1 + \frac{3\widehat{W}F^s}{F - \widehat{W}F^s} \right) U_e^- \log F \quad (2.3.6)$$

To bound $A_e^-(t)$ we will use the L^2 maximal inequality on

$$U_e^-(s) - U_e^-(0.45) - \int_0^t b(U_e^-(s)) ds$$

Lemma 2.3.3. *For $e \in \mathcal{E}$ we have with high probability that for all $0.45 \leq t \leq T_1^o$*

$$U_e^-(s) \geq W_e(0.45) - \frac{3\widehat{W}\kappa}{1-\kappa} - F^{-0.2}$$

Proof. Lemmas 2.3.2 and 2.3.1 imply that $U_e^-(s) \leq F^{-s}A_e^+(s) \leq \widehat{W}$. For $0.45 \leq s \leq T_1^o$ the infinitesimal variance term

$$v(U_e^-(s)) \leq F^{-0.45} \left(1 + \frac{3\widehat{W}F^{s-1}}{1-\kappa} \right) \widehat{W}$$

which is $o(F^{-0.4})$ as $F \rightarrow \infty$. Using the L^2 maximal inequality it follows that as $F \rightarrow \infty$

$$P^* \left(\sup_{0.45 \leq t \leq 0.7} \left| U_e^-(t) - W_e(0.45) + \int_{0.45}^t (\log F) \left(\frac{3\widehat{W}F^{s-1}}{1-\widehat{W}F^{s-1}} \right) U_e^-(s) ds \right| > F^{-0.2} \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Using $U_e^-(s) \leq \widehat{W}$ for $s \geq 0.45$, and $\widehat{W}F^{s-1} \leq \kappa$ and a little calculus we see that if $0.45 \leq t \leq T_1^o$

$$0 \leq \int_{0.45}^t \frac{3\widehat{W}F^{s-1} \log F}{1-\widehat{W}F^{s-1}} U_e^-(s) ds \leq \frac{3\widehat{W}}{1-\kappa} F^{t-1} \widehat{W} \quad (2.3.7)$$

To clean up the last result note that if $t \leq T_1^o$, $F^{t-1}\widehat{W} \leq \kappa$ and the desired result follows. \square

2.4 Growth of tree agreements

In this section we show that, assuming no surprises, the number of agreements on any component ψ reaches a positive fraction of issues at time $T_1 F \log F$ where T_1 was defined in (2.3.1). One can do this by using the infinitesimal analysis techniques as in Section 2.3 to bound the growth of tree agreements and use a *spanning tree* of ψ to conclude the result.

2.4.1 Upper bound

Let \mathbf{t} be a *tree* which is a subgraph of \mathcal{E}_+ , and let p be its number of edges. Let $A_{\mathbf{t}}$ be the number of issues that all voters on the tree agree on. Our first step is to get an upper bound for $A_{\mathbf{t}}(s)$.

Lemma 2.4.1. *Let E_0^* be the expected value conditional on $A_e(0)$*

$$E_0^* A_{\mathbf{t}}(s) \leq F^{ps-(p-1)} \prod_{e \in \mathbf{t}} A_e(0)$$

For $p \geq 2$ this implies that $A_{\mathbf{t}}(s) = 0$ with high probability when $s < \Delta_p = 1 - 1/p$. We will see that the upper bound is the right order of magnitude but too big by a constant factor. In what follows, for example in the proof of Lemma 2.4.2, it is convenient to define $\Delta_1 = 0.45$.

Proof. The upper bound processes $A_e^+(t) = |J_e(t)|$ are independent and have $J_e(t) \supset I_e(t)$. $P(f \in J_e(t) | A_e^+(t)) \leq A_e^+(t)/F$, and $E_0^* A_e^+(t) = F^s A_e(0)$ so

$$E \left| \bigcap_{e \in \mathbf{t}} J_e(t) \right| \leq F(F^{s-1})^p \prod_{e \in \mathbf{t}} A_e(0)$$

and we have proved the desired result. □

In this subsection we are ignoring surprises, so growth can only occur at the end points of the path, i.e., $A_{\mathbf{t}}$ has dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} +1 & \text{ at rate } \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \sim L^{\mathbf{t}}, e \in \mathbf{t}} A_e \frac{A_{\mathbf{t} \setminus \{e\}} - A_{\mathbf{t}}}{F - A_e} \log F \\ -1 & \text{ at rate } \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e^* \sim \mathbf{t}, e^* \notin \mathbf{t}} A_{e^*} \frac{A_{\mathbf{t}} - A_{e^* \cup \mathbf{t}}}{F - A_{e^*}} \log F \end{aligned}$$

where $e \sim L^\mathfrak{t}$ (resp. $e \sim \mathfrak{t}$) means that e is connected to a leaf of \mathfrak{t} (reps. the tree itself \mathfrak{t}), and the overall factor of $\log F$ comes from the fact time s corresponds to time $sF \log F$ in the original process. The factor of F disappears because the probability of picking an agreement is A_e/F . Note these rates are associated with $\mathfrak{t} \setminus \{e\}$ for $e \in L^\mathfrak{t}$, which is a tree again, and $e^* \cup \mathfrak{t}$, which might be a tree or a unicyclic graph, where in the latter case $A_{e^* \cup \mathfrak{t}}$ is defined analogously.

Lemma 2.4.2. *Let $W_\mathfrak{t} = (1/p!) \prod_{e \in \mathfrak{t}} W_e(0.45)$ and $\delta > 0$. With high probability*

$$|F^{-ps+(p-1)} A_\mathfrak{t}(s) - W_\mathfrak{t}| \leq F^{-\delta/3}$$

for all $\Delta_p + 2\delta/p \leq s \leq 1 - \delta/p$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on p . When $p = 1$ this follows from Lemmas 2.3.1 and 2.3.3.

To do the induction step, note that since we stop at time $1 - \delta/p$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \sim L^\mathfrak{t}, e \in \mathfrak{t}} A_e \frac{A_{\mathfrak{t} \setminus \{e\}} - A_\mathfrak{t}}{F - A_e} \log F \approx [pW_\mathfrak{t} + o(F^{-\delta/3p})] \cdot F^{ps-(p-1)}$$

and the upper bound in Lemma 2.4.1 implies that the $-A_\mathfrak{t}$ in the rate for positive jumps and the rate for negative jumps can be ignored.

To analyze the behavior of $A_\mathfrak{t}(s)$, we let

$$U_\mathfrak{t}(s) = \frac{A_\mathfrak{t}(s)}{F^{ps-(p-1)}} \quad \text{for } s \geq \Delta_p + \delta/p$$

Computing as in (2.3.5) and (2.3.6) we conclude that when $s \geq \Delta_p$ the infinitesimal mean and variance are, omitting the error term,

$$\begin{aligned} b(U_\mathfrak{t}) &= -p(\log F) F^{-ps+(p-1)} A_\mathfrak{t}(s) + p F^{-ps+(p-1)} b(A_\mathfrak{t}) \\ &\approx p \log F (0.5 |L^\mathfrak{t}| \cdot W_\mathfrak{t} - U_\mathfrak{t}(s)), \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.1}$$

$$v(U_\mathfrak{t}) \leq p \log F \cdot F^{-ps+(p-1)} W_\mathfrak{t} = o(F^{-\delta/3}). \tag{2.4.2}$$

Let $T(p, \delta) = 1 - 1/p + \delta/p$ and $P_{p,\delta}^* = P(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{T(p,\delta)})$. By definition $-T(p, \delta)p + (p-1) = \delta/p$, so the L^2 maximal inequality implies that as $F \rightarrow \infty$

$$P_{p,\delta}^* \left(\sup_{t \in [T(p,\delta), T_1]} \left| U_t(s) - U_t(T(p, \delta)) - \int_{T(p,\delta)}^t b(U_t(s)) ds \right| \geq 0.5F^{-\delta/3} \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.4.3)$$

Lemma 2.4.3. *Suppose y is continuous with*

$$\left| y(t) - y(0) + D \int_0^t (y(s) - C) ds \right| \leq \varepsilon \quad (2.4.4)$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq T$ where C and $D > 0$ are fixed constants. Then we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |y(t) - y^*(t)| \leq 2\varepsilon$$

where $y^*(t) = y(0)e^{-Dt} + C(1 - e^{-Dt})$ is the unique solution to the integral equation

$$y^*(t) = y(0) - D \int_0^t (y^*(s) - C) ds.$$

Intuitively, the integral equation is close to $y'(t) = -D(y(t) - C)$, so the solution should be close to the solution of the differential equation.

Proof. Let $Y(t) = \int_0^t (y(s) - C) ds$. The integral inequality (2.4.4) implies

$$Y'(t) + (C - y(0)) + DY(t) \leq \varepsilon$$

Since $Y'(t) + DY(t) \leq \varepsilon + y(0) - C$ we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} (e^{Dt} Y(t)) \leq (\varepsilon + y(0) - C) e^{Dt}$$

Using $Y(0) = 0$ and integrating

$$e^{Dt} Y(t) \leq (y(0) - C + \varepsilon) \int_0^t e^{Ds} ds = (y(0) - C + \varepsilon) \frac{e^{Dt} - 1}{D}$$

and we have

$$Y(t) \leq (\varepsilon + y(0) - C) \frac{1 - e^{-Dt}}{D}. \quad (2.4.5)$$

Similarly if we start with $Y'(t) + (C - y(0)) + DY(t) \geq -\varepsilon$ we end up with

$$Y(t) \geq (-\varepsilon + y(0) - C) \frac{1 - e^{-Dt}}{D}. \quad (2.4.6)$$

To get the upper bound on $y(t)$, we use (2.4.4) and the upper bound on in (2.4.6)

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &\leq \varepsilon + y(0) - DY(t) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + y(0) - (-\varepsilon + y(0) - C)(1 - e^{-Dt}) \\ &= \varepsilon + y(0)e^{-Dt} + (C + \varepsilon)(1 - e^{-Dt}) + \varepsilon \leq 2\varepsilon + y^*(t). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the lower bound is similar. □

Remark 2.4.1. *The reader should note that in the first two lines of the last computation we use both $Y'(t) + (C - y(0)) + DY(t) \leq \varepsilon$ and $\geq -\varepsilon$ (to get (2.4.6)), so there is no one sided version of this result.*

Back to the proof of Lemma 2.4.2. Using Lemma 2.4.3 with $D = p \log F$, $C = W_{\mathfrak{t}}$ and $\varepsilon = F^{-\delta/3}$ with the formula for $y^*(t)$, we have

$$|U_{\mathfrak{t}}(T(p, \delta) + t) - U_{\mathfrak{t}}(T(p, \delta))e^{-pt \log F} + W_{\mathfrak{t}}(1 - e^{-pt \log F})| \leq F^{-\delta/3}$$

By Lemma 2.4.1, $E_0^* U_{\mathfrak{t}}(T(p, \delta)) \leq C_{\mathfrak{t}}$. So if $t \geq 2\delta/p$, $U_{\mathfrak{t}}(T(p, \delta))e^{-pt \log F} = o(F^{-\delta/3})$, and $W_{\mathfrak{t}}e^{-pt \log F} = o(F^{-\delta/3})$, which with (2.4.3) proves the desired result. □

2.4.2 Results up to T_1

For our results to be useful they have to hold up to $T_1 = \inf\{T : \max_e A_e^+(t) \geq \kappa F\}$.

Lemma 2.4.4. *Let $W_{\mathfrak{t}}^+ = W_{\mathfrak{t}} + F^{-\delta/3}$. If $\kappa > 0$ is small and if F is large then with high probability*

$$F^{-pt+(p-1)} A_{\mathfrak{t}}(t) \leq 2W_{\mathfrak{t}}^+ \quad \text{for } 1 - \delta/p \leq t \leq T_1$$

Proof. To begin, we note that the Lemma 2.4.2 implies

$$A_t(1 - \delta/p) \leq W_t^+ F^{1-\delta}$$

Noting that the infinitesimal variance of A_t is always $\leq F \log F$ and using the L^2 maximal inequality, we have that as $F \rightarrow \infty$

$$P_{1-\delta/p}^* \left(\sup_{1-\delta/p \leq t \leq T_1} A_t(t) - A_t(1 - \delta/p) - pW_t^+ F \int_{1-\delta/p}^t \frac{F^{ps-p} \log F}{1 - \widehat{W} F^{s-1}} ds \geq F^{0.6} \right) \rightarrow 0$$

For $1 - \delta/p \leq t \leq T_1$, using $1 - \widehat{W} F^{s-1} \geq 1 - \kappa$ gives

$$\int_{1-\delta/p}^t \frac{F^{p(s-1)} \log F}{1 - \widehat{W} F^{s-1}} ds \leq \frac{1}{1 - \kappa} \cdot \frac{1}{p} F^{pt-p}$$

Multiplying the last bound by $pW_t^+ F$ and combining our estimates, we see that

$$A_t(t) \leq F^{0.6} + W_t^+ F^{1-\delta} + \frac{W_t^+}{p(1 - \kappa)} F^{pt-(p-1)} \quad \text{for } 1 - \delta/p \leq t \leq T_1$$

and the desired result follows when $\kappa < 1 - \frac{1}{2p}$. \square

Now that we have upper bounds on the $A_t(t)$ we can get lower bounds.

Lemma 2.4.5. *If $\kappa > 0$ is small enough then there are constants $c_t(\kappa, p) > 0$ so that if $F \geq F_t$*

$$F^{-pt+(p-1)} A_t(t) \geq c_t \quad \text{for } 1 - \delta/p \leq t \leq T_1.$$

Proof. Again we use induction, Lemma 2.3.3 gives the result for $p = 1$. Noting that the infinitesimal variance of A_t is always $\leq F \log F$ and using the L^2 maximal inequality, we have that as $F \rightarrow \infty$

$$P_{1-2\delta/p}^* \left(\inf_{1-2\delta/p \leq t \leq T_1} A_t(t) - A_t(1 - 2\delta/p) - \int_{1-2\delta/p}^t b(A_t(s)) ds \leq -F^{0.6} \right) \rightarrow 0$$

From the rates we see that for $s \leq T_1$, $b(A_t(s))/\log F$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t \ni e \sim L^t} A_e \frac{A_{t \setminus \{e\}} - A_t}{F} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t \nexists e^* \sim t} A_{e^*} \frac{A_t - A_{e^* \cup t}}{F(1 - \kappa)}$$

We will drop the last term in the second sum which is nonpositive. Using Lemma 2.4.4 and the induction hypothesis, the above is

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \ni e \sim L^{\mathfrak{t}}} F^s c_{e_1} \frac{F^{(p-1)s-(p-2)} c_{\mathfrak{t} \setminus \{e\}}}{F} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \not\ni e^* \sim t, \text{ or } \mathfrak{t} \ni e \sim L^{\mathfrak{t}}} F^s (2W_{e^*}^+) \frac{F^{ps-(p-1)} (2W_{\mathfrak{t}}^+)}{F(1-\kappa)}.$$

Rewriting $sq - (q-1) = q(s-1) + 1$ we see that the last expression has the form

$$F^{p(s-1)+1} a_{\mathfrak{t}} - F^{(p+1)(s-1)+1} b_{\mathfrak{t}}$$

for constants $a_{\mathfrak{t}}, b_{\mathfrak{t}}$ recursively defined as

$$a_{\mathfrak{t}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \ni e \sim L^{\mathfrak{t}}} c_{\{e\}} c_{\mathfrak{t} \setminus \{e\}}$$

$$b_{\mathfrak{t}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \not\ni e^* \sim t, \text{ or } \mathfrak{t} \ni e \sim L^{\mathfrak{t}}} \frac{(2W_{e^*}^+)(2W_{\mathfrak{t}}^+)}{1-\kappa}$$

So we have

$$\int_{1-2\delta/p}^t b(A_{\mathfrak{t}}(s)) ds \geq \frac{a_{\mathfrak{t}}}{p} (F^{p(t-1)+1} - F^{1-2\delta}) - \frac{b_{\mathfrak{t}}}{p+1} F^{(p+1)(t-1)+1}$$

Using $F^{t-1} \leq \kappa/\widehat{W}$ and $A_{\mathfrak{t}}(1-2\delta/p) \geq 0$ the desired result follows by setting

$$c_{\mathfrak{t}} < \frac{a_{\mathfrak{t}}}{p} - \frac{b_{\mathfrak{t}}}{p+1} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\widehat{W}}$$

which is positive if $\kappa > 0$ is small enough. □

Lemma 2.4.6. *For any initially active component ψ consensus, with high probability $A_{\psi}(T_1) \geq c_* F$ where $c_* = c_*(\kappa, \psi)$ is a positive constant. In words, consensus has been reached over a positive fraction of issues on ψ .*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{t} be a spanning tree of the component ψ , let $t = T_1$ and κ sufficiently small as in Lemma 2.4.5. Using (2.3.1) and (2.3.2) one can conclude that with high probability

$$A_{\psi}(T_1) \geq A_{\mathfrak{t}}(T_1) \geq c_{\mathfrak{t}} F^{pT_1-(p-1)} \geq c_{\mathfrak{t}} (\kappa/\widehat{W})^p F > 0. \quad (2.4.7)$$

Letting $c_* = c_{\mathfrak{t}} (\kappa/\widehat{W})^p$ completes the proof. □

2.5 Consensus on the giant component

Our goal in this section is to show that, under the assumption that there are no surprises, consensus on the giant component χ can be reached on all F issues by time $T_1 F \log F + c_N F \log \log F$. To do such in general settings, we switch to study Axelrod's model on a given component ψ running at rate F (short as *Axelrod's dynamics*) starting from an initial configuration where the number of issues ψ agree on is $\geq \delta F$. Define σ_f as the first time Axelrod's dynamics reaches consensus over issue f on ψ . The main Lemma in this section is

Lemma 2.5.1. *For Axelrod's dynamics on ψ that has reached consensus over $\geq \delta F$ issues at time 0 where $\delta > 0$ is a constant, there is a constant C so that the first time ψ reaches consensus on all issues*

$$\max_f \sigma_f \leq (CN^6/\delta) \log \log F \quad (2.5.1)$$

with high probability as $F \rightarrow \infty$

Remark 2.5.1. *Under the assumption of no surprises, Lemma 2.4.6 implies that Axelrod's model on the giant component χ possess the same opinion on $c_*(\kappa, \chi)F$ issues at time $T_1 F \log F$. Since our model is Markovian we can apply Lemma 2.5.1 with $\delta = c_*(\kappa, \chi)$ which indicates that consensus on the giant component χ can be reached over all F issues by time $T_1 F \log F + c_N F \log \log F$, where $c_N = CN^6/c_*(\kappa, \chi) > 0$ does not depend on F , completing the argument.*

We start the proof of Lemma 2.5.1 by showing

Lemma 2.5.2. *For each $f = 1, \dots, F$ let*

$$t_0 = t_0(\delta, N) = \frac{N^6}{\delta}. \quad (2.5.2)$$

There is an enlarged probability space where we can construct independent $(\tilde{\sigma}_f : f = 1, \dots, F)$ such that $\sigma_f \leq \tilde{\sigma}_f$ for all $f = 1, \dots, F$, and for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$P(\tilde{\sigma}_f > nt_0) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n. \quad (2.5.3)$$

Remark 2.5.2. We prove Lemma 2.5.2 by assume first that there are only two opinions held by voters of ψ over each issue and prove

$$P\left(\tilde{\sigma}_f > n\frac{N^4}{\delta}\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n. \quad (2.5.4)$$

then generalize our argument to the case of multiple opinions to conclude (2.5.4).

Proof. The two-opinion case. We assume without loss of generality that the opinion set on each issue is $\{0, 1\}$. To prove (2.5.4), note that in Axelrod's dynamics we pick an issue on which there is a disagreement at random, however by the idea of Poisson thinning we achieve the same dynamics by instead picking at random from all issues at rate

$$F \cdot \frac{A_e(t-)}{F} \cdot \frac{1}{(F - A_e(t-)) \vee 1} = \frac{A_e(t-)}{(F - A_e(t-)) \vee 1} \quad (2.5.5)$$

since when an issue is picked on which there is agreement nothing happens.

We proceed and complete the proof by constructing a coupling between Axelrod's dynamics and a stack of independent random walks. Imitation events for issue $f = 1, \dots, F$ on edge e occur at rate $\frac{A_e(t-)}{F - A_e(t-)}$. When imitation happens the opinion is either copied or eliminated with probability $1/2$ for each, independent of the dynamics before time t . Set

- (i) $(\Lambda_{f,k}^0(t) : t \geq 0, f = 1, \dots, F, k = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{E}|)$ be a collection of unit Poisson processes independent across $f = 1, \dots, F$ and $k \in [|\mathcal{E}|]$, and
- (ii) $(X_f^n : n \geq 1)$ be a collection of independent fair coins that take value $\{-1, +1\}$ with probabilities $1/2$ each, independent across $f = 1, \dots, F$.

With these tools at hand one can recursively build up Axelrod's dynamics as what follows. Let $\tau_0 = 0$. For each $n = 0, 1, \dots$ suppose the process has been defined for $t \in [0, \tau_n]$, we define the next phase of process as

- Let D_f^n denotes the set of edges connected by two voters holding different opinions for issue f . D_f^n is nonempty whenever $\tau_n < \sigma_f$. Let $\iota_f^n : [|\mathcal{E}|] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be a bijective map satisfying $\iota_f^n(1) \in D_f^n$. Such map is adapted to the process filtration at τ_n .

- Define τ^* as the minimal jump time of $(\Lambda_{f,e}(t) : t \geq 0)$ among all $f = 1, \dots, F$ and $e \in \mathcal{E}$, where for $t \in (\tau_n, \tau^*]$

$$\Lambda_{f,\iota_f^n(k)}(t) = \Lambda_{f,\iota_f^n(k)}(\tau_n) + \Lambda_{f,k}^0 \left(\mathbf{B}_k + \frac{A_{\iota_f^n(k)}(\tau_n)}{(F - A_{\iota_f^n(k)}(\tau_n)) \vee 1} (t - \tau_n) \right) - \Lambda_{f,k}^0(\mathbf{B}_k).$$

where \mathbf{B}_k stands for the expression

$$\sum_{n'=0}^{n-1} \frac{A_{\iota_f^{n'}(k)}(\tau_{n'})}{(F - A_{\iota_f^{n'}(k)}(\tau_{n'})) \vee 1} (\tau_{n'+1} - \tau_{n'}).$$

which is $\geq \tau_n \cdot \delta$. Let e^* denote the edge whose associated Λ -process achieves the minimal jump time.

- If two voters connecting e^* share the same opinion on issue f , no dynamics occurred at τ^* so we set $\tau_n = \tau^*$ and return to Bullet 1. Otherwise set $\tau_{n+1} = \tau^*$.
- At $t = \tau_{n+1}$, we flip a coin X_f^{n+1} to determine the direction of imitation on e^* for issue f of Axelrod's dynamics. If X_f^{n+1} is head then the opinion pattern on e^* flips from $10 \rightarrow 11$, i.e. the voter which holds opinion 0 takes the opinion of its neighbor across e^* ; otherwise the pattern flips from $10 \rightarrow 00$.
- Update $(A_e(\tau_{n+1}) : e \in \mathcal{E})$.

We are making our coupling very explicit in order to be able to define an associated process $M_f(t) =$ the number of individuals holding opinion 1 for issue f . Let

$$\Lambda_f(t) = \sum_{n:\tau_n \leq t} \left(\sum_{e \in D_f^n} \Delta \Lambda_{f,e}(\tau_n) \right),$$

which counts all the jumps occurred on the edge set D_f^n . From the previous definition of process

$$\Lambda_f(t) \geq \Lambda_{f,1}^0 \left(\mathbf{B}_1 + \frac{A_{\iota_f^n(1)}(\tau_n)}{(F - A_{\iota_f^n(1)}(\tau_n)) \vee 1} (t - \tau_n) \right) \geq \Lambda_{f,1}^0(\delta t). \quad (2.5.6)$$

Set

$$M_f(t) = M_f(0) + \sum_{n=1}^{\Lambda_f(t)} X_f^n.$$

Since there are only two opinions our consensus time σ_f is equal to the time $M_f(t)$ first hits the boundary of $[0, |\psi|]$. To define coupled random walks let $\tilde{\Lambda}_f(t) = \Lambda_{f,1}^0(\delta t)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_f$ be the first time t that

$$\tilde{M}_f(t) = M_f(0) + \sum_{n=1}^{\tilde{\Lambda}_f(t)} X_f^n$$

hits the boundary of $[0, |\psi|]$. We have $\tilde{\sigma}_f$ being independent across $f = 1, \dots, F$, and because of (2.5.6), $\sigma_f \leq \tilde{\sigma}_f$ for all $f = 1, \dots, F$. It is obvious that $\tilde{M}_f(t)$ is a time-change of simple random walk on $[0, |\psi|]$ with $|\psi| \leq N^2$. Classical gambler's ruin result implies that independent of initial value of ξ_0

$$E_{\xi_0} \tilde{\sigma}_f \leq \delta^{-1} \frac{|\psi|^2}{4} \leq \frac{N^4}{4\delta} \quad (2.5.7)$$

From the Markov property of Axelrod's dynamics, Markov's inequality and (2.5.7)

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\tilde{\sigma}_f > n \cdot \delta^{-1} N^4 \mid \tilde{\sigma}_f > (n-1) \cdot \delta^{-1} N^4\right) &\leq \sup_{\xi_0} P_{\xi_0}(\tilde{\sigma}_f > \delta^{-1} N^4) \\ &\leq (\delta^{-1} N^4)^{-1} \left(\sup_{\xi_0} E_{\xi_0} \tilde{\sigma}_f\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.5.8)$$

where supremum is taken among all initial ξ_0 . (2.5.4) follows immediately by taking products for (2.5.8) for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ □

Proof of Lemma 2.5.2 in the general case. For the multiple opinions case let I be the ordered set of opinions $q_1, \dots, q_{|I|}$ held by all individuals on issue f . To generalize our previous arguments we

- Map the opinions $\{q_1\}$ and $I \setminus \{q_1\}$ to the new opinions $\bar{1}$ and $\bar{0}$;
- Let $M_f(t) =$ the number of voters taking the new $\bar{1}$. Then $M_f(t)$ absorbs at the boundary of $[0, |\psi|]$ at $\sigma_f^{(1)}$, which is upper bounded by $\tilde{\sigma}_f^{(1)}$ as in (2.5.4);

- If $M_f(t)$ is absorbed at N^2 consensus is reached and we are done. Otherwise we reduce the opinion set to $I \setminus \{q_1\}$ and start a new round by mapping the opinion sets $\{q_2\}$ and $I \setminus \{q_1, q_2\}$ as the new opinions $\bar{1}$ and $\bar{0}$ and return the first bullet.

Keep the procedures until $M_f(t)$ hits N^2 before 0 for some round K . Since $|I| \leq N^2$, $K \leq N^2 - 1$ and the sum $\tilde{\sigma}_f \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{N^2-1} \tilde{\sigma}_f^{(k)}$ bounds σ_f from above with $\tilde{\sigma}_f$ being independent across $f = 1, \dots, F$, (2.5.7) indicates that $E\tilde{\sigma}_f \leq (4\delta)^{-1}N^6$. Markov property along with Markov's inequality implies for t_0 defined in (2.5.2)

$$P(\tilde{\sigma}_f > n \cdot t_0 | \tilde{\sigma}_f > (n-1) \cdot t_0) \leq t_0^{-1} \left(\sup_{\xi_0} E_{\xi_0} \tilde{\sigma}_f \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (2.5.9)$$

Lemma 2.5.2 follows by taking products. □

Remark 2.5.3. *To explain our proof of (2.5.4) note for an issue that ψ reaches consensus over, arrows do not pose effects on edges of agreement. When the opinions are different we read $10 \rightarrow 11$ as flipping out a head (+1) and $10 \rightarrow 00$ as a tail (-1), recorded by X_1, X_2, \dots . These fair coins are then recycled to couple the 1-counters of Axelrod's dynamics for a fixed issue with uniformly slower random walks, and a sequence of independent upper-bounding variables for the consensus time can be constructed thereafter.*

Proof of Lemma 2.5.1. Referring to (2.5.2) for the definition of t_0 we define a discrete-time Markov chain \underline{A}_n to give a lower bound on $A_\psi(nt_0)$. It starts from $\underline{A}_0 = 0$ and has transition probability

$$P(\underline{A}_{n+1} = k + i | \underline{A}_n = k) = \binom{F-k}{i} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{F-k} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq F-k.$$

From Lemma 2.5.2 there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that there exists a coupling $(A_\psi(nt_0), \underline{A}_n)$ such that $A_\psi(nt_0) \geq \underline{A}_n$. It is clear that

$$E(\underline{A}_{n+1} | \underline{A}_n = k) = k + \frac{1}{2}(F-k).$$

Let $\underline{b}_n = E(F - \underline{A}_n)$. Taking expectation in the last display we obtain $\underline{b}_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}\underline{b}_n$ so

$$EA_\psi(nt_0) \geq E\underline{A}_n = F\underline{b}_n \geq F(1 - 2^{-n})$$

Taking $n = C \log \log F$, we have

$$E(F - A_\psi(Ct_0 \log \log F)) \leq F \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{C \log \log F}.$$

One takes $C = 3/\log 2 > 0$ to obtain $EA_\psi(Ct_0 \log \log F) \geq (1 - (\log F)^{-2})F$. Since $F - A_\psi(Ct_0 \log \log F)$ is nonnegative, Markov's inequality implies

$$P(F - A_\psi(Ct_0 \log \log F) \geq (\log F)^{-2}F) \leq \frac{(\log F)^{-3}F}{(\log F)^{-2}F} = (\log F)^{-1} \quad (2.5.10)$$

which goes to 0 as $F \rightarrow \infty$. One can then complete the proof of Lemma 2.5.1 using Lemma 2.5.2 and

Lemma 2.5.3. *We have*

$$P\left(\max_f \tilde{\sigma}_f - Ct_0 \log \log F \geq \frac{2t_0}{\log 2} (\log F)^{-1}\right) \leq \frac{1}{F}. \quad (2.5.11)$$

Proof. (2.5.10) implies that w.h.p. after time $Ct_0 \log \log F$, each of the individual voter models in the coupling is running at rate $\geq (\log F)^2$. By Lemma 2.5.2 the $\tilde{\sigma}_f$ are independent and the tail of distribution bounded geometrically. From this it follows that

$$P\left(\max_f \tilde{\sigma}_f - T_* \geq (\log F)^{-2}Kt_0\right) \leq F(1/2)^K$$

Taking $K = (2/\log 2) \log F$ we obtain the desired result. □

3

Surprises

Having completed the argument assuming no surprises, we now return to the real dynamics where surprise events can happen. The crucial consequence of surprises is an edge with no initial agreement can be *activated by surprises* in later phases. As the readers will see, surprises will occur before time T_1 with probability $1 - O(\kappa)$, and the agreements on edges created by surprises are $\leq (\log F)^\alpha$ until consensus is reached on the giant component χ over all undisturbed issues. We begin with the case of one surprise. In this situation our argument has two cases: the surprise adds one edge to the giant component, or connects it to an existing component.

3.1 The probability of no surprises before $T_1 F \log F$

We say that *coincidence* occurs initially on issue f if there exist distinct voters i, j which are not neighbors such that $\xi_0(i, f) = \xi_0(j, f)$. Issues where coincidence occurs initially are the only ones that can produce surprises. Without much difficulty one can prove

Lemma 3.1.1. *Let \mathcal{N}_S be the set of issues where coincidence occurs initially and suppose $F \leq \gamma Q$. We have $E|\mathcal{N}_S| \leq \gamma N^4/2$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}_f = \{\text{coincidence occurs initially on issue } f\}$. There are $\binom{N^2}{2}$ pairs of vertices

which have the same opinion on issue f with probability $1/Q$ so

$$P(\mathcal{C}_f) \leq \frac{1}{Q} \binom{N^2}{2} \quad (3.1.1)$$

Hence Lemma 3.1.1 follows from (3.1.1) and

$$E|\mathcal{N}_S| = \sum_{f=1, \dots, F} P(\mathcal{C}_f) \leq \frac{F(N^2)^2}{2Q} \leq \gamma N^4/2.$$

□

Our main Lemma in this section claims that if $\kappa > 0$ is small, with probability $1 - O(\kappa)$ there are no surprises before $T_1 F \log F$.

Lemma 3.1.2. *Let $H_*(\kappa, F)$ be the event that there is no surprise event before time $T_1 F \log F$. Then $P(H_*(\kappa, F)) \geq 1 - \gamma \kappa N^6$.*

Proof. We refer the readers to Section 2.2 for the definitions of $I_e(t)$ and $J_e(t)$. Let P^+ be the probability measure conditioned on the initial configuration. The probability that some surprise event occurs is

$$\begin{aligned} P^+(H_*(\kappa, F)^c) &\leq P^+ \left(\mathcal{N}_S \cap \left(\bigcup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} I_e(T_1) \right) \neq \emptyset \right) \\ &\leq P^+ \left(\mathcal{N}_S \cap \left(\bigcup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} J_e(T_1) \right) \neq \emptyset \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{f_S \in \mathcal{N}_S} P^+ \left(f_S \in \bigcup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} J_e(T_1) \right) \leq |\mathcal{N}_S| \cdot \frac{2\kappa N^2 F}{F}. \end{aligned}$$

since $\cup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} J_e(t)$ is a uniform subset of $\{1, \dots, F\}$ and has cardinality $\leq \kappa |\mathcal{E}| F = 2\kappa N^2 F$.

Lemma 3.1.1 implies

$$P(H_*(\kappa, F)) = 1 - EP^+(H_*(\kappa, F)^c) \geq 1 - E|\mathcal{N}_S| \cdot 2\kappa N^2 \geq 1 - \gamma \kappa N^6.$$

□

Remark 3.1.1. *In the later sections we assume $H_*(\kappa, F)$ occurs, and the probability and expectation notations P and E stand for the conditional ones on $H_*(\kappa, F)$. Lemma 3.1.2 implies that the conditioning imposes little effect on the distributions since the probability is bounded away from 0 as $F \rightarrow \infty$.*

3.2 One surprise

Remark 2.5.1 in the beginning of Section 2.5 indicates that in the case of no surprises, Axelrod's model reach consensus on all issues on χ along with all other components at time $T_1 \log F + c_N \log \log F$. In this section we study the growth of one surprise edge connecting to an individual not in the giant component χ .

We continue, as in the beginning of Section 2.5 to run Axelrod's model at rate F after T_1 . Let e^* be the edge activated by a surprise and connected the main component ψ to either a single voter or a component ψ' . Also in the first (resp. second) case, assume for ψ (resp. $\psi^* = \psi, \psi'$), at time T^* consensus has reached on ψ (resp. ψ^*) over $\geq \delta F$ issues where $\delta > 0$ is a constant. Let τ_{e^*} be the first time an agreement on e^* emerges. Define the new component $\mathcal{C} = \psi \cup \{e^*\} \cup \psi'$ (To unify both cases we force to write $\psi' = \emptyset$ in the case of single voter) and

$$T_{e^*}^o = \inf\{t \geq \tau_{e^*} : A_{\mathcal{C}}(t) \geq 1\}, \quad T_{e^*}^w = \inf\{t \geq \tau_{e^*} : A_{e^*}(t) = 0\}$$

If $T_{e^*}^w < T_{e^*}^o$ then agreement on the surprise edge e^* is lost, so ψ is once again disconnected with ψ' , and it has to be reactivated by a new surprise. Otherwise we are in the case that the issues of agreements on \mathcal{C} can grow. By restarting the process the former case can be combined with the latter one, and we may without loss of generality assume that latter is the case. Let σ_f^a be the first time that *activation time*, i.e. the first time that an agreement on e^* is generated on issue f . Let

$$\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t) = \inf\{t : \sigma_f^a \leq t\}.$$

In words, $\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)$ denotes the set that records the issues over dynamics on e^* occurred by time t . We are able to conclude that in both cases, the full component \mathcal{C} reaches positive level $\delta_{e^*} F$ before the number of issues for which there is agreement on ψ or ψ' drops below $(\delta/2)F$. Using the coupling with a branching process we can also conclude that once an issue has been activated on \mathcal{C} it takes $O(\log F)$ time for the number of issues \mathcal{C} agree on to reach positive level.

3.2.1 Surprises in single-edge case

In this case the surprise edge e^* does not connect ψ to any component. We introduce for $\kappa > 0$

$$T_{e^*}(\kappa) = \inf\{t \geq T_* : |\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)| \geq \kappa F\}$$

$$T_2(\delta_0) = \inf\{t \geq T_* : A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t) \geq \delta_0 F\}$$

Lemma 3.2.1. *For $\kappa > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ appropriately chosen, with high probability*

$$T_2(\delta_0) \leq T_{e^*}(\kappa).$$

Proof. Since growth on e^* is the only source of disturbance of the consensus on ψ , a little thought reveals that $A_\psi(t) - A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t)$, the number of issues agreed on ψ but not on e^* , has

$$A_\psi(t-) - A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t-) \geq A_\psi(T_*) - |\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)|. \quad (3.2.1)$$

for all $t \geq T_*$. When κ is chosen to be $\delta/2$ the above is $\geq (\delta/2)F$ for $t \in [T_*, T_{e^*}(\kappa)]$. Consider the edge activated by surprise $e^* = \{i, j\}$ where $i \in \psi$ and $j \notin \psi$. We use $\mathcal{I}_\psi(t)$ to denote the set of issues individuals of ψ agree on at time t , so that $A_\psi(t) = |\mathcal{I}_\psi(t)|$. At time t where $\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)$ adds issue f to itself, either

- (i) i gives its opinion to j and $f \in \mathcal{I}_\psi(t-)$, and $A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t)$ increases by 1, or
- (ii) j gives its opinion to i or $f \notin \mathcal{I}_\psi(t-)$, $A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t)$ does not increase.

By time $t \leq T_{e^*}(\kappa)$ case (i) above has probability

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_\psi(t-) - A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t-)}{F - A_{e^*}(t-)} \geq \frac{(\delta/2)F}{2F} = \frac{\delta}{4},$$

so the agreement on $\psi \cup \{e^*\}$ at T_{e^*} is bounded below by Binomial($\kappa F, \delta/4$). To complete the proof we use the following classical large deviation result for binomial distribution

Lemma 3.2.2. *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. with $P(X_i = 1) = p$, $P(X_i = 0) = 1 - p$. Then*

$$P(X_1 + \dots + X_n < n(p - \varepsilon)) \leq \exp(-\varepsilon^2 n/2).$$

When $\varepsilon = p/2$ this is just

$$P(\text{Binomial}(n, p) < (p/2)n) \leq \exp(-(p^2/8)n).$$

Proof. If $\alpha > 0$ then

$$P(X_1 + \dots + X_n \leq n(p - \varepsilon)) e^{-\alpha n(p - \varepsilon)} \leq (pe^{-\alpha} + (1 - p))^n$$

Taking log's, dividing by n , rearranging and then using $\log(1 + x) \leq x$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log P(X_1 + \dots + X_n \leq n(p - \varepsilon)) &\leq \alpha(p - \varepsilon) + \log(1 + p(e^{-\alpha} - 1)) \\ &\leq \alpha(p - \varepsilon) + p(e^{-\alpha} - 1) = -\alpha\varepsilon + p(e^{-\alpha} - 1 + \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Now $e^{-\alpha} - 1 + \alpha \leq \alpha^2/2$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$ so taking $\alpha = \varepsilon$ and using $p \leq 1$ gives

$$P(X_1 + \dots + X_n < n(p - \varepsilon)) \leq \exp(-\varepsilon^2 n/2)$$

and completes the proof of Lemma 3.2.2. □

Now applying Lemma 3.2.2 with $n = \kappa F$, $p = \delta/4 = 2\varepsilon$ and assume $\kappa \leq 1/8$ without loss of generality we obtain

$$P(A_{\psi \cup e^*}(T_{e^*}(\kappa)) \geq (\kappa\delta/8)F) \geq P(\text{Binomial}(\kappa F, \delta/4) \geq (\kappa\delta/8)F) \geq 1 - \exp(-(\delta^2/128)\kappa F).$$

Letting $\delta_0 = \kappa\delta/8$ completes the proof of Lemma 3.2.1. □

To estimate T_2 the time reaching consensus on $\psi \cup \{e^*\}$ over $\delta_0 F$ issues, we have

Lemma 3.2.3. *With high probability $T_2(\delta_0) \leq C(\delta) \log F$ as $F \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. From the proof of Lemma 3.2.1 we see that for time $t \leq T_{e^*}$, $A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t)$ can be coupled with $A_{\psi \cup e^*}^-(t)$, a Yule binary fission which starts from $A_{\psi \cup e^*}^-(T_*) = 1$ running at rate $\delta/4$, so that

$$A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t) \geq A_{\psi \cup e^*}^-(t), \quad T_* \leq t \leq T_{e^*}. \quad (3.2.2)$$

Using the standard results of branching process (see e.g. [1]) the first time $A_{\psi \cup e^*}^-(t)$ reaches $\delta_0 F$, denoted by \widehat{T}_{e^*} , is equal to $T_* + (\delta/4)^{-1}(\log(\delta_0 F) + V^F)$ where V^F converges weakly to V^∞ with cumulative distribution function $P(V^\infty \leq x) = \exp(-\exp(-x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore for $C > (\delta/4)^{-1}$ the weak convergence implies

$$P\left(\widehat{T}_{e^*} - T_* \geq C \log F\right) = P\left(V^F \geq [(\delta/4)C - 1] \log F - \log \delta_0\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } F \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.2.3)$$

One can then finish the argument by combining Lemma 3.2.1, (3.2.3) and

$$T_{e^*}(\kappa) \leq \widehat{T}_{e^*}. \quad (3.2.4)$$

(3.2.4) can be proved by contradiction as follows. Suppose $T_{e^*}(\kappa) > \widehat{T}_{e^*}$ then the coupling in (3.2.2) works for $t = \widehat{T}_{e^*}$ and thereby $A_{\psi \cup e^*}(\widehat{T}_{e^*}) \geq A_{\psi \cup e^*}^-(\widehat{T}_{e^*}) \geq \delta_0 F$, contradicting the definition of $T_{e^*}(\kappa)$. \square

3.2.2 Surprises occurs in middle of two components

Let σ_f^* be the time that Axelrod's model reaches consensus (and hence fixation) on \mathcal{C} for issue f , i.e. all members of the new component \mathcal{C} share the same opinion on issue f , $|\psi'|$ denote the number of vertices in ψ' , $t_1^*(\kappa, \psi') = 2|\psi'|^2/\kappa$ and define the following stopping times

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\psi(\kappa) &= \inf\{t \geq T_* : A_\psi(t) < (\delta/2)F\} \\ \tau_{\psi'}(\kappa) &= \inf\{t \geq T_* : A_{\psi'}(t) < (\delta/2)F\} \\ T_3^*(\kappa) &= \inf\{t > 0 : |\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)| \geq (\kappa/2)e^{-t_1^*} F\} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2.4. *For $\kappa > 0$ and $\delta_{e^*} > 0$ appropriately chosen such that with high probability as $F \rightarrow \infty$ $T_3^*(\kappa) < \infty$, and*

$$T_3(\delta_{e^*}) \leq T_3^*(\kappa) + t_1^*(\kappa, \psi') \leq \min\{\tau_\psi(\kappa), \tau_{\psi'}(\kappa)\}. \quad (3.2.5)$$

The idea of proof is to couple the counter $A_{\mathcal{C}}(t)$ for $t \leq T_*$ with a lower-bounded one that is easier to analyze. Consider vertex x^* whose opinion over an issue f at its activation time

σ_f^a takes over ψ' . Let $G_f^{\mathcal{C}}$ denote the event that consensus is reached by time $T_3^* + t_1^*$, i.e.

$$G_f^{\mathcal{C}} = \{\sigma_f^* \leq T_3^* + t_1^*, \xi_{\sigma_f^*}(f, x) = \xi_{\sigma_f^a}(f, x^*) \forall x \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Lastly let

$$\eta_{e^*}(\kappa, \psi') = (\delta/4) \frac{1}{2^{|\psi'|}}. \quad (3.2.6)$$

Lemma 3.2.5. *For $\kappa > 0$ appropriately chosen, there is an enlarged probability space where set of independent events $(\tilde{G}_f^{\mathcal{C}} : f = 1, \dots, F)$ live, satisfying*

(a) $G_f^{\mathcal{C}} \supseteq \tilde{G}_f^{\mathcal{C}}$ for $f \in \mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_3^*(\kappa))$;

(b) $P\left(\tilde{G}_f^{\mathcal{C}}\right) \geq \eta_{e^*}(\kappa, \psi')$.

Proof. Let $\{i, j\} = e^*$ with i in the giant component ψ , and $\kappa = \delta/2$. To explain why η_{e^*} defined in (3.2.6) is a lower bound, note the first factor is no greater than the probability that consensus has been reached on ψ on the issue that i gives her/his opinion to j , and hence

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_{\psi}(t-) - A_{\psi \cup e^*}(t-)}{F - A_{e^*}(t-)} \geq \frac{(\delta/2)F}{2F} = \delta/4,$$

once again due to (3.2.1). The second factor is the lower-bound probability that the opinion successfully spread to all members of ψ' and therefore consensus on \mathcal{C} is reached over issue f . We utilize the techniques provided in the proof of Lemma 2.5.2 and couple the dynamics with independent martingales $(M_f^{\mathcal{C}}(t), t \geq \sigma_f^a : f = 1, \dots, F)$ which performs random walks at constant rate $\kappa \leq \kappa/(1 - \kappa)$ on $\{0, 1, \dots, |\psi'|\}$ with absorbing boundaries. With $(\tilde{\sigma}_f^* : f = 1, \dots, F)$ defined as independent stopping time $M_f^{\mathcal{C}}(t)$ reaches $|\psi'|$, standard coupling argument gives $\sigma_f^* \leq \tilde{\sigma}_f^*$ for all $f = 1, \dots, F$. Let

$$\tilde{G}_f^{\mathcal{C}} = \{\tilde{\sigma}_f^* - \sigma_f^a \leq t_1^*, M_f^{\mathcal{C}}(\tilde{\sigma}_f^*) = |\psi'|\}$$

Apparently $G_f^{\mathcal{C}} \supseteq \tilde{G}_f^{\mathcal{C}}, f \in \mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_3^*)$ form independent events and hence

$$P\left(\tilde{G}_f^{\mathcal{C}} | \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_f^a}\right) \geq P\left(M_f^{\mathcal{C}}(\sigma_f^a + t_1^*) = |\psi'| | \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_f^a}\right). \quad (3.2.7)$$

The right-hand side is just the probability a random walk S_t jumping at rate κ starting from 1 get absorbed at $|\psi'|$ before at 0. Let $\tau_{0,|\psi'|} = \inf\{t : S_t = 0 \text{ or } |\psi'|\}$, so using standard results of random walk the RHS in (3.2.7)

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq P_1(S_{\tau_{0,|\psi'|}} = |\psi'|, \tau_{0,|\psi'|} \leq t_1^*) \geq P_1(S_{\tau_{0,|\psi'|}} = |\psi'|) - P_1(\tau_{0,|\psi'|} \geq t_1^*) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|\psi'|} - \frac{E_1 \tau_{0,|\psi'|}}{t_1^*} = \frac{1}{|\psi'|} - \frac{(|\psi'| - 1)/\kappa}{t_1^*} \geq \frac{1}{2|\psi'|}. \end{aligned}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_3^*)$. Taking expectation again we obtain the result. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2.4. In our setting once consensus on \mathcal{C} for at least one issue is reached it will not be diminished, and hence finite Markov chain theory tells that $T_3 < \infty$, leaving the rest to prove (3.2.5). We continue to choose $\kappa = \delta/2$, and an issue f the dynamics on e^* feeds in an opinion so the consensus on ψ breaks down, and the consensus will be reached with probability bounded away from 0 by time t_1^* . For simplicity we give only one chance for each single issue and the recovery process takes t_1^* time with probability of success $\geq \eta_{e^*} > 0$. Using (3.2.1) we have for all $t \geq T_*$

$$\min\{A_\psi(t), A_{\psi'}(t)\} \geq \delta F - |\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)| \geq (\delta/2)F$$

which implies $T_3^* + t_1^* \leq \min\{\tau_\psi, \tau_{\psi'}\}$. Thus the branching process upper bound indicates that there exist G_1, \dots, G_n i.i.d. with geometric distribution of probability $e^{-t_1^*}$ such that $|\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_3^* + t_1^*)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{(\kappa/2)e^{-t_1^*}F} G_i$. Chebyshev's inequality implies that if Z, Z_1, \dots, Z_n are independent with common distribution $\text{geometric}(p)$

$$P\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \geq 2EZ\right) \leq P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - EZ\right| \geq EZ\right) \leq \frac{\text{var}(Z)}{n(EZ)^2} = \frac{(1-p)p^{-2}}{np^{-2}} \leq \frac{1}{n},$$

so with probability $\geq 1 - Ce^{t_1^*}F^{-1}$ we have $|\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_3^* + t_1^*)| \leq (\kappa/2)e^{-t_1^*}F \cdot 2e^{t_1^*} = \kappa F$ which proves the first inequality in (3.2.5). Regarding to the second one note as long as $\min\{A_\psi(t), A_{\psi'}(t)\} \geq (\delta/2)F$ we can use the arguments in Section 2.5 and couple with independent random walks indexed by $f = 1, \dots, F$. Lemma 3.2.5 allows us to couple $A_C(T_3^* + t_1^*)$

with a binomial variable

$$Y \sim \text{Binomial}((\kappa/2)e^{-t_1^*}F, (2|\psi'|)^{-1}), \text{ so that } A_C(T_3^* + t_1^*) \geq Y.$$

Applying Lemma 3.2.2 with $n = (\kappa/2)e^{-t_1^*}$ and $p = 2\varepsilon = (2|\psi'|)^{-1}$ we obtain $A_C(T_3^* + t_1^*) \geq \delta_{e^*}F$ with probability $\geq 1 - \exp(-(\kappa|\psi'|^{-2}/64)e^{-t_1^*}F)$ for $\delta_{e^*} := (\kappa/8)|\psi'|^{-1}e^{-t_1^*}$, completing the proof. \square

Lemma 3.2.6. *There exists $C(\kappa, \psi') > 0$ such that with high probability as $F \rightarrow \infty$ $T_3(\delta_{e^*}) \leq C(\kappa, \psi') \log F$.*

Proof. The process $A_C(t)$ can be lower bounded by a discrete-time branching process where \underline{A}_n with $\underline{A}_0 = 1$ and offspring distribution $1 + \text{Bernoulli}(\tilde{\eta}_{e^*})$ where $\tilde{\eta}_{e^*} = (1 - e^{-t_1^*})\eta_{e^*}$. Coupling result indicates

$$\underline{A}_n \leq A_C(t_1^* \cdot 2n) \tag{3.2.8}$$

Note if we choose $C_1 > 0$ such that $(1 + \tilde{\eta}_{e^*})^{C_1} = 1.1$, our case that the offspring distribution has no probability mass on 0, finite second moment and the expectation > 1 , so from [1]

$$W^F = \frac{\underline{A}_{C_1 \log F}}{(1 + \tilde{\eta}_{e^*})^{C_1 \log F}}$$

which converges almost surely (and hence weakly) to a positive variable W^∞ . Thus

$$P(\underline{A}_{C_1 \log F} \leq \delta_{e^*}F) = P(W^F \leq \delta_{e^*}F^{-0.1}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Using coupling in (3.2.8), w.h.p.

$$T_3(\delta_{e^*}) \leq t_1^* \cdot 2C_1 \log F.$$

so to conclude the Lemma one can pick $C = 2t_1^*C_1$ which depends only on κ, ψ' . \square

3.3 Surprises in general case and proof of Theorem 4

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 4 in the general case. If there are multiple surprises then at time T_* we have several components linked by edges activated by surprises, and the techniques from Section 3.2 can be adapted to this situation. The ultimate conclusion is the same: we end up with agreement for a positive fraction of issues on the final component, and then the process proceeds to fixation.

Let $T_* = (2N^6/\delta) \log \log F$ which is twice the RHS of (2.5.1). The following Lemma says that at time T_* , the number of agreements on any edge activated by a surprise event is very small compared to F .

Lemma 3.3.1. *There is a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $|\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_*)| \leq (\log F)^\alpha$ with high probability for any edge $e^* \in \mathcal{E}$ with $A_{e^*}(0) = 0$,*

Proof. Lemma 3.1.2 indicates that $A_{e^*}(0) = 0$ on the set $H_*(\kappa, F)$, which occurs with probability $\geq 1 - \varepsilon$ when $\kappa \leq \varepsilon/(\gamma N^6)$. $|\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)|$ can be coupled and upper bounded by Yule binary fission at rate 1 starting with the same initial conditions. Computing the expectation gives $E|\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)| \leq \exp(t)$, so from (2.5.1)

$$P(|\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_*)| \geq (\log F)^\alpha) \leq (\log F)^{-\alpha} \cdot E|\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_*)| \leq \exp\left(\left(\frac{2N^6}{\delta} - \alpha\right) \log \log F\right)$$

which tends to 0 for fixed $\alpha > (2N^6/\delta)$. □

We will assume in this section that the network is *star-like*, i.e. each component is linked to the giant component with one single edge, and all surprise edges must connect to χ . In the case where N is large this is a reasonable assumption since the giant component scales as $O(N)$ while the second largest is of $O(\log N)$. The competing growth arguments for agreements on several extended components no longer work, since the growth rates can be different and hardly estimated in accuracy, so we turn to a multi-round process. The sketch is as follows. For e^* being a surprise edge at T_* let ϕ_{e^*} be the component χ is connected to via e^* , and define $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{e^* \notin \chi : e^* \sim \chi \text{ and } A_{\chi \cup e^* \cup \phi_{e^*}}(T_*) \geq 1\}$ as the set of edges activated

by surprises within rescaled time $[0, T_*]$ and have at least one issue of agreement on the new component at time T_* . In each round $k \geq 0$ we identify the surprise edges $\{e^* : e^* \in \mathcal{P}\} \subset \mathcal{S}_k$ where the number of agreements over each $e^* \in \mathcal{P}$ is of positive fractions. τ_k^o is the time that we have e^* and the component it connects to, ϕ_{e^*} , join the giant component. The arguments in Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 can be adapted to allow

$$A_{\chi_k \cup \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} (\{e^*\} \cup \phi_{e^*})}(\tau_k^o) \geq \delta_{k+1} F$$

for some constant $\delta_{k+1} > 0$. Let $\chi_{k+1} = \chi_k \cup \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} (\{e^*\} \cup \phi_{e^*})$ and $\mathcal{S}_{k+1} = \mathcal{S}_k \setminus \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} \{e_k^*\}$, then we are back in the setup where $A_{\chi_{k+1}} \geq \delta_{k+1} F$ and $\max_{e^* \in \mathcal{S}_{k+1}} A_{\phi_{k+1}} < \kappa F$. The procedure is gone through for K rounds until $\mathcal{S}_K = \emptyset$, so agreements on the ultimate component ϕ_K has agreements on $\delta_K F$ issues.

To argue for each round k , let $\mathcal{C} = \chi \cup \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} (\{e^*\} \cup \phi_{e^*})$. At time T_* consensus has been reached on χ and $(\phi_{e^*} : e^* \in \mathcal{S})$ over all issues not disturbed by surprises. We introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\chi(\kappa) &= \inf\{t \geq T_* : A_\chi(t) < 0.75F\} \\ T_{\mathcal{P}}(\kappa) &= \inf\{t \geq T_* : \max_{\mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)| \geq \kappa F\} \\ T_\Delta(\kappa) &= \inf\{t \geq T_* : A_{\mathcal{C}}(t) \geq \delta_{e^*} F\} \end{aligned}$$

which are stopping times with regards to the filtration generated by Axelrod's model at rate F .

Lemma 3.3.2. *At T_S we have for some $\delta' < \kappa$ positive such that with high probability as $F \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\left| \bigcap_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}^F(T_{\mathcal{P}}) \right| \geq \delta' F.$$

Proof. Assume $\kappa_{e^*} = A_{e^*}(T_{\mathcal{P}}(\kappa))$ and we have $\mathcal{J}_{e^*} = \mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_{\mathcal{P}})$ as random subset of $\{1, \dots, F\}$ of size $\kappa_{e^*} F$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(\left| \bigcap_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}_{e^*} \right| \right) &= \left(\prod_{e^*} \kappa_{e^*} \right) F \\ \text{var} \left(\left| \bigcap_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}_{e^*} \right| \right) &= \sum_{f \in [F]} \text{var}(\mathbf{1}_{f \in \bigcap_{e^*} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}}) + \sum_{f, g \in [F], f \neq g} \text{cov}(\mathbf{1}_{f \in \bigcap_{e^*} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}}, \mathbf{1}_{g \in \bigcap_{e^*} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}}) \leq F/4 \end{aligned}$$

where by simple calculations the covariance terms are ≤ 0 . Let $Y = |\bigcap_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}|$ then by applying Chebyshev's inequality

$$P\left(Y \leq \frac{1}{2}E(Y)\right) \leq \frac{4\text{var}(Y)}{(E(Y))^2} \leq cF^{-1}$$

and hence the desired result follows by taking $\delta' = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} \kappa_{e^*}$. \square

Lemma 3.3.3. *With constants $\kappa > 0$ appropriately chosen, w.h.p. $T_\Delta \leq T_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \tau_\chi$.*

Proof. Since κ is small we can assume WLOG $\kappa|\mathcal{P}| \leq 1/4$. The issues in $\bigcup_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}$ are the only ones whose agreement can possibly break down, and thus $I_\chi(t) \supseteq I_\chi(T_*) \setminus \bigcup_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)$ for $t \geq T_*$ which, along with Lemma 3.3.1, implies

$$A_\chi(t) \geq F - (\log F)^a - \sum_{e^* \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{J}_{e^*}(t)| \geq F - (\log F)^a - \kappa|\mathcal{P}|F$$

for $t \leq T_{\mathcal{P}}$. By definition of τ_χ the second inequality is valid. For the first one, we consider for issue $f \in \bigcap_{e^*} \mathcal{J}_{e^*}(T_{\mathcal{P}})$ each edge activated by surprises $e^* = \{i, j\}$ where $i \in \chi$ and $j \in \phi_{e^*}$. Either

- (i) i copies its opinion to j and $f \in I_\chi(t-)$, and the opinion at j immediately spreads over to all members of ϕ_{e^*} , one extra agreement on $\chi \cup e^* \cup \phi_{e^*}(t)$ is generated;
- (ii) i copies its opinion to j and $f \in I_\chi(t-)$, but the opinion at j was fastly taken over by the opinion of ϕ_{e^*} , no increment is caused;
- (iii) j copies its opinion to i or $f \notin I_\chi(t-)$, no increment is caused.

Let $|\phi_{e^*}|$ be the number of vertices in the component ϕ_{e^*} . Note from the arguments in Section 3.2.1 and Section 3.2.2, before τ_χ case (i) above has probability $\geq (0.75/2)\eta_{e^*}(\kappa, \phi_{e^*})$. Apply Lemma 3.2.2 with $n = \delta'F$ (δ' defined in the proof of Lemma 3.3.2), $\kappa' = \prod_{\mathcal{P}} ((0.75/2)\eta_{e^*}(\kappa, \phi_{e^*}))$, $p = \kappa' = 2\varepsilon$ we have with high probability the agreement $A_{\chi \cup \mathcal{P} \cup \phi_{\mathcal{P}}}(T_{\mathcal{P}})$ is bounded below by $\kappa'F$ which makes the first inequality valid in our settings. \square

Theorem 4 follows from Lemma 3.3.3 and 3.3.1.

Bibliography

- [1] Athreya, K. B., and Ney, P. (1972) *Branching processes* (Vol. 196). Springer, New York
- [2] Axelrod, R. (1997) The dissemination of culture: a model with local convergence and global polarization. *J. Conflict. Resolut.* 41, 203–226
- [3] Castellano, C., Fortunato, S., and Loreto, V. (2009) Statistical physics of social dynamics. *Rev. of Mod. Phys.* 81, 591–646
- [4] Castellano, C., Marsili, M., and Vespignani, A. (2000) Nonequilibrium phase transition in a model for social influence. *Phys. Rev. Letters.* 85, 3536–3539
- [5] Deffuant, G., Neau, D., Amblard, F., and Weisbuch, G. (2000) Mixing beliefs among interacting agents. *Adv. Complex Syst.* 3, 87–98
- [6] Durrett, R. (1995) Ten lectures on particle systems. Pages 97–201 in *Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 1608.
- [7] Durrett, R. (1996) *Stochastic Calculus: A Practical Introduction*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL
- [8] Durrett, R. (2007) *Random Graph Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press
- [9] Durrett, R. (2010) *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Fourth Edition. Cambridge University Press
- [10] Durrett, R., and Mayberry, J. (2011). Traveling waves of selective sweeps. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 21, 699–744

- [11] Ethier, S.N., and Kurtz, T.G. (1986) *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley and Sons, New York
- [12] Harris, T. E. (1972) Nearest-neighbor Markov interaction processes on multidimensional lattices. *Adv. in Math.* 9 (1), 66–89.
- [13] Kesten, H. (1982) *Percolation Theory for Mathematicians*. Birkahuser, Boston
- [14] Kurtz, T. G. (1970) Solutions of ordinary differential equations as limits of pure jump Markov processes. *J. Appl. Prob.* 49–58.
- [15] Lanchier, N. (2009) Opinion dynamics with confidence threshold: an alternative to the Axelrod model. *Alea.* 6, 1–42
- [16] Lanchier, N. (2012) The Axelrod model for the dissemination of culture revisited. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 22, 860–880
- [17] Lanchier, N., and Scarlatos, S. (2012) Fixation in the one-dimensional Axelrod model. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* to appear
- [18] Lanchier, N., and Schweinsberg, J. (2012) Consensus in the two-state Axelrod model. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 122, 3701–3717.
- [19] Liggett, T. M. (1985) *Interacting Particle Systems*. Springer.
- [20] Vázquez, F., Krapivsky, P.L., and Redner, S. (2003) Constrained opinion dynamics: freezing and slow evolution. *J. Phys. A.* 36, L61–L68
- [21] Vázquez, F., and Redner, S. (2003) Ultimate fate of constrained voters. *J. Phys. A.* 37, 8479–8494
- [22] Vilone, D., Vespignani, A. and Castellano, C. (2002) Ordering phase transition in the one-dimensional Axelrod model. *Eur. Phys. J. B.* 30, 399–406.

Biography

Junchi Li was born on February 20, 1990 in Beijing, China. After completing his education at Talented Children Training Program in Beijing No. 8 High School he entered the School of Mathematical Sciences of Peking University of China in 2005, earned his B.S. in Mathematics and Applied Mathematics with high distinction in July 2009. He flew over the Pacific Ocean to join the mathematics department of Duke University as a doctorate student, concentrating on probability theory and its applications with minor focus on statistics.

Junchi has also worked as a summer analyst in Duke University Management Company, the manager of Duke University's Endowment, assisting its development of investment strategies. He has accepted a position as a strategy researcher in Sunrise Futures, LLC, a proprietary trading firm located in Chicago. He will join the company soon after completing his Ph.D.