## Behaviour Dynamics in Social Networks -Assignment 7

Maria Hotoiu, Federico Tavella

December 5, 2017

#### Abstract

Verification by mathematical analysis of stationary points.

### 1 Determine equilibria for a constant stimulus

The values chosen for the parameters are: repetition=30, duration=30,  $\eta_1$ =0.4,  $\eta_2$ =0.3,  $\mu_1$ =0.8 and  $\mu_2$ =0.9.

#### 1.1 Question 1

The final equilibrium values for the states rep, prep and feel based on observations in the simulation are:

**rep**: 1

**prep**: 0.991535551 **feel**: 0.89068188

#### 1.2 Question 2

The observed equilibrium values based on observation in the simulation:  $\omega_1 = 0.832149364$ 

 $\omega_2 = 0.898285371$ 

The predicted equilibrium values based on mathematical analysis:

 $\omega_1{=}0.832149364$ 

 $\omega_2{=}0.898285371$ 

The two sets of values for the connection weights are equal, therefore the accuracy is 0.

#### 1.3 Question 3

The differences between the aggregated impact and the values for the two adaptive connections for these equilibria vary from 0 to 0.2 in the first case (aggimpact- $\omega_1$ ) and from 0 to 0.1 in the second case (aggimpact- $\omega_2$ ). By exploring the difference between the aggregated impact and  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  in the stationary points we can observe that the accuracy is  $0<10^{-2}$ .

#### 1.4 Question 4

```
c_{feel}(\omega_2 \text{prep}(t)) = \text{feel}(t) \implies
id(\omega_2 \text{prep}(t)) = \text{feel}(t) \implies
id(\omega_2 \text{prep}) = \underline{\text{feel}} \implies
\omega_2 \text{prep} = \underline{\text{feel}}
```

If we replace the values with the observed ones we get: 0.898285371\*0.991535551=0,890681512430035. This means that the accuracy is  $0,0000004<10^{-2}$ , so we can say that the equation is verified.

# 2 Determine stationary points for an alternating stimulus

Formula used for accuracy: (observed value–predicted value)/predicted value=error. In our case, the observed values are  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  and the predicted value is the aggregated impact.

#### 2.1 Question 1

The values chosen for the parameters are: repetition=40, duration=20,  $\eta_1$ =0.4,  $\eta_2$ =0.3,  $\mu_1$ =0.8 and  $\mu_2$ =0.9.

Examples of stationary point:.

**rep**: t0-t18, t20-t38 etc.

**prep**: t77, t78, t79, t115, t116 etc.

feel: t116, t117, t118 etc.

Examples of equilibrium points and the corresponding differences between the aggregated impact and  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$ :

- point t78: aggimpact- $\omega_1$ =-0.027005337  $\Longrightarrow$  accuracy=0.25 and aggimpact- $\omega_2$ =-0.001819542  $\Longrightarrow$  accuracy=0.11
- point t116: aggimpact- $\omega_1$ =-0.031671136  $\Longrightarrow$  accuracy=0.25 and aggimpact- $\omega_2$ =-0.000811289  $\Longrightarrow$  accuracy=0.11

#### 2.2 Question 2

The values chosen for the parameters are: repetition=20, duration=10,  $\eta_1$ =0.4,  $\eta_2$ =0.3,  $\mu_1$ =0.8 and  $\mu_2$ =0.9.

Examples of stationary points.

**rep**: t0-t8 **prep**: t159 **feel**: t160

Example of equilibrium point and the corresponding differences between the aggregated impact and  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$ :

• point t218: aggimpact- $\omega_1$ =-0.01893416  $\Longrightarrow$  accuracy=0.25 and aggimpact- $\omega_2$ =-1.59672E-05  $\Longrightarrow$  accuracy=-1.59672E-05/0.000143704