Comment on ‘Mean-field solution of structural balance dynamics in nonzero temperature’
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In recent numerical and analytical studies, Rabbani et al. [Phys. Rev. E 99, 062302 (2019)] observed the first-order phase transition in social triads dynamics on complete graph with \( N = 50 \) nodes. With Metropolis algorithm they found critical temperature on such graph equal to 26.2. In this comment we extend their main observation in more compact and natural manner. In contrast to the commented paper we estimate critical temperature \( T^c \) for complete graph not only with \( N = 50 \) nodes but for any size of the system. We have derived formula for critical temperature \( T^c = (N - 2)/a^c \), where \( N \) is the number of graph nodes and \( a^c \approx 1.71649 \) comes from combination of heat-bath and mean-field approximation. Our computer simulation based on heat-bath algorithm confirm our analytical results and recover critical temperature \( T^c \) obtained earlier also for \( N = 50 \) and for systems with other sizes. Additionally, we have identified—not observed in commented paper—phase of the system, where the mean value of links is zero but the system energy is minimal since the network contains only balanced triangles with all positive links or with two negative links. Such a phase corresponds to dividing the set of agents into two coexisting hostile groups and it exists only in low temperatures.
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There are several attempts to theoretical description and computational simulation of the Heider balance [1–3] in literature [4]. Very recently [5], the Heider’s dynamics has been enriched with social temperature \( T \) [6]. In Ref. 5 authors show that in the investigated system the first order phase transition from ordered to disordered state is observed.

In this Comment we show much more simpler theoretical approach leading to the same conclusions basing on heat-bath and mean-field approximation well supported with computer simulation.

Let us consider a network of \( N \) agents and let us assume strengths of links between two agents \( i \) and \( j \) are \( x_{ij} = \pm 1 \). The dynamics towards the Heider balance can be written as

\[
x_{ij}(t+1) = \text{sign} \left( \sum_k x_{ik}(t)x_{kj}(t) \right),
\]

where summation goes via \( M_{ij} \) common nearest neighbours of connected nodes \( i \) and \( j \), i.e. \( M_{ij} \) is the number of triangles that involve the link \( i, j \). It means that for a single triangle system presented in Fig. 1 the first and the third triangle are balanced in the Heider’s sense (as friend of my friend is my friend and enemy of my friend is my enemy), while the second and the fourth are not. In the latter case actors at triangles nodes either encounter the cognitive dissonance—as they cannot imagine how his/her friends can be enemies—or everybody hates everybody, what should lead to creation of two-against-one coalition.

![FIG. 1: Heider’s triads corresponding to balanced (the first and the third) and imbalanced (the second and the fourth) states](image)

If one assumes that the link dynamics possesses a probabilistic character then a natural form of updating rule (1) as in Heider dynamics can be:

\[
x_{ij}(t+1) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{with probability } p, \\ -1 & \text{with probability } (1 - p), \end{cases}
\]

where

\[
p = \frac{\exp(c)}{\exp(c) + \exp(-c)}
\]

and

\[
c = T^{-1} \sum_k M_{ik} x_{ik}(t)x_{kj}(t).
\]

Here the positive variable \( T \) can be considered as a social temperature [6] and in the limit \( T \to 0^+ \) we have \( p \to 1
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The expected value \(<x_i(t+1)\) in such an approach equals to

\[
<x_i(t+1)> = \tanh \left( T^{-1} \sum_{k} M_{ij} x_{ik}(t) x_{kj}(t) \right),
\]

where \(\langle \ldots \rangle\) stands for a mean value related to the stochastic process defined by Eq. (2). The mean \(<x_i(t+1)>\) is a continuous variable that can be negative or positive and for \(T \to 0^+\) the Eq. (3) reduces to Eq. (1).

In a mean-field-like approximation instead of Eq. (3) we have

\[
\{<x_i(t+1)>\} \approx \tanh \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k} \{<x_{ik}(t)>\} \{<x_{kj}(t)>\} \right),
\]

where \(\{ \ldots \}\) denotes average over all \(N(N-1)/2\) available nodes’ pairs. Although the above approximation can be seen as a very crude approach below we give arguments why it is justified.

If the system consists only of balanced triads 1(a) and 1(c) then for \(x_{ij} = +1\) we have always \(x_{ik} x_{kj} = +1\) (see Fig. 2(a)). On the other hand when a link with a label \(x_{ij} = -1\) belongs to a triad 1(c) then \(x_{ik} x_{kj} = -1\). It follows that for such systems all components of the sum of RHS (3) are the same. Since we aim to consider systems close to equilibrium we assume that we can use this approach also for Eq. (4). Now let us assume—also in agreement with the spirit of mean-field approximation—that all averages are the same

\[
\{<x_{ij}>\} = \{<x_{ik}>\} = \{<x_{kj}>\} = x.
\]

It follows we get

\[
x(t+1) = \tanh[a x^2(t)],
\]

where

\[
a = M/T,
\]

and \(M = \{M_{ij}\}\) is the average number of common neighbours of agents \(i\) and \(j\) (it also the number of different triads containing the edge \(ij\)).

Considering Eq. (6) as one-dimension map one can study its fixed points. We immediately recognise \(x^0 = 0\) as a stable fixed point for any value of \(a\) parameter and for \(a \ll 1\) this is the only fixed point of Eq. (6). However for \(a \gg 1\) there are two other fixed points, \(x^u < x^s\) corresponding to unstable \(x^u(a)\) and stable \(x^s(a)\) solutions. In fact \(x^u\) is a separatrix between domain of attractions of fixed points \(x^0\) and \(x^s\). When \(a \gg 1\) then \(x^u \approx 1/a\). When the parameter \(a\) diminishes from large values (it means the temperature \(T\) increases) then fixed points \(x^u\) and \(x^s\) coincide together to the point \(x^c\) for a certain value of \(a = a_c\) (see Fig. 3).

It means that for \(a > a_c\) the system is bi-stable and for \(a < a_c\) the system is mono-stable. The above values \(a_c, x^c\) can be received from a pair of transcendental algebraic relations describing the fixed point and its tangency condition, namely

\[
x^c = \tanh (a^c x^c)^2
\]

and

\[
2a^c x^c = \cosh^2 (a^c x^c)^2.
\]

The solutions (see Fig. 3) are

\[
x^c_{\text{th}} \approx 0.796388
\]
FIG. 4: The time evolution of average value of all links strengths \( \{x_{ij}\} \) for various values of social temperature \( T \) and various system size \( N \). The starting point of simulation is homogeneous state with \( \{x_{ij}\} = +1 \) and the scanning temperature step \( \Delta T = 1 \). The solid red line corresponds to \( x_{th}^c \) given by Eq. (9a).

\[
\alpha_{th} = \tanh^{-1} \left( \frac{x_{th}^c}{x_{th}^c} \right)^2 \approx 1.71649. \tag{9b}
\]

Let us note that since \( x_{th}^c > 0 \) thus a system can express hysteresis phenomenon. It means also that one should not observe the values \( 0 < x < x_{th}^c \) as stable solutions.

To check the analytical results in computer simulation we directly apply Eq. (2) for time evolution of \( x_{ij} \) for complete graph with \( N \) nodes. For the complete graph the average number of nodes \( ij \) pair neighbour is equal to \( M = \{M_{ij}\} = N - 2 \) and thus according to Eq. (7) one should expect

\[
\alpha_{nu} = (N - 2)/T_{nu}^c. \tag{10a}
\]

In order to find the value of \( T_{nu}^c \) we start simulation...
TABLE I: The numerically obtained values of $T^c_{nu}$ and $a^c_{nu}$ calculated basing on Eq. (10a) together with their estimated expanded uncertainties $U(a^c_{nu})$. The uncertainty of $T^c_{nu}$ is $u(T^c_{nu}) = 1/\sqrt{3}$, while $U(a^c_{nu})$ is calculated basing on Eq. (10b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$T^c_{nu}$</th>
<th>$a^c_{nu}$</th>
<th>$U(a^c_{nu})$</th>
<th>$a^c_{nu} - a^c_{lb}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.2835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.0935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.0495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>230.5</td>
<td>1.726</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>463.5</td>
<td>1.7217</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with $T = 0$ and we scan the temperature $T$ with step $\Delta T$ and we look for such value of $T^*$ for which $\langle x_{ij} \rangle$ is positive but for $T^* + \Delta T$ is zero. The true value of $T^c_{nu}$ is hidden somewhere in interval $[T^*, T^* + \Delta T]$. We assume that $T^c$ value is uniformly distributed in the interval $[T^*, T^* + \Delta T]$ what allow us for estimation of its uncertainty as $u(T^c_{nu}) = \Delta T / \sqrt{3}$. The estimated value of $T^c_{nu} = (T^* + T^* + \Delta T) / 2$. Basing on Eq. (7) we calculate the value of $a^c_{nu}$ and we can estimate its expanded uncertainty as

$$U(a^c_{nu}) = k \left| \frac{\partial a}{\partial T} \right|_{T = T^c} u(T^c_{nu}) = k \frac{N - 2}{(T^c_{nu})^2} u(T^c_{nu}),$$

with coverage factor $k = 3$ [8].

In Fig. 4 the time evolution of $\{x_{ij}\}$ for various values of social temperature $T$ and various system size $N$ are presented. The starting point of simulation is homogeneous state with $\{x_{ij}\} = +1$ and the scanning temperature step is set to $\Delta T = 1$. The solid red line corresponds to $x_{ij}$ given by Eq. (9a).

The obtained critical temperatures $T^c_{nu}$, their uncer-
tainties \( U(T_{nu}^c) \) are collected in Tab. I. The obtained values of \( a_{nu}^c \) coincide nicely with those obtained analytically (see Eq. (9b)) even under very crude assumptions given by Eq. (6). The values of \( a_{nu}^c \) agree within expanded uncertainties \( U(a_{nu}^c) \) with its analytical partner \( a_{ih}^c \).

In Figs. 5(a), (c) the dependences of \( \{x_{ij}\} \) vs. \( T \) for \( N = 200 \) and \( N = 50 \) are presented. The averaging symbol \( \langle \cdots \rangle \) stands for time average over the last \( \tau = 1000 \) time steps of simulation, this time average should be approximately equal to the average \( \langle \cdots \rangle \) used in the Eq. (4), which comes from the ergodic theorem. The solid symbols correspond to the starting point \( \forall i, j : x_{ij} = +1 \), while open symbols stand for random initial state \( \{x_{ij}\} = 0 \). The latter recovers \( x^0 = 0 \) mentioned earlier.

In Figs. 5(b), (d) the dependences of the system energy

\[
E = -\frac{\sum_{i,j,k} x_{ij} x_{jk} x_{ki}}{\langle 3 \rangle}
\]

are presented. There is a discontinuous change of mean system energy at the critical temperature, this corresponds to Fig. 4(b) in Ref. 5. According to our crude approximation (5) we expect \( E = -x^0 \), and this approximation is marked by solid blue line in Figs. 5(b), (d). Similarly to numerically obtained values of \( \{x_{ij}\} \) also values of \( E \) agree fairly with proposed mean-field approximation.

We have observed also that for some range of temperature \( 0 \leq T < T_d \) (\( T_d \) is another critical temperature, \( T_d < T^c \)) when we start from random initial condition \( \{x_{ij}\} = 0 \), then this average fluctuates around zero in time but the mean system energy is \( E = -1 \) (see Figs. 5(a)–(b) and 5(c)–(d)). In other words, this energy is the same as the system energy corresponding to paradise (with only positive links) state \( \{x_{ij}\} = 1 \). Although the fact, that the state \( \{x_{ij}\} = 0 \) is stable in time follows from Eq. (6) its nature can be seen strange since naively one would expect a picture of disordered system corresponding to the many unbalanced triangles with \( E = 0 \) and not \( E = -1 \). This could mean that ground state of the system is degenerated.

In order to understand this phenomenon we investigated frequencies \( f \) of different triangles in the network when we start system evolution from various initial conditions. When we start with \( \{x_{ij}\} = 0 \) then for low temperatures (see Fig. 6(b)) there is a special distribution of the triangles types in the system, namely, there are only balanced triangles in the network. Let us note, that the energy of any balanced triangle is the same and equals to \(-1\), thus the system mean energy is also \( E = -1 \) in this phase. Moreover, since the observed number of \(+1++\) triangles is exactly three times lower than number of \(+1−−\) triangles (see Fig. 6(b)) the mean link strength is equal zero. Such composition of balanced state has been already predicted by Cartwright and Harary [3] in middle '50 (see also e.g. Ref. 9) and it corresponds to forming in the system two groups of agents, where links among agents in the same group are friendly (positive) while links between members of these groups are hostile (negative). This special coexistence of two hostile groups is possible for \( T < T_d \) when we have only numerical values of \( T_d \) as presented by open symbols in Fig. 5. At \( T = T_d \) the discontinuous phase transition takes place when the number of unbalanced triads abruptly increases and as results the system energy becomes zero (see dashed arrows connecting open symbols in Figs. 5(b) and 5(d)). This transition is not seen at values of \( \{x_{ij}\} \), which is zero below and zero above \( T_d \).

The ground state with \( E = -1 \) and \( \{x_{ij}\} = 1 \) is recognized for \( 0 \leq T < T^c \) when systems starts with homogeneous initial conditions [see Fig. 6(f)]. At \( T = T^c \) the discontinuous phase transition changes \( \{x_{ij}\} \) from
\[ x^c \approx 0.796388 \text{ to zero (see Figs. 5(a), (c)) and at the same time the system energy changes from } E = -(x^c)3 \text{ to the value } E = 0 \text{ (see Figs. 5(b), (d))}. \]

Let us stress that for \( T^d < T < T^c \) depending on the initial conditions the system energy is either close to the ground state or equal to zero (see Figs. 5(b), (d)).

In this Comment we present simple analytical approach which describes the first order phase transition observed in thermalised Heider’s balance system at the complete graph. Our mean-field approximation predicts that the system critical temperature equals to \( T = (N - 2)/a^c \), where \( N \) is the number of graph nodes and \( a^c \approx 1.71649 \) comes from combination of heat-bath and mean-field approximation. This temperature corresponds to transition from a system starting close to paradise, \( \{ x_{ij} \} = x^c \approx 0.796388 \), to the disordered system with equal number of positive and negative links. The results of computer simulations agree within estimated uncertainties with our analytical calculations.

On the other hand, starting with randomly selected \( x_{ij} = \pm 1 \) we reach in simulation only the disordered state with \( \{ x_{ij} \} = 0 \) corresponding to stable fixed point \( x^d \).

This indicates that heating the system from \( T = 0 \) to \( T = T^c \) decreases an average \( \{ x_{ij} \} \) until \( x > x^c \), but above \( T^c \) we can only reach \( \{ x_{ij} \} = 0 \). Cooling the system from \( T > T^c \) towards \( T \to 0^+ \) will never reproduce positive values of \( \{ x_{ij} \} > 0 \) and in this sense the hysteresis-like loop may be observed in the system.

The mean-field approach should work perfectly on complete graph, and indeed, the computer simulations confirm our theoretical approach, as the obtained numerically values \( a^c_{\text{num}} \) agree within its expanded uncertainties with analytically calculated values \( a^c_{\text{th}} \). The direct implementation of Eq. (2) follows heat-bath algorithm [7, p. 505], which is equivalent to Metropolis scheme [10] utilised in Ref. 5.

The critical temperature \( T^c = 26.2 \) for complete graph with \( N = 50 \) nodes estimated in Ref. 5 agrees roughly with our estimation of \( T^c \) for \( N = 50 \). However, in contrast to Ref. 5 we show, that critical temperature \( T^c \) depends on system size as \( T^c = (N - 2)/a^c \), where \( a^c \) characterises the system independently on the system size \( N \).

Finally, we have identified—not mentioned in the commented paper—phase of the system, where values of links take random variables \( \{ x_{ij} \} = 0 \) but the system stays in its ground state with \( E = -1 \). This ground state degeneration is observed for \( T < T^d \) with \( T^d < T^c \). This phase consists of special mixture of balanced triangles \((+++)\) and \((---)\), where density of the second type of triads is three times larger than the first one and it corresponds to dividing the set of agents into two coexisting hostile groups. Finding value of \( T^d \) analytically—where this phase disappears—is beyond predictions of our approach and it remains a challenge.
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