

# Diffusion, peer pressure and tailed distributions

Fabio Cecconi<sup>‡</sup>, Matteo Marsili<sup>‡</sup>, Jayanth R. Banavar<sup>†</sup> & Amos Maritan<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>‡</sup> *International School for Advanced Studies (S.I.S.S.A.), Via Beirut 2-4, 34014 Trieste, INFN and the Abdus Salam International Center for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy*

<sup>†</sup> *Department of Physics, 104 Davey Laboratory, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802*  
(February 3, 2022)

We present a general, physically motivated non-linear and non-local advection equation in which the diffusion of interacting random walkers competes with a local drift arising from a kind of peer pressure. We show, using a mapping to an integrable dynamical system, that on varying a parameter, the steady state behaviour undergoes a transition from the standard diffusive behavior to a localized stationary state characterized by a tailed distribution. Finally, we show that recent empirical laws on economic growth can be explained as a collective phenomenon due to peer pressure interaction.

Fluctuations – measured by deviations from the mean value of an observable – of large systems often satisfy a Gaussian distribution. A classic example is a linear diffusion process [1–4] which has numerous applications in many branches of science [5]. However, there are many situations in Nature in which the probability of occurrence of a fluctuation of size  $|\Delta|$  is proportional to  $\exp(-|\Delta|^p)$ , with  $p$  taking on a value greater than or equal to 1 (exponential tails), but smaller than 2 [6]. Examples include the temperature distribution of a Rayleigh-Benard system [7,8], disordered systems such as foams [9] and glasses or granular materials [10], with even fatter tails in financial data [11,12].

We present here a physically motivated advection equation and its exact steady state solution. The equation has a drift term, originating from a kind of a peer pressure, of the same nature as that due to mechanisms of chemotactic signalling by microorganisms [13,14] or by the onset of cooperation in social groups [15,16], or by competition between economic units [17]. We show that, on varying a parameter, there is a transition from diffusive behavior to a localized stationary state characterized by an exponential distribution.

Consider a diffusional process in which random walkers move either to the right or to the left randomly and with no bias. In the long time limit, the distribution of walkers becomes flat and infinitely spread out. The mechanism for collective self-organization in our model is a kind of peer pressure. The non-linearity arises from an interaction (of spatial range  $\xi$ ) between the walkers, which leads to a drift or a bias term which opposes the diffusional spreading and promotes aggregation. The basic idea is one in which a walker perceives the populations of other walkers over a range  $\xi$  both right and left of her own location and has a drift in the more crowded direction. In the limit of small  $\xi$ , one obtains regular diffusive behavior, whereas a new class of steady state behavior characterized by non-Gaussian distributions is obtained when  $\xi$  is sufficiently large.

This idea may be encapsulated in a nonlinear equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( v(x, t) P \right) + D \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial x^2} \quad (1)$$

where  $P(x, t)$  is the distribution function of the locations of the random walkers at time  $t$  with a drift velocity  $v(x, t)$ . The nonlinearity arises because  $v$  is itself a non-local function of  $P$  and is given by

$$v(x, t) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\Phi_+(x, t) - \Phi_-(x, t)}{\Phi_+(x, t) + \Phi_-(x, t)} \quad (2)$$

where

$$\Phi_+(x, t) = \int_x^\infty dy e^{(x-y)/\xi} P(y, t), \quad (3)$$

$$\Phi_-(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^x dy e^{(y-x)/\xi} P(y, t), \quad (4)$$

and  $\lambda$  sets the scale for the drift velocity. Physically,  $\Phi_+(x, t)$  and  $\Phi_-(x, t)$  are measures of the population, within a range  $\xi$ , to the right and left of location  $x$  and the drift velocity is then a normalized imbalance between these two populations.

In colonies of social individuals, each member can release chemical substances in the environment (for example, pheromones) revealing the presence of food sources in a given area. The individuals in the colony are able to detect higher concentrations of the chemical signal and are attracted toward the food and move accordingly. The plausible assumption that the concentration of the chemicals in a given region is proportional to the local density of individuals translates into an effective interaction between members of the colony, and leads to the non-local drift term in Eq. (1). The interaction causes the net migration of an individual in the direction of the higher local density. The length scale,  $\xi$ , is a measure of the range of the biological sensory system of individuals. Thus Eq. (1) describes Brownian motion with a bias that mimicks attractive chemotactic signalling [13] and promotes aggregation leading to a drift controlled by the population difference in localized regions on the right and left of  $x$ . Physically, the standard Gaussian solution

is obtained when there is no drift ( $\lambda = 0$ ) or when the interaction length scale goes to zero ( $\xi \rightarrow 0$ ).

The existence of a transition in the steady state behavior is revealed by a linear stability analysis of the homogeneous state. One can look for solutions of Eq. (1) in the form  $P \sim \exp[ikx - \gamma(k)t]$  representing spatially periodic perturbations. A direct substitution into Eq. (1) provides the exponential growth rate

$$\gamma(k) = D(1 - r)k^2, \quad (5)$$

where

$$r = \frac{\lambda \xi}{2D}. \quad (6)$$

Hence the homogeneous state is stable ( $\gamma(k) > 0$ ) when  $r < 1$ . For  $r > 1$  on the contrary, small perturbations grow with time and the homogeneous state becomes unstable. Thus  $r$  plays the role of a control parameter of a phase transition.

A mapping to an Hamiltonian dynamical systems allows us to derive the stationary solution of Eq. (1). Indeed the steady state distribution ( $\dot{P}_s = 0$ ) satisfies the ordinary differential equation

$$P'_s = \frac{\lambda}{2D} \frac{\Phi_+ - \Phi_-}{\Phi_+ + \Phi_-} P_s \quad (7)$$

where the prime denotes the derivative  $d/dx$ . The steady state values of  $\Phi_+$  and  $\Phi_-$ , in turn, satisfy

$$\Phi'_+ = \Phi_+/\xi - P_s \quad (8)$$

$$\Phi'_- = -\Phi_-/\xi + P_s \quad (9)$$

obtained by taking derivatives of Eqs. (3) and (4) respectively. It is convenient to introduce the new variables  $Q = \Phi_+ + \Phi_-$  and  $\Pi = \Phi_+ - \Phi_-$ , so that Eqs. (8) and (9) may be written as

$$Q' = \Pi/\xi \quad (10)$$

$$\Pi' = Q/\xi - 2P_s. \quad (11)$$

Then, from Eqs. (7) we have

$$\frac{P'_s}{P_s} = \frac{\lambda}{2D} \frac{\Pi}{Q} \quad (12)$$

which, with the aid of Eq. (10) can be integrated with respect to  $x$ , yielding

$$\ln P_s - r \ln Q = \text{const.} \quad (13)$$

Thus, the steady distribution is  $P_s(x) = CQ(x)^r$ , where  $C$  is a normalization factor.

The system of ordinary differential equations (Eqns. 10 and 11) can be regarded as an integrable dynamical system (whose energy is conserved)

$$Q' = \Pi/\xi \quad (14)$$

$$\Pi' = Q/\xi - 2CQ^r \quad (15)$$

describing the motion of a particle in one-dimensional potential

$$V(Q) = -\frac{Q^2}{2\xi} + \frac{2C}{1+r} Q^{r+1}. \quad (16)$$

The spatial coordinate in the original system,  $x$ , plays the role of time in the dynamical system. The equation of motion can be derived from the Hamiltonian,

$$H(\Pi, Q) = \frac{\Pi^2}{2\xi} + V(Q) \quad (17)$$

which is a constant of motion,  $H(\Pi, Q) = E$  in the dynamical system. Its constant value  $E$  is fixed by the boundary conditions on  $P_s(x)$ . For instance, the requirement that  $P_s$  be normalized for infinite systems, implies that  $Q(x = \pm\infty) = 0$  and  $\Pi(x = \pm\infty) = 0$ , so that  $E$  is automatically set to zero.




FIG. 1. Plot of the potential  $V(Q)$  for  $\lambda = 10$ ,  $D = 1/4$  and  $\xi = 1/31$  ( $r = 20/31$  - dashed line) and  $\lambda = 30$   $D=1/4$  and  $\xi = 1/20$  ( $r = 3$  - full line).

This mechanical analogy allows one to obtain a complete understanding of the model with the key factor being the shape of the potential energy (Eqn. 16). A qualitative change in the nature of  $V(Q)$  occurs (see Fig. 1) when  $r$  crosses the value 1, i.e. for  $\lambda\xi = 2D$ , signalling a transition in the system's behaviour. When  $r < 1$  (dashed curve of Fig. 1), only the solution  $Q(x) = 0$  is physically acceptable and thence  $P_s(x) = 0$ . This corresponds to a probability distribution which spreads out and vanishes as in standard diffusion. When  $r > 1$  a non-trivial trajectory of the Hamiltonian system is possible (full line of Fig. 1) with  $Q$  vanishing when the fictitious time  $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ . This trajectory corresponds to a non-trivial asymptotic distribution (see Fig. 2). The solution for  $r > 1$  is obtained by integrating the differential equation

$$Q' = 1/\xi \sqrt{Q^2 - gQ^{r+1}}, \quad (18)$$

which is obtained by solving for  $\Pi$  as a function of  $Q$  (for  $E = 0$ ) and substituting the result into Eq. (14), with  $g = 4C\xi/(1+r)$ . This leads to

$$P_s(x) = A(r) \cosh \left[ \frac{r-1}{2\xi} (x - x_0) \right]^{-2r/(r-1)}, \quad (19)$$

where  $A(r) = (r-1)\Gamma[(3r-1)/(2r-2)]/\{2\xi\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma[r/(2r-2)]\}$  enforces normalization and  $x_0$  is a constant which arises from the integration of Eq. (18).

The presence of a single control parameter in the model can be deduced by a dimensional argument. Indeed, through the rescaling:  $X = x/\xi$  and  $\tau = Dt/\xi^2$ , the coefficient  $\lambda/2$  in Eq. (2) becomes  $r$  and the dependence on  $\xi$  disappears. Indeed when expressed in terms of  $X$ , the stationary state distribution depends only on  $r$ .

The change of behavior at  $r = 1$  is a proper phase transition. Indeed it is accompanied by *spontaneous breaking* of the translation symmetry  $x \rightarrow x + a$  of Eq. (1) for  $r > 1$ . The location,  $x_0$ , of the distribution's center is dynamically selected and it depends, in a complex manner, on the initial conditions. Furthermore, one may define a localization length,  $\ell$ , which is the spread of the distribution  $P_s(x)$ , and which diverges as  $\ell = |1-r|^{-\nu}$  with a critical exponent,  $\nu = 1$ , signalling the transition to the delocalized, translationally invariant steady state. The dynamics of relaxation to the steady state is characterized by an exponential decay with a characteristic time diverging as one approaches the transition.

Another interesting feature of the system is the possibility of spatially periodic steady-state solutions of Eq. (1) for suitable boundary conditions, corresponding to periodic orbits of the associated Hamiltonian systems with negative energy. However, unlike Eq. (19), such solutions are expected to be unstable to perturbations.

Many examples in which aggregation processes compete with diffusional tendencies can also be found in economics. Competition between economic units may lead to effective “peer” pressure captured by the drift in our model, whereas the diffusion term accounts for individual idiosyncratic behavior. Such a situation could arise in charitable giving, when it is not anonymous. A given individual would, in an attempt to keep up with the Joneses, adjust his contribution in the direction of higher or lower giving depending on what his peers are doing. Of course, in this instance, the range of interactions,  $\xi$ , is limited because it is not feasible for an ordinary individual to mimic the behavior of a Bill Gates. In other contexts, tent-shaped distributions, which deviate sharply from a Gaussian, have been observed for the growth rates of firms, nations’ gross domestic product (GDP) and complex organizations ([17] and references therein). We have analyzed the time series of the growth rates of commodity prices across different Italian cities (see Fig. 3) and we find similar exponential tails.




FIG. 2. The scaled asymptotic distribution  $P_s$  for  $\lambda = 1$  and several values of  $r$ . Solid lines refer to the exact solution Eq. (19). The open circles are obtained on numerically integrating the differential equation (1) in the large  $t$  limit for  $r = 3$ .




FIG. 3. Histograms of the monthly growth rate  $R$  of two consumer price indices collected among 78 Italian Provinces within the period January 1995 - June 2001. The data are from “Italy’s National Statistical Institute” (ISTAT). The filled circles refer to expenditures for food and non-alcoholic beverages, whereas the open circles show the data for miscellaneous goods and services (see <http://www.istat.it/Anotizie/Acom/precon/indiceistat/paniere.htm> for the entries). Both sets of data show the typical “tent-shaped” distribution in sharp contrast with the prediction of a Gaussian shape of Gibrat theory. The full and dot-dashed lines indicate a fit with Equation (19).

The growth rate of an economic indicator  $b$  – such as the turnover of an organization, a nation’s GDP, or the

price of a commodity in a city – is defined as

$$R(t) = \ln \frac{b(t+1)}{b(t)}$$

where  $t$  and  $t+1$  represent two consecutive time units (days, months, years etc.). The classical theory, due to Gibrat [18], predicts that  $R(t)$  has a Gaussian distribution. Empirical data, however, shows a tent-shaped distribution on a logarithmic scale. In the case of firms, Stanley *et al.* [17,19] have proposed an explanation in terms of the internal hierarchical organization of non-interacting firms.

Our model provides a different explanation in which it is the interaction among firms which is responsible for the deviation from a Gaussian distribution. In a way, the peer pressure mechanism can be regarded as a *regression towards the mean* effect [20]. This term usually refers to an explicit “attraction” of  $R(t)$  towards a slowly varying moving average. Such an effect, however, is unable to reproduce tent shaped distributions without *ad hoc* assumptions on the precise nature of the attraction potential.

Here, instead, we refer to a collective phenomenon of “regression towards the population mean”: Each unit is attracted towards the instantaneous population average. It is the effective interaction among agents that generates a sort of “feedback” that induces the regression towards the mean mechanism. From a microeconomic point of view, it is reasonable to assume that the behavior of an economic agent is influenced by other agents. For example, a firm will strive to increase its growth rate if other peer firms grow at a higher rate. This interaction introduces correlations in  $R(t)$  that destroy the diffusive features and produces the characteristic exponential tails.

In summary, we have introduced and studied, both analytically and numerically, a one-dimensional diffusion equation with nonlinear and nonlocal features. The asymptotic evolution of the equation leads to the walkers being attracted toward a state which exhibits a well defined non-Gaussian distribution characterized by exponential tails independent of the nature of the initial condition. This mechanism of peer pressure may provide the basis for the development of more realistic models of self-aggregation and self-organization in cooperative states of populations of interacting individuals [21].

- [1] K. Pearson, *The problem of the random walk*, Nature **72**, 294 (1905).
- [2] K. Pearson, *The problem of the random walk*, Nature **72**, 342 (1905).
- [3] Rayleigh, *The problem of the random walk*, Nature **72**, 318 (1905).
- [4] S. Chandrasekhar, *The random walk*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **15**, 1 (1943).
- [5] M.F. Shlesinger, B.J. West and E.W. Montroll, *Random walks and their applications in the physical and biological sciences*, AIP conference proceedings **109**, (American Institute of Physics, New York, 1984).
- [6] L.P. Kadanoff, *Turbulent Heat Flow: Structures and Scaling* Physics Today, pp. 34, August (2001).
- [7] T. Bohr, M.H. Jensen, G. Paladin and A. Vulpiani, *Dynamical Systems Approach to Turbulence* (Cambridge University Press U.K. 1999).
- [8] M.C. Cross and P.C. Hohenberg, *Pattern formation outside of equilibrium*, Rev. Mod. Phys., **65**, 851 (1993).
- [9] C.S. O’Hern, S.A. Langer, A.J. Liu, and S.R. Nagel, *Force distributions near jamming and glass transitions*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 111 (2001).
- [10] H. M. Jaeger, S. R. Nagel, and R. P. Behringer, *Granular solids, liquids, and gases*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1259 (1996).
- [11] R.N. Mantegna and H.E Stanley, *Scaling Behaviour in the Dynamics of an Economics Index*, Nature **376**, 46, (1995).
- [12] E. Eberlein and U. Keller, *Hyperbolic distribution in finance*, Bernoulli **1**, 281, (1995).
- [13] E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen and H. Levine, *Cooperative self-organization of microorganisms*, Advances in Physics **49**, 395 (2000).
- [14] J.D. Murray *Mathematical Biology* Biomathematics **19**, (Springer-Verlag Berlin-Heidelberg (1989).
- [15] R. Axelrod, *The Complexity of Cooperation: Agent-based Models of Competition and Collaboration* (Princeton University Press: Princeton N.J., 1997).
- [16] K. Sigmund and M.A. Nowak, *Evolution of indirect reciprocity by image scoring*, Nature **393**, 573 (1998).
- [17] M.H.R. Stanley *et. al.*, *Scaling Behaviour in the Growth of Companies*, Nature **379**, 804 (1996).
- [18] R. Gibrat, *Les Inegalites Economiques* (Sirey, Paris 1931)
- [19] L.A.N Amaral *et. al.* *Scaling Behaviour in Economics: I. Empirical results for company growth*, J. Phys. I France **7**, 621 (1997).
- [20] M. Friedman J. Econ. Lit. **30**, 2192 (1992).
- [21] This work was supported by INFM and NASA.