## Inelastically scattering particles and wealth distribution in an open economy

Frantisek Slanina

Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Na Slovance 2, CZ-18221 Praha, Czech Republic

U sing the analogy with inelastic granular gasses we introduce a model for wealth exchange in society. The dynam ics is governed by a kinetic equation, which allows for self-sim ilar solutions. The scaling function has a power-law tail, the exponent being given by a transcendental equation. In the lim it of continuous trading, closed form of the wealth distribution is calculated analytically.

PACS num bers: 89.65.-s, 05.40.-a, 02.50.-r

## I. IN TRODUCTION

The distribution of wealth among individuals within a society was one of the rst \natural laws" of economics [1]. Indeed, its study was motivated by the desire to bring the accuracy attributed to natural sciences, namely physics, to economic sciences. The celebrated P areto law states that the higher end of the wealth distribution follows a power-law P (W) W<sup>1</sup> with exponent robust in time.

The validity of the Pareto law was questioned and reexam ined m any times but the core message, stating that the tail of the distribution is a power law remains in force. There are recent investigations, e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5], giving reasonable empirical evidence for it. In fact, it is not so much the functional form itself but its spatial and tem poral stability that is intriguing. Indeed, while the value of the exponent m ay slightly vary from one society to another, the very fact of the power-law 0.tail in the distribution is valid alm ost everywhere. Recent investigations suggest that the range of validity of the Pareto law m ay extend as far in the past as to the ancient Egypt of the Pharaohs [6].

The universality of the power-law tail is surely a phenom enon asking for explanation. Recently, there was a lot of e ortestablishing nally the multiplicative random processes repelled from zero as a mathematical source of the power-law distributions [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. A Itematively, the killed multiplicative processes as sources of power-laws were studied in [4]. However, there are plenty of possible ways how the multiplicative random processes of this type com e onto scene. One of the most studied im plementations were the generalized Lotka-Volterra equations [10, 11, 12, 13] and the analogy with directed polymers in random media [21, 22, 23]. Both of these schemes are formalized by a kinetic equation describing the exchange of wealth between agents and global redistribution of wealth which plays the role of repelling from zero. Related approaches were subsequently pursued by a number of studies and sim ulations [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35,

#### 36, 37, 38, 39, 40].

M ore recently, empirical studies of the lower end of the wealth axis showed that the distribution of wealth is rather exponential than power-law, while the high-wealth tail still remains power-law [3, 41, 42]. This nding was interpreted as a result of a conservation law for total wealth, leading to the robust B oltzm ann-like exponential distribution, whatever the random wealth exchange be, in full analogy with the energy distribution in a gas of elastically scattering m olecules.

This, together with older studies within the same spirit [43], lead to the view of economic activity as a scattering process of agents, analogous to inelastically scattering particles [29, 30, 31, 44, 45, 46, 47]. Indeed, the inelasticity is indispensable to explain the power-law tail and it is also reasonable to suppose that the total wealth increases on average.

The num erical simulations performed to date con m the emergence of power-law tail in agent-scattering processes with great reliability. However, analytic insight is lacking in most of the studies available today. The main concern of our work is to ll this gap, providing analytical results at least for a simplied model of wealth exchange. To comply with the task we will be guided by existing analytical approaches for models of inelastically scattering particles.

Inelastic scattering of particles was studied thoroughly in the context of granular materials [48]. The sim plest one of the models used is the Maxwellmodel, whose inelastic variant was investigated in detail [49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61]. More realistic models of granular gasses were also introduced [62, 63] but their full account goes beyond the topic of this work. The most in portant conclusion of these studies is that a self-sim ilar solution of the kinetic equations exist, which is not stationary in time, but assumes time-independent form after proper rescaling of the energy. The tail of the scaling function becomes power-law under certain condition.

The form alism developed for granular gases can be readily adapted for binary wealth exchange of agents. Indeed, within the mean-eld version of the M axwellm odel the particles scatter random ly one with another irrespectively of their positions. This corresponds to random ly picking pairs of agents for interaction, with no care of the

E lectronic address: slanina@ fzu.cz

(possibly com plex) structure of their relationships. In reality the econom ic activity goes along links in a com plex social network [64, 65]. Indeed, recently there were investigations of the role of network topology in wealth distribution [34, 66]. We may consider the present model as an approximation of that network by a complete graph.

The main di erence from the mean-eld M axwell m odel is that the energy of the granular gas decreases by dissipation, while the average total wealth of the agents increases due to the econom ic activity. The sign of the non-conservation is therefore opposite in the two cases. W hile the form of the equations may remain the same, the solution cannot be directly continued from one domain to another. Therefore, while the case of dissipation is relatively well understood, new approaches are needed in the case of production. That is the aim of the present work.

# II. IN TERACT IN G AGEN TS AS SCATTER IN G PARTICLES

#### A. Description of the process

In agine a society of N agents, each of which possess certain wealth  $v_i$ , i = 1;2; ::::N. T in e-to time the agents interact in essentially instantaneous \collision" events, when certain fraction of the wealth can be exchanged. M oreover, we suppose the system is open and the interaction can catalyze an increase of the total wealth of the two interacting agents. Indeed, the source of the hum an wealth lies beyond our society and the ultimate cause is the energy poured to the Earth from the Sun. Nonetheless, the external energy is utilized only through a hum an activity and we simplify the problem by assuming that the net increase of wealth happens at the very moments of agents' interaction.

W e also assume that only pairwise interaction occurs. This may be a very crude assumption, as corporate decisions a ect many agents simultaneously. However, we expect the presence of multilateral interactions does not a ect the essential mechanisms in work here.

The dynam ics of our model is described as follows. In each time stept a pair of agents (i; j) is chosen random ly. They interact and exchange wealth according to the symmetric rule

$$\begin{array}{cccc} v_{i}(t+1) & = & 1+ & & v_{i}(t) \\ v_{j}(t+1) & & & 1+ & & v_{j}(t) \end{array}$$
(1)

All other agents leave their wealth unchanged,  $v_k$  (t + 1) =  $v_k$  (t) for all k di erent from both i and j. The parameter 2 (0;1) quanti es the wealth exchanged, while > 0 m easures the ow of wealth from the outside. The process is sketched schem atically in Fig. 1.

This rule is similar to those studied in [43, 53, 56] and simulated numerically in [29, 31, 44, 47] but we consider it slightly more realistic as it treats the agents in a priori symmetric manner. It also embraces various sources of



FIG.1: Schem atic picture of the scattering process, where the wealth is exchanged and produced.

wealth non-conservation within a single e ective parameter . In fact, also the form ulation based on the sim ilarity with the problem of directed polymers [21, 22] can be reduced to a rule of the form sim ilar to (1). Therefore, we are studying a representative of a whole class of related m odels and we expect the analytical results we will present have rather broad relevance.

## B. K inetic equation

The equation (1) describes a matrix multiplicative stochastic process of vector variable v (t) in discrete time t. Processes of this type are thoroughly studied e.g. in the context of granular gasses. Indeed, if the variables  $v_i$  are interpreted as energies corresponding to i-th granular particle, we can map the process to the mean-eld limit of the M axwellm odel of inelastic particles. However, the energy dissipation conventionally quantied by the restitution coe cient in plies now the negative value < 0, contrary to our assumption > 0. We will see later that this apparently small variation makes big di erence in the analytical treatment of the process.

The full information about the process in time t is contained in the N-particle joint probability distribution  $P_N$  (t;v<sub>1</sub>;v<sub>2</sub>;:::;v<sub>N</sub>). However, we can write a kinetic equation involving only one- and two-particle distribution functions

$$P_{1}(t+1;v) P_{1}(t;v) = \frac{2}{N} P_{1}(t;v) + Z$$

$$+ P_{2}(t;v_{1};v_{j}) ((1 + )y + v_{j} v) dv_{i}dv_{j}$$
(2)

which may be continued to give eventually an in nite hierarchy of equations of BBGKY type. As a standard approximation we use the factorization

$$P_{2}(t;v_{1};v_{1}) = P_{1}(t;v_{1})P_{1}(t;v_{1})$$
(3)

which breaks the hierarchy on the lowest level, neglecting the correlations between the wealth of the agents, induced by the scattering. In fact, this approximation becomes exact for N  $\,!\,$  1 . Therefore, in thermodynamic limit the one-particle distribution function bears all information.

Rescaling the time as = 2t=N in the therm odynamic limit N ! 1, we obtain for the one-particle distribution function P (;v) = P<sub>1</sub>(t;v) a Boltzm ann-like kinetic equation

$$\frac{@P (v)}{Z^{@}} + P (v) =$$

$$P (v_{i})P (v_{j}) ((1 + )\Psi + v_{j} + v) dv_{i}dv_{j}$$
(4)

which describes exactly the process (1) in the limit N !1. This equation has the same form as the mean-eld version for the well-studied M axwell model of inelastically scattering particles [54, 56, 57]. The main di erence consists in the fact that here the wealth increases, while in inelastic gas the energy decreases. This seem ingly little di erence has, how ever, deep consequences for the solution of Eq. (4).

Note also that within the fram ework of Maxwellm odel the distributions are expressed in terms of velocities, while our dynamical variables correspond rather to energies of the particles.

## III. SOLUTION OF THE KINETIC EQUATION

## A. Self-sim ilar solutions

Note is that the average wealth  $v = {R \choose v} P(v) dv$  in the process described by the kinetic equation (4) grows exponentially

$$v() = v(0)e$$
 (5)

and therefore Eq. (4) has no stationary solution. How ever, we may look for a quasi-stationary self-sim ilar solution in the form [50, 54, 56, 57]

P(;v) = 
$$\frac{1}{v()}$$
 ( $\frac{v}{v()}$ ): (6)

U sing the Laplace transform  $(x) = \begin{pmatrix} R_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  (w)  $e^{-xw} dw$ w e can write a non-local di erential equation for the scaling function in the form

$$x^{0}(x) + (x) = ((1 + )x) (x)$$
 (7)

A hint about possible solutions can be obtained from a special exactly solvable case =  $2^{n} + 2$ . It can be easily veri ed [54] that the function  $\hat{}_{1}(x) = (1 + \frac{p}{2x})e^{\frac{p}{2x}}$  is a solution of (7). Inverting the Laplace transform we obtain the corresponding wealth distribution  $_{1}(w) = \frac{p}{2}w^{5=2} \exp(\frac{1}{2w})$  which has similar form as obtained in previous studies [13, 21, 22]. However, in this case the value of is negative, which contradicts our assumption of wealth increase, while for > 0

the above idea leading to the function  $^{1}(x)$  does not work. Therefore, we must look for alternative ways. The leading idea of our approach is that equation (7) is nearly local for sm all values of and . Therefore, we will expand the factors on the RHS of Eq. (7) in Taylor series in and and perform the limit ; ! 0. As the param eters and quantify the amount of wealth increase and exchange in single trade event, we interpret the latter limit as the limit of continuous trading. In fact, such limit should involve also a rescaling of time , but because we are interested only in stationary regime, the explicit tim e dependence does not enter our considerations.

It should be also stressed that an important feature can be inferred from the observation that the system behaves dimensity for positive and negative . Indeed, it suggests a singularity at the point of precise conservation of wealth, = 0.



FIG.2: Solution of the equation  $f_0(;;)$  (1+ ) + 1 = 0 for = 0:1 and = 0:0025 (full line) and = 0:004 (dashed line).

#### B. Power-law tails

The main concern in empirical studies of wealth distribution is about the shape of tails, which assumes powerlaw form. The behavior of the distribution (w) for w ! 1 can be deduced from the singularity of the Laplace transform (x) at x ! 0. Therefore, we assume the following behavior [54, 57]

$$\hat{x} = 1 \quad x + A \, jxj + \dots \text{ for } x ! 0$$
 (8)

where 2 (1;2). This type of singularity results in the power-law tail as (w) w  $^{1}$  for w ! 1 . Insertion of (8) into (7) leads to a transcendental equation for the exponent

$$(1 + ") + 1 " = 0$$
 (9)

the solution of which is illustrated in Fig. 2. Obviously, there is always a trivial solution = 1. The power-law tail is due to another, non-trivial solution, which falls into the desired interval (1;2) only for certain values of the parameters and . We can see the allowed region in Fig. 3; solution in the range 2 (1;2) exists within the shaded region. We can also see that xed value of de nes a line in the - plane. We can approach the lim it ! 0, ! 0 while keeping constant. This is to be interpreted as continuous trading, as the am ount of wealth exchange and increase in a single trading step is in nitesim ally sm all. M aking this, the non-local term s in Eq. (7) becom e local and we can expect to obtain an ordinary di erential equation, soluble by standard m ethods.



FIG. 3: Solution in the range 2 (1;2) exists within the shaded region. dashed line corresponds to = 2, dash-dotted line corresponds to = 1 and full line to the solution =  $\frac{3}{2}$ .

## C. Continuous trading lim it

Indeed, expanding (9) we obtain the following formula relating and for xed in the limit of continuous trading ! 0, ! 0:

$$= \frac{1}{2}^{2} + 0(^{3}) + 0(^{2}) :$$
 (10)

The leading correction term to (10) depends on the value of ; for 1 <  $\,$  < 3=2  $\pm$  is of order 0 (  $^2$  ), for 3=2 <

< 2 it is of order O ( $^3$ ), while in the special point = 3=2 we should include both correction terms, as they are of the same order O ( $^3$ ). System atic expansion in is developed in Appendix A.

Taking the same  $\lim it with xed$  in Eq. (7) we obtain, using (10), the following equation

$$\frac{1}{2}x^{0}(x) + \frac{1}{2}^{0}(x) + (x) = 0 : \quad (11)$$

Of the two independent solutions of (11) only one has correct asymptotics  $\hat{}(x) ! O$  for x ! + 1. It can be expressed using m odi ed Bessel function

$$(x) = C^{0}x^{=2} K (2^{p} - p x)$$
 (12)

where the constant  $C^{0}$  is xed by the normalization  $^{(0)} = 1$ . Inverting the Laplace transform we nally obtain the wealth distribution

$$(w) = C w ^{1} \exp(-\frac{1}{w})$$
 (13)

with C = (1) = ().

We can see that the distribution obtained exhibits the desired power-law behavior for large wealth. Moreover, it has a maximum at a nite value of  $w = w_{max}$ 

( 1)=( + 1) and depression for low wealth values. The size of the depletion is determ ined by the exponential term in (13), i. e. by the same value of which determines the power in the power-law. This corresponds to the idea presented e. g. in Ref. [11] stating that it is the value of the lower bound for the allowed wealth which determines the value of the exponent. Here, how ever, this result comes purely form ally as a result of the analytic computation. In our approach it is the interplay between wealth increase (parameter ) and wealth exchange (parameter ) that dictates the value of the exponent .

## D. Corrections for nite trading in one step

Expanding the equation (7) in powers of and it is possible to include system atic corrections to equation (11) and therefore corrections to wealth distribution (13) for nite amount of wealth increase and exchange in single trading step. D etails of the calculations are given in Appendix A; here we only sum marize the results.

The expansion (10) of the parameter in powers of can be continued as

$$= \frac{1}{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}^{2} + \frac{$$

Correspondingly, the wealth distribution, expanded in powers of is

$$(w) = \frac{(1)}{()} w^{-1} \exp \frac{1}{w}$$

$$1 + \frac{1}{3} \frac{2}{w} \frac{1}{w^{2}} 10$$

$$\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \ln w + \frac{1}{w} 01^{-2(-1)} + 0^{-4} (4^{-2})$$

(15)

where the constants  $_{01}$  and  $_{10}$  are given in Appendix A. We show in Fig. 4 the wealth distribution according to (15) for = 1:7 and several positive values of , namely for = 0:03, 0:1, and 0:3. We can see that the distribution is a ected mainly at small values of wealth, shifting the maximum toward smaller when increases. On the contrary, the tail of the distribution is nearly una ected, showing universal and robust power-law behavior.



FIG.4: W ealth distribution according to Eq. (15) for ! 0 (full line), = 0.03 (dashed line), = 0.1 (dash-dotted line), and = 0.3 (dotted line).

Let us stress again that the solution known for < 0 cannot be properly continued to the region of > 0, due to the presence of singularity at = 0. The singularity can be seen e. g. in the behavior of the solution of Eq. (9), as shown in Fig. 5. However, for = 3=2 the formula (13) describes the solution of (7) on both lim its ! O<sup>t</sup> and ! 0. This implies that the singularity is rather weak, because the solution of Eq. (7) is continuous in , and only the derivative with respect of has a jump at = 0. One may speculate about the fate of the singularity if we allowed and not xed param eters but random processes them selves. Most probably the singularity would vanish but nalanswer is left for future work.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

W e form ulated a model of wealth production and exchange, where agents random ly interact pairwise. U sing the analogy with the mean-eld version of the M axwell m odel for inelastic scattering of granular particles we obtain analytical results for the wealth distribution.

The dynam ics of the model is governed by a kinetic equation for one-particle distribution function. We look for self-sim ilar scaling solutions, corresponding to rede ning the unit of wealth after each wealth increase. The form of these solutions is given by a non-local di erential



FIG.5: Solution of equation (9) for = 3=2 in the ranges > 0 (full line) and < 0 (dashed line). Note the singularity at = 0 which means that we must skip from one of the three solutions of (9) to another one.

equation, exactly soluble only in the practically irrelevant case of net wealth decrease. Therefore we turned to approximation schemes.

First, we looked at the behavior for large wealth. The tail of the wealth distribution has a power-law form, and its exponent is determined by the interplay between the intensity of the wealth exchange and the amount of wealth produced. The form line in the - plane with xed is found, depending quadratically on for ! 0. The physically allowed values 2 (1;2) determine a horm-shaped region in the - plane.

The second approximation consisted in taking the limit of continuous trading, m eaning sm all wealth production and small exchange within a single trading operation, while keeping the exponent constant. Here we obtained closed formula for the entire wealth distribution, which has power-law tail as expected and a maximum at certain (low) wealth value. The form of the wealth distribution corresponds to those found in previous studies [13, 21, 22]. It is interesting to note that this general form has one-to-one correspondence between the position w<sub>m ax</sub> of the maximum of the distribution and the value of the exponent. There are few agents having wealth below  $w_{m ax}$ . This suggests that the intuition form alized e.g. in [11, 13], that the exponent is \tuned" by the low -wealth behavior of the distribution, m ay be in work quite generally. Here, the free param eters are apparently the wealth production and exchange, but in reality these param eters may be them selves tuned by a mechanism which xes the position of the maximum of the wealth distribution, i.e. the lowest wealth com patible with survival.

However, there is still open question of the speci c values of the exponent, which are quite robust in di erent societies. It seems, also on the basis of our results, that it cannot be explained by the bare mechanism of econom ic exchange and some other ingredient, possibly of A gency of the C zech R epublic. sociological origin, is required.

## A cknow ledgm ents

I wish to thank PaulK rapivsky and EliBen-Naim for stimulating comments and discussions. This work was supported by the project No. 202/01/1091 of the G rant

$$=\frac{1}{8} \frac{3^{p} + 17}{p} \frac{29^{3} + 15^{2} + 4^{5}$$

However, the non-local di erential equation (7) still does not yield explicit solution. Inverting the expression (A1) we get the following series expansion

$$= \frac{1}{4} {}^{2} \frac{1}{12} {}^{3} + \frac{1}{16} {}^{4} \frac{7}{144} {}^{5} + \frac{113}{2592} {}^{6} + 0 {}^{7} : (A2)$$

For general value of the variable is expressed as a series in two small parameters and  $=2^{\overline{(1)}}$ , which coincide only if = 3=2. Therefore, we can write

$$= 2 \frac{X^{4}}{m n} \frac{m + 2(1)n}{m + 2(1)n}$$
 (A 3)

and the various terms take variable precedence in the order of sm allness when ! 0, depending on the value of . For the rst several coe cients we have

$$_{00} = \frac{1}{2}$$
 (A 4)

$$_{10} = \frac{(1)(2 1)}{6}$$
 (A 5)

$$_{01} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} :$$
 (A 6)

Starting from the expansion (A 3) we can convert the rst order non-local di erential equation (7) for ^(x) into in nite-order local di erential equation for (w). The price to pay for it is that the coe gients in the latter (w)w<sup>k</sup>dw of the equation contain the moments k =solution itself. Indeed, we can write

$$((1 + )x) = \lim_{y \le x} \exp((x)) x \frac{d}{dy} (y)$$
 (A7)

$$(x) = \lim_{y \ge 0} \exp x \frac{d}{dy} (y) :$$
 (A8)

Therefore, we obtain a linear combination of term softhe follow ing form

$$x^{m+n} \frac{d^{m}(x)}{dx^{m}} \frac{d^{n}(0)}{dx^{n}}$$
(A 9)

## APPENDIX A: SYSTEMATIC EXPANSION FOR SMALL AND .

Let us start with the special value = 3=2. Here, the equation (9) has an explicit solution in the form

$$3^{P-} + 17 \quad 29^{3=2} + 15^{2} + 4^{5=2} \quad 4^{3} + \frac{p}{3} \quad 3^{2} \quad 2^{P-} \quad 2^{P-} + 1^{3} \quad P - 1^{6}$$

$$P - 3^{3=2} \quad 2^{2} \quad (A1)$$

which, after inverse Laplace transform, give rise to term s

$$(1)^{m+n} = \frac{d^{m+n}}{dw^{m+n}} [w^m (w)]$$
: (A10)

However, the rst two moments are xed by de nition. Indeed, the norm alization of the probability distribution xes the zeroth m om ent and the xed average wealth, imposed by the scaling condition (6) xes the rst moment, so that  $_0 = _1 = 1$ . This consideration leads to the equations for lowest correction to the solution (13), which are free of unknown higher mom ents.

Generally, the solution can be then expressed in the form of the series in powers of and 2(1)

$$(w) = {}_{0} (w) {}_{m n n 0} (w) {}^{m + 2(1)n} : (A 11)$$

We assume  $_{00}$  (w) = 1. The norm alization must be independent of , which can be written as

$$\int_{0}^{1} (w)_{mn} (w) dw = \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} (A 12)$$

Therefore, the lowest term obeys the equation

7

$$\frac{w^2}{2} \quad {}_0^0 (w) + \frac{+1}{2} w \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad {}_0 (w) = 0 \quad (A13)$$

which has the following solution satisfying the norm alization (A12)

$$_{0}$$
 (w) =  $\frac{(1)}{()}$  w  $^{1}$  exp  $\frac{1}{w}$  : (A 14)

Indeed, it coincides with the result of (13).

The next two terms satisfy the following equations

$$\frac{w^2}{2} {}_{10}^0 (w) = \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{w}$$
 (A 15)

$$\frac{w^2}{2} \, {}^0_{01} \, (w) = \frac{1}{2} \, \frac{1}{2} \, (w \, 1) \, (A \, 16)$$

which can be easily solved. W e obtain

$$_{10}$$
 (w) =  $\frac{1}{3}$   $\frac{2}{w}$   $\frac{1}{w^2}$   $_{10}$  (A 17)

$$_{01}$$
 (w) =  $\frac{2}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\ln w + \frac{1}{w}$   $_{01}$  (A 18)

and the constants  $_{01}$ ;  $_{10}$  are xed by the normalization condition (A12). We not explicitly

$$_{10} = (A 19)$$
  
 $_{01} = \ln (1) () + \frac{1}{1} (A 20)$ 

- [1] V. Pareto, Cours d'econom ie politique, (Lausanne, F. Rouge, 1897).
- [2] M. Levy and S. Solom on, Physica A 242, 90 (1997).
- [3] A.D ragulescu and V.M.Yakovenko, Physica A 299, 213 (2001).
- [4] W .J.Reed and B.D.Hughes, Phys. Rev. E 66, 067103 (2002).
- [5] H.A oyam a, W .Soum a, and Y.Fu jiw ara, Physica A 324, 352 (2003).
- [6] A.Y.AbulM agd, Phys. Rev. E 66, 057104 (2002).
- [7] M. Levy and S. Solom on, Int. J. M od. Phys. C 7, 595 (1996).
- [8] M. Levy and S. Solom on, Int. J. M od. Phys. C 7, 65 (1996).
- [9] O. Biham, O. Makai, M. Levy, and S. Solomon, Phys. Rev.E 58, 1352 (1998).
- [10] S.Solom on, in: Decision technologies for Computational Finance, ed. A.-P. Refenes, A.N. Burgess, and J.E. Moody (Kluwer Academ ic Publishers, 1998).
- [11] S. Solom on, in: Application of Simulation to Social Sciences, ed. G. Ballot and G. W eisbuch (Hermes Science Publications, 2000).
- [L2] Z.-F. Huang and S. Solom on, Eur. Phys. J. B 20, 601 (2001).
- [13] S.Solom on and P.R ichm ond, Physica A 299, 188 (2001).
- [14] A.Blank and S.Solom on, Physica A 287, 279 (2000).
- [15] S.Solom on and M.Levy, cond-m at/0005416.
- [16] Z.-F. Huang and S. Solom on, Physica A 294, 503 (2001).
- [17] D. Somette and R. Cont, J. Phys I France 7, 431 (1997).
- [18] D. Somette, Physica A 250, 295 (1998).
- [19] D.Somette, Phys. Rev. E 57, 4811 (1998).
- [20] H. Takayasu, A. H. Sato, and M. Takayasu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 966 (1997).
- [21] M. Marsili, S. Maslov, and Y.-C. Zhang, Physica A 253, 403 (1998).
- [22] J.P. Bouchaud and M. Mezard, Physica A 282, 536 (2000).
- [23] Z.Burda, D.Johnston, J.Jurkiewicz, M.Kaminski, M. A.Nowak, G.Papp, and I.Zahed, cond-mat/0101068.
- [24] W .Soum a, cond-m at/0011373.
- [25] H.Aoyama, Y.Nagahara, M.P.Okazaki, W. Souma, H. Takayasu, M. Takayasu, cond-m at/0006038.
- [26] W .Soum a, cond-m at/0202388.
- [27] W. Souma, Y. Fujiwara, and H. Aoyama, cond-mat/0108482.
- [28] Y.Fujiwara, W. Souma, H. Aoyama, T. Kaizoji, and M.

where  $(x) = {}^{0}(x) = (x)$  is the logarithm ic derivative of the gamma function.

Aoki, cond-m at/0208398.

- [29] A. Chakraborti and B. K. Chakrabarti, Eur. Phys. J. B 17, 167 (2000).
- [30] B. K. Chakrabarti and A. Chatterjee, in: Applications of Econophysics, Conference proceedings of Second Nikkei Symposium on Econophysics, Tokyo, Japan, 2002 (Springer-Verlag, Tokyo, 2003) pp.280-285; cond-m at/0302147.
- [31] A. Chatterjee, B. K. Chakrabarti, and S. S. Manna, cond-mat/0301289, to be published in Physica A; Phys. Scripta T 106, 36 (2003); cond-mat/0311227.
- [32] A.Das and S.Yarlagadda, cond-m at/0304685.
- [33] S. Pianegonda, J. R. Iglesias, G. Abram son, and J. L. Vega, Physica A 322, 667 (2003).
- [34] J. R. Iglesias, S. Goncalves, S. Pianegonda, J. L. Vega, and G. Abram son, Physica A 327, 12 (2003).
- [35] S.Pianegonda and J.R. Iglesias, cond-m at/0311113.
- [36] J.R. Iglesias, S.G on calves, G.A bram son, and J.L.Vega, cond-m at/0311127.
- [37] M. Anazawa, A. Ishikawa, T. Suzuki, and M. Tom oyose, cond-m at/0307116.
- [38] T. M izuno, M. K atori, H. Takayasu, and M. Takayasu, cond-m at/0308365.
- [39] T. Mizuno, M. Takayasu, and H. Takayasu, cond-m at/0307270.
- [40] Y.Fujiwara, C.DiGuilmi, H.Aoyama, M.Gallegati, and W.Souma, cond-mat/0310061.
- [41] A.Dragulescu and V.M.Yakovenko, Eur. Phys.J.B 17, 723 (2000); Eur. Phys.J.B 20, 585 (2001); in: Modeling of C om plex System s: Seventh G ranada Lectures, A IP C onference Proceedings 661, 180 (New York, 2003).
- [42] V.M.Yakovenko, cond-m at/0302270.
- [43] S. Ispolatov, P.L.K rapivsky, and S.Redner, Eur. Phys. J.B 2, 267 (1998).
- [44] N. Scafetta, S. Picozzi, and B. J. West, cond-mat/0209373.
- [45] N. Scafetta and B. J. W est, cond-m at/0306579.
- [46] M.G Ligor and M. Ignat, Eur. Phys. J.B 30, 125 (2002).
- [47] S.Sinha, cond-m at/03043224.
- [48] H. M. Jaeger, S. R. Nagel, and R. P. Behringer, Rev. M od. Phys. 68, 1259 (1996).
- [49] A.V.Bobylev, J.A.Carillo, and I.M.Gamba, J.Stat. Phys. 98, 743 (2000).
- [50] A.V.Bobylev and C.Cercignani, J.Stat.Phys.106, 547 (2002); J.Stat.Phys.110, 333 (2003).
- [51] A. Baldassarri, U. Marini Bettolo Marconi, and A.

Puglisi, Europhys. Lett. 58, 14 (2002).

- [52] I. Ispolatov and P.L.K rapivsky, Phys. Rev. E 61, R 2163 (2000).
- [53] E.Ben-Naim and P.L.Krapivsky, Phys. Rev. E 61, R5 (2000).
- [54] P. L. K rapivsky and E. Ben-Naim, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 35, L147 (2002).
- [55] E. Ben-Naim and P. L. Krapivsky, Phys. Rev. E 66, 011309 (2002).
- [56] D. ben-Avraham, E. Ben-Naim, K. Lindenberg, and A. Rosas, Phys. Rev. E 68, 050103 (2003).
- [57] M.H.Emstand R.Brito, Europhys.Lett.58, 182 (2002).
- [58] M.H.Emst and R.Brito, cond-m at/0111093; Phys. Rev. E 65, 040301 (2002); J. Stat. Phys. 109, 407 (2002);

Europhys.Lett.58,182 (2002); cond-m at/0304608.

- [59] E.Ben-Naim and P.L.Krapivsky, cond-m at/0301238.
- [60] T. Antal, M. Droz, and A. Lipowski, Phys. Rev. E 66, 062301 (2002).
- [61] E.Barkai, Phys. Rev. E 68, 055104 (2003).
- [62] A. Baldassarri, U. Marini Bettolo Marconi, and A. Puglisi, cond-m at/0105299.
- [63] A. Baldassarri, U. Marini Bettolo Marconi, A. Puglisi, and A. Vulpiani, Phys. Rev. E 64, 011301 (2001).
- [64] D.J.W atts and S.H. Strogatz, Nature 393, 440 (1998).
- [65] A.-L.Barabasi and R.Albert, Science 286, 509 (1999).
- [66] T. Di Matteo, T. Aste, and S. T. Hyde, cond-mat/0310544.