Perimeter polynomials and scaling analysis for percolation problems

Iwan Jensen

MASCOS, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne

The Australian and New Zealand Association of Mathematical Physics Lorne, December 5, 2012

> Supported by the Australian Research Council. Computing power provided by NCINF.

> Work with Robert M Ziff, University of Michigan

Perimeter polynomials and scaling

1. Introduction to percolation

2. Basic scaling theory.

3. Numerical tests of scaling.

4. Amplitude estimates.

Percolation models are commonly formulated in a lattice setting in which the edges and/or vertices are occupied (vacant) with probability p(1 - p).

Percolation models are commonly formulated in a lattice setting in which the edges and/or vertices are occupied (vacant) with probability p(1 - p).

Today I shall confine myself to the square lattice.

I shall refer to occupied edges and vertices as bonds and sites, respectively.

Percolation models are commonly formulated in a lattice setting in which the edges and/or vertices are occupied (vacant) with probability p(1 - p).

Today I shall confine myself to the square lattice.

I shall refer to *occupied* edges and vertices as bonds and sites, respectively.

Nearest neighbour sites are said to be connected and clusters are sets of connected sites.

Percolation models are commonly formulated in a lattice setting in which the edges and/or vertices are occupied (vacant) with probability p(1 - p).

Today I shall confine myself to the square lattice.

I shall refer to occupied edges and vertices as bonds and sites, respectively.

Nearest neighbour sites are said to be connected and clusters are sets of connected sites.

The behaviour of the model is controlled by the occupation probability *p*.

(日)

Percolation models are commonly formulated in a lattice setting in which the edges and/or vertices are occupied (vacant) with probability p(1 - p).

Today I shall confine myself to the square lattice.

I shall refer to occupied edges and vertices as bonds and sites, respectively.

Nearest neighbour sites are said to be connected and clusters are sets of connected sites.

The behaviour of the model is controlled by the occupation probability *p*.

When p is smaller than a critical value p_c all clusters remain finite.

Above p_c there is a non-zero probability P(p) of finding an infinite cluster.

Percolation models are commonly formulated in a lattice setting in which the edges and/or vertices are occupied (vacant) with probability p(1 - p).

Today I shall confine myself to the square lattice.

I shall refer to occupied edges and vertices as bonds and sites, respectively.

Nearest neighbour sites are said to be connected and clusters are sets of connected sites.

The behaviour of the model is controlled by the occupation probability *p*.

When p is smaller than a critical value p_c all clusters remain finite.

Above p_c there is a non-zero probability P(p) of finding an infinite cluster.

The percolation probability P(p) is the order parameter while the the average cluster size S(p), which diverges as $p \to p_c^-$, plays a role similar to a susceptibility.

Percolation problems are closely related to the combinatorial problem of lattice animals. Lattice animals are simply connected subgraphs of a lattice.

Percolation problems are closely related to the combinatorial problem of lattice animals. Lattice animals are simply connected subgraphs of a lattice.

The size of a lattice animal is the number of connected vertices (sites).

A D M A A A M M

Percolation problems are closely related to the combinatorial problem of lattice animals. Lattice animals are simply connected subgraphs of a lattice.

The size of a lattice animal is the number of connected vertices (sites).

A vertex is said to be a *perimeter site* if the vertex is a nearest neighbour of a site in the lattice animal.

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

Percolation problems are closely related to the combinatorial problem of lattice animals. Lattice animals are simply connected subgraphs of a lattice.

The size of a lattice animal is the number of connected vertices (sites).

A vertex is said to be a *perimeter site* if the vertex is a nearest neighbour of a site in the lattice animal.



Iwan Jensen (University of Melbourne)

Percolation problems are closely related to the combinatorial problem of lattice animals. Lattice animals are simply connected subgraphs of a lattice.

The size of a lattice animal is the number of connected vertices (sites).

A vertex is said to be a *perimeter site* if the vertex is a nearest neighbour of a site in the lattice animal.

Series expansions for many percolation properties can be obtained as weighted sums over the number of lattice animals, $g_{s,t}$, enumerated according to the number of sites (bonds) *s* and perimeter *t*.

< 口 > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

Percolation problems are closely related to the combinatorial problem of lattice animals. Lattice animals are simply connected subgraphs of a lattice.

The size of a lattice animal is the number of connected vertices (sites).

A vertex is said to be a *perimeter site* if the vertex is a nearest neighbour of a site in the lattice animal.

Series expansions for many percolation properties can be obtained as weighted sums over the number of lattice animals, $g_{s,t}$, enumerated according to the number of sites (bonds) *s* and perimeter *t*.

Perimeter polynomials are defined as

$$D_s(q) = \sum_t g_{s,t} q^t$$

and from these we can find the average number of clusters of size s per vertex

$$n_s(p) = p^s D_s(1-p) = \sum_t g_{s,t} p^s (1-p)^t$$

< 日 > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > <

According to standard scaling theory the cluster numbers behave as

$$n_s(p) = s^{-\tau} f[(p - p_c)s^{\sigma}] \quad (p \to p_c, s \to \infty),$$

where $\tau = 187/91$ and $\sigma = 36/91$.

According to standard scaling theory the cluster numbers behave as

$$n_s(p) = s^{-\tau} f[(p - p_c)s^{\sigma}] \quad (p \to p_c, \ s \to \infty),$$

where $\tau = 187/91$ and $\sigma = 36/91$.

The percolation probability can be expressed in terms of $n_s(p)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} -P(p) &= \sum_{s} [n_{s}(p) - n_{s}(p_{c})]s & \propto \int s^{1-\tau} [f(z) - f(0)] ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{(\tau-2)/\sigma} \int |z|^{-1 + (2-\tau)/\sigma} [f(z) - f(0)] dz \\ &= (\beta + \gamma) |p - p_{c}|^{\beta} \int |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] dz \end{aligned}$$

According to standard scaling theory the cluster numbers behave as

$$n_s(p) = s^{-\tau} f[(p - p_c)s^{\sigma}] \quad (p \to p_c, \ s \to \infty),$$

where $\tau = 187/91$ and $\sigma = 36/91$.

The percolation probability can be expressed in terms of $n_s(p)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} -P(p) &= \sum_{s} [n_{s}(p) - n_{s}(p_{c})]s & \propto \int s^{1-\tau} [f(z) - f(0)] ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{(\tau-2)/\sigma} \int |z|^{-1 + (2-\tau)/\sigma} [f(z) - f(0)] dz \\ &= (\beta + \gamma) |p - p_{c}|^{\beta} \int |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] dz \end{aligned}$$

The percolation probability P(p) is zero for $p < p_c$ and it follows that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

< 口 > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

According to standard scaling theory the cluster numbers behave as

$$n_s(p) = s^{-\tau} f[(p - p_c)s^{\sigma}] \quad (p \to p_c, \ s \to \infty),$$

where $\tau = 187/91$ and $\sigma = 36/91$.

The percolation probability can be expressed in terms of $n_s(p)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} -P(p) &= \sum_{s} [n_{s}(p) - n_{s}(p_{c})]s & \propto \int s^{1-\tau} [f(z) - f(0)] ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{(\tau-2)/\sigma} \int |z|^{-1+(2-\tau)/\sigma} [f(z) - f(0)] dz \\ &= (\beta + \gamma) |p - p_{c}|^{\beta} \int |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] dz \end{aligned}$$

The percolation probability P(p) is zero for $p < p_c$ and it follows that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

The corresponding integrals in the high-density region (that is the integral from 0 to ∞) should not vanish so as to give a non-zero percolation probability.

Iwan Jensen (University of Melbourne)

Perimeter polynomials and scaling

The distribution $n_s(p)$ has just a single maximum for $p \in [0, 1]$.

The distribution $n_s(p)$ has just a single maximum for $p \in [0, 1]$. For the scaling ansatz to be true we must have that the value of this maximum $n_s^{\max} = \max_{p \in [0, 1]} n_s(p) \propto s^{-\tau}$ and the position of the maximum p_s^{\max} must behave as $p_s^{\max} - p_c \propto s^{-\sigma}$.

The distribution $n_s(p)$ has just a single maximum for $p \in [0, 1]$. For the scaling ansatz to be true we must have that the value of this maximum $n_s^{max} = \max_{p \in [0, 1]} n_s(p) \propto s^{-\tau}$ and the position of the maximum p_s^{max} must behave as $p_s^{max} - p_c \propto s^{-\sigma}$.



The distribution $n_s(p)$ has just a single maximum for $p \in [0, 1]$. For the scaling ansatz to be true we must have that the value of this maximum $n_s^{max} = \max_{p \in [0, 1]} n_s(p) \propto s^{-\tau}$ and the position of the maximum p_s^{max} must behave as $p_s^{max} - p_c \propto s^{-\sigma}$.



 $\bar{n}_s(z) = s^{\tau} n_s(z)$, with $z = (p - p_c)s^{\sigma}$, should converge to a unique distribution. Plots of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vs. z for various values of s will exhibit a scaling collapse to a single curve.

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

 $\bar{n}_s(z) = s^{\tau} n_s(z)$, with $z = (p - p_c)s^{\sigma}$, should converge to a unique distribution. Plots of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vs. *z* for various values of *s* will exhibit a scaling collapse to a single curve.



 $\bar{n}_s(z) = s^{\tau} n_s(z)$, with $z = (p - p_c)s^{\sigma}$, should converge to a unique distribution. Plots of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vs. z for various values of s will exhibit a scaling collapse to a single curve.



 $\bar{n}_s(z) = s^{\tau} n_s(z)$, with $z = (p - p_c)s^{\sigma}$, should converge to a unique distribution. Plots of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vs. *z* for various values of *s* will exhibit a scaling collapse to a single curve.



Next we test whether the weighted integral of the derivative of the scaling function vanishes in the low-density region but is non-zero in the high-density region.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

Next we test whether the weighted integral of the derivative of the scaling function vanishes in the low-density region but is non-zero in the high-density region.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

We don't actually know the scaling function f(z) so we use the scaled cluster number distribution $\bar{n}_s(z)$ as an approximation to f(z).

Next we test whether the weighted integral of the derivative of the scaling function vanishes in the low-density region but is non-zero in the high-density region.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

We don't actually know the scaling function f(z) so we use the scaled cluster number distribution $\bar{n}_s(z)$ as an approximation to f(z).

We expect that, as $s \to \infty$, the relevant integrals of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vanish in the low-density region and approach a constant in the high-density region.

イロト イ団ト イヨト イヨト

Next we test whether the weighted integral of the derivative of the scaling function vanishes in the low-density region but is non-zero in the high-density region.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

We don't actually know the scaling function f(z) so we use the scaled cluster number distribution $\bar{n}_s(z)$ as an approximation to f(z).

We expect that, as $s \to \infty$, the relevant integrals of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vanish in the low-density region and approach a constant in the high-density region.

The integral runs from $-\infty$ to 0. Since $\bar{n}_s(z)$ is just a polynomial approximation to f(z) we can't extend the integration to infinity.

Next we test whether the weighted integral of the derivative of the scaling function vanishes in the low-density region but is non-zero in the high-density region.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

We don't actually know the scaling function f(z) so we use the scaled cluster number distribution $\bar{n}_s(z)$ as an approximation to f(z).

We expect that, as $s \to \infty$, the relevant integrals of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vanish in the low-density region and approach a constant in the high-density region.

The integral runs from $-\infty$ to 0. Since $\bar{n}_s(z)$ is just a polynomial approximation to f(z) we can't extend the integration to infinity.

However, there is a natural cut-off provided by the scaling variable *z* and the fact that the physical low-density region is $0 \le p < p_c$. The integral over *z* in the low-density region runs over the interval $[-z_- = -s^{\sigma}p_c, 0]$.

Next we test whether the weighted integral of the derivative of the scaling function vanishes in the low-density region but is non-zero in the high-density region.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-1-\beta} [f(z) - f(0)] \mathrm{d}z = \int_{-\infty}^{0} |z|^{-\beta} \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}f}{\mathrm{d}z} \right] \mathrm{d}z = 0$$

We don't actually know the scaling function f(z) so we use the scaled cluster number distribution $\bar{n}_s(z)$ as an approximation to f(z).

We expect that, as $s \to \infty$, the relevant integrals of $\bar{n}_s(z)$ vanish in the low-density region and approach a constant in the high-density region.

The integral runs from $-\infty$ to 0. Since $\bar{n}_s(z)$ is just a polynomial approximation to f(z) we can't extend the integration to infinity.

However, there is a natural cut-off provided by the scaling variable *z* and the fact that the physical low-density region is $0 \le p < p_c$. The integral over *z* in the low-density region runs over the interval $[-z_- = -s^{\sigma}p_c, 0]$.

Integrals over the high-density region is over the interval $[0, s^{\sigma}(1 - p_c) = z_+]$.



Asymmetry of scaled distribution

Start with the scaled distribution $\bar{n}_s(z) = s^{\tau} n_s(z)$, where $z = (p - p_c)s^{\sigma}$. Let z_s denote the position of the maximum. Look at the asymmetry around z_s

$$\bar{n}_s(z_s+y)-\bar{n}_s(z_s-y)$$

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

Asymmetry of scaled distribution

Start with the scaled distribution $\bar{n}_s(z) = s^{\tau} n_s(z)$, where $z = (p - p_c)s^{\sigma}$. Let z_s denote the position of the maximum. Look at the asymmetry around z_s

$$\bar{n}_s(z_s+y)-\bar{n}_s(z_s-y)$$



Iwan Jensen (University of Melbourne)

ANZAMP 2012 10 / 13

$$S(p) \propto \sum_{s} s^{2} n_{s}(p) \propto \int s^{2-\tau} f(z) ds$$

= $\frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{(\tau-3)/\sigma} \int |z|^{-1+(3-\tau)/\sigma} f(z) dz$
= $\frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma} \int |z|^{-1+\gamma} f(z) dz$
 $\sim \Gamma^{+/-} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma}$

ANZAMP 2012 11 / 13

æ

$$S(p) \propto \sum_{s} s^{2} n_{s}(p) \propto \int s^{2-\tau} f(z) ds$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{(\tau-3)/\sigma} \int |z|^{-1 + (3-\tau)/\sigma} f(z) dz$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma} \int |z|^{-1+\gamma} f(z) dz$$

$$\sim \Gamma^{+/-} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma}$$

The universal amplitude ratio Γ^-/Γ^+ can be estimated by integration of the cluster number distribution for the average cluster size in the high-density region

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

$$S(p) \propto \sum_{s} s^{2} n_{s}(p) \propto \int s^{2-\tau} f(z) ds$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{(\tau-3)/\sigma} \int |z|^{-1 + (3-\tau)/\sigma} f(z) dz$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma} \int |z|^{-1+\gamma} f(z) dz$$

$$\sim \Gamma^{+/-} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma}$$

The universal amplitude ratio Γ^-/Γ^+ can be estimated by integration of the cluster number distribution for the average cluster size in the high-density region

$$I_{s}^{+} = \int_{0}^{z_{+}} |z|^{\gamma-1} \bar{n}_{s}(z) \mathrm{d}z = \int_{0}^{z_{+}} z^{\gamma-1} \sum_{k=0} a_{k} z^{k} = \sum_{k=0} a_{k} (z_{+})^{k+\gamma} / (k+\gamma),$$

Iwan Jensen (University of Melbourne)

ANZAMP 2012 11 / 13

$$S(p) \propto \sum_{s} s^{2} n_{s}(p) \propto \int s^{2-\tau} f(z) ds$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{(\tau-3)/\sigma} \int |z|^{-1 + (3-\tau)/\sigma} f(z) dz$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma} \int |z|^{-1+\gamma} f(z) dz$$

$$\sim \Gamma^{+/-} |p - p_{c}|^{-\gamma}$$

The universal amplitude ratio Γ^-/Γ^+ can be estimated by integration of the cluster number distribution for the average cluster size in the high-density region

$$I_{s}^{+} = \int_{0}^{z_{+}} |z|^{\gamma-1} \bar{n}_{s}(z) \mathrm{d}z = \int_{0}^{z_{+}} z^{\gamma-1} \sum_{k=0} a_{k} z^{k} = \sum_{k=0} a_{k} (z_{+})^{k+\gamma} / (k+\gamma),$$

and in the low-density region

$$J_{s}^{-} = \int_{-z_{-}}^{0} (-z)^{\gamma-1} \bar{n}_{s}(z) \mathrm{d}z = \int_{0}^{z_{-}} z^{\gamma-1} \sum_{k=0} a_{k}(-z)^{k} = \sum_{k=0} (-1)^{k} a_{k}(z_{-})^{k+\gamma} / (k+\gamma),$$

from which we obtain the estimate $\Gamma_s^-/\Gamma_s^+ = I_s^-/I_s^+$.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Amplitude ratios: Bond percolation



The amplitude ratios have some curvature when plotted against 1/s.

Amplitude ratios: Bond percolation



The amplitude ratios have some curvature when plotted against 1/s.

A log-log plot of the difference between consecutive ratios clearly has a power-law decay with 1/s. The exponent work out to be around 0.85

Amplitude ratios: Bond percolation



The amplitude ratios have some curvature when plotted against 1/s.

A log-log plot of the difference between consecutive ratios clearly has a power-law decay with 1/s. The exponent work out to be around 0.85

Extrapolation then give $\Gamma^-/\Gamma^+ = 159.2 \pm 0.2$.

Amplitude ratios: Site percolation



The amplitude ratios have pronounced curvature when plotted against 1/s.

Amplitude ratios: Site percolation



The amplitude ratios have pronounced curvature when plotted against 1/s.

A log-log plot of the difference between consecutive ratios clearly has a power-law decay with 1/s. In this case the exponent work out to be around 0.55.

Amplitude ratios: Site percolation



The amplitude ratios have pronounced curvature when plotted against 1/s.

A log-log plot of the difference between consecutive ratios clearly has a power-law decay with 1/s. In this case the exponent work out to be around 0.55.

Extrapolation then give $\Gamma^-/\Gamma^+ = 164.5 \pm 1.5$