

On the Probability of Occurrence of Clusters in Abelian Sandpile Model

M. Moradi *, S. Rouhani †

Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology,
Tehran, P.O.Box: 11365-9161, Iran

Abstract

We have performed extensive simulations on the Abelian Sandpile Model (ASM) on square lattice. We have estimated the probability of observation of many clusters. Some are in good agreement with previous analytical results, while some show discrepancies between simulation and analytical results.

1 Introduction

Abelian Sandpile Model (ASM) is a generalization of BTW model, proposed by Bak, Tang and Wiesenfeld [1] for understanding the mechanism of Self-Organized Criticality (SOC). Although the physical relevance of ASM can be questioned, it is the simplest and most studied one among all other SOC systems. It is believed that, the model is an exactly solvable with all the features of the SOC systems [2]. There are very good reviews on this model, for example see [3, 4].

BTW sandpile model is defined as a simple cellular automata on the square lattice of size $L \times M$. On each site i a variable h_i is defined as its height, taking values $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. System evolves in discrete time: at each step one site is picked randomly and its height is increased by unity. If its height becomes larger than $h_c = 4$, this site is said to be unstable and it relaxes by toppling. The process of toppling is defined as follows: four grains leave the unstable site and each of its four neighbors gets one grain. So the number of grains is conserved during the toppling, except at the boundaries where some of the grains leave the system. If there is any unstable site remaining, it will also topple.

The process of toppling could be stated in another way. If the site i becomes unstable, h_j will be decreased by amount of Δ_{ij} , that is $h_j \rightarrow h_j - \Delta_{ij}$ where

$$\Delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 4, & i = j; \\ -1, & i, j \text{ are neighbors}; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

After a while the system reaches a steady state, in which it shows SOC. It has been shown that in this state, the number of different configurations the system accepts is $\det \Delta$ and the probability of all of them are the same. These configurations are named recurrent configurations in contrast with the transient ones which can only appear in the first steps of evolution, where the system has not yet reached the steady state.

The question is, what is the probability of finding one given cluster in SOC mode? It is possible to show that some sub-configurations are disallowed in SOC mode (e.g. clusters in fig. 1-a). There is an easy way to test whether a given cluster is forbidden or allowed, so the probability of some clusters are exactly equal to zero. Dhar and Majumdar calculated the probability of finding some allowed clusters using a beautiful idea [5]. This method is appropriate only for weakly allowed clusters. These clusters have the property that

*e-mail: mm_moradi@mehr.sharif.edu

†e-mail: rouhani@ipm.ir

decreasing the height of any of their sites, makes them forbidden (such as S_0 in fig. 1-b and all clusters in fig. 1-c and fig. 1-d). The first cluster calculated analytically in [5] was S_0 :

$$P(S_0) = \frac{2}{\pi^2} - \frac{4}{\pi^3} = 0.0736362... \quad (2)$$

A table of some other analytical results can be found in [9]. It is obvious that S_{10} and S_{11} in ref. [9] are not weakly allowed clusters and one can not use this method for them.

Yet there are many other clusters that are not included in this set of clusters, so their probabilities are still undetermined. It seems that some generalization is required for exact calculation of probability of these clusters. Some attempts have been made in this direction, for example in [6] all height probabilities have been calculated.




Figure 1: Some different types of clusters: (a) Forbidden Sub-Configurations. (b) Allowed Clusters (S_0 is also Weakly Allowed Cluster). (c) S_8 , S_9 have exactly the same analytical values but different simulation results. (d) Some of weakly allowed clusters which are in disagreement with analytical results.

Several works have been done based on analytical approach in [5] such as calculation of correlation functions [5], probability of clusters and correlation functions in boundaries [7, 8] and scaling fields [9]. Nevertheless, we focus only on the first problem: "the probability of weakly allowed clusters" because it contains all foundations of analytical approach throughout the literature.

2 Simulation results

The first simulations were done on small lattices and for simple clusters such as S_0 . Extensive simulations for the lattice of size 672×672 were undertaken by Manna in [?], who found $P(S_0) = 0.0736 \pm 0.003$. Grassberger and Manna also performed simulations on some larger lattices, but not with sufficiently high statistics [11].

Although these results are in agreement with analytical result in eq. (2), it seems more clusters should be tested with various sizes and forms. It is also needed to perform more precise simulation using larger lattices and more samples.

We first started with a lattice of size 500×500 and extended it to a 2000×2000 one and measured the probability of clusters introduced in the table of paper [9] for 2,000,000 samples. sampling is started when the system reaches SOC using the burning test [12]. Each new sample is obtained by adding a grain of sand and allowing the system to relax. This process is repeated for 2,000,000 times and we find a distribution function for probability of appearance of any given cluster. The result is typically a Gaussian distribution (see fig. 2).

Statistical analysis shows that for one of the clusters (S_8) there is a deviation from analytical result (fig. 2-a)¹. To confirm that the deviation does exist and is not a simulation error, we have done the same simulation for the cluster S_9 , which topographically is the same as S_8 . Also probability of S_9 is analytically the same as that of S_8 and simulation confirms its analytical result without any remarkable deviation as fig. 2-b.

¹In lattice of size 500×500 , the deviation was not so clear, though one could guess that there is something wrong.

It is also noticeable that the quantity studied by analytical approach, is an average over all recurrent configurations. Standard deviations in fig. 2-a and fig. 2-b are the error in each individual measurement of the sample, so the more appropriate quantity to stand for error bar is the standard error of the mean (σ_m). In our simulations it was generally much less than the error of precision concerning each individual sample which is equal to $\frac{1}{N}$ where N is the number of all attempts to find the specific cluster in each sample. This quantity, therefore, is the best one for estimating the error.

The simulation results for the clusters S_8 and S_9 were obtained :

$$P_{2000 \times 2000}(S_8) = 0.000162467 \pm 0.000000031 \quad \sigma = 0.000003072 \quad \sigma_m = 0.0000000022 \quad (3)$$

$$P_{2000 \times 2000}(S_9) = 0.000173098 \pm 0.000000031 \quad \sigma = 0.000002558 \quad \sigma_m = 0.0000000019 \quad (4)$$

to be compared with the analytical result :

$$P_{\text{Analytic}}(S_8) = P_{\text{Analytic}}(S_9) = 0.000173106... \quad (5)$$

We repeated the simulation on large lattices of size 500×500 , 1000×1000 and 2000×2000 for all clusters of $size \leq 6$. We found that there are more clusters in disagreement with the analytical results (e.g. clusters in fig. 1-d), though they are in a minority.

Repetition of simulation confirms our results and shows that there is a noticeable disagreement between analytical result and simulation. The origin of this disagreement remains to be understood.




Figure 2: Distribution of probability of clusters over 2,000,000 samples on lattice of size 2000×2000 : (a) $P(S_8)$ is in disagreement with analytical value (thick bar). (b) $P(S_9)$ is in good agreement with analytical value.

3 The source of deviation

Either simulation circumstances are not appropriate or something in analytical approach is not sufficiently reliable. In the former, some possible questions are imaginable and we discuss them to rule out this possibility.

One proposal is to do the simulation with more samples, because the number of recurrent configurations is much more than something like 2,000,000 ($\det \Delta \sim (3.21)^{L \times M}$) and so, our samples cover only a small part of configuration space of system. To rule out such a possibility we repeated simulation for a variety of samplings from 100,000 to 10,000,000 samples and no meaningful change was observed in the amount of deviation. In fact, the ergodicity of model makes our work reliable. Furthermore for each sampling, the initial recurrent configuration is generated randomly but the behavior observed in all of them is the same. Therefore this deviation cannot specific to some particular parts of configuration space.

Other critique of our claim may be the difference between the definition of probability of cluster in analytical approach and in our simulations. In analytical method, probability is defined in terms of the number of configurations in which the specific cluster appears in a given place, but in our case it is defined in terms of the number of appearance of the specific cluster in a given configuration. Although this difference

really exists, the average of probability over all places in the former should be equal to the average of probability over all recurrent configurations in the latter. So this can not address our question about the source of deviation. While this argument seems to be enough, we measured probability of clusters S_8 and S_9 directly with the first definition in different areas. In all cases we found the same difference as before between $P(S_8)$ and $P(S_9)$.

The other possible source of error could be finite size of the lattice in simulations, as the analytical values have been calculated exactly for infinite lattice. It is clear that for very small lattices, the calculated quantities do differ noticeably with results of infinite lattice. In larger lattices, finite size effect may also cause a little deviation from infinite case, but this can not be the source of observed deviation. It seems that the finite size effect is much smaller than the observed deviation in our simulation, as it has not appeared in majority of clusters in our simulation circumstances.

Another point about this critique is the fact that the similarity of S_8 and S_9 does not concern only infinite lattice. According to the analytical approach, the probability of appearance of clusters S_8 and S_9 are equal in every lattice and this claim of analytical approach is in considerable disagreement with our simulation results.

Using simulation for lattices with different sizes from 5×5 to 2000×2000 shows that the difference between $P(S_8)$ and $P(S_9)$ not only does not decrease with size, but also increases; whereas for lattice of size 5×5 , the difference between the two values is not statistically significant. But the problem arises quickly and becomes more serious for larger lattices specially because the error bar narrows down.

Finally, we may now focus on the analytical results. There does not seem to be a calculational problem. Therefore we suspect that a fundamental problem is involved which is however obscure to us.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to S. Moghimi-Araghi and M. A. Rajabpour for fruitful discussions.

References

- [1] P. Bak, C. Tang, and K. Wiesenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. 381 (1987) 59
- [2] D. Dhar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 1613 (1990) 64
- [3] E. V. Ivashkevich and V. B. Priezzhev, Physica A 97 (1998) 254
- [4] D. Dhar, Physica A 4 (1999) 263
- [5] S. N. Majumdar and D. Dhar, J. Phys. A L357 (1991) 24
- [6] V. B. Priezzhev, J. Stat. Phys. 955 (1994) 74
- [7] E. V. Ivashkevich, J. Phys. A 3643 (1994) 76
- [8] J. G. Brankov, E. V. Ivashkevich and V. B. Priezzhev, J. Phys. I France 1729 (1993) 3
- [9] S. Mahieu and P. Ruelle, Phys. Rev. E 066130 (2001) 64
- [10] A. Erzan and S. Shina, Preprint ICTP, Trieste (1990)
- [11] P. Grassberger and S. S. Manna, J. Phys. Paris 1077 (1990) 51
- [12] S. N. Majumdar and D. Dhar, Physica A 185 (1992) 129