

Gods come and go, and still the Turtle Moves.  $\square$ 

## Due: Friday, October 28, by 11:59 pm

https://pdodds.w3.uvm.edu/teaching/courses/2022-2023pocsverse/assignments/08/ Some useful reminders: Deliverator: Prof. Peter Sheridan Dodds (contact through Teams) Assistant Deliverator: Dylan Casey (contact through Teams) Office: The Ether Office hours: See Teams calendar Course website: https://pdodds.w3.uvm.edu/teaching/courses/2022-2023pocsverse Overleaf: LaTeX templates and settings for all assignments are available at https://www.overleaf.com/project/631238b0281a33de67fc1c2b.

All parts are worth 3 points unless marked otherwise. Please show all your workingses clearly and list the names of others with whom you <del>conspired</del> collaborated.

For coding, we recommend you improve your skills with Python, R, and/or Julia. The (evil) Deliverator uses (evil) Matlab.

Graduate students are requested to use  $\[mathbb{E}T_{E}X\]$  (or related TEX variant). If you are new to  $\[mathbb{E}T_{E}X\]$ , please endeavor to submit at least n questions per assignment in  $\[mathbb{E}T_{E}X\]$ , where n is the assignment number.

## Assignment submission:

Via Blackboard.

1. (3 + 3)

Repeat the first question from the previous assignment changed from  $\gamma=5/2$  to  $\gamma=3/2.$ 

Now  $1<\gamma<2$  so we should see a very different behavior.

Here's the question reprinted with  $\gamma$  switched to 3/2:

For  $\gamma = 3/2$ , generate n = 1000 sets each of  $N = 10, 10^2, 10^3, 10^4, 10^5$ , and  $10^6$  samples, using  $P_k = ck^{-3/2}$  with k = 1, 2, 3, ...

How do we computationally sample from a discrete probability distribution?

Hint: You can use a continuum approximation to speed things up. In fact, taking the exact continuum version from the first two assignments will work.

- (a) For each value of sample size N, sequentially create n sets of N samples. For each set, determine and record the maximum value of the set's N samples. (You can discard each set once you have found the maximum sample.) You should have k<sub>max,i</sub> for i = 1, 2, ..., n where i is the set number. For each N, plot the n values of k<sub>max,i</sub> as a function of i. If you think of n as time t, you will be plotting a kind of time series. These plots should give a sense of the unevenness of the maximum value of k, a feature of power-law size distributions.
- (b) Now find the average maximum value  $\langle ik_{\max,i} \rangle$  for each N.

The steps again here are:

1. Sample N times from  $P_k$ ;

2. Determine the maximum of the sample,  $k_{\max}$ ;

3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 a total n times and take the average of the n values of  $k_{\max}$  you have obtained.

Plot  $\langle k_{\text{max}} \rangle$  as a function of N on double logarithmic axes, and calculate the scaling using least squares. Report error estimates.

Does your scaling match up with your theoretical estimate for  $\gamma = 3/2$ ?

How to sample from your power law distribution (and similar kinds of beasts):

We now turn our problem of randomly selecting from this distribution into randomly selecting from the uniform distribution. After playing around a little,  $k = 10^6$  seems like a good upper limit for the number of samples we're talking about.

Using Matlab (or some ghastly alternative), we create a cdf for  $P_k$  for  $k = 1, 2, ..., 10^6$  and one final entry  $k > 10^6$  (for which the cdf will be 1).

We generate a random number x and find the value of k for which the cdf is the first to meet or exceed x. This gives us our sample k according to  $P_k$  and we repeat as needed. We would use the exactly normalized  $P_k = \frac{1}{\zeta(3/2)}k^{-3/2}$  where  $\zeta$  is the Riemann zeta function.

Now, we can use a quick and dirty method by approximating  $P_k$  with a continuous function  $P(z) = (\gamma - 1)z^{-\gamma}$  for  $z \ge 1$  (we have used the normalization coefficient found in assignment 1 for a = 1 and  $b = \infty$ ). Writing F(z) as the cdf for P(z), we have  $F(z) = 1 - z^{-(\gamma-1)} = 1 - z^{-1/2}$ . Inverting, we obtain  $z = [1 - F(z)]^{-2}$ . We replace F(z) with our random number x and round the value of z to finally get an estimate of k.

2. The 1-*d* theoretical percolation problem:

Consider an infinite 1-d lattice forest with a tree present at any site with probability p.

- (a) Find the distribution of forest sizes as a function of p. Do this by moving along the 1-d world and figuring out the probability that any forest you enter will extend for a total length  $\ell$ .
- (b) Find  $p_c$ , the critical probability for which a giant component exists. Hint: One way to find critical points is to determine when certain average quantities explode. Compute  $\langle l \rangle$  and find p such that this expression goes boom (if it does).
- 3. Show analytically that the critical probability for site percolation on a triangular lattice is  $p_c = 1/2$ .

## Hint—Real-space renormalization gets it done.:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JlkbU5U7QqU

4. (3 + 3)

## Coding, it's what's for breakfast:

(a) Percolation in two dimensions (2-d) on a simple square lattice provides a classic, nutritious example of a phase transition.

Your mission, whether or not you choose to accept it, is to code up and analyse the L by L square lattice percolation model for varying L.

Take L = 20, 50, 100, 200, 500, and 1000.

(Go higher if you feel L = 1000 is for mere mortals.)

(Go lower if your code explodes.)

Let's continue with the tree obsession. A site has a tree with probability p, and a sheep grazing on what's left of a tree with probability 1 - p.

Forests are defined as any connected component of trees bordered by sheep, where connections are possible with a site's four nearest neighbors on a lattice.

Each square lattice is to be considered as a landscape on which forests and sheep co-exist.

Do not bagelize (or doughnutize) the landscape (no periodic boundary conditions—boundaries are boundaries).

(Note: this set up is called site percolation. Bond percolation is the alternate case when all links between neighboring sites exist with probability p.) Steps:

i. For each L, run  $N_{\text{tests}}$ =100 tests for occupation probability p moving from 0 to 1 in increments of  $10^{-2}$ . (As for L, you may use a smaller or larger increment depending on how things go.)

- ii. Determine the fractional size of the largest connected forest for each of the  $N_{\rm tests}$ , and find the average of these,  $S_{\rm avg}$ .
- iii. On a single figure, for each L, plot the average  $S_{\text{avg}}$  as a function of p.
- (b) Comment on how  $S_{avg}(p; N)$  changes as a function of L and estimate the critical probability  $p_c$  (the percolation threshold).

For the few Matlabbers, a helpful reuse of code (intended for black and white image analysis): You can use Matlab's bwconncomp to find the sizes of components. Very nice.

- 5. (3 + 3)
  - (a) Using your model from the previous question and your estimate of  $p_c$ , plot the distribution of forest sizes (meaning cluster sizes) for  $p \simeq p_c$  for the largest L your code and psychological makeup can withstand. (You can average the distribution over separate simulations.)

Comment on what kind of distribution you find.

(b) Repeat the above for  $p = p_c/2$  and  $p = p_c + (1 - p_c)/2$ , i.e., well below and well above  $p_c$ .

Produce plots for both cases, and again, comment on what you find.