

Comment on: “Superscaling of Percolation on Rectangular Domains”

Gunnar Pruessner*

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ., Physics Department - Robeson Hall, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0435, USA

Nicholas R. Moloney†

Institute for Theoretical Physics, Eötvös University,
Pázmány Péter sétány 1/a, 1117 Budapest, Hungary, EU

(Dated: February 8, 2020)

In [1], the authors show numerically that spanning and percolation probabilities in two-dimensional systems with different aspect ratios obey a form of “superscaling”. This scaling form makes it possible to relate the percolation properties of a system with one set of parameters (L, ϵ, R) , to a system with another set of parameters.

In this comment, we would like to point out some difficulties with their proposed scaling ansatz and suggest why this remained undetected in their numerical analysis. Starting from the central result for the existence probability Eq. (8), one observes that it cannot account for Cardy’s exact result [2], because it states that E_p is independent of the aspect ratio R at the critical point, where $\epsilon = 0$.

Moreover, a simple analysis shows that the proposed scaling form for E_p does not behave as expected in the limit of large R . This can be seen as follows: The relation $E_p(L, \epsilon, R) = E_p(Lu^{-a/y_t}, \epsilon, Ru)$ follows directly from the scaling assumption for $u > 1$. The left hand side describes the probability of finding a cluster that spans any two opposite sides of a system of size $LR \times L$ at bond density $\rho = \epsilon + \rho_c$, while the right hand side describes the same probability for a system of size $LRu^{1-a/y_t} \times Lu^{-a/y_t}$. Choosing ρ small enough such that $E_p(L, \epsilon, R)$ is very small, it is clear that it must be exceeded at some point by $E_p(Lu^{-a/y_t}, \epsilon, Ru)$ in the limit of large u .

Similar problems apply to the percolation probability P , discussed around Eq. (10) in [1]. Using our earlier results [3], we could verify that the scaling ansatz (10) does not apply at $\epsilon = 0$, see Fig. 1. Also, while $P(L, \epsilon, R) = P(LR, \epsilon, R^{-1})$, this gives for the scaling function F in $P(L, \epsilon, R) \propto (L^{y_t} R^b)^{-x} F(\epsilon L^{y_t} R^b)$ that $F(1) = R^{(2b-y_t)x} F(R^{y_t-2b})$, which leads to a non-trivial scaling function only if $b = y_t/2 = 3/8$, far from $b = 0.05$ [1].

We suggest that these inconsistencies did not show up in the numerical analysis because of the way in which the authors “correct for finite-size effects”. After introducing this correction in Eq. (9), their data analysis is based on an $\epsilon = \rho - \rho_c$ in the scaling function shifted by a small amount to $\epsilon' = \rho - \rho'_c(L, R)$ where $\rho'_c(L, R)$ is defined implicitly by $E_p(L, \rho'_c(L, R) - \rho_c, R) = E_p(L, 0, 1)$. However, this shift is *not a finite size correction* because, *regardless of the size*, it is a necessary adjustment in order

to pro




FIG. 1: Percolation probability at $\rho = \rho_c$ for bond percolation, system size $30000R^{1/2} \times 30000R^{-1/2}$. The full line shows a comparison to Eq. (10) in [1], $P(30000R^{1/2}, 0, R) \propto R^{-\beta(-y_t/2+b)}$ with $y_t = 3/4$, $\beta = 5/36$ and $b = 0.05$.

Although the *shift vanishes in the thermodynamic limit*, $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \rho'_c - \rho_c = 0$, it remains crucial; the *difference* between the values of the observable with and without shift *does not vanish in the thermodynamic limit*, but converges to a finite constant, for example $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} E_p(L, \rho'_c - \rho_c, R) - E_p(L, 0, R) \neq 0$ if $R \neq 1$. This is possible because $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} E_p(L, \rho - \rho_c, R)$ is discontinuous at $\rho - \rho_c = 0$.

Allowing for such a shift undermines the notion of universality: In fact, there is a $\rho'_c(L, R)$ that deviates from ρ_c only by $\mathcal{O}(L^{-y_t})$ such that $E_p(L, \rho'_c - \rho_c, R)$ or $P(L, \rho'_c - \rho_c, R)$ is equal to any arbitrary constant $0 < c < 1$.

What the authors actually show is that, for example, $E_p(L, \epsilon, R) \propto F((\epsilon + \Delta\epsilon(L, R))L^{y_t}R^a)$ where $\Delta\epsilon = \rho'_c - \rho_c$, which is in fact a function of system size and aspect ratio. This limitation of their result becomes even clearer in the other scaling form they suggest which takes “into account higher order corrections to the scaling”, $E_p(L, \epsilon, R) \propto F(c_0(L, R) + \rho c_1(L, R) + \rho^2 c_2(L, R))$. This form, while interesting in itself, is not a form of scaling and therefore should not be called “superscaling”.

GP would like to thank the Alexander von Humboldt foundation as well as the NSF (DMR-0308548/0414122) for support.

*Electronic address: gunnar.pruessner@physics.org

†Electronic address: moloney@general.elte.hu

-
- [1] H. Watanabe, S. Yukawa, N. Ito, and C.-K. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 190601 (2004).
[2] J. Cardy, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **25**, L201 (1992), [hep-th/9111026](#).
[3] N. R. Moloney and G. Pruessner, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 037701 (2003), [cond-mat/0211240](#).