

Home Search Collections Journals About Contact us My IOPscience

The collapse of directed animals

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

1987 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 20 L847

(http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/20/13/007)

View the table of contents for this issue, or go to the journal homepage for more

Download details: IP Address: 129.252.86.83 The article was downloaded on 31/05/2010 at 20:47

Please note that terms and conditions apply.

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

## The collapse of directed animals

## Deepak Dhar

Theoretical Physics Group, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Homi Bhabha Road, Bombay-400005, India

Received 24 June 1987

Abstract. Directed animals on a square lattice with attractive nearest-neighbour and next-nearest-neighbour interactions are considered. Using an equivalence between the collapse problem and the directed site bond percolation problem, the bulk free energy per site is calculated exactly in the collapsed phase. It shows no singularity as the transition is approached from the collapsed side. For the three-dimensional directed animals, bulk free energy per site in the collapsed phase is calculated exactly if the interaction weights are related by an algebraic equation.

Branched polymers in dilute solution are known to undergo a collapse transition for sufficiently strong attractive interaction between monomers. For small attraction strength (i.e. when the polymer is in a good solvent) the polymer structure is ramified and the mean size of a polymer with N monomers varies as  $N^{\nu_a}$  where  $\nu_a$  is believed to be same as the exponent characterising the size of random animals. For strong attraction (i.e. bad solvent) the polymer collapses to a compact globular shape of size  $N^{\nu_c}$  where in d-dimensional space  $\nu_c = 1/d$ . At the transition point, the mean size varies as  $N^{\nu_i}$ , where  $\nu_i$  is, in general different from  $\nu_a$  and  $\nu_c$  and we have  $\nu_a > \nu_i > \nu_c = 1/d$ .

The structure of large-branched polymers below and above the collapse transition is the same as that of large percolation clusters above and below the critical percolation threshold. This suggests that the collapse transition may be in the same universality class as the percolation transition. A Flory-like argument by Family (1984) also suggests a similar conclusion. It is, however, not true in general. In two dimensions the exponent  $\nu_t$  was determined numerically by Derrida and Herrman (1983) and their result is quite different from the exactly known percolation exponent  $\nu_p = \frac{48}{91}$ . In a Potts-model formulation of the branched polymer problem, Coniglio (1983) found that the percolation and collapse fixed points are distinct, the fixed point describing the collapse transition being more stable. This would imply that the collapse transition will be percolation-like only for very special values of coupling constants.

In this letter, we study the collapse transition of directed animals in two and three dimensions. The problem has been studied using Monte Carlo simulations by Lam and Duarte (1986) and Lam (1987). In this special case, we find that the collapse problem is equivalent to the directed percolation problem. In two dimensions, the bulk free energy per site is determined exactly in the collapsed phase. In three dimensions, the result can be generalised, provided the two-body and three-body coupling constants are related by an equation.

Consider first the two-dimensional directed animals, say on a square lattice. A directed animal is a connected cluster of N sites (including the origin) such that a site

(i, j) belongs to the cluster only if it is the origin or if at least one of its predecessor sites (i-1, j) and (i, j-1) belongs to the cluster. Let  $n_{i,j}$  be the occupation number of the site (i, j) (taking values 0 and 1). For any allowed animal configuration A, we define the energy

$$H(A) = -J_1 \sum_{i,j} n_{i,j} (n_{i+1,j} + n_{i,j+1}) - J_2 \sum_{i,j} n_{i,j} n_{i+1,j-1}.$$
 (1)

Here  $J_1$  is the attractive interaction strength between nearest-neighbour sites, and  $J_2$  is the interaction between two sites having a common predecessor. The partition function is then defined to be

$$Z(J_1, J_2, N) = \sum_{A} \exp(-H(A))$$
(2)

where the summation over A extends over all possible directed animal configurations of N sites. The free energy per site is  $f(J_1, J_2)$  defined by taking the thermodynamic limit (Dickman and Schieve 1984, 1986)

$$f(J_1, J_2): \lim_{N \to \infty} -(\log Z(J_1, J_2, N))/N.$$
(3)

Consider now a directed site bond percolation process on this lattice defined as follows. Each bond is, independently of other bonds or sites, present with a probability  $p_{\rm B}$ . We assume that the origin is 'unblocked' and occupied and each site other than the origin is 'unblocked' with a probability  $p_{\rm S}$  (again independent of others). A site can be occupied only if it is unblocked *and* connected by an occupied bond to at least one of its occupied predecessors. The probability that the origin is connected to a finite cluster A of occupied sites in this process is

$$\operatorname{Prob}(A) = p_{\mathrm{S}}^{N-1} p_{\mathrm{B}}^{n_{1}} (1 - q_{\mathrm{B}}^{2})^{n_{2}} (1 - p_{\mathrm{B}} p_{\mathrm{S}})^{n_{3}} (q_{\mathrm{S}} + p_{\mathrm{S}} q_{\mathrm{B}}^{2})^{n_{4}}$$
(4)

where  $n_1(n_2)$  is the number of occupied sites with one (two) occupied predecessors,  $n_3(n_4)$  is the number of unoccupied (i.e. perimeter) sites with one (two) occupied precedessors and  $q_B = 1 - p_B$  and  $q_S = 1 - p_S$ . These numbers  $n_1$ ,  $n_2$ ,  $n_3$  and  $n_4$  are not independent, and can be expressed in terms of three quantities N,  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$  where  $N_1$ is the number of nearest-neighbour site pairs in the cluster A and  $N_2$  is the number of diagonal pairs having a common predecessor. Simple geometry gives (figure 1)

$$n_1 = 2N - N_1 - 2 \tag{5a}$$



Figure 1. A directed site animal on the square lattice. The occupied sites are shown by full circles. Open circles and triangles denote perimeter sites with one and two occupied predecessors respectively. The nearest-neighbour bonds (full lines) have strength  $J_1$  and diagonal bonds (broken lines) have strength  $J_2$ . In the cluster shown N = 16,  $N_1 = 18$ ,  $N_2 = 8$ ,  $n_1 = 12$ ,  $n_2 = 3$ ,  $n_3 = 4$  and  $n_4 = 5$ .

$$n_2 = N_1 - N + 1 \tag{5b}$$

$$n_3 = N_1 - 2N_2 + 2 \tag{5c}$$

$$n_4 = N + N_2 - N_1 - 1. \tag{5d}$$

The thermodynamic weight of the cluster A under the Hamiltonian H is  $\exp(N_1J_1 + N_2J_2)$ , which is the same form as in equation (4). Thus the relative weights between different animal configurations of size N under the Hamiltonian H are exactly the same as in the directed site bond percolation process if we put

$$\exp(J_1) = (1+q_B)(1-p_B p_S)/(q_S + p_S q_B)$$
(6a)

$$\exp(J_2) = (q_{\rm S} + p_{\rm S} q_{\rm B}^2) / (1 - p_{\rm B} p_{\rm S}^2)^2.$$
(6b)

In the percolation problem, the probability that the cluster containing the origin has precisely N sites is obtained by summing equation (4) for all configurations A containing N sites. We thus get

$$\operatorname{Prob}(|A| = N) = \frac{(1+q_{\rm B})(1-p_{\rm B}p_{\rm S})^2}{p_{\rm B}p_{\rm S}(q_{\rm S}+p_{\rm S}q_{\rm B}^2)} \left(\frac{p_{\rm S}p_{\rm B}(q_{\rm S}+p_{\rm S}q_{\rm B}^2)}{(1+q_{\rm B})}\right)^N Z(J_1, J_2, N).$$
(7)

Taking logarithms, and the thermodynamic limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$f(J_1, J_2) = \log\left(\frac{p_{\rm S} p_{\rm B}(q_{\rm S} + p_{\rm S} q_{\rm B}^2)}{(1+q_{\rm B})}\right) + \lim_{N \to \infty} (1/N) \log \operatorname{Prob}(|A| = N).$$
(8)

For  $p_B$  and  $p_S$  sufficiently large (above percolation threshold) it is known that the probability of large finite clusters of N sites decreases as  $\exp(-N^{1-1/d})$  for N tending to infinity (Kunz and Suillard 1978, Stauffer 1979). The second term on the right-hand side of equation (8) is thus zero, and we get in the collapsed phase

$$f(J_1, J_2) = \log\left(\frac{p_{\rm S} p_{\rm B}(q_{\rm S} + p_{\rm S} q_{\rm B}^2)}{1 + q_{\rm B}}\right)$$
(9)

where  $p_s$  and  $p_B$  can be determined in terms of  $J_1$ ,  $J_2$  from equation (6). The right-hand side of equation (9) is a smooth function of  $p_s$  and  $p_B$ , and remains so as  $p_s$  or  $p_B$  are decreased below the critical percolation threshold. Thus the bulk free energy per site  $f(J_1, J_2)$  shows no singularity as the transition is approached from the collapsed phase side. The onset of the transition is signalled by the vanishing of the surface free energy term (the term proportional to  $N^{1-1/d}$  in log Z). The average density of occupied sites in the bulk equals  $P_{\infty}(p_s, p_B)$ , the probability that a randomly chosen site in the corresponding percolation problem belongs to the infinite cluster.

The variables  $p_s$  and  $p_B$  may be eliminated from equation (9), and the result expressed in terms of  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  explicitly. The explicit expression is rather messy, and is omitted here. It simplifies considerably in special cases.

(i)  $J_2 = 0$ . This case corresponds to a pure bond percolation process with  $p_s = 1$ ,  $q_B = (e^{J_1} - 1)^{-1}$  and we get

$$f(J_1, J_2 = 0) = \log(e^{J_1} - 2/(e^{J_1} - 1)^2).$$
(10)

The free energy is non-singular for all  $\exp(J_1) > 2$ . But the critical threshold for the bond percolation problems is known from numerical studies (Kinzel and Yeomans 1981) to be approximately  $q_{BC} = 0.3553$ , which corresponds to  $\exp(J_{1C}) \approx 3.814$ . This agrees well with the Monte Carlo simulations of Lam and Duarte (1986).

Equation (10) may be expanded in powers of  $e^{-J_1}$ . The radius of convergence of the resulting series is clearly  $\frac{1}{2}$ , which is not equal to the critical value. This behaviour is quite unexpected (see, for example, Dickman and Schieve 1984).

(ii)  $J_1 = 0$ . This corresponds to a directed site percolation process with  $p_B = 1$ ,  $q_S = \exp(-J_2)$ . The free energy per site is easily seen to be

$$f(J_1 = 0, J_2) = \log[e^{-J_2}(1 - e^{-J_2})]$$
(11)

which is again valued only for  $e^{-J_2}$  less than its critical value  $e^{-J_2c}$ .

The arguments given above can be easily generalised to three dimensions. Consider a directed animal on the cubic lattice with Hamiltonian given by

$$H = -J_2 N_2 - J_3 N_3 \tag{12}$$

where  $J_2$  and  $J_3$  are interaction strengths, and  $N_2$  and  $N_3$  are the number of sites having two and three occupied predecessors respectively. The thermodynamic weight of this animal in the partition function is  $\exp(N_2J_2 + N_3J_3)$ .

For a directed bond percolation process on this lattice having bond concentration p, it is easy to check that the probability of occurrence of a cluster of N sites having  $N_2$  sites with two predecessors and  $N_3$  sites with three predecessors is

$$q^{3}(pq^{2})^{N-N_{2}-N_{3}-1}(q-q^{3})^{N_{2}}(1-q^{3})^{N_{3}}.$$
(13)

The two problems are thus equivalent if

$$(1+q)/q = e^{J_2} \tag{14a}$$

$$(1+q+q^2)/q^2 = e^{J_3}.$$
 (14b)

Eliminating q, we get the condition for the equivalence to hold is

$$e^{J_3} = e^{2J_2} - e^{J_2} + 1 \tag{15}$$

and the free energy per site in the collapsed phase is

$$f = \log(pq^2) = \log(e^{J_2} - 2/(e^{J_2} - 1)^3).$$
(16)

Equation (15) is a special case of the disorder condition or the cellular automation condition. For values of coupling constants satisfying this condition it is found that the partition function can be evaluated quite simply, and is an algebraic function of the Boltzmann weights. For a recent review, and earlier references on this topic, the reader is referred to a recent paper by Rujan (1987).

I thank M Barma for discussions and P M Lam for correspondence and for communicating his results prior to publication.

## References

Coniglio A 1983 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 16 L163

Derrida B and Herrman H 1983 J. Physique 44 1365

Dickman R and Schieve W C 1984 J. Stat. Phys. 36 435

Family F 1984 J. Stat. Phys. 36 881

Kinzel W and Yeomans J M 1981 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 14 L163

Kunz H and Suillard B 1978 J. Stat. Phys. 19 77

Lam P M 1987 Preprint Köln University

Lam P M and Duarte J A M S 1986 Preprint Köln University

Stauffer D 1979 Phys. Rep. 54 1

Rujan P 1987 J. Stat. Phys. to be published