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1. Introduction

Lattice self-avoiding walk models of monodisperse branched polymers of fixed connectivity or topology have been studied since the 1970s and remain of considerable interest in the statistical mechanics of polymeric systems. The scaling exponents of the partition function is a particular quantity of interest in these models, and they have been calculated for star polymers models both by computer \footnote{[1,6,10,11,17,20,21,33,35]} and using field theoretic approaches \footnote{[5,16,18,19,25]}.

In this paper we revisit the numerical estimation of lattice star scaling exponents, using a parallel implementation of flatGARM \footnote{[2,13,23]} similar to the parallel implementation of flatPERM \footnote{[6,22]}, as done in reference \footnote{[2]}. We also test some of the predictions in reference \footnote{[5]} for monodisperse acyclic branched polymers using a parallel implementation of the Wang-Landau algorithm \footnote{[32,37,39]}.
An \( f \)-star graph is an acyclic simple graph with one vertex of degree \( f \) (the central vertex), and \( f \) vertices of degree 1. The \( f \)-star graph has \( f \) arms, each connecting the central vertex to the vertex of degree 1. In figure 1 two \( f \)-star graphs are shown, namely a 3-star and a 5-star.

A lattice \( f \)-star is a lattice embedding of an \( f \)-star graph such that each arm is a self-avoiding walk from the central vertex of degree \( f \) to a vertex of degree 1. The arms of the embedded star are also mutually avoiding (but they share the single central vertex as the origin).

A lattice \( f \)-star is strictly uniform if its \( f \) arms all have the exact same length (number of edges or steps). The length of a lattice star is the total number of steps in all the arms of the star (that is, the sum of the lengths of the arms). If a strictly uniform \( f \)-star has length \( n \), then \( f \) is a divisor of \( n \).

A lattice \( f \)-star is almost uniform if its longest arm is exactly one step longer than its shortest arm. That is, if the \( j \)-th arm has \( n_j \) steps, then the \( f \)-star has length \( n = n_1 + n_2 + \ldots + n_f \) and it is almost uniform if \( \max\{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_f\} = 1 + \min\{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_f\} \).

Denote by \( s_n^{(f)} \) the number of monodisperse lattice \( f \)-stars of length \( n \) counted with the central vertex fixed at the origin. Notice that \( s_n^{(f)} \) is the number of strictly uniform \( f \)-stars and \( s_{nf+k}^{(f)} \) is the number of almost uniform \( f \)-stars of length \( nf+k \) for each fixed \( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\} \).

If \( f = 1 \) or \( f = 2 \), then a monodisperse \( f \)-star is reduced to either a self-avoiding walk from the origin (when \( f = 1 \)), or a self-avoiding walk with its middle vertex at the origin (if \( f = 2 \) and it is strictly uniform), or one of its middle vertices at the origin (if \( f = 2 \) and it is almost uniform). This shows that the number of 1-stars of length \( n \) is equal to \( c_n \), the number of self-avoiding walks of length \( n \) from the origin (so that \( s_n^{(1)} = c_n \)). The number of strictly uniform 2-stars of (even) length \( n \) is given by \( c_n \) (with \( n \) even), and the number of almost uniform 2-stars of (odd) length \( n \) is given by \( 2c_n \).
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(with \( n \) odd). That is, \( s^{(2)}_{2n} = c_{2n} \) and \( s^{(2)}_{2n+1} = 2c_{2n+1} \). In other words, a symmetry factor of 2 appears in the two cases of monodisperse 2-stars. In a similar way, symmetry factors will appear when monodisperse \( f \)-stars are counted, we give more details below.

If \( c_n \) is the number of self-avoiding walks from the origin in the hypercubic lattice, then the growth constant \( \mu_d \) is given by the limit

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log c_n = \log \mu_d. \tag{1}
\]

Asymptotically there is evidence that

\[
c_n = C n^{\gamma-1} \mu_d^n (1 + o(1)) \tag{2}
\]

where \( \gamma \) is the entropic exponent. The exact value \( \gamma = \frac{43}{32} \) is known in two dimensions [5], and numerical simulations show that \( \gamma \approx 1.15698(34) \) in three dimensions [26].

It is known that the growth constant \( \mu_d \) of strictly uniform \( f \)-stars is independent of \( f \) and is given by

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n_f} \log s^{(f)}_{nf} = \log \mu_d, \tag{3}
\]

where \( \mu_d \) is the growth constant of the self-avoiding walk defined in equation (1) [29, 31, 33, 34]. Methods similar to those in references [30, 33] can be used to prove that the limit exists and is equal to \( \log \mu_d \) for monodisperse lattice \( f \)-stars (when the limit in equation (3) is taken through \( \mathbb{N} \)). That is, the growth constant of monodisperse lattice \( f \)-stars is given by

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log s^{(f)}_n = \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{mf+k} \log s^{(f)}_{mf+k} = \log \mu_d \tag{4}
\]

for any \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( f \in \mathbb{N} \).

Monodisperse lattice \( f \)-stars of length \( n \) are put in classes of stars of lengths \( n = mf+k \) for \( k \in \{0,1,2,\ldots,f-1\} \). If \( k = 0 \) then the class of strictly uniform \( f \)-stars is obtained. For values \( 1 \leq k < f \) the \( f \)-stars are almost uniform. Similar to equation (2) it is thought that for \( n = mf+k \),

\[
s^{(f)}_{n} = s^{(f)}_{mf+k} = C^{(f)}_k n^{\gamma_f-1} \mu_d^n (1 + o(1)), \tag{5}
\]

for \( 1 \leq f \leq 2d \). If \( f > 2d \) then \( s^{(f)}_n \) can be defined by introducing a more complex central node (see figure 3). For values of \( k \in \{0,1,\ldots,f-1\} \) we will notice a persistent parity effect in our data, so that \( C^{(f)}_k \) should be dependent on \( k \) and we call the class for each \( k \) a parity class. The entropic exponent \( \gamma_f \) is known to be dependent on the number of arms [5]. Less is known about the amplitude \( C^{(f)}_k \) and our data in this paper will show that it is dependent on both the class (given by \( k \)) and the number of arms \( f \).

The entropic exponent \( \gamma_f \) of lattice \( f \)-stars is related to vertex exponents \( \sigma_f \). The exponent \( \sigma_1 \) is associated with end-vertices of degree 1 (namely end-points of arms or branches). The vertex exponents \( \sigma_f \) with \( f \geq 3 \) are associated with central nodes or vertices of degree \( f \) in lattice stars, or with nodes or vertices where several (at least 3) branches meet in branched structures.

Vertices associated with vertex exponents are shown in figure (1). For example, a 3-star has one central vertex of degree 3, and three end-vertices, and \( \gamma_3-1 \) is thought
to be given by $\sigma_3 + 3 \sigma_1$ (since the 3-star has one vertex of degree 3 and three vertices of degree 1. More generally, for $f$-stars,

$$\gamma_f - 1 = \sigma_f + f \sigma_1. \tag{6}$$

If $f = 1$ then equation (5) reduces to equation (2), and the result is that $\gamma - 1 = 2 \sigma_1$. If $f = 2$, then the star has two arms, and so is still a self-avoiding walk (albeit with the origin in its middle or near middle vertex). In this case $\sigma_2 + 2 \sigma_1 = \gamma - 1$ trivially. This shows that $2 \sigma_1 = \gamma - 1$ and $\sigma_2 = 0$.

Exact values of the other vertex exponents are known in two dimensions [5]. These are given by

$$\sigma_f = \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{4} f - \frac{9}{64} f^2. \tag{7}$$

Exact values and estimates of $\sigma_f$ in two dimensions are shown for $f \leq 6$ in table 1.

**Table 1.** Vertex exponents of $f$-stars in 2 dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$d = 2$ (Exact)</th>
<th>[35]</th>
<th>This work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1$</td>
<td>11/64</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1728(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_3$</td>
<td>-29/64</td>
<td>-0.45(2)</td>
<td>-0.4528(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_4$</td>
<td>-19/16</td>
<td>-1.17(4)</td>
<td>-1.196(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_5$</td>
<td>-141/64</td>
<td>-2.14(4)</td>
<td>-2.213(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_6$</td>
<td>-7/2</td>
<td>-3.36(5)</td>
<td>-3.512(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The best approaches to estimate $\sigma_f$ in three dimensions are numerical and the results from several studies are listed in table 2. These estimates were obtained using Monte Carlo approaches in various lattices, for example the results in reference [11] were obtained from simulations in the face-centered cubic lattice. Estimates in reference [28] were calculated for table 2 by taking the best estimate for $\gamma$, namely $\gamma = 1.15698(34)$ [26].

**Table 2.** Vertex exponents of $f$-stars in 3 dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>[35]</th>
<th>[1]</th>
<th>[28]</th>
<th>This work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0855(5)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0789(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_3$</td>
<td>-0.19(3)</td>
<td>-0.1675(5)</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.204(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_4$</td>
<td>-0.44(3)</td>
<td>-0.463(1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-0.499(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_5$</td>
<td>-0.85(5)</td>
<td>-0.8605(5)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-0.847(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_6$</td>
<td>-1.28(5)</td>
<td>-1.353(7)</td>
<td>-1.401</td>
<td>-1.281(29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant work using renormalization methods and the $\epsilon$-expansion [5,25] gives the estimate, in our notation,

$$\sigma_f + f \sigma_1 = \nu(\eta_f - f \eta_2) \tag{8}$$
for vertex exponents in three dimensions. The numbers $\eta_f$ were calculated to $O(\epsilon^3)$ \[25\]. To second order in $\epsilon$,

$$
\eta_f = -\frac{5}{8} f (f - 1) \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{32}(8f - 25) + O(\epsilon^2)\right).
$$

(9)

Since $2\sigma_1 = \gamma - 1$, and using a second order $\epsilon$-expansion for $\gamma$ (see reference \[16\]), the following second order $\epsilon$-expansion for $\sigma_f$ is obtained:

$$
\sigma_f = \frac{\epsilon}{16} f (2 - f) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{512} f (f - 2) (8f - 21) + O(\epsilon^3).
$$

(10)

Putting $\epsilon = 1$ should give estimates in three dimensions. In reference \[27\] equation (9) was extended by calculating terms up to order $\epsilon^4$. Predictions using the $\epsilon$-expansion for $\sigma_f$ in three dimensions to order $\epsilon^k$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are listed in table 3. The $\epsilon^1$ and $\epsilon^2$ approximations are obtained from equation (10), while the $\epsilon^3$ and $\epsilon^4$ estimates follow from reference \[27\]. A $[3/2]$ Padé approximation is also shown, and we determined it by a Borel resummation of the order $\epsilon^4$ expansion and using a Padé approximant to recalculate the exponents. The results are shown in the sixth column and are very good for $f \leq 4$, but deviate significantly from the numerical data for $f = 5$ and $f = 6$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$\epsilon^1$ [16]</th>
<th>$\epsilon^2$ [16]</th>
<th>$\epsilon^3$ [27]</th>
<th>$\epsilon^4$ [27]</th>
<th>Padé$[3/2]$</th>
<th>This work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1$</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td>0.0879</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>0.1425</td>
<td>0.0798</td>
<td>0.0789(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_3$</td>
<td>-0.1875</td>
<td>-0.1699</td>
<td>-0.2265</td>
<td>-0.1094</td>
<td>-0.2026</td>
<td>-0.204(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_4$</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.3281</td>
<td>-0.9037</td>
<td>0.9925</td>
<td>-0.5079</td>
<td>-0.499(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_5$</td>
<td>-0.9375</td>
<td>-0.3809</td>
<td>-2.5321</td>
<td>6.0673</td>
<td>-0.8964</td>
<td>-0.847(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_6$</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.2344</td>
<td>-5.8322</td>
<td>20.1822</td>
<td>-1.3594</td>
<td>-1.281(29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asymptotically the vertex exponent $\sigma_f$ is believed to change with $f$ as $[20, 36]$

$$
\sigma_f \simeq -f \sigma_1 + O(f^{-3/2}).
$$

(11)

Comparison to equation (10) suggests that the $\epsilon$-expansion should break down quickly with increasing $f$, as the order $\epsilon^n$ term is seen to grow as $O(f^{n+1})$. Moreover, it seems that the $\epsilon$-expansion cannot be improved by calculating ever higher order corrections, as those will have coefficients with ever higher powers of $f$, and so will increase in size with increasing $f$. This may give a divergent series which apparently approximates $\sigma_f$ best at the $\epsilon^1$ level for large values of $f$. However, resummation techniques do help getting better estimates, but even these are limited for large $f$, and by the increasing complexity of calculating ever longer $\epsilon$-expansions. See, for example, chapter 16 in reference \[15\].

1.1. Uniform acyclic branched structures (uniform trees)

Models of branched polymeric structures are lattice networks with connectivities or topologies denoted by $\mathcal{T}$. A lattice network consists of branches which are self-avoiding walks joining vertices of degrees equal to 1 or bigger than or equal to 3. The underlying
connectivity of a lattice network is denoted by a graph. This may be, for example, one of the cases shown in figure 1. Lattice f-stars are examples of lattice networks of fixed connectivity, and so are the other cases shown in figure 1. These cases include a comb \( C \), and two brushes \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \).

A lattice network is strictly uniform if all the branches are self-avoiding walks of the same length. If a strictly uniform lattice network of connectivity \( G \) has \( b \) branches, then the total number of such networks, equivalent under translations in the lattice, is denoted by \( c_n(G) \), and it is generally accepted that 

\[
c_n(G) = C_G n^{\gamma_G - 1} \mu_d^n \tag{12}
\]

The growth constant \( \mu_d \) is equal to that of self-avoiding walks \([29-31,34]\). The relation of the scaling exponent \( \gamma_G \) for a general network connectivity \( G \) with the star vertex exponents is given by the relation

\[
\gamma_G - 1 = \sum_{f \geq 1} m_f \sigma_f - c(G) \, d \nu, \tag{13}
\]

where \( m_f \) is the number of vertices of degree \( f \), and where \( c(G) \) is the cyclomatic index (the number of independent cycles) in the network. The models in figure 1 are acyclic, and by the above have exponents given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_C - 1 &= 4 \sigma_1 + 2 \sigma_3, \\
\gamma_{B_1} - 1 &= 5 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4, \\
\gamma_{B_2} - 1 &= 6 \sigma_1 + 2 \sigma_4. \tag{14}
\end{align*}
\]

For example, substituting for the \( \sigma_f \) their exact values gives \( \gamma_C - 1 = -\frac{7}{32} \) in two dimensions. The underlying assumption is that the \( \sigma_f \) are independent of the connectivity of the uniform branched polymer so that the presence of other nodes of given degree does not affect the value of the vertex exponent. For large \( n \) this is a reasonable assumption since the distance between any two branch points in the lattice graph increases as \( O(n^{\nu_d}) \) (where \( \nu_d \) is the metric exponent in dimension \( d \)).

Our results for lattice networks are shown in table 4. In the square lattice our estimates for \( \gamma_G - 1 \) are very close to the exact results. In the cubic lattice the predicted \( \epsilon \)-expansion results (at order \( \epsilon \)) deviate from the numerical results. Higher order \( \epsilon \)-expansion estimates do not improve these. The predictions by equation (14) are obtained by using our best estimates for \( \sigma_f \) in table 3 while the estimates in the final column were obtained by analysing our data for networks in section 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( G )</th>
<th>Square Lattice</th>
<th>Cubic Lattice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exact</td>
<td>This work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C )</td>
<td>(-7/32)</td>
<td>(-0.220(21))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_1 )</td>
<td>(-25/32)</td>
<td>(-0.781(45))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_2 )</td>
<td>(-43/32)</td>
<td>(-1.337(42))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2. Organisation of this paper

In this paper our main aim is to obtain accurate estimates of the numerical values of the vertex exponents $\sigma_f$ for $f \in \{1, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ in two and three dimensions, and to use data collected on the branched structures with connectivities $\{C, B_1, B_2\}$ in figure 1 to test the values determined from lattice stars.

Sampling of lattice stars using a parallel implementation of the flatGARM algorithm [2,23] is discussed in section 2, and our results for lattice stars are discussed in sections 3 and 4. Square lattice results are analysed in section 3 and cubic lattice results are examined in section 4. In these sections we give the analysis of our data and explain the calculation of numerical estimates for vertex exponents. Our best estimates of the vertex exponents are listed in the last columns of tables 1, 2 and 3. In the square lattice (table 1) our estimates are consistent with the exact values of the vertex exponents. Our results in the cubic lattice are close to those in references [35], [1] and [28] (see table 2), and collectively these results deviate from the predicted $\epsilon$-expansion values shown in table 3 up to order $\epsilon^4$, exposing short-comings in that approach.

The sampling of branched structures using the Wang-Landau algorithm is explained in section 5 and numerical results for the connectivities $\{C, B_1, B_2\}$ are given in section 5.1 in the square lattice, and in section 5.2 in the cubic lattice. Our results are consistent with the values determined by equations (13) and (14) for acyclic networks. The values of vertex exponents determined by analysing these data also are consistent with the values of the vertex exponents determined by analysis data for lattice stars, in both the square and cubic lattices.

We conclude the paper with a few final comments on amplitudes in section 6.

2. GARM sampling of lattice stars

We implemented the GARM algorithm [23] to sample monodisperse $f$-stars in the square and cubic lattices. The algorithm grows stars by recursively appending steps (edges) to each arm in turn.

The implementation of the algorithm for a 3-star is shown in figure 2. This 3-star has been grown to total length 28. The steps along the three arms are labeled in the order they were appended. For example, the steps along the arm labeled 1, were added first, fourth, seventh, tenth, and so on, giving the sequence of labels (1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28) along the arm. The labellings along the other two arms are similarly obtained.

More explicitly, consider growing a 3-star from the origin in the square lattice. A first step can be added to the trivial 3-star of length 0 consisting of only the origin in one of four possible ways. These possible steps is the atmosphere of the origin. Once the first step (labeled 1) is added, the second step can be added in one of three possible ways incident with the origin, and the third step can be added in one of two possible ways, also incident with the origin.
The origin to the vertex of degree 3 (for 5-stars), or of degree 4 (for 6-stars), is not the origin, or from a vertex nearest neighbour of the origin. The step (or edge) joining was used. These are illustrated in figure 3. In each case the arms of the star grow from the square lattice, and \( 3 \leq f \) in the cubic lattice, was done in this way.

Figure 2. Growing a lattice star by GARM. The three arms are labeled by \( \{1, 2, 3\} \) and steps are added cyclically in the order shown by the labels on the steps. The first step is added to the origin to start growing the first arm, then the second, and then the third. This is followed by adding the fourth step to the first arm, and so on, so that step \( m \) is appended to arm \( k \) where \( m = jf + k \) where \( 1 \leq k \leq f \). This elementary move is implemented using Rosenbluth dynamics \[24\], which with enrichment and pruning gives a flat histogram GARM algorithm \[23\] for lattice stars. This algorithm was implemented using the parallel implementation in reference \[2\]. Notice that only monodisperse (uniform or almost uniform) lattice stars are sampled by this algorithm.

These first three steps of the 3-star are the first steps along each of the arms of the star. The fourth step is appended to the first step, and then the algorithm proceeds cyclically by adding step five to step two, and so on. In figure 2 the 29-th step is about to be appended to the 26-th step in a partially grown 3-star. In this example there are three possible places (this is the atmosphere of the star) for the 29-th step. The step is added by selecting one of the three possible steps in the atmosphere with uniform probability. If the atmosphere is empty, then the star cannot grow, and it is abandoned and a new sequence of stars is grown, starting from the origin. In this way the algorithm produces a sequences of monodisperse 3-stars from a starting state (normally the empty star composed of only the vertex at the origin). Sampling of \( f \)-stars with \( 3 \leq f \leq 4 \) in the square lattice, and \( 3 \leq f \leq 6 \) in the cubic lattice, was done in this way.

In the case of 5-stars and 6-stars in the square lattice a more complex central vertex was used. These are illustrated in figure 3. In each case the arms of the star grow from the origin, or from a vertex nearest neighbour of the origin. The step (or edge) joining the origin to the vertex of degree 3 (for 5-stars), or of degree 4 (for 6-stars), is not counted as part of the length of the star.

Details of the GARM implementation of this algorithm then proceed as in reference
The GARM algorithm is an approximate enumeration algorithm estimating the number of stars of given size and class. The symmetry factors are given by the number of ways $f$-stars of given size and class can be grown by the algorithm.

In order to determine the symmetry factor, first note that the algorithm labels steps (or edges) in the order they are appended to the star (as shown in figure 2).

In the case of strictly uniform 3-stars the steps along each arm will get the sequence of labels $S_1 = (1, 4, 7, 10, \ldots, 3n+1, \ldots)$, or $S_2 = (2, 5, 8, \ldots, 3n+2, \ldots)$ or $S_3 = (3, 6, 9, \ldots, 3n, \ldots)$, depending on the order the arms are grown. Since there are three arms, the sequences $S_1$, $S_2$ and $S_3$ can be put on them in $3!$ different ways, so that the algorithm has $3!$ different ways of growing a given strictly uniform 3-star. Generally, a strictly uniform $f$-star can be grown in $f!$ distinct ways.

In the case of almost uniform 3-stars the symmetry factors are obtained as follows. Either there is a unique longest arm, or a unique shortest arm. If there is a unique longest arm, then it must be labeled with $S_1$, since its growth was initiated first. The other two arms are of equal length, and are labeled with $S_2$ and $S_3$ in two different ways. This shows that these almost uniform 3-stars can each be grown in 2 different ways by the algorithm. Similarly, if there is a unique shortest arm, then it must be labeled with $S_3$, and the other arms are labeled in two different ways by $S_1$ and $S_2$. Thus, these almost uniform 3-stars can be grown in 2 ways by the algorithm and so.

Figure 3. A uniform lattice 5-star and 6-star in the square lattice. The origin is indicated, and instead of having a central vertex, a more complicated center is used to accommodate the arms.
carry a symmetry factor of 2.

2.2. Symmetry factors in \( d = 2 \) for \( f \leq 4 \) and in \( d = 3 \) for \( f \leq 6 \)

We now generalise the above to almost uniform \( f \)-stars. A monodisperse \( f \)-star of length \( n = fm+k \) has \( k \) longest arms of length \( \lfloor n/f \rfloor \) and \( f-k \) shortest arms of length \( \lceil n/f \rceil \).

The growth of the longest arms must be initiated first by the algorithm in one of \( k! \) ways, and the remaining \( f-k \) shortest arms are initiated last by the algorithm in one of \( (f-k)! \) ways. This gives the symmetry factor \( k!(f-k)! \). For example, if \( f = 3 \) and \( k = 0 \), then we have strictly uniform 3-stars with symmetry factor 3!. If \( f = 3 \) and \( k = 1 \) or \( k = 2 \), then we recover the symmetry factor 2! as argued above.

In other words, since the approximate enumeration by the algorithm over-estimates the number of mono-disperse \( f \)-stars of length \( n = mf+k \) (where \( 0 \leq k < f \)) by a factor \( k!(f-k)! \) for \( n \geq f \), the algorithm estimates the number

\[
\nu_n^{(f)} = k!(f-k)! s_n^{(f)} = k!(f-k)! C_k^{(f)} n^{\sigma_f + f \sigma_1} \mu_d^{(n)} (1 + o(1))
\]

by equation (15) for \( n \geq f \). While the exponents \( \sigma_f \) and \( \sigma_1 \), and the growth constant \( \mu_d \), are independent of \( f \) and \( k \), the amplitude \( C_k^{(f)} \) can only be extracted if account is taken of the symmetry factor \( k!(f-k)! \). Introduce the amplitude \( U^{(f)} \) for \( f \)-stars counted by the algorithm (and so uncorrected by the symmetry factors). Then

\[
\nu_n^{(f)} = U^{(f)} n^{\sigma_f + f \sigma_1} \mu_d^{(n)} (1 + o(1)),
\]

and \( U^{(f)} \) is related to \( C_k^{(f)} \) in equation (15) by

\[
U^{(f)} = k!(f-k)! C_k^{(f)}.
\]

Our data will show that \( U^{(f)} \) is not dependent on \( k \), so the coefficients \( C_k^{(f)} \) can be estimated for each \( k \) by first estimating \( U^{(f)} \).

In table [3] an example of our data is given for monodisperse square lattice 4-stars up to length 12. These estimates were obtained by sampling 4-stars using parallel flatGARM [2, 23] along 4 parallel sequences with \( 10^9 \) started stars per sequence for a total of \( 4 \times 10^9 \) iterations. Data were collected for 4-stars to length 4000 (or 1000 steps per arm). The data in the second column is for \( u_n^{(4)} \), the approximate number of 4-stars, uncorrected for symmetry factors, estimated by the algorithm. These data are rounded to the nearest integer, except for the data point at \( n = 12 \). The symmetry factor is given in the third column, and the last column is the actual approximate number of 4-stars to length 12 in the square lattice, corrected for overcounting due to the symmetry factor.

We notice a strong parity effect in the last column, and our data show that this persists for larger values of \( n \).

The function \( u_n^{(f)} \) (with \( f = 4 \)) grows steadily in table [3]. Generally, by equation (15), \( u_n^{(f)} \sim n^{\sigma_f + f \sigma_1} \mu_d^{(n)} \), and by analysing the data for \( u_n^{(f)} \), estimates of the vertex exponents \( \sigma_f \) can be made. By accounting for the symmetry factors, amplitudes \( C_k^{(f)} \) in equation (5) for each of the parity classes can be estimated.

In figure 4 the ratio of \( f \)-stars to self-avoiding walks, \( u_n^{(4)}/c_n \), is plotted as a function on \( n \) on a log-log scale. Parity effects die down quickly with increasing \( n \) and the curve
Table 5. Monodisperse 4-stars in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$u_n^{(4)}$</th>
<th>Symmetry factor</th>
<th>$s_n^{(4)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2!</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3!</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1!3!</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2!2!</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>3!1!</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>4!</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>1!3!</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6472</td>
<td>2!2!</td>
<td>1618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14520</td>
<td>3!1!</td>
<td>2420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>31128</td>
<td>4!</td>
<td>1297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

becomes an almost straight line (as predicted by the asymptotic expressions for $c_n$ in equation (2) and for $u_n^{(f)}$ in equation (16)). However, if $c_n^{(f)}$ is extracted from our data, and a similar plot created, a strong and persistent parity effect will remain in the plot for all values of $n$.

In the next sections we shall estimate the vertex exponents $\sigma_f$ from our data by analysing $u_n^{(f)}$. The amplitudes $C_k^{(f)}$ in equation (5) will be determined by correcting our data for the symmetry factors.

2.3. Symmetry factors in $d = 2$ for $f = 5$ and $f = 6$

Stars with $f > 2d$ can be embedded in the $d$-dimensional hypercubic lattice by using more generalised “central nodes”. In this paper, the central nodes of 5-stars and 6-stars in the square lattice are illustrated in figure 3 - the central node occupies two nearest neighbour lattice sites and it can accommodate up to 6 arms to form a 6-star.

A 5-star in the square lattice with central node shown in the left panel of figure 3 will be strictly uniform if its 5 arms (not counting the extra step joining the two vertices of degrees 3 and 4) are of equal length. This star will have length (total number of edges) $5k+1$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots,$. As before, the length of an arm of the star is the total number of edges in it (so that the extra edge is not part of any arm). Therefore, almost uniform 5-stars have their longest arm one step longer than their shortest arm. Collectively, uniform and almost uniform 5-stars compose the set of monodisperse 5-stars.

These 5-stars are grown as follows. The initial steps of the first three arms are incident with the origin $\vec{0}$. An extra step is then added between the origin and the last remaining open vertex $\vec{v}$ adjacent to it. The fourth arm is initiated by appending a step to $\vec{v}$, and the fifth arm is similarly initiated by appending another step to $\vec{v}$. This initiates all the arms of the $f$-star, and the algorithm then proceeds by adding steps in turn to each of the arms, growing monodisperse 5-stars which are strictly uniform if the
length (the total number of steps, including the extra step (0, $\vec{v}$)) is $n = 5m+1$ (each arm has length $m$).

As before, the number of 5-stars in the square lattice of length $n$ is denoted $u_n^{(5)}$, and there are symmetry factors $V_k^{(5)}$ contributing to $u_n^{(5)}$ since the arms are labeled in the order they are grown by the flatGARM algorithm.

The symmetry factor of strictly uniform 5-stars is obtained by noting that the three arms incident with the origin can be grown in $3!$ different orders, and the fourth and fifth arms from the secondary node $\vec{v}$ of degree 3 in $2!$ ways. This gives a symmetry factor $3!2!$ for strictly uniform 5-stars.

In the case of almost uniform 5-stars a similar analysis gives the symmetry factors

$$V_k^{(5)} = \begin{cases} (3 - k)! k!2!, & \text{if } 0 \leq k < 3; \\ 3! (5 - k)! (k - 3)!, & \text{if } 3 \leq k \leq 4. \end{cases}$$

(18)

for 5-stars of lengths $n = 5m+1+k$ where $n \geq 6$.

The number of 5-stars counted by the algorithm is denoted by $u_n^{(5)}$ and they are listed in table 6 for lengths up to $n = 12$. The corresponding symmetry factors are listed in the third column of this table. After initial variation for short 5-stars, a periodic pattern for the symmetry factors emerges for longer 5-stars. The numbers $u_n^{(5)}$ are related to $s_n^{(5)}$ by

$$u_{n_{5m+1+k}}^{(5)} = u_n^{(5)} = V_k^{(5)} s_n^{(5)} = V_k^{(5)} C_k^{(5)} n^{\sigma_5+5\sigma_1} \mu_d^n (1 + o(1))$$

(19)
where \( U^{(5)} = V_k^{(5)} C_k^{(5)} \) is the amplitude.

### Table 6. Monodisperse 5-stars and 6-stars in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( u^{(5)}_n )</th>
<th>( V_k^{(5)} )</th>
<th>( s_n^{(5)} )</th>
<th>( u^{(6)}_n )</th>
<th>( V_k^{(6)} )</th>
<th>( s_n^{(6)} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2!</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2!</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3!</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3!</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3!</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3!</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3!2!</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3!2!</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>22!</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>22!</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>22!</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>23!</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>3!2!</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>3!3!</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3888.6</td>
<td>3!1!</td>
<td>648.1</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>3!3!</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7777.4</td>
<td>3!2!</td>
<td>648.1</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>3!2!</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18083.3</td>
<td>22!</td>
<td>4520.8</td>
<td>5375.9</td>
<td>3!2!</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The central nodes of a square lattice 6-star are shown in figure [3]. The initial steps of the first three arms are incident with the origin \( \vec{0} \). An extra step is then added between the origin and the last remaining open vertex \( \vec{v} \) adjacent to it. The fourth arm is then initiated by appending a step to \( \vec{v} \), and the fifth and sixth arms are similarly initiated by appending two additional steps to \( \vec{v} \). At this point there are seven steps, and \( \vec{0} \) and \( \vec{v} \) are the central nodes, each of degree 4. There are six end-vertices (each of degree equal to one), and the six arms of the 6-star will be grown by appending new steps to each in turn. This grows monodisperse 6-stars which are strictly uniform if their length (the total number of steps, including the extra step \( (0, \vec{v}) \)) is \( n = 6m+1 \).

As in the case of 5-stars, the number of 6-stars in the square lattice of length \( n \) grown by the flatGARM algorithm is denoted \( u^{(6)}_n \). There are symmetry factors \( V_k^{(6)} \) contributing to \( u^{(6)}_n \) since the arms are labeled in the order they are grown by the algorithm. The symmetry factor of strictly uniform 6-stars is obtained by noting that the three arms incident with \( \vec{0} \) can be grown in 3! different orders, and the fourth, fifth and sixth arms are incident with the secondary node \( \vec{v} \) and can be grown in 3! ways. This gives a symmetry factor 3!3! for strictly uniform 6-stars.

The symmetry factors for almost uniform 6-stars can be obtained in a similar way, and the result is that

\[
V_k^{(6)} = \begin{cases} 
(3 - k)! k! 3!, & \text{if } 0 \leq k < 3; \\
3! (6 - k)! (k - 3)!, & \text{if } 3 \leq k \leq 5,
\end{cases}
\]

for stars of length \( n = 6m+1+k \) where \( n \geq 7 \). The number of monodisperse square lattice 6-stars counted by the algorithm is given by

\[
u^{(6)}_{6m+1+k} = u^{(6)}_n = V_k^{(6)} s^{(6)}_n = V_k^{(6)} C_k^{(6)} n^{\sigma_0+6\sigma_1} \mu^{(1)}_n (1 + o(1))
\]
Table 7. Least squares fits of $\frac{1}{n} \log c_n$ in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\frac{\log c_n}{n} \approx \log \mu_2 + A \frac{\log n}{n} + B \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9700744 + 0.3680826 $\frac{\log n}{n}$ + 0.2491915 $\left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.9700750 + 0.3675831 $\frac{\log n}{n}$ + 0.2623059 $\left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.9700757 + 0.3669447 $\frac{\log n}{n}$ + 0.2844822 $\left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.9700763 + 0.3664341 $\frac{\log n}{n}$ + 0.3067704 $\left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.9700767 + 0.3660119 $\frac{\log n}{n}$ + 0.3286399 $\left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where $U^{(6)} = V_k^{(6)} C_k^{(6)}$ is the amplitude. These numbers are listed for small 6-stars in table 6.

3. Square lattice stars

3.1. The self-avoiding walk in the square lattice

Self-avoiding walks to length 25,000 were sampled using parallel PERM [2] (with 12 parallel sequences for a total of $2.66 \times 10^8$ iterations). The scaling of $c_n$ is given by equation (2) where $\gamma = \frac{43}{32} = 1.34375$. Taking logarithms on both sides and dividing by $n$ gives

$$\frac{1}{n} \log c_n \approx \log \mu_2 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{n} \log n + \frac{1}{n} \log C.$$  (22)

Since it is numerically difficult to distinguish between terms of orders $O \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)$ and $O \left( \frac{1}{n} \right)$, the model was modified to

$$\frac{1}{n} \log c_n \approx \log \mu_2 + A \frac{\log n}{n} + B \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$$  (23)

and this was used to estimate $\mu_2$ for data with $n$ greater or equal to a minimum cut-off $n_{\text{min}}$. Results of least square fits for $n_{\text{min}} \leq n \leq 25,000$ are shown in table 7.

Our best estimates for $\log \mu_2$ are obtained by extrapolating the estimates in table 7. This is done in figure 5 where the estimates of $\log \mu_2$ are plotted as a function of $\log n_{\text{min}}/n_{\text{min}}$ for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\}$ (these data are represented by the symbol $\times$). Extrapolating the data to $n_{\text{min}} = \infty$ by using a quadratic curve gives

$$\log \mu_2(n_{\text{min}}) \approx 0.9700801 - 0.0000526 \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.0001213 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2,$$  (24)

rounded to seven decimal places. This gives the extrapolated estimate $\log \mu_2 \approx 0.9700801$, compared to the best numerical estimate $\log \mu_2 \approx 0.970081147258(8)$ in the literature due to Clisby and Jensen [4]. An error bar is obtained by repeating the regressions in table 7 but using only a two parameter model. This gives

$$\log \mu_2(n_{\text{min}}) \approx 0.9700776 - 0.0000128 \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.000182 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2,$$  (25)
rounded to seven decimal places. The absolute difference between the constant terms in equations (24) and (25) is taken as the error bar. This gives the result
\[ \log \mu_2 = 0.9700801(25). \] (26)

An alternative model for the data is found by taking logarithms of equation (2) and then dividing by $\log n$. This gives
\[ \frac{\log c_n}{\log n} \approx (\gamma - 1) + \frac{n}{\log n} \log \mu_2 + \frac{\log C}{\log n}. \] (27)

To account for corrections, the four parameter model
\[ \frac{\log c_n}{\log n} \approx (\gamma - 1) + \frac{n}{\log n} \log \mu_2 + \frac{\log C}{\log n} + \frac{D}{n^2} \] (28)

was found to model the data well. Least squares fits using this model gave estimates of the coefficients which are relatively independent of the minimum cut-off $n_{\text{min}}$. This is shown in table 8 for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 50\}$. Notice that the constant terms in table 8 are estimates of $\gamma - 1$, and that the coefficient of $1/\log n$ is $\log C$ in equation (24). The estimate for $\log \mu_2$ is the coefficient of $n/\log n$. Estimates of $\log \mu_2$ are plotted against $\log n_{\text{min}}/n_{\text{min}}$ in figure 5 (denoted by the data points with symbol ◦).

Extrapolating the data in table 8 (for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\}$) using a quadratic model and discarding the results at $n_{\text{min}} = 10$ gives
\[ \log \mu_2(n_{\text{min}}) = 0.970081532 + O(10^{-7}) \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} + 0.0000027 \left( \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2, \]
\[ \gamma_2(n_{\text{min}}) - 1 = 0.3409675 + 0.0098848 \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} - 0.0272217 \left( \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2, \] (29)
\[ \log C(n_{\text{min}}) = 0.1828188 - 0.0789368 \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} + 0.2176997 \left( \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2. \]
Table 8. Least squares fits of \( \frac{\log c_n}{\log n} \) in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n_{\text{min}} )</th>
<th>( \frac{\log c_n}{\log n} \approx (\gamma - 1) + \frac{\log C}{\log n} + \frac{n \log \mu_2}{n^2} + \frac{D}{n^2} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3416942 + 0.1769842 ( \frac{1}{\log n} ) + 0.970081462 ( \frac{n}{\log n} ) + 1.5254284 ( \frac{1}{n^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3418332 + 0.1759180 ( \frac{1}{\log n} ) + 0.970081446 ( \frac{n}{\log n} ) + 2.0064694 ( \frac{1}{n^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3418459 + 0.1758197 ( \frac{1}{\log n} ) + 0.970081444 ( \frac{n}{\log n} ) + 2.0866691 ( \frac{1}{n^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.3418313 + 0.1759336 ( \frac{1}{\log n} ) + 0.970081444 ( \frac{n}{\log n} ) + 1.9067865 ( \frac{1}{n^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.3418097 + 0.1761025 ( \frac{1}{\log n} ) + 0.970081448 ( \frac{n}{\log n} ) + 1.5564758 ( \frac{1}{n^2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculating an error again by repeating this analysis with the correction term \( D/n \) (instead of \( D/n^2 \)), and discarding the data at \( n_{\text{min}} = 10 \), gives

\[
\log \mu_2 = 0.970081532(61), \quad \gamma_2 = 1.3416(17), \quad \text{and} \quad \log C = 0.1828(94).
\]  

(30)

This gives the estimate \( C = 1.201(12) \). The exponent \( \gamma_2 \) is slightly underestimated compared to its exact value, namely \( \gamma_2 = 1.34375 \). Similarly, \( \mu_2 \) is slightly overestimated compared to the result by Clisby and Jensen [4]. These estimates also contain an unknown systematic error due to the cut-off on the longest walks in our data set, namely that the simulation only sampled walks of length \( n \leq 25,000 \).

3.2. Square lattice 3-stars

Square lattice 3-stars were sampled using the parallel flatGARM algorithm for a total of \( 4 \times 10^9 \) started sequences (iterations) in 4 parallel sequences for lengths up to \( n = 3,000 \) (or 1,000 steps per arm). Estimates of \( u_n^{(3)} \) were returned by the simulation. Scaling of \( u_n^{(f)} \) with \( n \) is given by equation (16) and we note the exact values of \( \sigma_1 = \frac{11}{64} = 0.171875 \) and \( \sigma_3 = -\frac{29}{64} = -0.453125 \) by equations (6) and (7).

Table 9. Least squares fits of \( \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(3)}}{c_n} \right) \) in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n_{\text{min}} )</th>
<th>( \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(3)}}{c_n} \right) \approx \log \left( \frac{U_n^{(3)}}{C} \right) + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_3) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0791792 − 0.2828996 ( \log n ) − 0.1598044 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0868137 − 0.2816643 ( \log n ) − 0.1039876 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0664688 − 0.2814174 ( \log n ) − 0.0916168 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.0657707 − 0.2813376 ( \log n ) − 0.087427 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0648417 − 0.2812319 ( \log n ) − 0.0817561 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proceed by noting that

\[
\frac{u_n^{(3)}}{c_n} = \left( \frac{U_n^{(3)}}{C} \right) n^{\sigma_1 + \sigma_3} (1 + o(1)).
\]  

(31)
The $o(1)$ term is usually assumed to decay as a power of $n$, and the choice that it is proportional to $n^{-1/2}$ gives good numerical results. Take logarithms, expand, and simplify to get the model

$$
\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(3)}}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{U^{(3)}}{C} \right) + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_3) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}. 
$$

(32)

In figure 6 this is plotted as a function of log $n$, and the graph shows that the data is distributed along a curve which is very close to a straight line.

A linear fit (by putting $c = 0$ in equation (32)) to the data in figure 6 for $n \geq 10$ gives $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -0.2829$. This is close to the exact value $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -9/32 = 0.28125$. Regressions using least squares and the full model in equation (32) gives better results and in table 9 the results are listed for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$. The estimated values of $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3$ are stable in these regressions, and extrapolating using the model

$$
\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 |_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{n_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{n_{\text{min}}^2} 
$$

for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ gives

$$
\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 |_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -0.2813524 + 0.0086117 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 0.2441505 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}. 
$$

(33)

Repeating this, but putting $n_{\text{min}} \geq 50$, gives

$$
\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 |_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -0.2819956 + 0.1271027 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 4.5464231 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}. 
$$

(34)

By taking $n_{\text{min}}$ to infinity in equation (33) the best estimate is obtained. Two times the absolute difference between this estimate, and the estimate in equation (34) is taken as an error in the estimated value.

$$
\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -0.2814(13). 
$$

(35)
A least squares fit with $c_n$ taking the exact value $\approx 0$ gives $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = \pm 0.10902$, compared to the estimates obtained by extrapolating results from a fit using $\log(C) + b\log(n+c/n)$. Extrapolating the estimates of $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_3$ as $n_{min}$ increases in table 10, using the model $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_3|_{n_{min}} = a + b/n_{min} + c/n_{min}^2$ for $n_{min} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ gives

$$2\sigma_1 + \sigma_3|_{n_{min}} \approx -0.1098986 + 0.0086117 \frac{1}{n_{min}} - 0.1759300 \frac{1}{n_{min}^2}. \tag{38}$$

Taking $n_{min} \to \infty$ gives the estimate

$$2\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -0.10990(24). \tag{39}$$

The error bar is again twice the absolute difference between the best estimate in equation (38), and the estimate obtained by extrapolating results from a fit using $n_{min} \geq 50$. By equations (35) and (39) we get the following estimates for $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_3$:

$$\sigma_1 = 0.1715(16), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3 = -0.4528(30). \tag{40}$$

This gives $\gamma = 1.3429(32)$ in two dimensions, and these results compare well with the exact values $\sigma_1 = 0.171875$, $\sigma_3 = -0.453125$ and $\gamma = 1.34375$ in two dimensions.

Estimates of the amplitudes $C$ and $U(f)$ in equations (2) and (16) are obtained from three parameter fits using the model $\log(u_n^{(3)}/c_n) = \log(U^{(3)}/C) + b\log(n+c/n)$, and the model $\log(u_n^{(3)}/\sqrt{c_n}) = \log(U^{(3)}/2^{\sigma_1}\sqrt{C}) + b\log(n+c/n)$. The results are functions of $n_{min} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$. Extrapolating the results using a quadratic polynomial in $1/n_{min}$ gives

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(3)}}{C} \right) \approx 0.0577475 - 0.1028403 \frac{1}{n_{min}} + 1.1193231 \frac{1}{n_{min}^2},$$

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(3)}}{2^{\sigma_1}\sqrt{C}} \right) \approx 0.0259720 - 0.1252509 \frac{1}{n_{min}} + 1.1323648 \frac{1}{n_{min}^2}.$$
Table 11. Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{u_i^{(4)}}{c_n} \right)$ in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{u_i^{(4)}}{c_n} \right)$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{U_i^{(4)}}{C} \right) + (2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4) \log n + \frac{\sigma_1}{\sqrt{n}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1327922 − 0.8475779 log $n − 0.5313688 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td>0.171875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1209159 − 0.8462395 log $n − 0.4597527 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td>0.175188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.1101681 − 0.8450338 log $n − 0.3931698 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td>0.178216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1056697 − 0.8445332 log $n − 0.3640387 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td>0.181484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1032117 − 0.8442610 log $n − 0.3476475 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td>0.184654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amplitude ratio is estimated to be $U^{(3)}/C \approx 1.059$. Solving simultaneously for $U^{(3)}$ and $C$ (by using the estimate for $\sigma_1$ in equation (40)) gives

$$C = 1.171(12), \quad \text{and } U^{(3)} = 1.2507(70),$$

where error bars were obtained as before, including carrying through the uncertainty in the value of $\sigma_1$ in equation (40). The amplitudes $C_k^{(3)}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$ can be calculated using equation (17):

$$C_0^{(3)} = 0.2085(12), \quad C_1^{(3)} = C_2^{(3)} = 0.6253(36).$$

3.3. Square lattice 4-stars

Square lattice 4-stars were sampled using parallel flatGARM ($4 \times 10^9$ started sequences (iterations) in 4 parallel sequences) up to length $n = 4,000$ (or 1,000 steps per arm). The asymptotic behaviour of $u_i^{(4)}$ is given by equation (16) and the exponents have exact values $\sigma_1 = \frac{11}{64} = 0.171875$ and $\sigma_4 = -\frac{19}{16} = -1.1875$ by equations (6) and (7).

Proceed as in the last section for 3-stars. Least squares fits shown in table 11 using the model

$$\log \left( \frac{u_i^{(4)}}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{U_i^{(4)}}{C} \right) + (2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4) \log n + \frac{\sigma_1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ and extrapolating the estimates for $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4$ using the model $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4|_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{n_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$ gives the result $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4|_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -0.8433270 + -0.0547881 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.1139150 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$. By taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ we get our best estimate

$$2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4 = -0.8433(24),$$

where the error bar was determined by repeating the analysis for $n_{\text{min}} \geq 50$ and taking twice the absolute difference with the estimate above.

Next, consider the model

$$\log \left( \frac{u_i^{(4)}}{\sqrt{c_n}} \right) = \log \left( \frac{U_i^{(4)}}{2\sigma_1 \sqrt{C}} \right) + (3\sigma_1 + \sigma_4) \log n + \frac{\sigma_1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

The results of fits are listed in table 12. Extrapolating the estimates of $3\sigma_1 + \sigma_4$ in table 12 for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ using the model $3\sigma_1 + \sigma_4|_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{n_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$ gives
Table 12. Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{u^{(4)}_n}{\sqrt{c_{2n}}} \right)$ in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{u^{(4)}<em>n}{\sqrt{c</em>{2n}}} \right)$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{U^{(4)}_n}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) + (3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_4) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0755825 - 0.6734855 log $n - 0.3981636 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0651491 - 0.6723107 log $n - 0.3349493 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0542450 - 0.6710876 log $n - 0.2673687 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.0490258 - 0.6705607 log $n - 0.2335631 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0455524 - 0.6701221 log $n - 0.2104077 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_4 |_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -0.6668271 - 0.1725063 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 1.0701222 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$. Taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives the estimate

$$3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_4 = -0.6668(30),$$

(46)

where the error bar was determined by repeating the analysis for $n_{\text{min}} \geq 50$ and taking twice the absolute difference with the estimate above.

Solving equations (44) and (46) gives the estimates:

$$\sigma_1 = 0.1765(54), \quad \sigma_4 = -1.196(14).$$

(47)

This gives $\gamma_2 = 1.353(11)$ in two dimensions, and these results compare well with the exact values $\sigma_1 = 0.171875$, $\sigma_4 = -1.1875$ and $\gamma_2 = 1.34375$.

Next, we extract estimates for the amplitudes $C$ and $U^{(f)}$ in equations (2) and (16). Estimating $\log(U^{(4)}/C)$ and $\log(U^{(4)}/\sqrt{C})$ using the same approach as for 3-stars gives

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(4)}}{C} \right) \approx 0.0716312 - 0.1331676 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.7274872 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2},$$

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(4)}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx 0.0183967 + 0.3960981 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 3.3023965 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}.$$  

This gives the estimate $U^{(4)}/C \approx 1.074$ for the amplitude ratio. Solving simultaneously for $U^{(4)}$ and $C$ gives

$$C = 1.148(11), \quad \text{and } U^{(4)} = 1.233(26)$$

(48)

from which the amplitudes $C_k^{(4)}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ can be calculated using equation (17):

$$C_0^{(4)} = 0.05140(11), \quad C_1^{(4)} = C_3^{(4)} = 0.2056(42), \quad C_2^{(4)} = 0.3084(62).$$

(49)

3.4. Square lattice 5-stars

Square lattice 5-stars were sampled using parallel flatGARM ($4 \times 10^9$ iterations in 4 parallel sequences) for lengths up to $n = 5,000$ (or 1,000 steps per arm). Estimates of $u^{(5)}_n$ were returned by the simulation. The asymptotic behaviour of $u^{(5)}_n$ is given by equation (19). By equations (6) and (7), the exact values of the vertex exponents are $\sigma_1 = \frac{11}{64} = 0.171875$ and $\sigma_5 = -\frac{141}{64} = -2.203125$. 


Extrapolating the estimates using the model 

\[ \sigma \]

Least squares fits using the model in equation (52) are listed in table 14. Using the same approach as for 3-stars and 4-stars to model the data, this gives 

\[ \gamma \]

Taking \( \{ \text{best estimate} \) least squares fits give the results in table 13 for the model

\[ \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{c_n} \right) \approx \log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{C} \right) + (3\sigma_1 + \sigma_5) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \]

Table 13. Least squares fits of \( \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{c_n} \right) \) in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n_{\text{min}} )</th>
<th>( \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{c_n} \right) )</th>
<th>( \log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{C} \right) )</th>
<th>( (3\sigma_1 + \sigma_5) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5958636 - 1.6945416 \log n - 1.0928224 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5956312 - 1.6945413 \log n - 1.0824155 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5818899 - 1.6930338 \log n - 0.9908944 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.5760413 - 1.6923965 \log n - 0.9503345 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5708407 - 1.6918322 \log n - 0.9134167 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
<td>\text{---}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proceed in the same way as in the previous sections for 3-stars and 4-stars. Using the model

\[ \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{C} \right) + (3\sigma_1 + \sigma_5) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \]  

(50)

Least squares fits give the results in table 13 for \( n \geq n_{\text{min}} \) and \( n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\} \). Estimates of the exponent \( 3\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 \) are stable in these regressions, and we extrapolate these using the model \( 3\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 \mid_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + c \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2} \) where \( n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\} \). This gives \( 3\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 \mid_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -1.6885149 - 0.1833175 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 1.2327128 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2} \), from which the best estimate

\[ 3\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 = -1.68851(32) \]  

(51)

is obtained. The error bar, as before, is twice the absolute difference for \( n_{\text{min}} \geq 50 \).

Next, proceed as in equation (36) by considering the model

\[ \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{\sqrt{c_{2n}}} \right) = \log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{2^{1/2}C} \right) + (4\sigma_1 + \sigma_5) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \]  

(52)

Least squares fits using the model in equation (52) are listed in table 14. Extrapolating the estimates using the model \( 4\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 \mid_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + c \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2} \) for \( n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\} \) gives \( 4\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 \mid_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -1.5137755 - 0.2486305 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 1.7623621 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2} \). Taking \( n_{\text{min}} \to \infty \) gives the best estimate

\[ 4\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 = -1.5138(30), \]  

(53)

where the error bar was determined as above.

By equations (51) and (53) we get the following estimates for \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_5 \):

\[ \sigma_1 = 0.1747(34), \quad \sigma_5 = -2.213(11). \]  

(54)

This gives \( \gamma = 1.3494(68) \) in two dimensions, and these results compare well with the exact values \( \sigma_1 = 0.171875, \sigma_5 = -2.203125 \) and \( \gamma = 1.34375 \).

Next, extract estimates for the amplitudes \( C \) and \( U^{(f)} \) in equations (2) and (16). Using the same approach as for 3-stars and 4-stars to model the data,

\[ \log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{C} \right) \approx 1.4920893 - 0.3066756 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 0.0942668 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}, \]
Table 14. Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{\sqrt{c_2 n}} \right)$ in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(4)}}{\sqrt{c_2 n}} \right) \approx \log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) + (4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_5) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1.0596202 - 1.5211437 \log n - 0.9974975 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1.0602560 - 1.5212396 \log n - 0.9924894 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1.0464260 - 1.5197225 \log n - 0.9003618 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$1.0401425 - 1.5190378 \log n - 0.8567952 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1.0343297 - 1.5184070 \log n - 0.8155335 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx 1.4562376 - 0.4328018 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 1.9453113 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$. This gives the estimate $U^{(5)}/C \approx 4.446$. Solving simultaneously for $U^{(5)}$ and $C$ gives

$$C = 1.1859(84), \quad U^{(5)} = 5.273(56),$$

from which the amplitudes $C_k^{(5)}$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 4$ can be calculated using equation (18):

$C_0^{(5)} = C_3^{(5)} = 0.4392(46), \quad C_1^{(5)} = C_2^{(5)} = 1.318(14), \quad C_4^{(5)} = 0.8789(92).$ (56)

3.5. Square lattice 6-stars

Square lattice 6-stars were sampled by the parallel flatGARM algorithm (a total of $4 \times 10^9$ iterations) in 4 parallel sequences for stars of lengths up to $n = 6,000$ (or 1,000 steps per arm. The asymptotic behaviour of $u_n^{(6)}$ is given by equation (21). By equations (6) and (7) the exact values of the vertex exponents are $\sigma_1 = \frac{11}{64} = 0.171875$ and $\sigma_6 = -\frac{1}{2} = -3.5$.

We proceed in the same way as in the previous sections. The model

$log \left( \frac{u_n^{(6)}}{c_n} \right) = log \left( \frac{U^{(6)}}{C} \right) + (4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$ (57)

Table 15. Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(6)}}{c_n} \right)$ in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(6)}}{c_n} \right) \approx \log \left( \frac{U^{(6)}}{C} \right) + (4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3.2639438 - 2.8260322 \log n - 2.0146740 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3.3345321 - 2.8337399 \log n - 2.4736528 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$3.2791745 - 2.8277600 \log n - 2.0881606 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3.2638815 - 2.8261186 \log n - 1.9774043 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$3.2533124 - 2.8249901 \log n - 1.8983880 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is used to determine estimates of $4\sigma_1 + \sigma_6 = -\frac{45}{16} = -2.8125$. A least squares fit using the full model in equation (57) gives the results in table 15 for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$. The estimates of the exponent $4\sigma_1 + \sigma_6$ are stable, and we extrapolate them using the model $4\sigma_1 + \sigma_6|_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{n_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$, where $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$. This gives the result $4\sigma_1 + \sigma_6|_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -2.8172063 - 0.4940345 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 4.0327915 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$. From this we obtained our best estimate

$$4\sigma_1 + \sigma_6 = -2.8172(14),$$

(58)

where the error bar is again the twice the absolute difference with the estimate obtained by choosing $n_{\text{min}} \geq 50$ in the analysis.

Next, proceed as in equation (36) by considering the model

$$\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(6)}}{\sqrt{C_2n}} \right) = \log \left( \frac{U^{(6)}}{2\sigma_1 \sqrt{C}} \right) + (5\sigma_1 + \sigma_6) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (59)$$

Least squares fits using the model in equation (59) are listed in table 16. Extrapolating the estimates of $5\sigma_1 + \sigma_6$ using the model $5\sigma_1 + \sigma_6|_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{n_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$ for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ gives $5\sigma_1 + \sigma_6|_{n_{\text{min}}} \approx -2.6435373 - 0.5268063 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 4.3125772 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$. Taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives the estimate

$$5\sigma_1 + \sigma_6 = -2.6435(28) \quad (60)$$

with the error bar estimated as before.

By equations (58) and (60) we get the following estimates for $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_6$:

$$\sigma_1 = 0.1737(42) \quad \sigma_6 = -3.512(18).$$

(61)

This gives $\gamma = 1.3474(84)$ in two dimensions, and these results compare well with the exact values $\sigma_1 = 0.171875$, $\sigma_6 = -3.5$ and $\gamma = 1.34375$.

Next, we extract estimates for the amplitudes $C$ and $U^{(6)}$ in equations (2) and (16) using the same approach as for 3-stars, 4-stars and 5-stars. The results are

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(6)}}{C} \right) \approx 3.0940849 - 0.1814064 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 5.3629186 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2},$$

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(6)}}{2\sigma_1 \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx 3.0411458 + 0.2850587 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 16.2970780 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}.$$
Figure 7. Estimates of log $\mu_3$ using the model in equation (23) as a function of $\log n_{\text{min}}/n_{\text{min}}$ for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\}$ and for cubic lattice data (data points are represented by $\times$). Results using the model in equation (24) are represented by $\circ$. The estimate due to Clisby [3] is denoted by the bullet on the vertical axis.

Extrapolating by taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives the estimate $U^{(6)}/C \approx 22.07$ for the amplitude ratio. Solving simultaneously for $U^{(6)}$ and $C$ gives

$$C = 1.1444(66), \quad \text{and} \quad U^{(6)} = 25.25(15).$$

(62)

from which the amplitudes $C^{(6)}_k$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ can be calculated by equation (20):

$$C^{(6)}_0 = C^{(6)}_3 = 0.7015(82), \quad C^{(6)}_1 = C^{(6)}_2 = 2.104(26), \quad C^{(6)}_4 = C^{(6)}_5 = 2.104(26).$$

(63)

4. Results in 3 dimensions

In this section our numerical data on cubic lattice stars are analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\log \mu_2 + A \frac{\log n}{n} + B \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1.5441578 + 0.1866902 \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.2284975 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1.5441588 + 0.1853195 \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.2636952 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1.5441595 + 0.1843906 \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.2977194 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$1.5441599 + 0.1837266 \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.3285777 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1.5441602 + 0.1832265 \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} + 0.3563559 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Least squares fits of $\frac{\log c_n}{\log n}$ in the cubic lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\frac{\log c_n}{\log n} \approx (\gamma - 1) + \frac{\log C}{\log n} + \frac{n \log \mu_3}{\log n} + \frac{D}{n^2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$0.1574548 + 0.1897446 \frac{1}{\log n} + 1.544163658 \frac{n}{\log n} - 0.2215417 \frac{1}{n^2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$0.1572684 + 0.1911768 \frac{1}{\log n} + 1.544163680 \frac{n}{\log n} - 0.9590109 \frac{1}{n^2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$0.1571396 + 0.1921749 \frac{1}{\log n} + 1.544163695 \frac{n}{\log n} - 1.9532469 \frac{1}{n^2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$0.1570363 + 0.1929803 \frac{1}{\log n} + 1.544163706 \frac{n}{\log n} - 3.1747460 \frac{1}{n^2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$0.1569489 + 0.1936647 \frac{1}{\log n} + 1.544163716 \frac{n}{\log n} - 4.5835082 \frac{1}{n^2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. The self-avoiding walk in the cubic lattice

Cubic lattice self-avoiding walks to length $10,000$ were sampled using parallel flatPERM [2,6,10,22] along 12 parallel sequences for a total of $3.29 \times 10^9$ started walks. The data were fit to the model in equation (22) for $n \geq n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\}$. Results of the least squares fits for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 50\}$ are listed in table 17. In figure 7 estimates of $\log \mu_3$ are plotted as a function of $\frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}}$ for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\}$. Discarding the data point at $n_{\text{min}} = 10$ and doing a least squares regression using a quadratic curve gives

$$\log \mu_3(n_{\text{min}}) = 1.5441627 - 0.0000381 \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} + 0.0000829 \left( \frac{\log n_{\text{min}}}{n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (64)

Taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives the best estimate $\log \mu_3 \approx 1.5441627$. This can be compared to the best numerical estimate $\log \mu_3 = 1.544160971(18)$ due to Clisby [3].

To estimate an error bar, the analysis in table 17 was repeated using a two parameter model (by putting $B = 0$). The absolute difference in these estimates is taken as the error bar. The result is that

$$\log \mu_3 = 1.5441627(15).$$  \hspace{1cm} (65)

There is still a systematic error due to the cut-off on the length of walks at $n_{\text{max}} = 10,000$. Simulations with a larger $n_{\text{max}}$ should decrease the systematic error and improve this estimate.

Next, the entropic exponent $\gamma$ is estimated from the data. Using the model in equation (28) gives estimates of $\gamma$ which are relatively independent of the minimum cut-off $n_{\text{min}}$, as shown in table 18 (data points denoted by $\circ$ in figure 7).

Extrapolating the data in table 18 (for $20 \leq n_{\text{min}} \leq 200$ using a quadratic model gives

$$\log \mu_3(n_{\text{min}}) \approx 1.54416393 - 0.0000023 \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} + 0.0000054 \left( \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2,$$
$$\gamma(n_{\text{min}}) - 1 \approx 0.1547678 + 0.0237593 \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} - 0.0572352 \left( \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2,$$
$$\log C(n_{\text{min}}) \approx 0.1905400 \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} + 0.4618736 \left( \frac{1}{\log n_{\text{min}}} \right)^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (66)
Table 19. Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(3)}}{c_n} \right)$ in the cubic lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{u_n^{(3)}}{c_n} \right)$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{U_{(3)}^{(3)}}{C} \right) + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_3) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$-0.0309666 - 0.1192094 \log n - 0.0024331 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$-0.0277739 - 0.1195800 \log n - 0.0200097 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$-0.0246617 - 0.1199384 \log n - 0.0378803 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$-0.0215411 - 0.1202953 \log n - 0.0565034 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$-0.0189262 - 0.1205926 \log n - 0.0725784 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where the extrapolated value of $\gamma \approx 1.15477$ compares well to the best estimate $\gamma = 1.15698(34)$ due to Clisby [3]. Repeating the analysis in table 18 but with the correction term $D/n^2$ replaced by $D/n$ gives the estimate $\gamma = 1.1524$. Taking the absolute difference of these estimates as an error gives

$$\gamma_3 = 1.1548(24).$$  \hfill (67)

This also gives the estimate $\sigma_1 = 0.0769(12)$ for the vertex exponent, compared to result in table 2 and the predictions by the $\epsilon$-expansion (see table 3). This estimate is slightly smaller than the estimate in reference [1]. The predicted values due to the $\epsilon$-expansion in table 3 are not stable, and compared to our results, seems to be best at the order $\epsilon$ and the order $\epsilon^2$ levels.

The estimate for $\log \mu_3 \approx 1.54416393$ compares well with the result in equation (65). By determining an error bar, we obtain

$$\log \mu_3 = 1.5441639(27).$$  \hfill (68)

The constant $C$ is the amplitude in equation (2) and by the above, $\log C = 0.211(22)$ so that $C = 1.235(28)$.

4.2. Cubic lattice 3-stars

Lattice 3-stars of lengths up to 3,000 (1,000 steps per arm) were sampled along 4 parallel flatGARM sequences (for $4 \times 10^9$ iterations in total). Using the model in equation (32) least squares fits with $n \geq n_{\text{min}}$ were done for $10 \leq n_{\text{min}} \leq 200$. The results are shown for $n_{\text{min}} \leq 50$ in table 19. Extrapolating using the model $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 |_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + c \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$ for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ gives $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 \approx -0.1236551 + 0.1560298 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2} - 1.1340692 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^3}$. Taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives the estimate $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -0.1237$, which compares well with the first order $\epsilon$-expansion estimate $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 \approx -1/8 = -0.1250$. An error is determined by repeating the analysis but with $n_{\text{min}} \geq 50$ and then taking the error to be twice the absolute difference in the estimates. This gives the estimate $\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -0.1258$. Two times the absolute difference between these estimates is taken as the error. This gives

$$\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -0.1237(44).$$  \hfill (69)
Least squares fits of the data with this model gives the results in table 20. Extrapolating the coefficient of \( \log n \) using \( 2 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 \) for \( n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\} \) gives \( 2 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 \approx -0.0431868 + 0.1560298 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 0.8367870 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2} \). Taking \( n_{\text{min}} \to \infty \) and determining an error bar as before give

\[
2 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 = -0.0432(32). \tag{70}
\]

Solving for \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_3 \) from equations (69) and (70) gives

\[
\sigma_1 = 0.0805(76), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3 = -0.204(12). \tag{71}
\]

The estimate of \( \sigma_1 \) above is close to that in reference [1] and compares reasonably well with the order \( \epsilon^n \) predictions with \( n \leq 3 \) in table 3. However, it deviates significantly from the estimated at \( \epsilon^4 \) in table 3. The estimate \( \sigma_3 = -0.204(12) \) is reasonably close to the estimates in references [1, 28, 35], and also agrees reasonably with predicted order \( \epsilon^n \) estimates in table 3 for \( n = 1, 2, 3 \). However, it is significantly different from the prediction at order \( \epsilon^4 \).

Estimates of the amplitudes \( C \) and \( U^{(3)} \) in equations (2) and (16) are again obtained by using the three parameter models \( \log(u_n^{(3)}/c_n) = \log(U^{(3)}/C) + b \log n + c/n \) and \( \log(u_n^{(3)}/\sqrt{c_{2n}}) = \log(U^{(3)}/2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}) + b \log n + c/n \). Least squares fits for \( n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\} \), followed by extrapolating the results as a quadratic in \( 1/n_{\text{min}} \) gives

\[
\log \left( \frac{U^{(3)}}{C} \right) \approx -0.0151243 - 0.6479011 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 4.8698321 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}, \tag{72}
\]

\[
\log \left( \frac{U^{(3)}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx 0.0171740 - 0.5065797 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 3.7493220 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}. \tag{73}
\]

Taking \( n_{\text{min}} \to \infty \) gives two equations with three unknowns \( (U^{(3)}, C, \sigma_1) \). Choosing \( \sigma_1 \) as determined in equation (71) gives

\[
C = 1.193(56), \quad \text{and} \quad U^{(3)} = 1.175(36), \tag{74}
\]

from which the lattice star amplitudes \( C_k^{(3)} \) for \( k = 0, 1, 2 \) can be calculated using equation (17):

\[
C_0^{(3)} = 0.1958(54), \quad C_1^{(3)} = C_2^{(3)} = 0.587(16). \tag{75}
\]
4.3. Cubic lattice 4-stars

Lattice 4-stars of lengths up to 4,000 (1,000 steps per arm) were sampled along 4 parallel flatGARM sequences (a total of $4 \times 10^9$ iterations). Using the model in equation (32), least squares fits were done for $n \geq n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\}$. The results are shown for $n_{\text{min}} \leq 50$ in table 21. Extrapolating using the model

$$2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4|_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + c \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$$

for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ gives $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4 \approx -0.3398857 + 0.2066064 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 1.3659311 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$. Taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives an estimate for $2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4$:

$$2\sigma_1 + \sigma_4 = -0.3399(28).$$

The error bar was determined by repeating the analysis for $n_{\text{min}} \geq 50$ and taking twice the absolute difference in the estimates.

Next, the ratio $s^{(4)}_n/\sqrt{c_{2n}}$ is modelled by equation (37). Least squares fits give the results in table 22. Extrapolating the coefficient of $\log n$ in table 22 using the model

$$3\sigma_1 + \sigma_4|_{n_{\text{min}}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + c \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$$

for $n_{\text{min}} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ gives $3\sigma_1 + \sigma_4 \approx -0.2601471 + 0.2066064 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 1.2617999 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}^2}$. Taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ and repeating this analysis but with $c = 0$ in equation (37) to estimate the error gives

$$3\sigma_1 + \sigma_4 = -0.2601(28).$$

\begin{table}
\caption{Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{u^{(3)}_n}{c_n} \right)$ in the cubic lattice}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
$n_{\text{min}}$ & $\log \left( \frac{u^{(3)}_n}{c_n} \right) \approx \log \left( \frac{U^{(3)}}{C} \right) + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_3) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$
\hline
10 & $-0.1820653 - 0.3326110 \log n + 0.1486224 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
20 & $-0.1666277 - 0.3343592 \log n + 0.0581155 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
30 & $-0.1633604 - 0.3347247 \log n + 0.0375684 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
40 & $-0.1589275 - 0.3352183 \log n + 0.0089029 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
50 & $-0.1545304 - 0.3357053 \log n - 0.0203448 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{table}

\begin{table}
\caption{Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{s^{(4)}_n}{\sqrt{c_{2n}}} \right)$ in the cubic lattice}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
$n_{\text{min}}$ & $\log \left( \frac{s^{(4)}_n}{\sqrt{c_{2n}}} \right) \approx \log \left( \frac{U^{(4)}}{C} \right) + (3\sigma_1 + \sigma_4) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$
\hline
10 & $-0.1471991 - 0.2531053 \log n + 0.1562205 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
20 & $-0.1312058 - 0.2549165 \log n + 0.0624785 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
30 & $-0.1279496 - 0.2552808 \log n + 0.0420088 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
40 & $-0.1236479 - 0.2557597 \log n + 0.0141945 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
50 & $-0.1194818 - 0.2562212 \log n - 0.0135149 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{table}
Table 23. Least squares fits of \( \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{c_n} \right) \) in the cubic lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n_{\min} )</th>
<th>( \log \left( \frac{u_n^{(5)}}{c_n} \right) \approx \log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{C} \right) + (3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_5) \log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.6920254 – 0.6116261 ( \log n ) + 0.8534120 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} ) ( n_{\min} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.6711229 – 0.6139526 ( \log n ) + 0.7260649 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} ) ( n_{\min} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.6728432 – 0.6137661 ( \log n ) + 0.7383366 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} ) ( n_{\min} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-0.6756541 – 0.6134602 ( \log n ) + 0.7579534 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} ) ( n_{\min} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-0.6779261 – 0.6132139 ( \log n ) + 0.7741566 ( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} ) ( n_{\min} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solving for \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_4 \) in equations (76) and (77) gives

\[
\sigma_1 = 0.078(12), \quad \sigma_4 = -0.499(28). \tag{78}
\]

While the estimate of \( \sigma_1 \) compares well with the result in reference [1], it compares reasonably with the order \( \epsilon \) and \( \epsilon^2 \) predictions in table 3. The estimate for \( \sigma_4 \) above compares well with the results listed in table 2 from references [35] and [1] and the order \( \epsilon \) predicted value in table 3, it deviates significantly from the higher order predictions of the \( \epsilon \)-expansion.

Estimates of the amplitudes \( C \) and \( U^{(4)} \) are obtained as was done for 3-stars in equations (72) and (73). This gives

\[
\log \left( \frac{U^{(4)}}{C} \right) \approx -0.1426716 + -0.7750165 \frac{1}{n_{\min}} + 5.5958523 \frac{1}{n_{\min}^2}, \tag{79}
\]

\[
\log \left( \frac{U^{(4)}}{2 \sigma_1 \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx -0.1079370 + -0.7201530 \frac{1}{n_{\min}} + 5.1475448 \frac{1}{n_{\min}^2}. \tag{80}
\]

We have two equations, and three unknowns (\( U^{(4)}, C, \sigma_1 \)). Choosing \( \sigma_1 \) as determined in equation (78) gives

\[
C = 1.197(25), \quad \text{and} \quad U^{(4)} = 1.038(19) \tag{81}
\]

from which the amplitudes \( C_k^{(4)} \) for \( k = 0, 1, 2, 3 \) can be calculated using equation (17):

\[
C_0^{(4)} = 0.04325(79), \quad C_1^{(4)} = C_3^{(4)} = 0.1730(32), \quad C_2^{(4)} = 0.2595(47). \tag{82}
\]

4.4. Cubic lattice 5-stars

Lattice 5-stars of length up to 5,000 (1,000 steps per arm) were sampled along 4 parallel flatGARM sequences for a total of \( 4 \times 10^9 \) iterations. Using the model in equation (32) regressions with \( n \geq n_{\min} \) were done for \( n_{\min} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\} \). The results are shown for \( n_{\min} \leq 50 \) in table 23. Extrapolating the coefficient of \( \log n \) in table 23 using the model \( 3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_5 |_{n_{\min}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{\min}} + c \frac{1}{n_{\min}^2} \) for \( n_{\min} \in \{10, 20, 30, \ldots, 200\} \) gives

\[
3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_5 \approx -0.6110255 - 0.1260978 \frac{1}{n_{\min}} + 1.2085706 \frac{1}{n_{\min}^2}. \tag{83}
\]

Taking \( n_{\min} \to \infty \) gives the estimate

\[
3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_5 = -0.6110(22). \tag{83}
\]
Table 24. Least squares fits of $\log \left( \frac{s_n^{(5)}}{\sqrt{c_{2n}}} \right)$ in the cubic lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_{\text{min}}$</th>
<th>$\log \left( \frac{s_n^{(5)}}{\sqrt{c_{2n}}} \right)$</th>
<th>$\log(U^{(5)}/C) + (4\sigma_1 + \sigma_5)\log n + \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$-0.6543541 - 0.5324794 \log n + 0.8513227 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$-0.6323624 - 0.5349266 \log n + 0.7171497 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$-0.6336137 - 0.5347916 \log n + 0.7263057 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>$-0.6361138 - 0.5345196 \log n + 0.7437804 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$-0.6381886 - 0.5342947 \log n + 0.7585864 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The error was estimated by repeating the analysis but using a linear model (by putting $c = 0$ in equation (32)).

Next, consider the ratio $s_n^{(5)}/\sqrt{c_{2n}}$ and the model in equation (37). Using the same approach as in table 23 to analyse the data gives the results in table 24. By extrapolating the coefficient of $\log n$ in table 24 using the model

$$4\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 \approx -0.5324014 - 0.1260978 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} + 1.1071968 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$$

This gives the estimate

$$4\sigma_1 + \sigma_5 = -0.5324(13),$$

where the error bar was determined by repeating this analysis but using a two parameter model (with $c = 0$ in table 24).

Solving simultaneously for $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_5$ from equations (83) and (84) gives

$$\sigma_1 = 0.0786(35), \quad \sigma_5 = -0.847(13).$$

While the estimate of $\sigma_1$ compares well with the result in reference [1], it also compares reasonably with the order $\epsilon$ and $\epsilon^2$ predictions in table 3. The estimate for $\sigma_5$ above compares well with the results listed in table 2 from references [35] and [1], but these all deviate from the $\epsilon$-expansion estimates listed in table 3.

Estimates of the amplitudes $C$ and $U^{(5)}$ are obtained using the approach used for 3-stars in equations (72) and (73). This gives

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{C} \right) \approx -0.6291487 + 1.3872895 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 10.0852839 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}$$

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(5)}}{2\sigma_1 \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx -0.5898498 + 1.3241122 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}} - 9.6551622 \frac{1}{n_{\text{min}}}.$$

Taking $n_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives two equations containing three unknowns ($U^{(5)}, C, \sigma_1$). Choosing $\sigma_1 = 0.0786(35)$ as determined in equation (85) gives

$$C = 1.206(14), \text{ and } U^{(5)} = 0.643(53).$$

From this the amplitudes $C_k^{(5)}$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 4$ are calculated by equation (17). The results are

$$C_0^{(5)} = 0.005359(43), \quad C_1^{(5)} = C_4^{(5)} = 0.02679(23), \quad C_2^{(5)} = C_3^{(5)} = 0.05358(44).$$
4.5. Cubic lattice 6-stars

Lattice 6-stars of length up to 6,000 (1,000 steps per arm) were sampled along 4 parallel flatGARM sequences for a total of $4 \times 10^9$ iterations. The model in equation (32) was used with regressions for $n \geq n_{min} \in \{10, 20, \ldots, 200\}$. The results are shown for $n_{min} \leq 50$ in table 25. Discarding the data point at $n_{min} = 10$ and then extrapolating the coefficient of log $n$ in table 25 using the model $4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6 |_{n_{min}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{min}} + c \frac{1}{n_{min}^2}$ for $n_{min} \in \{20, 30, \ldots, 200\}$ gives $4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6 \approx -0.9669604 - 0.4279159 \frac{1}{n_{min}} + 4.9016477 \frac{1}{n_{min}^2}$. Taking $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$ gives the estimate

$$4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6 = -0.9669(34).$$

(90)

Next, consider the ratio $s_n^{(6)} / \sqrt{c_2 n}$ and the model in equation (37). Least squares fits give the results in table 26. Discarding the data point at $n_{min} = 10$ and then extrapolating the coefficient of log $n$ in table 26 using the model $5 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6 |_{n_{min}} = a + b \frac{1}{n_{min}} + c \frac{1}{n_{min}^2}$ for $n_{min} \in \{20, 30, \ldots, 100\}$ gives $5 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6 \approx -0.885525 - 0.4279159 \frac{1}{n_{min}} + 4.5088472 \frac{1}{n_{min}^2}$. Taking $n_{min} \rightarrow \infty$ gives the estimate

$$5 \sigma_1 + \sigma_6 = -0.8886(28).$$

(91)

Solving simultaneously for $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_6$ from equations (90) and (91) gives

$$\sigma_1 = 0.0784(62), \quad \sigma_6 = -1.281(29).$$

(92)
While the estimate of $\sigma_1$ compares well with the result in reference [1], it also compares reasonably with the order $\epsilon$ and $\epsilon^2$ predictions in table 3. The estimate for $\sigma_6$ above compares well with the results listed in table 2 from references [35] and [1], but these all deviate from the $\epsilon$-expansion estimates listed in table 3.

Estimates of the amplitudes $C$ and $U^{(6)}$ are again obtained as was done for 3-stars in equations (72) and (73). This gives

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(6)}}{C} \right) \approx -1.5873230 + 3.0451585 \frac{1}{n_{\min}} - 23.1572775 \frac{1}{n_{\min}^2},$$

$$\log \left( \frac{U^{(6)}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx -1.5473333 + 2.9715789 \frac{1}{n_{\min}} - 22.6516021 \frac{1}{n_{\min}^2}.$$  

Taking $n_{\min} \to \infty$ gives two equations with three unknowns $(U^{(6)}, C, \sigma_1)$. Choosing $\sigma_1 = 0.0784(62)$ as determined in equation (92) gives

$$C = 1.208(19), \quad \text{and} \quad U^{(6)} = 0.2469(30),$$

from which the amplitudes $C_k^{(6)}$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 5$ can be calculated using equation (17):

$$C_0^{(6)} = 0.000343(42), \quad C_1^{(6)} = C_5^{(6)} = 0.002058(25), \quad C_2^{(6)} = C_4^{(6)} = 0.005144(62), \quad C_3^{(6)} = 0.006859(83).$$

5. Sampling Branched Structures

In this section the consistency of vertex exponents is examined by considering the scaling of more general branched structures. That is, we calculate the entropic exponents of the acyclic branched structures in figure 1 to show that they satisfy the relations in equation (14) within the numerical accuracy obtained in this paper.

As in section 1.1, define the length or size $n$ of a lattice network to be the total number of steps or edges. A lattice network with connectivity $G$ is monodisperse or strictly uniform if all branches have the same length. The underlying connectivities of networks in this study are shown in figure 1 and are $C$ (a comb) and two kinds of brushes, namely $B_1$ and $B_2$. Examples of these networks are shown in figures 8, 9 and 10. The scaling of $C$, $B_1$ and $B_2$ are given by equation (12), and the entropic exponents are given in terms of the vertex exponents in equation (14).

To sample lattice networks we use a parallel implementation of the Wang-Landau Algorithm [32]. This algorithm efficiently approximates the density of states in the
presence of a cost function. In this case the cost function is the energy of the states. The sampling is from a probability distribution that becomes asymptotically uniform. If $E_{\text{old}}(g(E_{\text{old}}))$ is the energy (respectively density) of the current configuration and $E_{\text{new}}(g(E_{\text{new}}))$ is the energy (respectively density) of the proposed configuration, a proposed move to the new state is accepted with probability $\min\{g(E_{\text{old}})/g(E_{\text{new}}), 1\}$. Each time a state is visited, the density of states is updated by a modification factor $f$ such that $g(E) \leftarrow g(E) \cdot f$. A histogram $H(E)$ recording each visit is kept and a flatness criterion for the histogram is used to update the modification factor $f$. That is, when the histogram achieves the flatness criterion it is reset and $f$ is reduced in a predetermined fashion. This must be done with care, since if $f$ is decreased too rapidly this can lead to saturation errors. In our implementation there are 4 parallel streams that are used to control the update of $f$ common to all parallel streams.

For branched structures the algorithm first grows a central uniform star and then grows the additional branches from the endpoint of that star. To grow a star with $f$ arms the central vertex is fixed and at each stage $f$ steps are sampled uniformly at random to be appended to the end of the star. If there are no intersections in the proposed steps and the state change is accepted then the new configuration is kept. Otherwise, the original configuration is re-read and the density is updated accordingly. When the star is fully grown the branch vertex is chosen uniformly at random from the $f$ candidates. Once chosen the remaining branches are grown from the branch vertex analogously to the arms of the star. Let $b$ denote the number of total branches (including the original star arms), each of length $\ell$, of the comb or brush under consideration. The process of first growing a star and then growing the remaining branches is iterated so that each structure of uniform length $n = b\ell$ is independently sampled via the Wang-Landau algorithm for $\ell = 1, ..., 200$. For each $\ell$, on the order of $10^9$ configurations were sampled. A more explicit formulation of the Wang-Landau algorithm used for sampling stars is provided below for reference.

Wang-Landau Algorithm
This algorithm samples $M$ stars with $s$ arms, each of length 0 to $\ell$ and returns the approximate counts $\hat{c}_\ell$ at each length $\ell$. Define $d_\ell = \ln(\hat{c}_\ell)$

1. Let $d_\ell = 0$ for all $\ell$, set $f = 1$ and let $v_0$ be the vertex at the origin. Set checkpoint $c$ to test for histogram flatness and $o_\ell$ the number of observations of length $\ell$ for each $\ell$. Let $t = 1$ be the number of checks.

2. Suppose $\ell > m \geq 0$. Choose uniformly among the nearest neighbors of $\{v_{m}^1, ..., v_{m}^s\}$, unoccupied or otherwise, to propose the next steps of the star.

3. If the proposed move is $\{v_{m-1}^1, ..., v_{m-1}^s\}$ then step back with probability $\min\{1, \exp\{d_m - d_{m-1}\}\}$. Set $d_{m-1} = d_{m-1} + f$ and $o_{m-1} = o_{m-1} + 1$. Otherwise reread the current location and set $d_m = d_m + f$ and $o_m = o_m + 1$. Else check for intersections with previously visited vertices $\{v_i^1, ..., v_i^s\}$ for $i = 0, ..., m - 1$ and amongst the proposed vertices. If there are no intersections set $\{v_{m+1}^1, ..., v_{m+1}^s\}$ to be the new vertices with probability $\min\{1, \exp\{d_m - d_{m+1}\}\}$. 

Set $d_{m+1} = d_m + f$ and $o_{m+1} = o_m + 1$. Otherwise if the proposed vertices are rejected or there is an intersection, reread the current location and set $d_m = d_m + f$ and $o_m = o_m + 1$.

4. Suppose $m = \ell$. Then perform the steps as in step 3 but step forward with probability 0.

5. Repeat steps 2 to 4 until $c$ iterations are performed. Test for histogram flatness by considering the $o_t$. If the desired flatness is reached set $t = t + 1$ and update $f$.

6. Repeat steps 2 to 5 until $M$ observations have been reached.

Data were collected and analysed similarly to the analysis done in sections 3 and 4. In determining the approximate counts for lattice networks, there are (similarly to the case for lattice stars) symmetry factors which should be taken into account when calculating amplitudes $C_g$.

The symmetry factors are determined as follows: Let the root star of the network have $f$ arms, and $b-f$ branches are grown on the endpoint of one of the root star arms. The symmetry factor is then equal to the number of ways to colour these arms, namely $(f-1)!(b-f)!$. This is seen by noting that the arm from which the branching occurs is coloured in one way, and the remaining arms in $(f-1)!$ ways. The last $b-f$ arms can be coloured in $(b-f)!$ ways.

In addition, the counts also have to be normalised by counting the number of ways the same network can be grown by the algorithm. Each network of length $n$ is grown by first growing a star of length $\ell f$ and then growing the addition arms comprising $(b-f)\ell$ steps. In $d$ dimensions the sample space of each step in the $f$-star is $(2^d)^f$ and for the additional branches is $(2^d)^{b-f}$. In flat histogram sampling these factors are accounted for in the relative weights of stars-to-network. Since stars are grown first and the empty walk of unit weight is the root of the star, if the normalization is done in this way, there is systematic under-counting by a factor of $(2^d)^f - (b-f)!$. Taken together, in order to account for these factors we must divide the original counts by $\frac{(f-1)!(b-f)!}{(2^d)^f - 2^f}^\ell$.

5.1. Lattice networks in the square lattice

5.1.1. Uniform comb $\mathcal{C}$: These networks have $b = 5$ branches and were sampled for $n = b\ell$ where $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, 200$ (that is, 200 steps per branch) giving a maximum size of $n = 1000$. Taking logarithms of the ratio $c_n(\mathcal{C})/c_n$, using equations (2) and (12) gives the model

$$\log \left( \frac{c_n(\mathcal{C})}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{C_C}{C} \right) + (2\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3) \log n \quad (97)$$

where the exact value of the coefficient of $\log n$ is $-\frac{9}{16} = -0.5625$. Performing two parameter fits to estimate the exponents from our data gave good results, with statistically insignificant corrections to scaling. A systematic error is estimated by comparing the results to that of a three parameter regression adding the term $\frac{\xi}{n}$ to the right hand side of equation (97). The estimated systematic error is the absolute difference between these estimates.
In addition, to account for corrections due to small networks, the regressions were done for \( \ell \geq \ell_{\text{min}} \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 50\} \) and the estimates for \( \log(C_C/C) \) and \( 2\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3 \) are extrapolated using \( 2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2} \) and \( \log\left(C_C/C\right)|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2} \). In the three parameter model the extrapolation was done for \( \ell_{\text{min}} = 1, \ldots, 15 \). These ranges were arbitrarily chosen to use a similar fraction of the data as in the three parameter analysis for stars which has lengths range over \( n_{\text{min}} = 10, \ldots, 200 \) and to avoid over-fitting due to the data limitations. In the two parameter setting the model results in the fits:

\[
2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1 \approx -0.5623770 + 0.0594230 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} - 0.0461858 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2},
\]

\[
\log\left(\frac{C_C}{C}\right) \approx -1.0756251 - 0.3764730 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + 0.2933096 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}.
\]

(98)

By taking \( \ell_{\text{min}} \to \infty \), \( 2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1 = -0.5623(73) \) and \( \log(C_C/C) = -1.075(53) \).

Turning to the regression

\[
\log\left(\frac{c_n(C)}{c_n}\right) = \log\left(\frac{C_C}{2^{\sigma_1}C}\right) + (2\sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1) \log n
\]

and extrapolating in the same fashion gives the fits:

\[
2\sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1 \approx -0.3909141 + 0.0526031 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} - 0.0426635 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2},
\]

\[
\log\left(\frac{C_C}{2^{\sigma_1}C}\right) \approx -1.1095588 - 0.3333163 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + 0.2706370 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}.
\]

(100)

Taking \( n_{\text{min}} \to \infty \) gives the estimates \( 2\sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1 = -0.3909(66) \) and \( \log\left(\frac{C_C}{2^{\sigma_1}C}\right) = -1.109(49) \). Solving the above simultaneously for \( C, C_C, \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_3 \) gives the following estimates for the exponents and the amplitudes:

\[
C = 1.18(29), \quad C_C = 0.404(75), \quad \sigma_1 = 0.171(14), \quad \sigma_3 = -0.453(17).
\]  

(101)

The estimated errors are computed by carrying through the errors computed in the original fits. The exponent estimates agree very well with the exact values \( \sigma_1 = 0.171875 \) and \( \sigma_3 = -0.453125 \). The exponent \( \gamma_C \) can be determined by noting that \( \gamma_C - 1 = 4\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3 = 2(3\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3) - (2\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3) \) and then substituting the results \( 3\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3 \approx -0.3909(66) \) and \( 2\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3 \approx -0.5623(73) \) obtained above. The result is \( \gamma_C - 1 = -0.220(21) \).

5.1.2. Uniform brush \( \mathcal{B}_1 \): In this case the number of branches is \( b = 6 \) and states with \( n = bl \) were sampled for \( \ell = 1, 2, \ldots, 200 \) (200 steps per branch) which in this case gives a maximum length \( n = 1200 \). The model for \( c_n(\mathcal{B}_1)/c_n \) is given by

\[
\log\left(\frac{c_n(\mathcal{B}_1)}{c_n}\right) = \log\left(\frac{C_{\mathcal{B}_1}}{C}\right) + (\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1) \log n.
\]

(102)

Fitting the model to our data for \( \ell_{\text{min}} = 1, 2, \ldots, 50 \) and extrapolating the exponent \( \sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2} \) and the amplitude ratio by \( \log(C_{\mathcal{B}_1}/C)|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2} \) gives

\[
\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1 \approx -1.1253182 + 0.1279727 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} - 0.0992754 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}.
\]
Vertex exponents for lattice stars

\[ \log \left( \frac{C_{B_1}}{C} \right) \approx -1.9787896 - 0.8355429 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} + 0.6499901 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}. \]  

(103)

Taking \( \ell_{\min} \to \infty \) gives \( \sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3 \sigma_1 = -1.125(15) \) and \( \log(C_{B_1}/C) \approx -1.97(11) \).

Turning to the regression

\[ \log \left( \frac{c_n(B_1)}{c_{2n}} \right) = \log \left( \frac{C_{B_1}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) + (\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 4 \sigma_1) \log n \]  

(104)

and extrapolating in the same way gives the fits:

\[ \sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 4 \sigma_1 \approx -0.9539269 + 0.1228745 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} - 0.0965910 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}, \]

\[ \log \frac{C_{B_1}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \approx -2.0123421 - 0.8023954 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} + 0.6322802 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}. \]  

(105)

Taking \( \ell_{\min} \to \infty \) gives the estimates \( \sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 4 \sigma_1 \approx -0.953(15) \) and \( \log(C_{B_1}/2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}) \approx -2.01(11) \). Substituting \( \sigma_3 = -0.453(17) \) from equation \( 101 \) and solving simultaneously gives

\[ C = 1.18(79), \; C_{B_1} = 0.163(79), \; \sigma_1 = 0.171(31), \; \sigma_4 = -1.187(127). \]  

(106)

These results are in good agreement with the exact values \( \sigma_1 = 0.171875 \) and \( \sigma_4 = -1.1875 \). The exponent \( \gamma_{B_1} \) can be determined by noting that \( \gamma_{B_1} - 1 = 5 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4 = 2(4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4) - (3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4) \) and then substituting the results \( 4 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4 \approx -0.953(15) \) and \( 3 \sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4 \approx -1.125(15) \) obtained above. The result is \( \gamma_{B_1} - 1 = -0.781(45) \).

5.1.3. Uniform brush \( B_2 \): These lattice networks have \( b = 7 \) branches and were sampled for \( n = b \ell \) where \( \ell = 1, 2, \ldots, 200 \) (200 sites per branch). This gives a maximum length of \( n = 1400 \). We analysed the model

\[ \log \left( \frac{c_n(B_2)}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{C_{B_2}}{C} \right) + (2 \sigma_4 + 4 \sigma_1) \log n. \]  

(107)

Fitting the model to our data for \( \ell_{\min} = 1, 2, \ldots, 50 \) and extrapolating the exponent \( 2 \sigma_4 + 4 \sigma_1 |_{\ell_{\min}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\min}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\min}^2} \) and the amplitude ratio by \( \log(C_{B_2}/C) |_{\ell_{\min}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\min}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\min}^2} \) gives

\[ 2 \sigma_4 + 4 \sigma_1 \approx -1.6788349 + 0.1629652 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} - 0.1202270 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}, \]

\[ \log \left( \frac{C_{B_2}}{C} \right) \approx -2.8266080 - 1.0833930 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} + 0.8014111 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}. \]  

(108)

which by taking \( \ell_{\min} \to \infty \) gives \( 2 \sigma_4 + 4 \sigma_1 = -1.679(14) \) and \( \log \frac{C_{B_2}}{C} = -2.83(11) \).

Turning to the regression

\[ \log \left( \frac{c_n(B_2)}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{C_{B_2}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) + (2 \sigma_4 + 5 \sigma_1) \log n \]  

(109)

and extrapolating in the same way gives

\[ 2 \sigma_4 + 5 \sigma_1 \approx -1.5077206 + 0.1598141 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} - 0.1192023 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}, \]

\[ \log \left( \frac{C_{B_2}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \right) \approx -2.8584528 - 1.0624933 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} + 0.7943977 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}. \]  

(110)
Taking \( \ell_{\text{min}} \to \infty \) gives the estimates \( 2\sigma_4 + 5\sigma_1 \approx -1.508(14) \) and \( \log(C_{B_2}/2^{\sigma_1}\sqrt{C}) \approx -2.85(11) \). Solving simultaneously for \( C, C_{B_2}, \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_4 \) gives

\[
C = 1.19(73), \quad C_{B_2} = 0.070(31), \quad \sigma_1 = 0.171(28), \quad \sigma_4 = -1.182(64). \quad \tag{111}
\]

These results agree very well with the exact values \( \sigma_1 = 0.171875 \) and \( \sigma_4 = -1.1875 \). The exponent \( \gamma_{B_2} \) can be determined by noting that \( \gamma_{B_2} - 1 = 6\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4 = 2(5\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4) - (4\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4) \) and then substituting the results \( 5\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4 \approx -1.508(14) \) and \( 4\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4 \approx -1.679(14) \) obtained above. The result is \( \gamma_{B_2} - 1 = -1.337(42) \).

5.2. Lattice networks in the cubic lattice

5.2.1. Uniform comb \( C \): These networks have \( b = 5 \) branches and were sampled for lengths \( n = b\ell \) for \( \ell = 1, 2, \ldots 200 \) (200 steps per branch) to a maximum length of \( n = 1000 \). The model for the ratio \( c_n(C)/c_n \) is

\[
\log \left( \frac{c_n(C)}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{C C^{-\gamma}}{C} \right) + (2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1) \log n. \quad \tag{112}
\]

Fitting the model for \( \ell \geq \ell_{\text{min}} = 1, 2, \ldots, 50 \) and extrapolating the results for \( \log(C_C/C) \) and \( 2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1 \) using \( \log(C_C/C)|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2} \) and \( 2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2} \) gives

\[
2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1 \approx -0.2315391 - 0.0255909 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + 0.0210492 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}, \quad \log \left( \frac{C_C}{C} \right) \approx -1.4236964 + 0.1632761 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} - 0.1345616 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}. \quad \tag{113}
\]

Taking \( \ell_{\text{min}} \to \infty \) gives \( 2\sigma_3 + 2\sigma_1 = -0.2315(55) \) and \( \log(C_C/C) \approx -1.423(39) \). Turning to

\[
\log \left( \frac{c_n(C)}{c_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{C C^{-\gamma}}{C} \right) + (2\sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1) \log n \quad \tag{114}
\]

and extrapolating the resulting fits give

\[
2\sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1 \approx -0.1518479 - 0.0269920 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + 0.0219299 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}, \quad \log \left( \frac{C_C}{2^{\sigma_1}\sqrt{C}} \right) \approx -1.3894656 + 0.1722886 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} - 0.1403284 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}. \quad \tag{115}
\]

Taking \( \ell_{\text{min}} \to \infty \) gives the estimates \( 2\sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1 = -0.1518(58) \) and \( \log(C_C/2^{\sigma_1}\sqrt{C}) = -1.389(41) \). Solving the above simultaneously for \( C, C_C, \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_3 \) gives

\[
C = 1.19(23), \quad C_C = 0.288(43), \quad \sigma_1 = 0.079(11), \quad \sigma_3 = -0.195(14). \quad \tag{116}
\]

These estimated exponents are in good agreement with the estimate \( \sigma_1 = 0.07849(17) \) \[26\] and our estimates \( \sigma_1 = 0.0789(20) \) (in table \[3\]) and \( \sigma_3 = -0.204(12) \) (found by our analysis of 3-stars in the cubic lattice; see equation \[71\]). The exponent \( \gamma_C \) can be determined by noting that \( \gamma_C - 1 = 4\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3 = 2(3\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3) - (2\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3) \) and then substituting the results \( 3\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3 \approx -0.1518(58) \) and \( 2\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_3 \approx -0.2315(55) \) obtained above. The result is \( \gamma_C - 1 = -0.072(18) \).
5.2.2. Uniform brush $B_1$: These networks have $b = 6$ branches and were sampled for $n = b\ell$ where $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, 200$ (200 steps) giving a maximum length of $n = 1200$. The model for $c_n(B_1)/c_n$ is given by

$$\log\left(\frac{c_n(B_1)}{c_n}\right) = \log\left(\frac{C_{B_1}}{C}\right) + (\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1) \log n.$$  \hfill (117)

Fitting the model to our data for $\ell_{\text{min}} = 1, 2, \ldots, 50$ and extrapolating the exponent $\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}$ and the amplitude ratio by $\log(C_{B_1}/C)|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}$ gives

$$\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1 \approx -0.4539925 + 0.0001155 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} - 0.0025122 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2},$$

$$\log \frac{C_{B_1}}{C} \approx -2.5473478 - 0.0016987 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + 0.0168582 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}. \hfill (118)$$

Taking $\ell_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives $\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 3\sigma_1 = -0.4540(21)$ and $\log(C_{B_1}/C) = -2.547(15)$.

Next, turning to the regression

$$\log\left(\frac{c_n(B_1)}{c_n}\right) = \log\left(\frac{C_{B_1}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}}\right) + (\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 4\sigma_1) \log n$$  \hfill (119)

and extrapolating in the same way gives the fits:

$$\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 4\sigma_1 \approx -0.3744694 - 0.0005720 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} - 0.0020522 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2},$$

$$\log \frac{C_{B_1}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}} \approx -2.5121238 + 0.0028541 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + 0.0137683 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}. \hfill (120)$$

Taking $\ell_{\text{min}} \to \infty$ gives the estimates $\sigma_4 + \sigma_3 + 4\sigma_1 = -0.3744(20)$ and $\log(C_{B_1}/2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{C}) = -2.512(15)$. Substituting in the estimate for $\sigma_3$ from the previous uniform comb analysis and solving the above simultaneously for $C$, $C_{B_1}$, $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_4$ gives

$$C = 1.198(82), \quad C_{B_1} = 0.0937(49), \quad \sigma_1 = 0.0795(42), \quad \sigma_4 = -0.497(29). \hfill (121)$$

These estimated exponents are in good agreement with the estimate $\sigma_1 = 0.07849(17)$ \cite{26} and our estimates $\sigma_1 = 0.0789(20)$ (in table 3) and $\sigma_4 = -0.499(16)$ (found by our analysis of 4-stars in the cubic lattice; see equation (78)). The exponent $\gamma_{B_1}$ can be determined by noting that $\gamma_{B_1} - 1 = 5\sigma_1 + 3\sigma_3 + 4\sigma_4 = 2(4\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4) - (3\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4)$ and then substituting the results $4\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4 \approx -0.3744(20)$ and $3\sigma_1 + \sigma_3 + \sigma_4 \approx -0.4540(21)$ obtained above. The result is $\gamma_{B_1} - 1 = -0.2948(61)$.

5.2.3. Uniform brush $B_2$: These networks have $b = 7$ branches and were sampled for $n = b\ell$ where $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, 200$ (200 steps) giving a maximum length of $n = 1,400$. The model for $c_n(B_2)/c_n$ is given by

$$\log\left(\frac{c_n(B_2)}{c_n}\right) = \log\left(\frac{C_{B_2}}{C}\right) + (2\sigma_4 + 4\sigma_1) \log n.$$  \hfill (122)

Fitting the model to our data for $\ell_{\text{min}} = 1, 2, \ldots, 50$ and extrapolating the exponent $2\sigma_4 + 4\sigma_1|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}$ and the amplitude ratio by $\log(C_{B_2}/C)|_{\ell_{\text{min}}} = a + \frac{b}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + \frac{c}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2}$ gives

$$2\sigma_4 + 4\sigma_1 \approx -0.6695365 - 0.0077013 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}} + 0.0032415 \frac{1}{\ell_{\text{min}}^2},$$
\[ \log \left( \frac{C_{B_2}}{C} \right) \approx -3.6712739 + 0.0518432 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} - 0.0229230 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}. \] (123)

By taking \( \ell_{\min} \to \infty \) gives \( 2\sigma_4 + 4\sigma_1 = -0.6695(14) \) and \( \log(C_{B_2}/C) = -3.671(10) \).

Next, consider
\[ \log \left( \frac{c_n(B_2)}{e_n} \right) = \log \left( \frac{C_{B_2}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{\ell}} \right) + (2\sigma_4 + 5\sigma_1) \log n. \] (124)

Perform the fit to the data and extrapolate in the same way as before to obtain
\[ 2\sigma_4 + 5\sigma_1 \approx -0.5896372 - 0.0090608 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} + 0.0043467 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}, \]
\[ \log \left( \frac{C_{B_2}}{2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{\ell}} \right) \approx -3.6383112 + 0.0613620 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}} - 0.0304773 \frac{1}{\ell_{\min}^2}. \] (125)

Taking \( \ell_{\min} \to \infty \) gives the estimates \( \sigma_4 + 5\sigma_1 = -0.5896(11) \) and \( \log(C_{B_2}/2^{\sigma_1} \sqrt{\ell}) \approx -3.6383(73) \). Solving the above simultaneously for \( C, C_{B_2}, \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_4 \) gives
\[ C = 1.193(46), \ C_{B_2} = 0.03036(86), \ \sigma_1 = 0.0798(25), \ \sigma_4 = -0.4945(58). \] (126)

The estimates of \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_4 \) agree well with \( \sigma_1 = 0.07849(17) \) [26] and our estimates \( \sigma_1 = 0.0789(20) \) (in table 3) and \( \sigma_4 = -0.499(16) \) (found by our analysis of 4-stars in the cubic lattice; see equation (78)). The exponent \( \gamma_{B_2} \) can be determined by noting that \( \gamma_{B_2} - 1 = 6\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4 = 2(5\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4) - (4\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4) \) and then substituting the results \( 5\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4 \approx -0.5896(11) \) and \( 4\sigma_1 + 2\sigma_4 \approx -0.6695(14) \) obtained above. The result is \( \gamma_{B_2} - 1 = -0.5097(46) \).

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have given an account of sampling lattice stars and acyclic lattice networks using parallel implementations of flatGARM [2, 23] and the Wang-Landau algorithm [32]. Our simulations produced a large set of data in the form of approximate counts, which we analysed to extract estimates of the vertex exponents \( \sigma_j \) in lattice networks, and the amplitudes of self-avoiding walks and lattice stars.

Our final estimates for the vertex exponents in the square and cubic lattices are listed in tables 1, 2 and 3. In those cases where we have estimated a given exponent several times, we list the average of the estimates and give an error bar which is the statistical error bar of the estimates. In table 1 we confirm, within the stated errors, the exact values of the vertex exponents in the square lattice. Our results in the cubic lattice in table 2 are consistent with the estimates in older studies, but again show the short-comings in estimates due to higher order \( \epsilon \)-expansions in table 3. For the exponents \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_3 \) the \( \epsilon \)-expansion gives reasonable results at the order \( \epsilon \) or \( \epsilon^2 \) level, but breaks down for higher order. The \( \epsilon \)-expansions for \( \sigma_4 \), \( \sigma_5 \) and \( \sigma_6 \) estimates are best (but not good) at the order \( \epsilon \) level, but break down for higher order expansions.

As a byproduct of our simulations, we have estimated the self-avoiding walk parameters in equation 2, in some cases several times. Collecting all these instances and taking averages give
\[ \mu_2 = 2.6381577(34), \ \gamma = 1.3442(32), \ \text{and} \ C = 1.170(22), \ \text{in the square lattice}; \]
Table 27. Estimated amplitudes in the square lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$U^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_0^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_1^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_2^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_3^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_4^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_5^{(f)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2507(70)</td>
<td>0.2085(12)</td>
<td>0.6253(36)</td>
<td>0.6253(36)</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.233(26)</td>
<td>0.05140(11)</td>
<td>0.2056(42)</td>
<td>0.3084(62)</td>
<td>0.2056(42)</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.273(56)</td>
<td>0.4392(46)</td>
<td>1.318(14)</td>
<td>0.4392(46)</td>
<td>1.318(14)</td>
<td>0.8789(92)</td>
<td>$-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.25(15)</td>
<td>0.7015(82)</td>
<td>2.104(26)</td>
<td>2.104(26)</td>
<td>0.7015(82)</td>
<td>2.104(26)</td>
<td>2.104(26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Estimated amplitudes in the cubic lattice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$U^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_0^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_1^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_2^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_3^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_4^{(f)}$</th>
<th>$C_5^{(f)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.175(36)</td>
<td>0.1958(54)</td>
<td>0.587(16)</td>
<td>0.587(16)</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.038(19)</td>
<td>0.04325(79)</td>
<td>0.1730(32)</td>
<td>0.2595(47)</td>
<td>0.1730(32)</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.643(53)</td>
<td>0.005350(43)</td>
<td>0.02679(23)</td>
<td>0.05358(44)</td>
<td>0.05358(44)</td>
<td>0.02679(23)</td>
<td>$-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2469(30)</td>
<td>0.000343(42)</td>
<td>0.002058(25)</td>
<td>0.005144(62)</td>
<td>0.006859(83)</td>
<td>0.005144(62)</td>
<td>0.002058(25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\mu_3 = 4.684051(10)$, $\gamma = 1.15838(61)$, and $C = 1.202(15)$, in the cubic lattice. (127)

The estimate of $\gamma$ in the cubic lattice slightly overestimates this exponent, and the other estimates are consistent with results in the literature (see, for example, tables 1.1 and 1.2 in reference [14]). The estimates for $C$, particularly in the square lattice, remain dispersed, probably due to model dependency and parity effects in our analysis. Even so, the individual estimates are within the 95% confidence interval of the average (the error bars stated above are 68% confidence intervals on the stated averages). In both the square and cubic lattices these estimates are slightly lower than those obtained when only analysing self-avoiding walk data (see sections 3.1 and 4.1).

Our results for the entropic exponents for the lattice networks $C$, $B_1$ and $B_2$ are listed in table 3. In the square lattice our results are very close to the predicted exact values. However, in the cubic lattice our results deviate from the predictions of the first order $\epsilon$-expansion (predictions using second and higher order $\epsilon$-expansion estimates are even more off the mark).

In addition, we have estimated the amplitudes of uniform and almost uniform lattice stars. We collect these in table 27 for the square lattice, and in table 28 for the cubic lattice.
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