

Exact asymptotic solution of an aggregation model with a bell-shaped distribution

F. Leyvraz*

*Instituto de Ciencias Físicas—Universidad Nacional
Autónoma de México, Cuernavaca, Morelos, México*

(Dated: April 10, 2024)

Abstract

We present in a detailed manner the scaling theory of irreversible aggregation characterized by the set of reaction rates $K(k, l) = 1/k + 1/l$. In this case, it is possible to determine the behaviour of large-size aggregates in the limit of large times in a way that allows a highly detailed analysis of the behaviour of the system. This is the so-called scaling limit, in which the cluster size distribution collapses to a function of the ratio of the cluster size to a time-dependent *typical size*. The results confirm the far more general results of earlier work concerning a general scaling theory for so-called reaction rates of Type III, which are characterised by the property that aggregates of very different sizes react faster than comparable aggregates of similar sizes. For these, the cluster size distribution decays rapidly to zero both for sizes much larger and much smaller than the typical size, and is thus often described as being “bell-shaped”. For clusters much larger than the typical size, however, an unexpected subleading correction is discovered. Finally, several results going beyond the scope of the scaling limit are obtained: in particular the behaviour of concentrations for fixed cluster size in the large-time limit and the large-size behaviour for clusters at a fixed time. The latter again shows subleading deviations from the expected behaviour.

Keywords: irreversible aggregation, exact solution, Smoluchowski equations, scaling

* leyvraz@icf.unam.mx; Centro Internacional de Ciencias, Cuernavaca, Morelos, México

I. INTRODUCTION

Irreversible aggregation is the process whereby aggregates grow by the scheme



with no backward reaction. Here A_k denotes an aggregate consisting of k elemental aggregates (monomers) and $K(k, l)$ denotes the dependence of the rate at which the aggregation occurs, as a function of the masses of the 2 aggregates.

Such processes occur in a broad variety of physical systems. Thus in aerosols and colloids these are quite common, as well as in many other contexts. The concentration $c_j(t)$ of aggregates of mass j varies according to the following kinetic equation

$$\dot{c}_j(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^{\infty} K(k, l) c_k(t) c_l(t) [\delta_{j,k+l} - \delta_{j,k} - \delta_{j,l}]. \quad (2)$$

The size dependence of the $K(k, l)$ is determined by the detailed physics of the process under study. For aerosols which diffuse and coalesce irreversibly in three dimensions, for instance, a standard approximation for the rate is given by

$$K(k, l) = [R(k) + R(l)] [D(k) + D(l)] \quad (3)$$

where $R(k)$ describes the typical radius of an aggregate of mass k and $D(k)$ its diffusion constant (for greater background on the physics of such systems, see for example [1–3]). If the aggregates are spherical objects, we have $R(k)$ proportional to $k^{1/3}$ and similarly $D(k)$ goes as $k^{-1/3}$.

At this point it may be useful to point out that irreversible aggregation as treated here is only a small part of a large field of research, so rich that attempting to sketch it would be idle. Suffice it to say that, even for pure aggregation, it is possible to consider such variants as the introduction of source terms, multiple species, spatial structure and the interaction with diffusion, as well as many other issues. Some of these variants are described in [4]. On the other hand, we may also consider fragmentation, or fragmentation in coexistence with aggregation. The review [5] together with the references therein may be useful to the reader interested in this subject. Finally, for a broad view of related topics, [6] is of considerable interest, whereas for applications in concrete systems, see [1–3].

A general scaling theory for the solutions of (2) was developed by [7–9] following initial earlier work in [10], and reviewed in [4]. In it, it is assumed that there exist a function $S(t)$

diverging as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which corresponds to the typical size of the aggregate size distribution at time t , and a function $\Phi(x)$ such that

$$c_j(t) \simeq [S(t)]^{-2} \Phi\left(\frac{j}{S(t)}\right). \quad (4)$$

Here the symbol \simeq simply signifies that the two sides of the equation grow at approximately the same rate in the appropriate limit. I specifically do not wish to commit myself to any specific mathematical statement when using this notation.

The scaling theory makes two kinds of predictions. One is extremely general, and concerns the rate of growth of $S(t)$. Let the reaction kernel $K(k, l)$ be homogeneous of degree λ , that is

$$K(ak, al) = a^\lambda K(k, l) \quad (5)$$

at least asymptotically as $k, l \rightarrow \infty$. Then the typical size $S(t)$ grows as

$$S(t) \simeq t^{1/(1-\lambda)} \quad (t \rightarrow \infty). \quad (6)$$

A more detailed analysis concerns the small- x behaviour of $\Phi(x)$, which leads to the distribution of cluster sizes for sizes much less than the typical size.

To this end, we need to define another exponent characterising the behaviour of $K(k, l)$ for very different values of k and l : first let us define

$$K(k, l) = k^\lambda \mathcal{K}\left(\frac{l}{k}\right). \quad (7)$$

The exponents μ and ν are then given by

$$\mathcal{K}(x) \simeq x^\nu \quad (x \rightarrow \infty), \quad (8a)$$

$$\mathcal{K}(x) \simeq x^\mu \quad (x \rightarrow 0). \quad (8b)$$

It follows immediately from the definition that

$$\mu + \nu = \lambda \quad (9)$$

For example, if we take the case of the rates $K(k, l)$ given by (3):

$$K(k, l) = (k^{1/3} + l^{1/3})(k^{-1/3} + l^{-1/3}), \quad (10)$$

we find the values $\lambda = 0$, $\mu = -1/3$ and $\nu = 1/3$.

These exponents define to a large extent the nature of the scaling behaviour of the system. First, all our considerations pertain to the case $\lambda < 1$. When $\lambda > 1$, a divergence of the typical size followed by loss of mass to an infinite aggregate occurs at finite time. Rates for $\lambda < 1$ are divided in 3 broad types, according to the sign of μ [7]. Type I corresponds to $\mu > 0$, Type II to $\mu = 0$, and Type III to $\mu < 0$. The kernel (10) is thus of Type III.

The scaling function behaves for $x \ll 1$ differently for the 3 types. For type I we have

$$\Phi(x) \simeq x^{-\tau}, \quad \tau = 1 + \lambda \quad (11)$$

for $x \ll 1$. This means that there is a broad range of sizes over which the aggregates are power-law distributed. On the other hand, Type II kernels behave in a quite non-universal manner. In most known cases, $\Phi(x)$ also goes as a power $x^{-\tau}$, but for a value of τ which depends on the detailed behaviour of $K(k, l)$. Finally, Type III kernels have a scaling function $\Phi(x)$ which goes faster than any power towards zero as $x \rightarrow 0$. Specifically

$$\Phi(x) \simeq \text{const.} \cdot x^{-\lambda} \exp(-\text{const.} \cdot x^{-|\mu|}). \quad (12)$$

The aggregate sizes do not show a great variation and their distribution is sometimes described as being bell-shaped.

Another issue is the behaviour of $\Phi(x)$ for $x \gg 1$ which determines the behaviour of the concentrations of clusters of size much larger than the typical size. In that case, $\Phi(x)$ always decays exponentially, but also has a correction exponent θ defined by

$$\Phi(x) \simeq \text{const.} \cdot x^{-\theta} \exp(-\text{const.} \cdot x). \quad (13)$$

For all kernels we have

$$\theta = \lambda, \quad (14)$$

except in the case $\nu = 1$, for which a similar lack of universality exists as for the $x \ll 1$ behaviour when $\mu = 0$ [8].

There are several rate kernels for which (2) can be solved exactly. Interestingly, if we limit ourselves to the non-gelling case $\lambda \leq 1$, they are all of type II; the most prominent

examples are

$$K_1(k, l) = \alpha + \beta(k + l), \quad (15a)$$

$$K_2(k, l) = 2 - q^k - q^l \quad (q < 1), \quad (15b)$$

$$K_3(k, l) = \alpha \delta_{k,1} \delta_{l,1} + \beta (\delta_{k,1} + \delta_{l,1}) + \gamma, \quad (15c)$$

$$K_4(k, l) = \alpha + \beta [(-1)^k + (-1)^l] + \gamma(-1)^{k+l}. \quad (15d)$$

where α , β , and γ are arbitrary constants, positive or zero [11–14]. It would thus be of interest to obtain any kind of rigorous information on kernels of type I or III. In particular, it is of interest to obtain exact, or at least accurate, asymptotic results, for a kernel of type III, since these are the kind that arises in the most natural way in aerosol physics. This is what we shall do in this paper.

In the following we consider the case, also treated earlier in [15], given by

$$K(k, l) = \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{l}. \quad (16)$$

It is also straightforward to show that the faintly more general version

$$K(k, l) = \frac{1}{\alpha k + \beta} + \frac{1}{\alpha l + \beta}, \quad (17)$$

where $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta > -\alpha$ are arbitrary, behaves in the scaling limit in exactly the same way as the kernel given by (16), which shows that the behaviour we describe is at least to some extent universal. We shall not have anything else to say about this generalised kernel, however.

The kernel (16) has $\lambda = \mu = -1$, so that we have

$$S(t) \simeq \sqrt{t}. \quad (18)$$

and presumably

$$\Phi(x) \simeq \text{const.} \cdot x^{-1} \cdot \exp(-\text{const.} \cdot x^{-1}) \quad (x \ll 1). \quad (19)$$

On the other hand, for $x \gg 1$, we obtain

$$\Phi(x) \simeq \text{const.} \cdot x \exp(-\text{const.} \cdot x). \quad (20)$$

In the following we shall show rigorously the above relations, and additionally evaluate explicitly the different constants involved. We further provide a technique to evaluate the

scaling function to high accuracy. We shall also obtain subleading corrections to the behaviours stated above.

Beyond the scaling limit, some other issues can also be treated. In particular we discuss the large-time behaviour of clusters of fixed size, which cannot be found via scaling. Similarly, the limit of large sizes for clusters at a fixed given time can be treated to a high degree of accuracy. In earlier treatments [20, 21], this behaviour was obtained through an approximation valid only in the limit of small times. Here we solve exactly this small-time limit for the reaction rates (16). We find it to involve an exponential decay modified by a power-law prefactor. Both the large-size limit of the scaling function and the finite-time large size behaviour differ from the small-time behaviour by a non-trivial correction to the power-law prefactor.

In Section II we introduce the basic techniques as well as the notation. In Section III we summarise the results to be developed. In Section IV we derive the results for the scaling behaviour summarised in Section III. In Section V and in Section VI we derive results beyond the scaling approximation: in the former, we describe the behaviour of large clusters at fixed times, and in the latter we analyse the behaviour of cluster of given size at large times. Finally we present conclusions in Section VII. Several Appendices clear up various technical points. In particular, Appendix A presents the detailed properties of a solution of a given nonlinear ODE, which is closely related to the scaling function of the problem.

II. PROBLEM AND FUNDAMENTAL EQUATIONS

The Smoluchowski's equations (2) read, for the case we are interested in

$$\dot{c}_j = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{c_k c_{j-k}}{k} - \frac{c_j}{j} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k - c_j \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_k}{k} \quad (21)$$

Kernels of the form

$$K(k, l) = f(k) + f(l) \quad (22)$$

can be treated using a standard transformation, introduced by Lushnikov [16]. We introduce the new dependent and independent variables

$$N(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k(t) \quad (23a)$$

$$\phi_j = \frac{c_j}{N(t)} \quad (23b)$$

$$ds = N(t)dt. \quad (23c)$$

In these new variables, the equations (21) read

$$\frac{d\phi_j}{ds} = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\phi_k \phi_{j-k}}{k} - \frac{\phi_j}{j} \quad (24)$$

This can be carried through for any kernel of the form (22) and eliminates the non-recursive removal terms, which is always a considerable step towards the solution. Indeed, it is clear that an exact expression for $\phi_j(s)$ can always be obtained recursively, by solving a linear equation with a (recursively known) inhomogeneity. The rapidly growing complexity of the resulting expressions makes this approach impractical. As an example, the first 4 explicit expressions for $\phi_j(s)$ are given by:

$$\phi_1(s) = e^{-s} \quad (25a)$$

$$\phi_2(s) = \frac{2e^{-2s}}{3} (e^{3s/2} - 1) \quad (25b)$$

$$\phi_3(s) = \frac{e^{-3s}}{56} (-48e^{3s/2} + 27e^{8s/3} + 21) \quad (25c)$$

$$\phi_4(s) = \frac{2e^{-4s}}{36855} (13000e^{3s/2} - 10935e^{8s/3} - 5460e^{3s} + 6944e^{15s/4} - 3549) \quad (25d)$$

However, no clear pattern appears to be recognisable. In the present case additional progress can be made: define the generating function

$$G(z, s) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_j(s)}{j} e^{-jz}. \quad (26)$$

(24) then reads

$$G_{zs}(z, s) = G_z(z, s)G(z, s) + G(z, s), \quad (27)$$

where the subscripts indicate a partial derivative with respect to the variable. Frequently, being able to cast a problem as a PDE in the way we have done here leads straightforwardly

to the full solution. This is not the case here: the PDE (27) is surprisingly complex, and I have made no headway at all.

Let us then look at the scaling limit. Using the standard approach discussed for example in [4], the scaling theory predicts the existence of a function $S(t)$ which grows as \sqrt{t} and of a function $\Phi(x)$ such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j c_j(t) f\left(\frac{j}{S(t)}\right) = \int_0^{\infty} x \Phi(x) f(x) dx \quad (28)$$

holds for all appropriate functions $f(x)$. Putting $f(x) = 1/x$ —which is possibly a problem from a rigorous viewpoint, but we are now only making plausibility considerations—one immediately obtains that

$$N(t) = \text{const.} \cdot S(t)^{-1} = O(t^{-1/2}). \quad (29)$$

From this follows that we expect the following scaling form for $G(z, s)$:

$$G(z, s) = \frac{1}{s} \Psi(zs). \quad (30)$$

Putting this into (27) leads to

$$\rho \Psi'' = \Psi \Psi' + \Psi. \quad (31)$$

Here we may note that, if we had carried out an exactly identical computation using the general kernel (17), we would also have obtained (31), thus justifying the remark that the two kernels are rigorously identical in the scaling limit. Again I have not been able to find a solution of this apparently simple equation. In Appendix A I show a large number of detailed properties of (31). In particular, I show that there is a unique solution such that $\Psi(\rho)$ is positive, smooth at the origin and monotonically decreasing to zero. Solutions smooth at the origin are characterised by the initial conditions

$$\Psi(0) = 1, \quad (32a)$$

$$\Psi'(0) = -1, \quad (32b)$$

$$\Psi''(0) = \kappa, \quad (32c)$$

where κ is arbitrary. The unique monotonically decreasing positive solution is characterised by a uniquely defined value κ_0 numerically found to be between 1.45582 and 1.45583. All other solutions of the type described by (32) diverge (for $\kappa > \kappa_0$) or become negative (for

$\kappa < \kappa_0$). Since these behaviours cannot arise in the function we are looking for, it is clear that the unique solution defined by $\kappa = \kappa_0$ is the only acceptable one.

The fact that the solution of (21) actually tends towards the scaling solution defined by (31) follows from the work of Norris [17], whereas the fact that the integro-differential equation which the scaling function can be shown to satisfy [9] actually has a solution under fairly general circumstances, was shown in [18]. The peculiar feature of our approach, however, resides in the very explicit nature of the equations to be solved, and the rather immediate, though somewhat tedious, character of the proof of existence, which is entirely constructive. It is performed in detail in Appendix A. We also show in Appendix B in detail that (31) follows from the well-known integro-differential equation introduced in [9, 10].

III. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Since the results presented are rather numerous, I wish to summarise them in the following for the reader's convenience. But first a matter of notation. Above I have used the symbol \simeq to denote a very rough concept of similar growth, with no particular commitment to any specific meaning. On the other hand, when I wish to make a more specific statement, for instance that $f(t)$ and $g(t)$ approach a common limit, I shall express this as

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} = 1, \quad (33)$$

or else, using the o -notation of Landau

$$f(t) = g(t) [1 + o(1)] \quad (34)$$

Here $o(1)$ represents a quantity which tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since we shall be interested in the precise rate of growth of various quantities, these notations will be useful.

Essential to the entire further development is the following connection between $\Psi(\rho)$, the solution of (31) described in Appendix A, and the scaling function $\Phi(x)$ defined in (28)

$$\Psi(\rho) = \kappa_0 \int_0^\infty dx \frac{\Phi(x)}{x} e^{-\rho x}. \quad (35)$$

A. Large-time behaviour of moments

We obtain the following rigorous results on the large-time behaviour of the moments of $c_j(t)$ for $n \geq 0$: let

$$\mu_n(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^n c_j(t). \quad (36)$$

The asymptotic behaviour of $\mu_n(t)$ is then given by, in terms of the variable s instead of t :

$$\mu_n(s) = m_n^{(\infty)} s^{n-1} [1 + o(1)] \quad (s \rightarrow \infty), \quad (37a)$$

$$m_n^{(\infty)} = \kappa_0^{-1} (-1)^{n+1} \partial_{\rho}^{n+1} \Psi(\rho) \big|_{\rho=0}. \quad (37b)$$

Explicit expressions for $m_n^{(\infty)}$ are obtained from (37b) by recursive evaluation of the derivatives of $\Psi(\rho)$ at the origin by the techniques described in Appendix A, see in particular (A5). We obtain for instance

$$m_0^{(\infty)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_0} \quad (38a)$$

$$m_1^{(\infty)} = 1 \quad (38b)$$

$$m_2^{(\infty)} = 2 \quad (38c)$$

$$m_3^{(\infty)} = 3 \left(1 + \frac{\kappa_0}{2} \right) \quad (38d)$$

Finally, expressions for $n = -2$ and -1 are also found

$$m_{-1}^{(\infty)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_0} \quad (39a)$$

$$m_{-2}^{(\infty)} = \frac{3}{2\kappa_0} \quad (39b)$$

The connection between s and t is also found asymptotically:

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2t(s)}{\kappa_0 s^2} = 1. \quad (40)$$

In the large- n limit, the $m_n^{(\infty)}$ behave as

$$m_n^{(\infty)} = \frac{2}{\kappa_0} (n+1)! \Lambda^{-(n+1)} \left[1 - \frac{2\Lambda}{3n(n+1)} \right] [1 + o(1)] \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (41)$$

Here $-\Lambda$ is the nearest singularity of $\Psi(\rho)$ to the origin, which, as shown in Appendix A, lies on the negative real axis. It is numerically evaluated in Appendix C.

B. Behaviour of the scaling function $\Phi(x)$ for small and large clusters

The scaling function defined by (28) for $x \rightarrow 0$ behaves as

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{\Gamma}{\kappa_0} \frac{\exp(-1/x)}{x} [1 + o(1)] + \text{const.} \cdot \frac{\exp(-4/x)}{x^{7/2}} [1 + o(1)]. \quad (42)$$

Here $-\Lambda$ is, as above, the nearest singularity of $\Psi(\rho)$ and Γ describes the asymptotic behaviour of $\Psi(\rho)$ as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, via

$$\Psi(\rho) = 2\Gamma\sqrt{\rho} K_1(2\sqrt{\rho}) [1 + o(1)], \quad (43)$$

where K_1 is the modified Bessel function [19]. This behaviour is shown in Appendix A and Γ is evaluated numerically in Appendix C.

Note that the behaviour of $\Phi(x)$ as described in (42) consists of 2 different exponential decays going at different rates. As we shall see in the following subsection, something very similar occurs if we consider the large-time behaviour of clusters of fixed size, which is not, however, described by the scaling function.

We now turn to the behaviour of the scaling function $\Phi(x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. We obtain

$$\Phi(x) = 2\kappa_0^{-1} \exp(-\Lambda x) \left(\Lambda x - \frac{1}{3x} \right) [1 + o(1)]. \quad (44)$$

In other words, the leading behaviour is exponential decay corrected by a power-law prefactor x , in agreement with the general theory developed in [20], which predicts a prefactor $x^{-\lambda}$, where λ is the degree of homogeneity of the reaction kernel. We see however a non-trivial correction to this factor, which is a rather unexpected result.

All the above results will be derived in Section IV.

C. Large clusters

In this subsection and the next, we turn to behaviour outside the scaling limit. For small times, it is known that solving the Smoluchowski equations (2) without the loss term leads to the exact small-time behaviour, which can be obtained recursively through the *Ansatz*

$$c_j(t) = \lambda_j t^{j-1} [1 + O(t)] \quad (45)$$

where the λ_j are exactly given by $j2^{-(j-1)}$.

In earlier work [20, 21], it had been assumed that both the scaling behaviour for $x \gg 1$ and the behaviour of large clusters at fixed time would be given by a qualitatively similar behaviour. We have already seen that the scaling function for $x \gg 1$ behaves differently, see (44), with a non-trivial subleading correction. In Appendix F, we also show that at a fixed value of time the large clusters behave as

$$c_j(t) = j \left(1 - \frac{2}{3j^2 R(t)} \right) R(t)^j [1 + o(1)] \quad (t \rightarrow \infty) \quad (46)$$

We therefore see that, if we look at subleading behaviour, there is a real difference between the recursion describing the behaviour at the smallest times and the behaviour of large clusters, both when viewed in the scaling limit and when taken at fixed times for $j \rightarrow \infty$.

All the above results will be derived in Section V.

D. Large-time behaviour of fixed size clusters

Here we ask how clusters of fixed size decay at large times: one finds:

$$\phi_j(s) = \alpha_j \exp(-s/j) + \alpha'_j \exp(-4s/j). \quad (47)$$

Here α_j and α'_j are size-dependent constants which cannot be evaluated explicitly. Numerical work, however, shows that $\alpha_j \simeq j^{-1}$.

We see how the two different exponential decays are reflected in the scaling behaviour at $x \ll 1$, so that we may say that the scaling theory is consistent with the large-time behaviour for clusters of fixed size. This need not be the case, as is well-known, for instance, for reaction kernels such as (15c): there one shows that the scaling theory predicts a large-time decay of t^{-2} , for clusters of size $1 \ll j \ll S(t) = t$. Monomers, on the other hand, generally have a non-universal decay.

All the above results will be derived in Section VI.

IV. SCALING BEHAVIOUR: DERIVATIONS

Let us first establish a connection between $G(z, s)$ and $\Phi(x)$. Let us take $S(t)$ to be equal to s . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j c_j(t) \exp\left(-\frac{j\rho}{s}\right) &= N(s) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j \phi_j(t) \exp\left(-\frac{j\rho}{s}\right) \\ &= s^2 N(s) \partial_{\rho}^2 G\left(\frac{\rho}{s}, s\right). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In the scaling limit, we have, see (28):

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j c_j(t) \exp\left(-\frac{j\rho}{s}\right) = \int_0^{\infty} dx x \Phi(x) e^{-\rho x}. \quad (49)$$

We thus have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \left[s^2 N(s) \partial_{\rho}^2 G\left(\frac{\rho}{s}, s\right) \right] = \int_0^{\infty} dx x \Phi(x) e^{-\rho x}. \quad (50)$$

Now we know that if $sG(\rho/s, s)$ tends to a limit, that limit is the function $\Psi(\rho)$ defined by (31) and described in greater detail in Appendix A. As we have stated before, it is uniquely determined by the differential equation (31) together with the conditions that it be regular at $x = 0$ and positive and finite for all positive values of x . We thus obtain

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} [sN(s)] \partial_{\rho}^2 \Psi(\rho) = \int_0^{\infty} dx x \Phi(x) e^{-\rho x}, \quad (51)$$

and hence

$$\Psi(\rho) = \left(\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} [sN(s)] \right)^{-1} \int_0^{\infty} dx \frac{\Phi(x)}{x} e^{-\rho x}. \quad (52)$$

This result corresponds to the fundamental equation (35) stated in the previous section. Up to a constant which we shall later show to be equal to κ_0 , $\Psi(\rho)$ is the Laplace transform of $\Phi(x)/x$, where $\Phi(x)$ is the scaling function for the concentrations $c_j(t)$, again as defined by (28).

A. Large-time behaviour of moments and connection between t and s

Using the connection between $\Phi(x)$ and $\Psi(\rho)$ established in (49) with $\rho = 0$, we obtain the identity

$$\int_0^{\infty} x \Phi(x) dx = 1, \quad (53)$$

from which we obtain from (51) that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} [sN(s)] = \frac{1}{\Psi''(0)} = \kappa_0^{-1}, \quad (54)$$

thereby showing (38a) as well as the claim made after (52). Since the derivatives of $\Psi(\rho)$ at the origin can all be computed recursively in terms of κ_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(s) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^n c_j(s) \\ &= N(s) s^n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^n \phi_j(s) \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

In the scaling limit, this expression can be expressed in terms of $\partial_\rho^{n+1} \Psi(\rho)$ and yields the result stated in (37). The asymptotic connection between s and t stated in (40) also follows straightforwardly from (54).

Moreover, along these lines, the fact that $\Psi(0) = 1$ tells us that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \left(s^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_j}{j} \right) = \kappa_0^{-1}, \quad (56)$$

which leads to the result in (39a). Finally, the result obtained in Lemma 3 of Appendix A yields a result for the asymptotic behaviour of yet another moment, namely μ_{-2} , as obtained in (39b). Thus the asymptotic behaviour of all moments with $n \geq -2$ is determined in elementary terms from the knowledge of κ_0 .

Even though it is possible to obtain the $m_n^{(\infty)}$ explicitly by a recursion, it is not possible to obtain an explicit expression for them. Determining their asymptotic behaviour as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is therefore not trivial. Clearly, this depends on the nature of the singularity of $\Psi(\rho)$ closest to the origin. From the results of Appendix A, Lemma 2, we see that the coefficients of the series development of $\Psi(\rho)$ are real and of alternating sign, so that this singularity, which we denote by $-\Lambda$, must lie on the negative real axis. Its value cannot be expressed in elementary terms from κ_0 , but can be computed numerically by integration of (31) up to values of ρ close to $-\Lambda$. This is carried out in detail in Appendix C, together with other numerical evaluations. Its position is found to have the value $\Lambda \approx 1.576132\dots$

The leading behaviour of the singularity at $-\Lambda$ is readily found, by matching orders of divergence, to be a simple pole, with a residue 2Λ . In other words

$$\Psi(\rho) = \frac{2\Lambda}{\rho + \Lambda} [1 + o(1)] \quad (57)$$

for ρ near $-\Lambda$, up to singular terms of higher order. Deciding whether or not such corrections exist is a bit more intricate, and is carried out in Appendix D. One finds that there is in fact a correction given by

$$\Psi(\rho) = \left[\frac{2\Lambda}{\rho + \Lambda} - 2 - \frac{2}{3}(\rho + \Lambda) \ln(\rho + \Lambda) \right] [1 + o(1)]. \quad (58)$$

From this then follows the result claimed in (41), where the correction in n^{-2} corresponds to the singularity found in (58).

In all the preceding considerations, the scaling limit has been used. It may be asked whether this is legitimate. The problem is that small clusters, even in the infinite time limit, are not necessarily described by the scaling limit, as discussed for instance in [13]. The results above thus strictly speaking do not apply to the moments as defined by (55), but rather to moments defined as

$$\tilde{\mu}_{n,\epsilon}(s) = \sum_{j \geq \epsilon s} j^n c_j(s). \quad (59)$$

The basic result (37a) should thus read rather

$$m_n^{(\infty)} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} [s^{-(n-1)} \tilde{\mu}_{n,\epsilon}(s)]. \quad (60)$$

It turns out, however, that these distinctions are unnecessary, and that (37a) is correct as it stands. The proof is a bit intricate and is thus relegated to Appendix E.

B. Behaviour of small clusters

Another important issue is the behaviour of $\Phi(x)$ close to the origin, that is, the behaviour of cluster of size much less than the typical size $S(t) \propto s \propto \sqrt{t}$. This corresponds to the behaviour of $\Psi(\rho)$ for $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. As shown in Appendix A, Lemma 7, $\Psi(\rho)$ decays as $2\Gamma\sqrt{\rho} K_1(2\sqrt{\rho})$, where Γ is an undetermined positive constant and K_1 is a modified Bessel function [19]. Asymptotically, this means that

$$\Psi(\rho) = \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma \rho^{1/4} \exp(-2\sqrt{\rho}) [1 + o(1)] \quad (61)$$

Note again that the constant Γ does not have an explicit expression in terms of κ_0 , but it can be obtained to high accuracy by numerical integration of (31), which leads to the value $\Gamma \simeq 1.70787$. The details are discussed in Appendix C.

It is readily calculated that

$$2\sqrt{\rho} K_1(2\sqrt{\rho}) = \int_0^\infty \frac{\exp(-1/x)}{x^2} e^{-\rho x} dx, \quad (62)$$

which leads to the leading part of the result stated in (42). This is in excellent agreement with the results of [15] as well as with the general scaling results derived for instance in [4].

To obtain the rest of the result stated in (42) we ask about the next-to-leading asymptotic small- x behaviour of $\Phi(x)$, or correspondingly, the next-to-leading asymptotic large- ρ behaviour of $\Psi(\rho)$. This can be obtained as follows: define

$$H(\rho) = 2\Gamma\sqrt{\rho} K_1(2\sqrt{\rho}), \quad (63)$$

which is the exact asymptotic behaviour of $\Psi(\rho)$ and consider

$$\Psi_1(\rho) = \frac{\Psi(\rho)}{H(\rho)}. \quad (64)$$

Clearly $\Psi_1(\rho)$ approaches 1 as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. If we now rewrite (31) for $\Psi_1(\rho)$, we find

$$\rho\Psi_1''(\rho) + 2\rho\frac{H'(\rho)}{H(\rho)}\Psi_1'(\rho) = H(\rho)\Psi_1(\rho)\Psi_1'(\rho) + 2H'(\rho)\Psi_1(\rho)^2. \quad (65)$$

Replacing Ψ_1 by its limiting value we obtain

$$\rho\Psi_1''(\rho) + 2\rho\frac{H'(\rho)}{H(\rho)}\Psi_1'(\rho) = H(\rho)\Psi_1'(\rho) + 2H'(\rho). \quad (66)$$

This is a first order linear equation for $\Psi_1'(\rho)$. We now perform the substitution

$$\Psi_1'(\rho) = H(\rho)^{-2}\chi(\rho) \quad (67)$$

which leads to

$$\rho\chi'(\rho) = H(\rho)\chi(\rho) + H'(\rho)H(\rho)^2. \quad (68)$$

Since $H(\rho)$ is rapidly decaying as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, we see that $\chi(\rho)$ tends to a limiting value, which is of the order of the integral of the inhomogeneity, that is, $H(\rho)^3$ as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. We thus conclude that

$$\Psi_1'(\rho) \approx H(\rho)^2\chi(\rho) \approx H(\rho) \quad (\rho \rightarrow \infty). \quad (69)$$

From this follows that the order of magnitude of the correction to scaling is $\rho H(\rho)^2$, in other words

$$\Psi_1(\rho) = 1 + \text{const.} \cdot \rho^{3/2} \exp(-4\sqrt{\rho}) \quad (70)$$

But the Laplace transform of $x^{-9/2} \exp(-4/x)$ is given by

$$\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{1024} e^{-4\sqrt{\rho}} (64\rho^{3/2} + 96\rho + 60\sqrt{\rho} + 15) \quad (71)$$

which has the same large- ρ asymptotic behaviour as $\Psi_1(\rho)$, implying that $\Phi(x)/x$ has the same subdominant small- x behaviour as $x^{-9/2} \exp(-4/x)$. In other words, the correction goes to zero as $x \rightarrow 0$ exponentially faster than the leading behaviour, and with a different correction exponent. Explicitly this yields the full expression given in (42).

C. Behaviour of large clusters

We may also ask how $\Phi(x)$ behaves as $x \rightarrow \infty$, in other words, how does the concentration of large clusters behave. Since $\Psi(\rho)$ is well-defined and finite over a finite range of negative values of ρ , it follows from (52) that $\Phi(x)/x$ decays exponentially as $x \rightarrow \infty$. More information is obtained by referring to our results on the nearest singularity of $\Psi(\rho)$, which is at $\rho = -\Lambda$. As discussed earlier and shown in Appendix D, see (58), this singularity is a simple pole with residue 2Λ and a correction term of the form $(\rho + \Lambda) \ln(\rho + \Lambda)$. We therefore have:

$$\kappa_0 \int_0^\infty \frac{\Phi(x)}{x} e^{-\rho x} dx = \left[\frac{2\Lambda}{\rho + \Lambda} - 2 - \frac{2}{3} (\rho + \Lambda) \ln(\rho + \Lambda) \right] [1 + o(1)] \quad (72)$$

in the limit $\rho \rightarrow -\Lambda$. Since the Laplace transform $\chi(\rho)$ of

$$-\frac{2}{3} \frac{\exp(-\Lambda x)}{x^2 + b} \quad (73)$$

has the same asymptotic behaviour for $\rho \rightarrow -\Lambda$ as the correction to $\Psi(\rho)$ for any positive value of b , we obtain for $\Phi(x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ the asymptotic expression stated earlier in (44). The approximate value of Λ is computed in Appendix C.

V. BEHAVIOUR AT LARGE SIZES FOR FIXED TIMES

The behaviour at large sizes for fixed times has been assumed to be similar to the behaviour for large sizes at very small times. This can be understood qualitatively by imagining that, at time t , the system has acquired a typical size $S(t)$. We may now coarse grain the system in such a way that all aggregates within a (large) multiple of $S(t)$ are viewed as monomers. On that scale, all aggregates of large size are much larger than all aggregates

that have been produced at that time, and we may therefore proceed similarly to the case in which monomers altogether dominate the cluster size distribution.

In the limit of small times, we may make the *Ansatz* (45), which solves the system (2) in leading order of t for small t . Putting (45) into (2) leads to the recursion

$$\lambda_1 = 1 \tag{74a}$$

$$(j-1)\lambda_j = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} K(k, j-k) \lambda_k \lambda_{j-k}. \tag{74b}$$

where (74a) follows from the assumption that the initial distribution has concentration 1 of monomers. This simply reflects the fact that at short times, loss terms are dominated by the (recursive) production terms.

Putting the expression

$$\lambda_j = 2^{-(j-1)} j, \tag{75}$$

into (74), we find that it provides the unique solution in the case we study. Again this is in good agreement with the general predictions of [20, 21]. Indeed, in these references it is shown that the behaviour of the general recursion (74) is given by

$$\lambda_j \simeq j^{-\lambda} R^j, \tag{76}$$

where R is a non-universal constant (except when $\nu = 1$, which is a singular case). Since we have $\lambda = \mu = -1$, the result (75) is in full agreement with the predictions. Again, these results were also derived in [15].

Note that the behaviour at finite times is in agreement with the scaling prediction to leading order. To subleading order, however, we have seen in (44), that the singularity of $\Psi(\rho)$ is a pole modified by a correction of order $(\rho + \Lambda) \ln(\rho + \Lambda)$. This implies a correction of relative order $1/x^2$ to the leading behaviour $x e^{-x}$ of the scaling function for large x , see (44). This implies that there is a discrepancy between the small-time approximation, which leads to an exact exponential decay for the concentrations at large sizes, and the scaling function, which displays a correction $-2/(3x^2)$.

In Appendix F we present arguments suggesting that in fact there are in fact also similar corrections to the simple pole singularity of $G(z, t)$ at fixed finite t , contrary to the small-time approximation. This means that both the large-size limit of the aggregate size distribution at fixed times and the scaling limit for large values of x behave similarly. On the other

hand, the simpler approximation involving a recursion relation valid for small times does not accurately capture these features.

VI. BEHAVIOUR AT LARGE TIMES FOR AGGREGATES OF FIXED SIZE

In the previous Section we have analysed the behaviour of aggregates having a size proportional to the typical size, namely of size $xS(t)$, for values of x which are either $x \ll 1$ or $x \gg 1$. In the following, we shall look at aggregates of fixed size, in the limit $s \rightarrow \infty$.

Consider the system of equations (24). Inductively it is easily seen that each $\phi_j(s)$ is a finite linear combination of decaying exponentials. Indeed, let

$$\phi'_j(s) = F_j(s) - \phi_j(s)/j \quad (77)$$

and assume $F_j(s)$ to consist of a finite linear combination of decaying exponentials. It is then easy to show that $\phi_j(s)$ is a linear combination of these same exponentials and $\exp(-s/j)$ for instance using the Laplace transform approach.

If we denote by $\sigma_{j,k}$ the decay rates and by Σ_j the set of all the rates that correspond to $\phi_j(s)$, we have

$$\phi_j(s) = \sum_k \alpha_k \exp(-\sigma_{j,k}s). \quad (78)$$

Inductively we also show that

$$\Sigma_j = \bigcup_{k=1}^{j-1} (\Sigma_k + \Sigma_{j-k}) \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{j} \right\} \quad (79)$$

where the sum of two sets is defined as the set of all possible sums between elements of both sets.

From this follows that the slowest decay rate in Σ_j is always $1/j$. The next lowest decay rate in Σ_j arises from the sum of the 2 lowest rates of $\Sigma_{j/2}$. This means that the next lowest decay rate of Σ_j is of the order $4/j$.

This implies that each $\phi_j(s)$ has exactly one exponential contribution of the form $\exp(-s/j)$. In other words, the large-time decay of $\phi_j(s)$ is exactly $\alpha_j \exp(-s/j)$ for a given value of α_j . Hence the behaviour of $c_j(s)$ is given by

$$c_j(s) = \frac{\alpha_j}{s} e^{-s/j} \quad (s \rightarrow \infty) \quad (80)$$




FIG. 1. Value of $k\alpha_k$ for $2 \leq k \leq 15$ plotted as a function of $1/k$. One sees that the extrapolation to a limiting value seems reasonable. The line is a least-squares fit through the points with $k \geq 5$ and yields an asymptotic value of 1.71.

This is qualitatively similar to the scaling result, which states that for $x \ll 1$

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{\Gamma}{\kappa_0} \frac{\exp(-1/x)}{x} [1 + o(1)] \quad (81)$$

and this would suggest that

$$\alpha_j \simeq j^{-1}. \quad (82)$$

It is possible, of course, to evaluate the α_j recursively, but it is not possible to find for them an explicit expression. On the other hand, one can evaluate the α_j explicitly for $1 \leq j \leq 15$ and verify that, at least for these values, (82) appears to hold to a good approximation: we show the product $k\alpha_k$ in Figure 1 for $2 \leq k \leq 15$, as a function of $1/k$ and it appears reasonably to extrapolate to a well-defined value. The explicit values of α_j are also tabulated in Table I.

We thus find the large-time behaviour of fixed size aggregates to be consistent with the scaling behaviour of aggregates of size small with respect to the typical size. While such agreement is not in itself surprising, it should be pointed out that this is not a necessary feature of aggregating models: several counterexamples have been discussed, for instance, in [4]. Indeed, this coincidence goes even beyond the leading order: as noted above, the next to leading order for the large-time exponential decay consists of decay rates of the order of

TABLE I. The values of α_j as defined in (82) for $2 \leq j \leq 15$, evaluated from exactly computed fractions.

2	0.6666666666666667
3	0.482142857142857
4	0.376828110161443
5	0.309065279025988
6	0.261879521457270
7	0.227157280354022
8	0.200546422642681
9	0.179506571151271
10	0.162456450838603
11	0.148360805859407
12	0.136513680323195
13	0.126417243694629
14	0.117710416149960
15	0.110124961934082

$4/j$, so that one has the result stated in (47).

Here the α'_j are the prefactors corresponding to the decay rate $4/j$. Again this fits well with the behaviour of the scaling function, which displays both a decay of type $\exp(-1/x)$, with a correction of order of $\exp(-4/x)$. On the other hand, the order of the α'_j cannot be estimated, as there are too few expressions for $\phi_j(s)$ available.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

To summarise, we have derived an exact ordinary differential of second order for the Laplace transform of the scaling function of the solution for Smoluchowski's equations (2) for the rate kernel

$$K(k, l) = \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{l}. \quad (83)$$

We show that this differential equation has a unique solution with the properties required of the Laplace transform of a scaling function. From this we obtain a large number of accurate

asymptotic results involving the detailed behaviour of the scaling function both for $x \gg 1$ and $x \ll 1$. Similarly we obtain the amplitudes for the large time behaviour of all the integer moments

$$\mu_n(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^n c_j(s) \quad (84)$$

for $n \geq -2$, as well as the detailed asymptotic connection between s and t . The detailed behaviour of the scaling function coincides quite well with the general predictions of the scaling theory, as described for instance in [4]. Finally we also obtain results for behaviour which in principle is not accessible to scaling, such as the behaviour of clusters at large sizes and fixed time, or else the behaviour of clusters of fixed size at large times.

As stated in Section II, the convergence of the exact solution to a scaling limit follows from the work of Norris [17]. Whether a more precise description of this convergence could be obtained by a detailed study of the solution of (27) is left for future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges financial support of the grants UNAM–DGAPA PA-PIIT IN113620 and CONACyT 254515.

Appendix A: Qualitative behaviour of the fundamental equation

In the following, we shall prove the following theorem

Theorem 1 *The solutions of the problem*

$$\rho \Psi'' = \Psi (\Psi' + 1) \quad (A1)$$

which are smooth and positive at $\rho = 0$ and satisfy $\Psi''(0) \neq 0$ fall into three mutually disjoint classes:

1. *Those which cross the ρ axis at some value ρ_0 of ρ . These then remain negative for some values $\rho > \rho_0$.*
2. *Those which reach a positive minimum at some positive value ρ_0 of ρ . These grow for all $\rho > \rho_0$, until they eventually diverge. In any case, they do not tend to zero as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$*

3. a unique function with $\Psi(0) = 1$, $\Psi'(0) = -1$ and $\Psi''(0) = \kappa_0$ given by a unique positive value satisfying $1.45582 < \kappa_0 < 1.45583$. This function goes to zero as $\text{const.} \cdot 2\sqrt{\rho}K_1(2\sqrt{\rho})$ as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ on the positive real axis.

The results follow from a tedious sequence of lemmas

Lemma 1 *Any solution of (A1) smooth at $\rho = 0$ and with $\Psi(0) > 0$ and $\Psi''(0) \neq 0$ satisfies $\Psi(0) = -\Psi'(0) = 1$*

Indeed, if $\Psi'(0) \neq -1$, then, since $\Psi(0) \neq 0$, $\Psi''(\rho)$ diverges to ∞ as $\rho \rightarrow 0$, so $\Psi(\rho)$ cannot be smooth. One now rewrites (A1) as follows

$$\rho(1 - \Psi)\Psi'' = \Psi(\Psi' + 1 - \rho\Psi''). \quad (\text{A2})$$

Since we have assumed the smoothness of $\Psi(\rho)$ near $\rho = 0$, by Taylor's theorem applied to $\Psi'(\rho)$ for ρ near 0, the r.h.s. of (A2) is of order $O(\rho^2)$ as $\rho \rightarrow 0$. Since $\Psi''(0) \neq 0$, it follows that the l.h.s. can only be of the same order if $1 - \Psi$ vanishes linearly in ρ as $\rho \rightarrow 0$. We have thus shown the lemma. Note that the hypothesis $\Psi''(0) \neq 0$ is indeed necessary, since $\Psi = b - \rho$ is an exact solution of (A1) for all b . Note that we exclude the case in which $\Psi''(0) = 0$ because these solutions do not satisfy the requirements of the problem at hand: indeed $\Psi(\rho)$ is the Laplace transform of the scaling function $\Phi(x)/x$, so that the second derivative of $\Psi(\rho)$ corresponds to the first moment of the positive function $\Phi(x)$, which cannot vanish.

In the following, we shall exclusively limit ourselves to solutions satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 1. We shall denote them as regular solutions.

Lemma 2 *There is a family of regular solutions of (A1) indexed by the arbitrary real parameter $\kappa = \Psi''(0)$. These solutions are analytic in an appropriately small neighbourhood of the origin.*

Define $z = \Psi - 1 + \rho$. (A1) then becomes

$$\rho z'' - z' = z z' - \rho z'. \quad (\text{A3})$$

From Lemma 1, we know that $z(0) = z'(0) = 0$. Now if we consider the leading order behaviour of both terms of (A3) if $z = \kappa\rho^2/2$, we find that the equation is identically

satisfied for all values of κ . If we now substitute

$$z(\rho) = \frac{\kappa\rho^2}{2} + \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} (-1)^n a_n \rho^n \quad (\text{A4})$$

formally in (A3), we obtain the following recurrence relations

$$a_2 = \frac{\kappa}{2}. \quad (\text{A5a})$$

$$a_{m+1} = \frac{1}{m^2 - 1} \left(\sum_{k=2}^{m-1} k a_k a_{m-k+1} + m a_m \right) \quad (m \geq 2) \quad (\text{A5b})$$

To show that the series defined by (A4) has a finite radius of convergence, we choose $R > \max(a_2, 1)$ arbitrary. It is then straightforward to show that

$$a_m \leq R^m, \quad (\text{A6})$$

so that the series converges in a circle of radius R . The Lemma is thus completely proved.

Lemma 3 *Let $\Psi(\rho)$ be any regular solution of (A1) with the property of being integrable over the positive real axis. Then one has*

$$\int_0^{\infty} \Psi(\rho) d\rho = \frac{3}{2}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Note that we say nothing here concerning either the existence or the uniqueness of such solutions. To prove (A7), we rewrite (A1) as

$$\frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} [\rho\Psi(\rho)] = \frac{d}{d\rho} \left(\frac{\Psi(\rho)^2}{2} + 2\Psi(\rho) \right) + \Psi(\rho) \quad (\text{A8})$$

and integrate from 0 to infinity on both sides, from which the lemma immediately follows from the fact that $\Psi(0) = 1$ and $\Psi'(0) = -1$.

Lemma 4 *Let $\Psi(\rho)$ be a regular solution of (A1). Then $\Psi''(\rho) > 0$ as long as $\Psi(\rho) > 0$.*

This follows from the following remark

$$\Psi''(\rho) = \Psi(\rho) \frac{\Psi'(\rho) - \Psi'(0)}{\rho} = \Psi(\rho) \Psi''(\xi) \quad (\text{A9})$$

where $0 \leq \xi \leq \rho$, which follows from the Intermediate Value Theorem. The Lemma follows, since, if $\Psi''(\rho)$ changed sign, (A9) would be violated at the first point where $\Psi''(\rho) = 0$.

Lemma 5 *Let $\Psi(\rho)$ be a regular solution of (A1) and assume that there is an $\rho_0 > 0$ such that $\Psi'(\rho_0) = 0$ and $\Psi(\rho_0) > 0$. Then $\Psi(\rho)$ grows monotonically for $\rho \geq \rho_0$.*

This follows from the preceding lemma. In fact, it can be shown that in this case there is a $\rho_1 > \rho_0$ where $\Psi(\rho)$ diverges. However, it is not necessary to show this: the Lemma's conclusion shows that such a $\Psi(\rho)$ is unacceptable, since it does not tend to zero as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 6 *Let $\Psi(\rho)$ be a regular solution of (A1) such that $\Psi(\rho_0) = 0$ for some $\rho_0 > 0$. Then $\Psi(\rho)$ is negative for some $\rho > \rho_0$.*

Let ρ_0 be the smallest ρ such that $\Psi(\rho_0) = 0$. Thus $\Psi'(\rho_0) \leq 0$. If the inequality is strict, the Lemma follows by Taylor's theorem. But $\Psi'(0) = 0$ violates the uniqueness theorem for ODE's, since $\Psi(\rho) = 0$ is a solution of (A1). The Lemma follows.

Lemma 7 *Let $\Psi(\rho)$ be a regular solution of (A1), with $\Psi(\rho) > 0$ for all $\rho > 0$ and tends to zero as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. Then there is a constant Γ such that*

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Psi(\rho)}{2\sqrt{\rho} K_1(2\sqrt{\rho})} = \Gamma \quad (\text{A10})$$

From Lemma 5 we see that such a solution may neither have a minimum, nor ever become zero. It thus decays monotonically to zero. Since it follows from (A9) that $\Psi''(\rho) > 0$ for all $\rho > 0$, $\Psi'(\rho)$ is monotonically increasing for all $\rho > 0$. It follows that $\Psi'(\rho)$ also tends to zero as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. Under these conditions, it is clear that (A1) can, for $\rho \gg 1$, be approximated by the linear equation

$$\rho \Psi'' = \Psi \quad (\text{A11})$$

which has the two solutions $\sqrt{\rho} I_1(2\sqrt{\rho})$ and $\sqrt{\rho} K_1(2\sqrt{\rho})$. The Lemma is proved, since the former diverges exponentially.

Lemma 8 *Let $\Psi_1(\rho)$ and $\Psi_2(\rho)$ be the two solutions such that $\Psi_i''(0) = \kappa_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and let $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2$. Then for all $\rho > 0$ such that no $\Psi_i(\rho)$ has either diverged or become negative, $\Psi_1(\rho) < \Psi_2(\rho)$.*




FIG. 2. Plot of $\Psi(\rho)$ both on a direct and on a logarithmic scale. The strongly non-exponential decay is clearly noticeable.

From the Taylor series of $\Psi_i(\rho)$, it immediately follows that $\Psi_1(\rho) < \Psi_2(\rho)$ as well as $\Psi'_1(\rho) < \Psi'_2(\rho)$ on a sufficiently small open interval $(0, \epsilon)$. Assume now that the Lemma's conclusion fails. Then there is a smallest ρ_0 for which $0 < \Psi_1(\rho_0) = \Psi_2(\rho_0) < \infty$. Again, since the two solutions are not identical, it follows from the uniqueness theorem for ODE's that $\Psi'_1(\rho_0) \neq \Psi'_2(\rho_0)$ and thus that $\Psi'_1(\rho_0) > \Psi'_2(\rho_0)$. There hence exists a smallest ρ_1 with $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_0$, such that $\Psi'_1(\rho_1) = \Psi'_2(\rho_1)$. Since $\Psi''_i(\rho) > 0$ for all $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_1$, $\Psi'_i(\rho)$ is growing in this interval. Since $\Psi'_1(\rho) < \Psi'_2(\rho)$ for $0 < \rho < \rho_1$, we have $\Psi''_1(\rho_1) > \Psi''_2(\rho_1)$. But this, together with the already established facts that $\Psi_1(\rho_1) < \Psi_2(\rho_1)$ (since $0 < \rho_1 < \rho_0$) and that $\Psi'_1(\rho_1) = \Psi'_2(\rho_1)$ (by definition of ρ_1) lead to a contradiction with (A1). The Lemma is

thus proved.

Lemma 9 *There exist solutions that go negative, and solutions with a positive minimum.*

If we choose $\kappa = 0$, then the corresponding solution is $\Psi(\rho) = 1 - \rho$. This becomes negative at $\rho = 1$. By continuous dependence on initial conditions, solutions with sufficiently small positive values of κ will go negative at some positive value of ρ . It remains to show that, for κ sufficiently large, $\Psi(\rho)$ has a minimum. Using the Taylor series with remainder one obtains, using $\Psi'''(0) = -\kappa/3$:

$$\Psi'(\rho) = -1 + \kappa\rho - \kappa\xi^2 \quad (\text{A12})$$

with $0 \leq \xi \leq \rho$. From this follows

$$\Psi'\left(\frac{2}{\kappa}\right) = 1 + O(\kappa^{-1}) \quad (\text{A13})$$

which is positive for sufficiently large κ . The lemma follows since $\Psi'(0) = -1$.

Lemma 10 *There exists a unique solution satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 7.*

Using the theorem concerning the continuous dependence of the solutions of ODE's on initial conditions, we see that the set S_1 of κ such that the solution goes negative is open. So is the set S_2 of κ such that a positive minimum arises. From Lemma 8 additionally follows that both these sets are of the form $(-\infty, \kappa_1)$ and (κ_2, ∞) , with $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$. It follows from Lemma 9 that these are both finite numbers. I show that the solution corresponding to κ_1 remains positive everywhere and goes to 0 as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. That it is positive follows from the definition and the fact that S_1 is open, so that $\kappa_1 \notin S_1$. Since $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$, we also have $\kappa_1 \notin S_2$, so that the function must be monotonically decreasing. Indeed, all functions corresponding to values of κ in the interval $[\kappa_1, \kappa_2]$ must have these properties. Thus all these functions must tend to a limit. We now show that no solution of (A1) can remain positive, monotonically decreasing, and tend to a value different from 0. Let the asymptotic value of $\Psi(\rho)$ be a . The right-hand side of (A1) then tends to a , but $\rho\Psi''(\rho)$ must then also tend to a non-zero constant, which is manifestly inconsistent with the fact that $\Psi(\rho)$ is decreasing monotonically.

All solutions corresponding to κ values inside $[\kappa_1, \kappa_2]$ are thus positive and go to zero. Now denote the solutions corresponding to the values κ_1 and κ_2 by $\Psi_1(\rho)$ and $\Psi_2(\rho)$ respectively.

Since they go to zero, they both behave for $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ as $\sqrt{\rho}K_1(2\sqrt{\rho})$, see Lemma 6, and are thus integrable. Let us now assume that $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2$. By Lemma 8 it follows that $\Psi_1(\rho) < \Psi_2(\rho)$. Since both are integrable, both satisfy (A7), by Lemma 3. But two positive functions satisfying $\Psi_1(\rho) < \Psi_2(\rho)$ cannot have the same integral. It is thus necessary that $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2$ and the solution that goes to zero is thus unique. The Lemma is proved, and hence the full result.

The common value of $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2$ is what we have called κ_0 . Its numerical value is easily estimated through numerical integration of (A1). We have found that $\Psi(\rho)$ becomes negative for $\kappa = 1.45582$ whereas it has a positive minimum for $\kappa = 1.45583$. If needed, greater accuracy can be attained, but the approach is not trivial and is sketched in Appendix C. A plot of the function is provided in Figure 2.

Appendix B: Derivation of (31) from the equation for the scaling function

As described in detail in [4], the scaling function $\Phi(x)$ generally satisfies the following equation for all ρ :

$$\rho \int_0^\infty x^2 \Phi(x) e^{-\rho x} dx = \int_0^\infty dx dy \left(1 + \frac{x}{y}\right) \Phi(x) \Phi(y) e^{-\rho x} [1 - e^{-\rho y}]. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Let us now define

$$\Psi(\rho) = \xi \int_0^\infty \frac{\Phi(x)}{x} e^{-\rho x} dx, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where ξ is a constant we later adjust. Then (B1) becomes

$$-\xi \rho \Psi'''(\rho) = \Psi'(\rho) \Psi'(0) - [\Psi'(\rho)]^2 + \Psi''(\rho) \Psi(0) - \Psi''(\rho) \Psi(\rho). \quad (\text{B3})$$

This is integrated to

$$-\xi \rho \Psi''(\rho) = \Psi(\rho) \Psi'(0) - \Psi(\rho) \Psi'(\rho) + \Psi'(\rho) [\Psi(0) - \xi]. \quad (\text{B4})$$

The additive constant is seen to vanish by considering the large- ρ behaviour. Setting $\rho = 0$ leads to $\xi = \Psi(0)$ and hence

$$\rho \Psi(0) \Psi''(\rho) = \Psi(\rho) [\Psi'(\rho) - \Psi'(0)]. \quad (\text{B5})$$

The values of $\Psi(0)$ and $\Psi'(0)$ can be set equal to one by appropriate scaling, thereby leading to (31). A minor point remains: (B2) does not yield the same proportionality constant as

that found in (52). This depends on the fact that the form (B1) of the integro-differential equation for $\Phi(x)$ implicitly assumes a definition of the typical size $S(t)$ different by a constant factor from that used in the body of the text.

Appendix C: The numerical determination of κ_0 , Γ , and Λ

Whereas the determination of κ_0 to the accuracy stated in Appendix A is reasonably straightforward, going any further requires some more detailed considerations. The difficulty is that for any value of $\kappa \neq \kappa_0$, the distance to the exact solution grows exponentially. In order to obtain a solution valid up to a given distance L , we thus need an initial condition that is accurate to an accuracy of $\exp(-\text{const.}/L)$.

On the other hand, solving the equation near $\rho = 0$ leads to loss of accuracy due to the vicinity of the origin, where the solution of (A1) generically diverges. The way this can be solved is to compute many terms of the Taylor series of $\Psi(\rho)$, say 60, and to use these to compute $\Psi(\epsilon)$ for ϵ moderately small (I used $\epsilon = 0.01$ and 0.005) to an accuracy of, say, 60 decimals. One then integrates (31) to very high accuracy until one reaches a value of ρ with $\Psi'(\rho) > 0$ or $\Psi(\rho) < 0$. We define an interval $[\kappa_-, \kappa_+]$, where for κ_- $\Psi(\rho)$ becomes negative, whereas for κ_+ $\Psi'(\rho)$ becomes positive. The interval is then iteratively halved until sufficient precision is reached. In this way we determine

$$\kappa_0 = 1.455\,824\,941\,943\,054\,763\ldots \quad (\text{C1})$$

where the decimals displayed are correct.

For the asymptotic ratio of $\Psi(\rho)$ and the asymptotic form $2\sqrt{\rho}K_1(2\sqrt{\rho})$, we plot this ratio minus an estimated value of Γ given by 1.70787 and show this in Figure 3.

The nearest singularity of $\Psi(\rho)$ is in leading order a simple pole, as can be seen analytically. To obtain an accurate numerical estimate, the simplest option is to take the first 100 coefficients of the Taylor series

$$\Psi(\rho) = 1 - \rho + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} a_k \rho^{k-1} \quad (\text{C2})$$

where $a_2 = \kappa_0/2$, at least to good accuracy. We then use these to estimate the radius of convergence via the ratio test. Since the Taylor coefficients are alternating, the nearest




FIG. 3. Ratio $\Delta(\rho) = \Psi(\rho)/[2\sqrt{\rho}K_1(2\sqrt{\rho})] - \Gamma$, where $\Gamma = 1.70787$. The plateau corresponds to the region of $\Psi(\rho)$ which corresponds to high accuracy to the asymptotic region, and where the deviations at $x \gg 1$ which lead eventually to the divergence of $\Psi(\rho)$, do not yet dominate.

singularity lies on the negative real axis. The result is shown in Figure 4 and appears to yield a result of about 1.576 13.

A nonlinear fit of $\ln |a_k|$ of the form $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 k + \gamma_3/k^2$ for $50 \leq k \leq 100$ yields

$$\gamma_1 = 0.693\,146\,740\,47\dots \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$\gamma_2 = -0.454\,973\,773\,012\dots \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$\gamma_3 = -0.523\,738\,153\,88\dots \quad (\text{C5})$$

where 11 decimals are stated, though it is clear that this is higher accuracy than warranted. Matching this with (58), one obtains $\gamma_1 = \ln 2$, $\gamma_2 = -\ln \Lambda$, and $\gamma_3 = -\Lambda/3$. The first of these is satisfied to high accuracy. Determining Λ using the second relation gives a result of comparable accuracy and consistent with the Padé approximants to be discussed now, whereas the third relation is satisfied to 2 decimals, which is acceptable accuracy for a subleading term.

As a cross-check, a Padé analysis was performed. In particular, a series of diagonal Padé approximants $[M, M]$ with $20 \leq M \leq 45$ was generated on the Taylor series mentioned




FIG. 4. Ratio $-a_k/a_{k+1}$ (+ signs) and the corrected ratio $-b_k/b_{k+1}$ (crosses), with $b_k = a_k(1 + 2/(3k^2))$, both shifted by 1.576 132 05 plotted as a function of $1/k$, for $20 \leq k \leq 100$. We note that the ratio of the b_k converges more rapidly to the limiting value, indicating that we have indeed eliminated the leading correction. Note that the shift is taken from the more accurate determination via Padé approximants merely to show consistency.

above. It is found that there is consistently a zero of the denominator closest to the origin, and that its value does not vary much from one approximant to the other: we plot this in Figure 5, and further show in Figure 6 the set of all zeroes of the denominator of the $[40, 40]$ approximant with norm less than 3: we see that there are no spurious zeroes in the complex plane. Note good agreement between this Padé analysis and the earlier ratio test.

As a final test, we use the Padé approximants evaluated above to compute the residue of the zero. The residue of a rational function $N(x)/D(x)$ at a zero x_0 of $D(x)$ is given by

$$\text{Res}_{x=x_0} \frac{N(x)}{D(x)} = \frac{N(x_0)}{D'(x_0)} \quad (\text{C6})$$

which is readily evaluated and which, when divided by 2, yields 1.576 1294 for the approximant of order $[40, 40]$. Since we had argued that the residue is 2Λ , this is quite satisfactory agreement.




FIG. 5. Zero of the denominator of the Padé approximant shifted by 1.576 132 05, as a function of the latter’s order, for $20 \leq k \leq 45$.

Appendix D: The singularity of $\Psi(\rho)$

As has been shown in the body of this work, the function $\Psi(\rho)$ has a singularity which is dominated by a simple pole at some point $-\Lambda$ on the negative real axis. Here we proceed to show that there exists a correction to the singularity, and that the leading and subleading behaviour of $\Psi(\rho)$ is given by

$$\Psi(\rho) = \left[\frac{2\Lambda}{\rho + \Lambda} - 2 - \frac{2}{3}(\rho + \Lambda) \ln(\rho + \Lambda) \right] [1 + o(1)] \quad (\text{D1})$$

This is shown as follows: define $y = \rho + \Lambda$. (31) becomes

$$(-\Lambda + y)\Psi''(y) - \Psi(y)\Psi'(y) - \Psi(y) = 0. \quad (\text{D2})$$

We now consider the singularity near $y = 0$. Matching leading singularities, we find that the leading behaviour is $2\Lambda/y$. To eliminate a subleading singularity of $4\Lambda/y^2$ in the left-hand side of (D2), we additionally need to correct this expression to $2\Lambda/y - 2$. Let us now define




FIG. 6. Zeroes of the denominator of the Padé approximant of order $[45, 45]$ having norm less than 3. The value of the nearest zero is unambiguous, and spurious zeroes do not appear, apart from one zero (not plotted, with a value approximately 0.0146) common to numerical accuracy to the numerator and the denominator, as well as several others in the positive half-plane, which are, however all farther than 2 from the origin. The zeroes accumulating near the closest zero are an indication of the existence of additional logarithmic singularities, as discussed in the text and shown in Appendix D.

$v(y)$ by

$$v(y) = y^{-1} \left(\Psi(y) - \frac{2\Lambda}{y} + 2 \right) \quad (\text{D3})$$

It satisfies the following equation

$$(\Lambda - y) [y^2 v''(y) + 4y v'(y) + 2] + y v(y) [y^2 v'(y) + y - 2 + y v(y)] = 0. \quad (\text{D4})$$

Clearly $v(y)$ cannot be bounded at $y = 0$, since otherwise, by taking the limit of the l.h.s. of (D4) for $y \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the contradictory relation $2\Lambda = 0$. Assuming a power law y^p with $p < 0$, we see that

$$p(p + 3) = 0, \quad (\text{D5})$$

so that only $p = -3$ is consistent, which, however, dominates the leading singularity and is thus unacceptable. This leads to assume a logarithmic divergence. Putting the *Ansatz* $v(y) = \alpha \ln y$ leads to $\alpha = -2/3$ by eliminating the leading singularity. A similar analysis to the above shows that the difference between $v(y)$ and $(-2/3) \ln y$ remains finite at $y = 0$, from which (D1) follows.

Appendix E: Scaling behaviour holds for the moments

In the following, we show that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the quantities $\mu_n(t)$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{n,\epsilon}(t)$, see (55) and (59), behave identically in the limit of $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This involves showing that the sum

$$\Delta_{n,\epsilon}(t) = \sum_{j < \epsilon s} j^n c_j(s) \quad (\text{E1})$$

is negligible as compared to $\tilde{\mu}_{n,\epsilon}(s)$, which is of order s^{n-1} .

The proof proceeds along somewhat different lines for $n \leq 0$ and $n \geq 2$. For $n = 1$ the result is self-evident. We start with the latter case.

We note the fact that, since $\mu_1 = 1$, we always have the inequality

$$c_j(s) \leq \frac{1}{j} \quad (\text{E2})$$

for all s . It follows that

$$\Delta_{n,\epsilon}(t) \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq \epsilon s} j^{n-1} \leq (\epsilon s)^{n-1}, \quad (\text{E3})$$

which is indeed negligible with respect to s^{n-1} .

For the case $n \leq 0$, we first consider the case $n \leq -1$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{n,\epsilon}(s) &= \sum_{j=1}^M j^n c_j(s) + \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} j^n c_j(s) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^M j^n \alpha_j \exp(-s/j) + \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} j^{n-1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E4})$$

$$\leq K_M \exp(-s/M) + CM^n \quad (\text{E5})$$

where the α_j are defined as in (47) and C is a fixed constant of order one. We now take for M a fixed, large number such that $CM^n \leq \epsilon$. As $s \rightarrow \infty$, the first term in the upper bound goes to zero. We thus see that, apart from a quantity that goes to zero as $s \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_{n,\epsilon}(s)$ is of order ϵ and the result is shown.

For $n = 0$ the result follows from the fact that

$$\dot{\mu}_0 = -\mu_0\mu_{-1}. \quad (\text{E6})$$

Since the theorem holds for all other moments, it follows for μ_0 .

Appendix F: Singularity structure of $G(z, s)$ at finite times

Here we show that at any given fixed time, the nearest singularity of the generating function $G(z, s)$ —lying, as usual, on the negative real axis—is a pole with a logarithmic correction of the same type as that observed as in the scaling function $\Psi(\rho)$. We denote this closest singularity by $-z_c(s)$

At small times the leading behaviour of the $\phi_j(s)$ is

$$\phi_j(s) = \lambda_j s^{j-1} [1 + O(s)], \quad (\text{F1})$$

where the λ_j are given by (75). This suggests introducing the following scaling form

$$G(z, s) = \frac{1}{s} H(z - \ln s, s). \quad (\text{F2})$$

If we introduce the new variable $x = z - \ln s$, the differential equation for $H(x, s)$ becomes

$$H_{xx} - H_x - HH_x = s(H_{xs} - H). \quad (\text{F3})$$

This equation has the following amusing property: if we set the *Ansatz*

$$H(x, s) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} s^m f_m(x), \quad (\text{F4})$$

the $f_m(x)$ can be determined recursively as the solution of an ODE, which is nonlinear, but explicitly solvable, for $m = 0$, and linear inhomogeneous for $m \geq 1$.

The equation for $f_0(x)$ is

$$f_0'' - f_0' - f_0 f_0' = 0. \quad (\text{F5})$$

The solution is given by

$$f_0(x) = -1 - C_1 \cot \left[\frac{C_1(x - x_0)}{2} \right], \quad (\text{F6})$$

where C_1 and x_0 are integration constants. Without loss of generality we may put the singularity at the origin by setting $x_0 = 0$ and replace the cotangent by a simple pole, setting

$$f_0(x) = -1 - \frac{2}{x} \quad (\text{F7})$$

Now f_1 solves the equation

$$f_1''(x) + \left(\frac{2}{x} + 1\right) f_1'(x) - \frac{2f_1(x)}{x^2} + \frac{2}{x} + 1 = 0. \quad (\text{F8})$$

This has the solution

$$f_1(x) = \frac{1}{x^2} \{4e^{-x}\text{Ei}(x) - [P_3(x) + 2[(x^2 - 2x + 2) \ln x] + C_2]\} \quad (\text{F9})$$

$$P_3(x) = x^3 - (C_1 + 3)x^2 + 2(C_1 + 2)x - 2C_1 \quad (\text{F10})$$

Developing around $x = 0$ to third order yields

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) = & \frac{2C_1 + C_2 + 4\gamma}{x^2} - \frac{2C_1 + C_2 + 4\gamma}{x} + C_1 + \frac{C_2}{2} + 2\gamma + \\ & \frac{x}{18} (-3C_2 - 12 \ln x - 12\gamma + 4) + \\ & \frac{x^2}{72} (3C_2 + 12 \ln x + 12\gamma - 25) + \\ & \frac{x^3}{1800} (-15C_2 - 60 \ln x - 60\gamma + 137) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F11})$$

up to terms of order 4. Here again C_1 and C_2 are integration constants and γ is Euler's constant. We cannot have an x^{-2} singularity, so we set $C_1 = -2\gamma - C_2/2$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) = & x^3 \left(-\frac{C_2}{120} - \frac{\ln x}{30} - \frac{\gamma}{30} + \frac{137}{1800} \right) + \\ & x^2 \left(\frac{C_2}{24} + \frac{\ln x}{6} + \frac{\gamma}{6} - \frac{25}{72} \right) + \\ & x \left(-\frac{C_2}{6} - \frac{2 \ln x}{3} - \frac{2\gamma}{3} + \frac{2}{9} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F12})$$

We thus find that the first order correction in s has an $x \ln x$ correction to the leading $-2/x$ behaviour, exactly similarly to the behaviour of the scaling function $\Psi(\rho)$ near its closest singularity $-\Lambda$.

We thus have as an approximate expression for $G(z, s)$ for s small: close to the singularity $z_c(s)$. We thus have approximately:

$$G(z, s) = -\frac{2}{z + z_c(s)} - 1 - \frac{2s}{3} [z + z_c(s)] \ln [z + z_c(s)] \quad (\text{F13})$$

and this correction, too, amounts to a correction of $-2z_c(s)/(3n^2)$ to the prefactor of the pure exponential decay, as stated in (46). This prefactor, on the other hand, depends on constants, the value of which cannot be determined. Note the considerable similarity to the results obtained for the scaling function. This suggests that the scaling limit is attained rather smoothly in the limit of large sizes.

REFERENCES

- [1] S.K. Friedlander, *Smoke, Dust and Haze: Fundamentals of Aerosol Behavior* (Wiley, New York, 1977).
- [2] R.L. Drake, in: *Topics in Current Aerosol Research*, eds. G. M. Hidy and J. R. Brock (Pergamon Press, New York, 1972), pp. 201.
- [3] H. Pruppacher and J. Klett, *Microphysics of Clouds and Precipitations* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1998).
- [4] F. Leyvraz, Scaling theory and exactly solved models in the kinetics of irreversible aggregation, *Phys. Repts.* **383**, (2003) 95–212
- [5] J. Banasiak, Analytic Fragmentation Semigroups and Classical Solutions to Coagulation–fragmentation Equations—a Survey, *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series* (2019) **35** (1), pp. 83–104
- [6] P.L. Krapivsky, S. Redner, and E. Ben-Naim, *A Kinetic View of Statistical Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2010).
- [7] P.G.J. van Dongen, M.H. Ernst, Dynamic scaling in the kinetics of clustering, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985) 1396–1399.
- [8] P.G.J. van Dongen, Cluster size distribution in irreversible aggregation at large times, *J. Phys. A* **18** (1985) 2779–2793.
- [9] P.G.J. van Dongen, M.H. Ernst, Scaling solutions of Smoluchowski’s coagulation equation, *J. Stat. Phys.* **50** (1988) 295–329.
- [10] S.K. Friedlander and C.S. Wang, The self-preserving particle size distribution for coagulation by Brownian motion, *J. Coll. Interface Sci.* **22** 126–132 (1966)

- [11] J.L. Spouge, Solutions and critical times for the monodisperse coagulation equation when $a_{ij} = A + B(i + j) + Cij$, J. Phys. A **16** (1983) 767–774.
- [12] F. Calogero and F. Leyvraz, A New Solvable Model of Aggregation Kinetics, J. Phys. A **32** 7697–7717 (1999)
- [13] M. Mobilia, P.L. Krapivsky and S. Redner, Kinetic anomalies in addition–aggregation processes, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **36** (16) 4533–4542 (2003)
- [14] F. Calogero y F. Leyvraz, New Results on a Parity-dependent model of Aggregation Kinetics, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, (2000) 5619–5629
- [15] Z. Mimouni and J.A.D. Wattis, Similarity solution of coagulation equation with an inverse kernel, Physica A **388**, (2009) 1067–1073
- [16] A.A. Lushnikov, Evolution of coagulating systems, J. of Colloid and Interface Sci. **45**, (1973) 549–556
- [17] J.R. Norris, Uniqueness, nonuniqueness and a hydrodynamic limit for the stochastic coalescent, Ann. Appl. Probab. **9** (1999) 78–109.
- [18] N. Fournier and Ph. Laurençot, Existence of Self-Similar Solutions to Smoluchowski’s Coagulation Equation, Comm. Math. Phys. **256** (2005) 589–609
- [19] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun (eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, National Bureau of Standards, Applied Mathematics Series (1972)
- [20] P.G.J. van Dongen and M.H. Ernst, Solutions of Smoluchowski’s coagulation equation at large cluster sizes, Physica A **145** (1987) 15–66.
- [21] M.H. Ernst, E.M. Hendriks, F. Leyvraz, Smoluchowski’s equation and the θ -exponent for branched polymers, J. Phys. A **17** (1984) 2137–2144.