# Scaling in a sim ple $m$ odel for surface grow th in a random $m$ edium 
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Surface grow th in random $m$ edia is usually govemed by both the surface tension and the random local forces. Sim ulations on lattices $m$ im ic the form er by im posing a $m$ axim um gradient $m$ on the surface heights, and the latter by site-dependent random grow th probabilities. H ere we consider the lim it m ! 1 , where the surface grows at the site $w$ ith $m$ inim al random num ber, independent of its neighbors. T he resulting height distribution obeys a sim ple scaling law, which is destroyed when localsurface tension is included. O urm odel is equivalent to Yee's sim pli cation of the B ak-Sneppen model for the extinction of biological species, where the height represents the num ber of tim es a biological species is exchanged.
$K$ eyw ords: surface grow th, $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulation .
Invasion percolation $\left[\begin{array}{l}{[1 \overline{1}]}\end{array}\right]$ is a $m$ odel for viscous ngering, in which at each tim e step a segm ent of the interface $m$ oves into the capillary channel which im poses the (overall) $m$ in im um resistance. $N$ um erically, th is is $m$ odeled by a lattioe of sites, where each site is assigned a random num ber betw een zero and one, and by $m$ oving the interface into the perim eter site $w$ ith the $s m$ allest random num ber. A fter a while, $m$ ost of the perim eter random num bers are relatively large (above the percolation threshold), and grow th occurs in \bursts" which explore the vicinity of where they started

A nother fam ily of grow th m odels is based on the \solid on solid" concept, where one ignores overhangs and allow s only steps which increase the height $h$ of the interface (relative to the in itial line or plane). Such models, which also allow for surface tension, include the K ardar-P arisi-Zhang (K P Z) $[\overline{3}] \mathrm{m}$ odel, where the random resistance depends on horizontal position x and on tim e , and the P arisi [4] m odel, where th is resistance is local, depending on both x and h . A discrete version of the latter,
 w th $\mathrm{m}=1$. Sneppen (and Jensen) [ $\left[\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{\sigma}\end{array}\right]$ considered variants of this m odel, in which neighbors continue to be updated until the K im K osterlitz constraint is obeyed everyw here. Bak and Sneppen [ī1] then used a related model to describe the extinction of biological species. In their model, they alw ays updated also the nearest neighbors of the grow ing site, irrespective of the height gradients. H ow ever, unlike Sneppen and Jensen, they did not continue these updates in an \avalanche" beyond the nearest neighbors. T he \bursts" were thus m ore localized than in the original Sneppen $m$ odel.

R ecently, Yee $[\underline{\theta}]$ introduced a sim pli ed version of the B ak-Sneppen $m$ odel, which can be identi ed as them ! 1 lim it. In thism odel, there is no surface tension constraint on the grow th, and thus each
\pillar" continues to grow as long as the random num ber in front of it is sm aller than those facing all other pillars. A though this $m$ odel preserves the long range inform ation on all the perim eter \resistances", it om its the interactions betw een neighbors, and is thus geom etry and dim ension-independent. In the language of invasion percolation, this $m$ odel could describe a collection of independent capillary channels, penetrated from one end by a viscous uid from the sam e reservoir, and with independent random ly varying resistances along each channel. T he rem oval of interactions allowed an analytic solution of $m$ any aspects of th is $m$ odel $\left[\frac{-9}{-1}\right]$ in agreem ent $w$ ith sim ulations, which were phrased in the biological language. In the present paper we re-interpret this m odel as one of surface grow th, and test if the resulting height distribution of this grow th obeys a standard scaling law . W e start w th the de nition of the $m$ odel and its sim ulation and end $w$ ith a partial analytical treatm ent.
$T$ he $Y$ ee version of the $B a k-S n e p p e n ~ m o d e l t a k e s ~ a n ~ a r r a y ~ o f ~ L ~ r a n d o m ~ n u m ~ b e r s ~ r i ; ~ i=1 ; 2 ;::: ; L ~$ initially distributed betw een zero and unity. At each tim e step $t!~ t+1$, the sm allest of the $L$ random num bers is replaced by a new random num ber. A fter som etim e ${ }_{\underline{1}-9,1}^{9}$, nearly all random num bers are very close to unity, and grow th occurs in large \bursts" w here a single \pillar" grow s, sim ilar to invasion
 $m$ odel replaces also the lattice neighbors of the lowest random number, and thus depends on the assum ed lattice geom etry; it gives a threshold $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{C}}$ below unity such that after a long time $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{C}}<r_{i}<1$ for nearly all i. The random num bers $r_{i}$ can be interpreted as tness $\left.\underline{\eta}_{1} 1\right]$ in biological evolution, or as the quality of court decisions in a judicial system w ith law boy-precedent [i8i]. W e now use the physical interpretation 何]. $^{-1}$
$W$ ith every elem ent i we associate a height variable $h_{i}$ which initially is zero for all $i$, and then increases by unity every tim e this elem ent i gets a new random value $r_{i}$ (which corresponds to the new perim eter site in front of the $m$ oving interface). W e can im agine a deposition process in whidh bricks drop dow $n$ onto the site $w$ the the lost random num ber $r_{i}$ and then change th is $r_{i}$ into another random number, or as the viscous uid moving along the i'th (one dim ensional) capillary channel, and reaching a new resistance. W hat is the probability distribution function (proportional to the histogram ) of the observed heights? For this purpose we stop the grow th whenever the highest $h_{i}$ value reaches a predeterm ined value $L_{z}$ (as usual in invasion percolation sim ulations and experim ents [1] $]$ )

To avoid overcrow ding ofour gures we binned the observed heights into pow ers oftw o; that m eans the $k$-th bin contained heights between $2^{k}{ }^{1}$ and $2^{k} \quad 1$. It is plausible that for $1 \quad h_{i} \quad L_{z}$ and large $L_{z}$ the results should depend $m$ ainly on the ratio $h_{i}=L_{z} . F$ igure 1 show $s$ in its three parts the binned histogram $N(h)$ in the scaled form $N=L_{z}$ versus $h=L_{z}$, giving a good data collapse for large enough L ; the three parts correspond to $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{z}}=\mathrm{L}=0.1,1$ and 10 and for large L seem to give the sam e curve. $T$ he in itial linear increase, for $h \quad L$, in these log-log plots, together $w$ th the fact that the bin size increases as the height $h$, would im ply that $w$ thout binning this increase corresponds to a constant probability distribution function / N . At large heights we see a cut-o since $h>L_{z}$ is im possible. In fact, $F$ ig. 2 show s that the unbinned distribution follow s roughly an exponential, / exp ( $6 \mathrm{~h}=\mathrm{L}$ ).

The time after which the tallest pillar hits the top, $h_{i}=L$, is show $n$ in $F$ ig. 3 for our squares (and rectangles). It increases roughly as $\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{z}} ; \mathrm{z}^{\prime} \quad 1: 8$. H ow ever, a slight curvature suggests that
asym ptotically the exponent $z \mathrm{~m}$ ay be 2. Indeed, a plot of $=L^{2}$ versus $1=L^{0: 3}$ ( $F$ ig. 4) seem $s$ to approach a nite lim it for $L$ ! 1 . This means that when the tallest pillar hits the top, a nite fraction of the whole L L lattioe is occupied by the bricks of the pillars (or by the invading uid). About the sam e intercept 0.07 w as also found from the high and the at rectangles of F ig. 1, for $=\left(L_{z} L\right)$ versus $1=L^{0: 3}$.

A s a function of tim e $t$, the average height $H$ trivially alw ays increases linearly in tim $e$, while the $w$ idth $W$ / $t$ of the height distribution has an exponent increasing tow ards unity for $t$ increasing tow ards (not shown).

N ow an interaction betw een neighboring sites $i$ is introduced. If $i$ is updated, then also i+1 and $i \quad 1$ are updated if $h_{i} \quad h_{i+1}$ jor $h_{i} \quad h_{i} j$ respectively, are $m$. Here $m$ is a xed number betw een 0 and $L_{z}$. This interaction corresponds to som e sort of surface tension, which tries to avoid too large gradients in the height pro le $h_{i}$. It also makes our model one-dim ensional, since now the neighborhood introduces a geom etry. The lim itm $=0$ corresponds to the $B a k-S n e p p e n ~ m o d e l(a l w ~ a y s ~$ updating of neighbors) and the $\lim$ it $m=L_{z}$ to the simpli ed Yee version (no updating of neighbors).

Figure 5 show show the time, the average height $H=<h_{i}>_{i}$ and the surface roughness < $\left(h_{i} H\right)^{2}>^{1=2}$ depend on this new param eterm ; they go neither to in nity nor to zero, but the height $H$ has a pronounced $m$ inim $u m$ at $s m$ all $m$. Because of this new length $m$, the above sim ple scaling in term $s$ of $h=L_{z}$ no longer works, even if as in $F$ ig. 6 we take $m$ to be that value ( 5 to 20) for which $H$ has a minim um. Thus the non-interacting version obeys sim ple scaling while the interacting version depends on the geom etry (here: one-dim ensional only) and disobeys sim ple scaling.

A s stated, $m$ any features of the $Y$ ee $m$ odelw ere calculated analytically by $N$ ew $m$ an $[\underline{9}]$. Speci cally, at tim e the sm allest random number on the \perim eter" was show $n$ to grow as

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(t)=\frac{t}{t+L} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

approaching unity at long times. Indeed, if a \pillar" starts growing at a timet L then it w ill continue to grow for $n$ consecutive steps, during which the new random num bers encountered by this \pillar" are sm aller than $x(t)$. The probability of such an $n$-step grow th was found to be exponential:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{x}^{\mathrm{n}}{ }^{1}(1 \quad \mathrm{x}) ; \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

yielding an average step of length

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{hni}=\frac{1}{1 x}=\frac{t+L}{L}: \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, our sim ulations con $m$ \bursts" whose length grows linearly with time. A lso, the same form alism yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(n \quad h n i)^{2} i=\frac{t(t+L)}{L^{2}} \text { or } h(n \quad h n i)^{2} i=h n i^{2}=\frac{t}{t+L} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

which also agrees w ith our sim ulations for large $L$ and $t$, see $F$ ig. 7. This unifractal distribution, in which $n$ scales (for $1 \quad L \quad t$ ) as $n \quad t=L$, is clearly di erent from that expected in other grow th m odels m entioned in our introduction.
$N$ ote also that a given grow th stops w hen the next random num ber is larger than $x$, which happens $w$ ith probability $1 \quad x=L=(L+t)$. A ssum ing that the random num bers are distributed equally betw een zero and one, every site w illbe encountered at least once when $1 \quad x$ becom es smaller than $1=\mathrm{L}$, i. e. at tim es of order $L^{2}$. It is not clear yet if th is result relates to our num erical values for , which were asym ptotically consistent $w$ th being / $\mathrm{L} \quad \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{z}} / \mathrm{L}^{2}$.

Ref. [q] also derived the probability to nd a grow th \run" of length $n$ at any tim e,

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{n}=x_{t=0}^{x^{1}} x(t)^{n} 1 \quad(1 \quad x(t))^{2} / \frac{1}{n}: \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The nalheight $h_{i}$ of a \pillar" is a sum over such \run" lengths, which grow longer and longer with time. O ur sim ulations show that for $L_{z}=L$, the typical num ber of such runs is of order $3\{5$. Thus, the distribution $N(h)$ discussed above should in principle be a convolution ofdistributions like $N_{n}$. We evaluated several such convolutions, w ith a variable num ber of \runs", and they all seem to converge asym ptotically (for large h) to $N$ ( $h$ ) $1=h$, which di ers from the exponential form found num erically in $F$ ig. 2. At the $m$ om ent we have no explanation for this discrepancy.
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Figure 1: Scaling of the pillar height histogram s: Curves for di erent L collapse, except for very sm all and very large heights. The shape of the $L \quad L_{z}$ lattice is a square (part a), a at rectangle (part b), and a high rectangle (part c). Up to 640,000 sam ples w ere averaged over.


Figure 2: Exam ples of unbinned and unscaled distributions of heights, show ing a roughly exponential decay, for $L=L_{z}=100$ and 300 .


Figure 3: $T$ im e to reach the top, versus $L$, for squares, at, and high rectangles.


Figure 4: The tim es of $F$ ig. 3 are show $n$ to follow $=L^{2}=0: 07+0: 5=\mathrm{L}^{0: 3}+::$ for large system s .


Figure 5: In uence of interaction param eter $m$ at $L=L_{z}=100$, averaged over 1000 sam ples, w ith $m=L$ corresponding to the sim pli ed Yee $m$ odel and $m=0$ to the one-dim ensional Bak-Sneppen $m$ odel. Part a show s the tim e to reach the top, part b the height (diam onds) and the w idth ( + ) of the surface de ned by the pillar tops.


Figure 6: Failed scaling of pillar height histogram $s$ for thousand $L \quad L$ sam ples. The interaction param eter $m$ was taken to give a m inim um of $H$ ( $m$ ) (diam onds in $F$ ig. 5b) and varies from 5 to 20. In contrast to the analogous F ig. 1, the di erent curves do not collapse to one curve.


Figure 7: Comparison of $\left.<(\mathrm{n}\langle\mathrm{n}\rangle)^{2}\right\rangle=\langle\mathrm{n}\rangle^{2} \mathrm{w}$ ith theoretical tim e dependence $\mathrm{t}=(\mathrm{t}+\mathrm{L})$, where $n$ is the length of a stretch ( $\backslash$ run" " $\left.{ }_{9}^{-1}\right]$ ) of uninterrupted updatings of the sam e site.

