

Watanabe and Hu Reply: In a recent Letter [1], Watanabe, Yukawa, Ito, and Hu (WYIH) proposed the idea of superscaling for percolation on rectangular domains and used numerical data near the effective critical density  $\rho_c^0$  to support such idea. In [2], Pruessner and Moloney (PM) pointed out some problems in [1]. Most of these problems are caused by the differences in using  $\rho_c^0$  or the bulk critical density  $\rho_c$  in the analysis. Figure 2 of [1] shows clearly that at  $\rho = \rho_c$  the existence probabilities  $E_p$  for different aspect ratios  $R$  are different [3]. Thus it is natural that we consider a horizontal line at  $E_p = 0.5$  in Fig. 2(a) to define the effective critical density  $\rho_c^0$  for curves with different aspect ratios  $R$  and using data near  $\rho_c^0$  to study superscaling shown in Fig. 4 of [1]. Please note that at  $\rho_c^0$ , the correlation length is of the order of vertical linear dimension  $L$ . By considering  $E_p$  near  $\rho_c^0$  rather than near  $\rho_c$ , we will not have the problems mentioned at the second and the third paragraphs of [2]. To avoid the confusion, in the abstract and the first paragraph of [1] we should replace "deviation from the critical point" by "deviation from the effective critical point  $\rho_c^0$ "; we should also replace the term "the critical point" below Eq. (1) and " $\rho_c$ " of Eq. (2) by "the effective critical point  $\rho_c^0$ " and " $\rho_c^0$ ", respectively.

The value of  $b$  in Eq. (10) of [1] was determined by PM to be  $3/8$  ( $y_t=2$ ) based on  $P(L;R) = P(RL;R^{-1})$ , while WYIH obtained  $b = 0.05$ . This discrepancy is caused by differences in definitions of percolating clusters. PM used only the largest cluster to define the percolation probability  $P$  and thus obtained  $P(L;R) = P(RL;R^{-1})$ . WYIH used all clusters extending from the top to the bottom of the system to define  $P$  and have  $P(L;R) \neq P(RL;R^{-1})$  for  $R > 1$ . Besides, WYIH used the effective critical density  $\rho_c^0$  in Fig. 7 of [1] to determine  $b = 0.05$ , while PM did not use  $\rho_c^0$ . To avoid the confusion, we should also use the effective critical density rather than the critical density to define  $b$  in Eq. (10) of [1] as in the case of Fig. 7.

Since a horizontal line at  $E_p = E_p(L;0;1)$  in Fig. 2 of [1] has been used to define  $\rho_c^0$ , Fig. 2 indicates that  $\rho_c^0$  depends on  $L$  and  $R$  and  $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} E_p(L; \rho_c^0; R) = E_p(L;0;R) \neq 0$  for  $R \neq 1$ . Thus PM correctly pointed out that the difference between using  $\rho_c^0$  and  $\rho_c$  does not vanish in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  for  $R \neq 1$ . For this reason, we should replace "correct for finite-size effects" above Eq. (9) in [1] by "study superscaling behavior".

The meaning of the nonlinear scaling variable questioned by PM can be understood from the mapping function  $f(\rho)$  defined by  $E_p(L;R) = E_p(L;f(\rho);1)$ , with  $f$  determined numerically and plotted in Fig. 1 which shows nonlinear dependence on  $\rho$  for  $R > 1$  and is con-

sistent with Fig. 6 and Table I of [1]. Finite-size scaling implies  $E_p(L;f(\rho);1) \sim F((f(\rho) - \rho_c^0)L^{y_t})$ ; combining this with the expansion of  $f(\rho)$  at  $\rho_c^0$  up to the linear term with  $(f - \rho_c^0) \sim R^a$  gives  $E_p(L;R) \sim F((\rho_c^0)L^{y_t}R^a)$ , which shows superscaling of  $E_p$  with scaling variable  $x = (\rho_c^0)L^{y_t}R^a$  and  $\rho_c^0$  (instead of  $\rho_c$ ) enters  $x$  naturally. We find that  $\ln(f - \rho_c^0)$  increases




FIG. 1: The mapping functions  $f$  in Eq. (1), which are nonlinear for  $R > 1$ . The inset shows how to obtain  $f$  from  $E_p$ . The solid circles are the effective critical points  $\rho_c^0$ .

linearly with  $\ln R$  with a well-defined exponent  $a = 0.14$  [4] which is consistent with that obtained in [1]. Similar calculations of the mapping functions of the percolation probability give the exponent  $b = 0.05$  [4] which is also consistent with that in [1].

Scaling can be considered as "data collapse" for critical system with different sizes [5]. We found very good data collapse for system with different aspect ratios in [1]. It is appropriate to call such results "superscaling".

This work was supported by Grants NSC 93-2112-M-001-027 and NSC 94-2119-M-002-001.

Hiroshi Watanabe<sup>1</sup> and Chin-Kun Hu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Complex Systems Science, Graduate School of Information Science, Nagoya University, Furouchou, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Nankang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan

Received 10 June 2005

PACS numbers 05.50.+q, 24.10.Lx, 89.75.Da

[1] H. Watanabe, S. Yukawa, N. Ito, and C.-K. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 19601 (2004).

[2] G. Pruessner and N. R. Moloney, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 258901 (2005).

[3] J. L. Cardy, J. Phys. A 25, L201 (1992).

[4] H. Watanabe and C.-K. Hu, unpublished data.

[5] H. E. Stanley, Rev. Mod. Phys. 71, S358 (1999).