The target problem with evanescent subdi usive traps

S.B.Yuste¹, J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo¹, and Katja Lindenberg²

⁽¹⁾ Departam ento de F sica, Universidad de Extrem adura, E-06071 Badajoz, Spain

⁽²⁾ Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry 0340,

and Institute for Nonlinear Science, University of California San Diego,

9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093-0340, USA

We calculate the survival probability of a stationary target in one dimension surrounded by di usive or subdi usive traps of time-dependent density. The survival probability of a target in the presence of traps of constant density is known to go to zero as a stretched exponential whose speci c power is determined by the exponent that characterizes the motion of the traps. A density of traps that grows in time always leads to an asymptotically vanishing survival probability. Trap evanescence leads to a survival probability of the target that may be go to zero or to a nite value indicating a probability of eternal survival, depending on the way in which the traps disappear with time.

PACS num bers: 82.40.-g, 82.33.-z, 02.50 Ey, 89.75 D a

I. IN TRODUCTION

The traditional trapping problem involves di usive (Brownian) particles (A) that wander in a medium doped with static traps (B) and disappear when they meet [1,2,3,4]. In the traditional target problem [5,6,7], on the other hand, one has static A particles and mobile traps. Both of these problems are described by the \reaction" A + B ! B, but in one case the A's move and the B's stand still, while in the other the B's move while the A's are stationary. Both of these problems have a long and active history in the literature. They not only represent experim entally observable phenom ena, but they have served as a testbed for theoretical and num erical studies and as a starting point for the form ulation of m odels for m ore com plex system s that have only recently been successfully solved analytically. For exam ple, the survival probability of an A particle in a medium of B particles when both species are di usive, rst investigated num erically in the sem inalwork of Toussaint and W ilczek [8], was only partially solved analytically [9, 10] until the recent full (asymptotic) solution in one dim ension [11, 12, 13, 14]. These results have also recently been generalized to subdi usive species [15]. The survival probability of A particles in the reactions A + A ! A and A + A ! 0 in one dimension when A is mobile is also of relatively recent vintage in the history of such analytic solutions [4, 16, 17].

The purpose of this paper is to extend the onedimensional target problem calculations for both diusive and subdi usive traps to the case of traps that them selves disappear in time according to some survival probability function of their own (e.g., exponential or power law). The decay of the moving traps with time of course increases the survival probability of the stationary target, and the interesting questions concern the interplay of the time dependences of the movement and decay of the traps. A related problem was considered in [18], where di usive particles A and traps B and C undergoing the explicit reactions (a) A + B + B + B + C + C A + B ! B, B + C ! 0 were considered using entirely di erent m ethods. Our m ethods are equally applicable to trap densities that increase with time, but this problem is less interesting because it necessarily leads to the eventual dem ise of the target.

A common characterization of the di usive motion of a particle is through its mean square displacement for large t,

$$x^{2}$$
 (t) $\frac{2K}{(1 +)}$ t : (1)

Here K is the (generalized) di usion constant, and is the exponent that characterizes norm al (= 1) or anom alous (€ 1) di usion. In particular, the process is sudi usive when 0 < < 1. Subi usive processes are ubiquitous in nature [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24], and are particularly useful for understanding transport in complex system s [3, 25].

The problem considered in this paper is a special case of a broad class of reaction-subdi usion processes that have been studied over the past decades. One approach that has been used to study these processes is based on the continuous time random walk (CTRW) theory with waiting-time distributions between steps that have broad long-time tails and consequently in nitem om ents, t ¹ fort! 1 with 0 < < 1. Another (t) approach is based on the fractional di usion equation, which describes the evolution of the probability density P (x;t) of nding the particle at position x at time t by m eans of the fractional partial di erential equation (in one dim ension) [7, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29]

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} P(x;t) = K_0 D_t^1 - \frac{\theta^2}{\theta x^2} P(x;t); \qquad (2)$$

where $_0 D_t^1$ is the Riem ann-Liouville operator,

$${}_{0}D_{t}^{1} P(x;t) = \frac{1}{()} \frac{e}{et} \int_{0}^{z} dt^{0} \frac{P(x;t^{0})}{(t t^{0})^{1}} : \quad (3)$$

In this paper we study the one-dimensional target problem for a static particle A subject to attack by diffusive or subdi usive traps B that may die before reaching the target A [18]. For this purpose, we generalize the ideas of B ray and B lythe [11], and of our own work [15] based on a fractional di usion equation approach. W hile recent work shows that a simple generalization of reaction-di usion to reaction-subdi usion equations in which the reaction and subdi usion terms are assumed to enter additively is not valid in some cases [30], this is not a di culty in our particular application. The di culties do not arise when the reaction process can be translated into a static boundary value problem , which is the case for the target (as well as the trapping) problem [28].

In som e cases, asym ptotic anom alous di usion behavior can be found from corresponding results for norm al diusion via the simple replacement of the total simple replacement of total simple replacement of the total simple replacement of total simple replace be understood from a CTRW perpective because the average num ber of jum ps n m ade by a subdi usive walker up to time t scales as hni t and, in m any instances the num ber of jum ps is the relevant factor that explains the behavior of the system . The simple replacem ent result is evidence of \subordination" (see Secs. 5 and 72of [6]). How ever, there are other instances where the behavior of subdi usive systems cannot be found in this way. A simple example is the survival probability of subdi usive particles in the trapping problem (see Sec. 5 of [6]). In particular, for system s where competing processes (motion toward target and death) occur according to di erent tem poral rules, such a replacem ent becom es ambiguous. This is the case for the problem considered here.

W hile our analytic results are based on the fractional di usion equation form alism, our num erical simulations are based on a CTRW algorithm. These two renditions of the problem are expected to di er if trapping events are likely in a small number of steps, that is, if the initial density of traps is too high. On the other hand, if the initial trap density is too low, then the simulations to produce valid statistics would take inordinately long because trapping events are rare and because the system has to be su ciently large to include m any particles. W e note this as a caveat for our subsequent com parisons.

In Sec. II we present an integral equation for the survival probability, which we reduce to quadrature in Sec. III. The resulting integral is explicitly evaluated for exponentially decaying trap densities (including a stretched exponential decay), as well as for trap densities that decay as a power law. Not surprisingly, we nd that a su ciently rapid decay of the trap density leads to a nite asymptotic survival probability of the target. C om parisons of our results with num erical simulations are also shown in this section. A sum mary and some conclusions are presented in Sec. IV.

II. IN TEGRAL EQUATION FOR THE SURVIVAL PROBABILITY

We consider a nite intervalL containing N = L mobile traps B of constant density initially distributed at random, and a single in mobile A particle at the origin. Following the approach of Bray et al. [14] for di usive traps and our generalization of this approach to the subdi usive case [15], we write the survival probability of A as P (t) = expf $_0$ (t)g, where $_0$ (t) is to be determined. To nd this function, one calculates in two ways the probability density to nd a B particle at the origin at time t,

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{t}} dt^{0} (t^{0}) G(t t^{0}) ; \qquad (4)$$

That the left side is this probability density is obvious. On the right side one has the renewal theory expression where $_0$ (t^0)d t^0 = (P=P)d t^0 is the probability that a B particle intersected A in the time interval (t^0 ; t^0 + d t^0) for the rst time, and the propagator G (t t^0) is the probability density for this particular B to be at the origin at time t. In one dimension it is given by [31, 32]

$$G (t) = \frac{1}{P \frac{1}{4 \text{ K t}}} H_{1;2}^{2;0} 0 \qquad \begin{array}{c} (1 = 2; = 2) \\ (0;1); (1=2;1) \end{array} \\ = \frac{P \frac{1}{4 \text{ K t}}}{\frac{1}{2}}; \qquad (5)$$

where H $_{1,2}^{2,0}$ is Fox's H -function, whose value at the given arguments we have used to write the last equality. In a dimension context than the target problem, B ray et al. [14] generalized their approach to a time-dependent density (t) of B. They argue that in place of Eq. (4) one now has

(t) =
$$\int_{0}^{2} dt^{0} \frac{(t)}{(t^{0})} \Box_{0} G(t t^{0});$$
 (6)

that is,

$$1 = \int_{0}^{\Delta_{t}} dt^{0} \frac{\Delta_{t}}{(t^{0})} G(t - t^{0}):$$
 (7)

This is the basic equation to be considered in this paper.

III. THE SURVIVAL PROBABILITY

To calculate the survival probability of particle A, we rew rite Eq. (7) explicitly as

$$p_{\overline{4K}} = \frac{1}{(1 = 2)} \int_{0}^{Z_{t}} dt^{0} \frac{(t^{0})}{(t = t^{0})^{-2}}; \quad (8)$$

where we have multiplied both sides by $p \frac{1}{4K}$, and where we have introduced

(t) =
$$\frac{-0}{(t)}$$
: (9)

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{(1 = 2)} \int_{0}^{2} dt^{0} \frac{(t^{0})}{(t = t^{0})^{-2}}; \quad (10)$$

with $f(t) = \frac{p}{4K}$. The solution of this classic equation is wellknown (see Sec. 12 in [33] or Eqs. (2.5a) and (2.5b) in [34]),

Here, as earlier, ${}_0D_t^1 \stackrel{=2}{=}$ is the R immann-L iouville fractional derivative. In our case f (t) = $\frac{1}{4K}$ is constant, so that

(t) =
$$\frac{-0}{(t)} = \frac{p}{4K} \frac{1}{(-2)} t^{-2}$$
 (12)

It then follows that

$$_{0} (t) = \frac{p \frac{1}{4K} Z_{t}}{(=2)} dz (z) z^{=2}; \qquad (13)$$

which provides a general solution to our problem for any

(t). W hile Eq. (13) applies to trap densities that grow or that decrease or even oscillate in time, the case of evanescent traps is the more interesting and the one we choose to focus on.

As a rem inder, we note that for traps of a constant density $(t) = _0$ the survival probability is given by

P (t) = exp
$$\frac{p \frac{1}{4K}_{0} t^{=2}}{(1 + =2)}$$
 : (14)

As a benchm ark, we show in Fig.1 a typical comparison of this result with simulation results. The agreement is clearly good, although a lower initial density run for a longer time would lead to even better agreement.

A. Exponentially decaying trap density

Suppose that the traps have a nite lifetime and decay exponentially, as in a unimolecular reaction, (t) = $_0 \exp(t=)$. The integral in Eq. (13) immediately leads to the solution

$$_{0}(t) = 1 \frac{(=2;t=)}{(=2)};$$
 (15)

where (b;x) is an incomplete G amm a function, and

$$(4K)^{1=2}$$
: (16)



FIG. 1: (Color online) $_{0}(t) = \ln P(t) \text{ vs t for non-evanescent traps as given in Eq. (14) (solid line) and sim – ulations (symbols along with error bars). Parameter values are <math>= 1=2$, $_{0} = 0.01$, $K = 1=(2^{D})$.

W hen = 1, i.e., when the traps are di usive, this reduces to

$$_{0}(t) = '_{1 0} \operatorname{erf}(t=):$$
 (17)

For arbitrary < 1, the survival probability of the target in the presence of the subdi usive traps with nite lifetim e thus is

P (t) = exp ' _0 1
$$\frac{(=2;t=)}{(=2)}$$
 : (18)

The interesting result here is that the function $_0(t)$ goes to the constant $_0(1) = `_0$ and not to in nity as t ! 1. Therefore the survival probability does not vanish with increasing time,

P (t) ! exp '
$$_{0}$$
 1 $\frac{e^{t}}{(=2)(t=)^{1}}$: (19)

We note that ' is a characteristic distance that measures the root mean square displacement of the traps during their decay time . Therefore $_0(1) = `_0$ is the ratio of this average displacement to the average initial distance $_0^{-1}$ between traps. This nite asymptotic survival probability, P (1) = exp (`_0), displays reasonable qualitative features: it increases with decreasing trap lifetime , and it decreases with increasing initial trap density $_0$. That there is a nite asymptotic survival probability re ects the fact that if the traps disappear exponentially while the traps move di usively or subdi usively), then many traps disappear before they can reach the particle, and there is a nite probability that the particle remains forever \safe."

The next two gures show the comparison of simulation results with our analytic outcom e. First, in Fig. 2



FIG. 2: (Color online) $_{0}(t)=_{0} = \ln P(t)=_{0} \text{ vst for exponentially evanescent traps. Solid line: Eq. (17). Squares: simulation results for a high initial density <math>_{0} = 0.1. \text{ X}$'s: simulation results for a lower initial density $_{0} = 0.01. \text{ Other parameter values are} = 1, = 100, \text{ and } K_{1} = D = 1=2. \text{ A sym ptotic value: } _{0}(1) = 1_{0} = 2.$

we illustrate our earlier caveat, that agreem ent cannot be expected if the initial density of traps is too high and the extinction rate of the traps is large, and that the agreem ent in proves with lower initial density. The disagreem ent is clear and can be traced exactly to the early time trapping events that cumulatively a ect the survival probability. Fig. 3 shows typical results for the lower initial density of traps and a more slow ly decaying trap density, where the agreem ent between analytic results and simulations is clearly very good.

Finally, it is straightforward to extend the results of this section to trap densities that decay as a stretched exponential, (t) = $_0 \exp[$ (t=)]. The integral (13) is still straightforward and gives

$$_{0}(t) = \frac{(2)}{(2)} 1 \frac{(2)}{(2)} ; (t) = \frac{(2)}{(2)} ; (t) = \frac{(2)}{(2)} ; (20)$$

which reduces to Eq. (15) when = 1. The asymptotic nite survival probability then is

P (t) ! exp '
$$_{0}\frac{(=2)}{(=2)}$$
 1 $\frac{e^{(t=)}}{(=2)(t=)^{(1=2)}}$ (21)

An interesting interplay of and should be noted: there are values of and for which the survival probability of the target when the trap density decays as a stretched exponential (< 1) is actually greater than with an exponential decay (= 1). This seem ingly counterintuitive behavior is connected with the reversal of time inequalities, i.e., with the fact that (t=) is greater (sm aller) than (t=) when t is sm aller (greater) than .



FIG.3: (Coloronline) $_{0}$ (t) = $\ln P$ (t) vst for exponentially evanescent traps of a lower initial density $_{0}$ = 0.01. Solid line: Eq. (18). Symbols: simulation results (there are error bars on the symbols but they are too small to see clearly). O ther parameter values are = 1=2, = 10⁸, and K = 1=(2^D). A symptotic value: $_{0}$ (1) = $_{1=2}^{1}$ = 1.06225.

B. Power law decaying trap density

Suppose now that the trap density decays as a power law as might happen, for instance, if there is a process of trap-trap annihilation. The trap density at long times then decreases as (t) t and it is to be expected that the target survival probability (and, in particular, whether it is asymptotically vanishing or nite) depends sensitively on the relation between the exponents and

. We expect that for su ciently large the target will again have a nite probability of surviving forever.

To nd a closed expression for the survival probability we need to specify (t) for all times, not just asymptotically, and we choose

$$(t) = \frac{0}{(1 + t=)} :$$
 (22)

W ith this form , the integral (15) can be carried out exactly, to give

$$_{0}$$
 (t) = $\frac{1}{(2)} B_{\frac{t}{(+t)}}$ (=2; =2) (23)

for all , where B is the incom plete B eta function [36, 37]

:

B $(z;w) = \int_{0}^{Z} dt t^{z-1} (1 t)^{w-1} w ith < (z) > 0:$ (24)

Equation (1) tells us that the typical length explored by a (living) trap grows with time as hx^2 (t) $i^{1=2}$ t⁼². On the other hand, the mean distance between traps grows as 1 t. It thus stands to reason that the asymptotic survival probability depends sensitively on

the relative magnitudes of and =2. To present more explicit results in this long-time regime we distinguish three cases.

C ase 1: > =2. In this case Eq. (23) can be written as

$$_{0}(t) = \frac{{}^{\prime}_{0}}{(=2)} B (=2; =2) I_{\frac{t}{(+t)}} (=2; =2):$$
(25)

Here B (z;w) is the B eta function (where the requirement < (z) > 0 and < (w) > 0 places us in the \C ase 1" regime), and $I_x(z;w)$ is the regularized incomplete B eta function as dened in Sec. 6.6.2 (pg. 263) of [37]. U sing the property 6.6.3 in [37] we can set $I_x(a;b) = 1$ $I_1 \times (b;a)$, and applying the relation 26.5.5 in [37] we can then write the asymptotic result

$$I_{\frac{t}{(+t)}} (=2; =2) = 1 \qquad \frac{(t=)^{-2}}{(-2)B(-2; =2)} + :::$$
(26)

C onsequently, recognizing the relation between the B eta function and the G amma function, as t ! 1 we arrive at the asymptotic result

$$_{0}$$
 (t) ! $_{0}$ $(=2)$ $(t=)^{=2}$ (t=) + ::: :
(=2) (=2) + ::: :
(27)

The survival probability thus approaches (via a power law decay of the exponent) the nite asymptotic value

P(t! 1) = exp '
$$_{0} \frac{(=2)}{()}$$
 : (28)

Figure 4 illustrates this result along with num erical $\sin -$ ulations for comparison.

C ase 2: < =2. In this case the integrand in Eq. (13) goes to zero m ore slow ly than 1=t fort ! 1, so that a simple asymptotic analysis of the integral (13) readily establishes that $_0$ (t) goes to in nity with increasing time as

$$_{0}$$
 (t) ! $\frac{1}{(-2)}$ $\frac{1$

so that the survival probability vanishes at long times as a stretched exponential,

P (t) ! exp
$$(=2)$$
 (t=) $(=2)$ (30)

A nalytic and simulation results for this case are shown in Fig. 5.

C ase 3: = =2. This is the marginal case, and the incomplete B eta function (24) can be rewritten as a hypergeom etric function,

$${}_{0}(t) = \frac{{}_{0}(t=)}{(=2)} {}_{2}F_{1}(;;1+;t=)$$
$$= \frac{{}_{0}}{(=2)} \ln(t=) + ::: \text{ ast }! 1 : (31)$$



FIG. 4: (Color online) $_{0}$ (t) = ln P (t) vst for power law evanescent traps with > =2 (\Case 1"). Parameter values are = 0:75, = 0:8, $_{0}$ = 0:01, = 10^{6} , and K = $1=(2^{D})$. A sym ptotic value: $_{0}$ (1) = $_{3=4}^{\circ}$ 0 = 2:36549. Solid line: Eq. (23). Sym bols: simulation results.



FIG.5: (Color online) $_{0}$ (t) = ln P (t) vst for power law evanescent traps with < =2 (\Case 2"). Parameter values are = 0.8, = 0.2, $_{0} = 0.01$, $= 10^{6}$, and K $= 1 = (2^{D})$. Solid line: Eq. (23). Symbols: simulation results along with error bars.

The survival probability thus decays as an inverse power,

$$P(t! 1)! (t=)^{\circ} (=2):$$
 (32)

Results for the marginal case are shown in Fig. 6.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have calculated the survival probability of a stationary target in a one-dimensional system in which di u-



FIG. 6: (Color online) $_{0}$ (t) = ln P (t) vst for power law evanescent traps with = =2 (\Case 3"). Parameter values are = 0.8, = 0.4, $_{0}$ = 0.01, = 10⁶, and K = 1=(2^P). Solid line: Eq. (23). Symbols: simulation results.

sive or subdi usive traps that elim inate the target upon encounter them selves disappear according to a survival probability. The root mean square displacement of the traps grows with time as $t^{=2}$, that is, disively when = 1 and subdiusively when < 1. The survival probability of the target depends sensitively on the interplay of two temporal events, namely, the motion of the traps as characterized by the exponent and their disappearance. W hen the motion of the traps is di usive or subdi usive and the traps do not decay in time, the survival probability goes to zero as a stretched exponential, Eq. (14). W hen the traps undergo exponential decay or stretched exponential decay, the target has an asym pototic safety m argin, that is, a nite probability of surviving forever, cf. Eqs. (19) and (21). W hen the traps are di usive or subdi usive and disappear according to a power law survival probability t , the survival of the

. If the traps m ove su ciently rapidly relative to their disappearance, that is, if =2 >, the target is trapped with certainty at long times, its survival probability go-

target depends sensitively on the relation between and

- [1] B. H. Hughes, Random Walks and Random Environments, Volume 1: Random Walks (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995); Volume 2: Random Environments (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996).
- G.H.W eiss, A spects and Applications of the Random W alk (North-Holland, Am sterdam, 1994); F. den Hollander and G.H.W eiss, in Contemporary Problems in Statistical, G.H.W eiss, ed. (SIAM, Philadelphia, 1994) p.147.
- [3] S. Havlin and D. ben Avraham, Adv. Phys. 36, 695 (1987).

ing to zero again as a stretched exponential, cf. Eq. (30). If the traps move slow $\frac{1}{2}$, then the target has a chance of eternal survival, cf. Eq. (28). At the critical relation =2 = the survival probability goes to zero as an inverse power of time, cf. Eq. (32). If in fact the trap density increases with time, the survival probability of the target necessarily vanishes asymptotically.

In this paper we have calculated the survival probability of a target particle in the presence of evanescent subdi usive traps of given time-dependent density. We could equally consider the inverse problem, namely, that of nding the time dependence of the density of traps to obtain a particular survival probability function. For this purpose we need only \invert" Eq. (12),

(t) =
$$\frac{p(=2)}{4K}t^1 = \frac{p(=t)}{p(t)}$$
: (33)

An exponentially decaying survival probability of the form P (t) = $e^{t^{\pm}}$ requires a density that decays as (t) $t^{1} = 2$. This is included in and consistent with Case 2 in Sec. IIIB with =2 = 1. Sim ilarly, for an inverse power decay of the form P (t) (t=)¹ we require that (t) t $=^{2}$ consistent with Case 3 in the same section.

This work has focused on the survival probability of a stationary target. The survival probability of a moving target, di usive or subdi usive, surrounded by nonevanescent di usive or subdi usive traps has been considered recently in a num ber of papers [11, 15]. Extension of our work with evanescent traps to the case of a di usive or subdi usive target is in progress [38].

A cknow ledgm ents

The research of S B Y and JJR L has been supported by the M inisterio de Educacion y Ciencia (Spain) through grant N o. F IS2004-01399 (partially nanced by FEDER funds) and by the European C om m unity's H um an Potential P rogram m e under contract HPRN-C T -2002-00307, DYG LAGEM EM .K L. is supported in part by the N ational Science Foundation under grant PHY -0354937.

- [4] D. ben Avraham and S. Havlin, Di usion and Reactions in Fractals and Disordered Systems (C am bridge University Press, C am bridge, 2000).
- [5] G. Zum ofen, J. K lafter, and A. B lum en, J. Chem. Phys. 79, 5131 (1983); J. K lafter, A. B lum en, and G. Zum ofen, J. Stat. Phys. 36, 561 (1984).
- [6] A.B lum en, J.K lafter, and G.Zum ofen, in Optical Spectroscopy of G lasses, I.Zschokke, ed. (Reidel, D ordrecht, 1986).
- [7] J. Sung, E. Barkai, R. J. Silbey, and S. Lee, J. Chem. Phys. 116, 2338 (2002).

- [8] D. Toussaint and F.W ilczek, J. Chem. Phys. 78, 2642 (1983).
- [9] M. Bram son and J. L. Lebow itz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2397 (1988).
- [10] M.Bram son and J.L.Lebow itz, J. Stat. Phys. 62, 297 (1991).
- [11] A.J.Bray and R.A.Blythe, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89, 150601 (2002); R.A.Blythe and J.Bray, Phys.Rev.E 67, 041101 (2003).
- [12] G.Oshanin, O.Benichou, M.Coppey, and M.Moreau, Phys. Rev. E 66, 060101R (2002).
- [13] M. Moreau, G. Oshanin, O. Benichou, and M. Coppey, Phys. Rev. E 67, 045104R (2003).
- [14] A.J.Bray, S.N.Majum dar, and R.A.Blythe, Phys. Rev.E 67,060102 (2003).
- [15] S.B.Yuste and K.Lindenberg, Phys. Rev. E 72, 061103 (2005).
- [16] S.Habib, K.Lindenberg, G.Lythe, and C.Molina-Pars, J.Chem. Phys. 115, 73 (2001).
- [17] S. B. Yuste and K. Lindenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 118301 (2001); ibid, Chem. Phys. 284, 169 (2002).
- [18] A.D.Sanchez, E.M. Nicola, and H.S.W io, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2244 (1997).
- [19] R.Metzler and J.K lafter, Phys. Rep. 339, 1 (2000).
- [20] J.-P. Bouchaud and A. Georges, Phys. Rep. 195, 127 (1990).
- [21] T.Kostolowicz, K.Dworecki, and S.M rowczynski, Phys. Rev. 71, 041105 (2005): ibid., Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 170602 (2005); K.Dworecki, Physica A 359, 24 (2006).
- [22] J.M.S.A.H.Romero, Phys.Rev.E 58, 2833 (1998).
- [23] J.M. Sancho, A. Lacasta, K. Lindenberg, I.M. Sokolov, and A. Romero, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 250601 (2004);
 A. M. Lacasta, J. M. Sancho, A. H. Romero, I. M. Sokolov, and K. Lindenberg, Phys. Rev. E 70, 051104 (2004); J.M. Sancho, A.M. Lacasta, K. Lindenberg, I. M. Sokolov, and A. H. Romero, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 188902 (2005).

- [24] Y. Kantor and M. Kardar, Phys. Rev. E 69, 021806 (2004); L. Chen and M. W. Deem, Phys. Rev. E 68, 021107 (2003); P.Gallo and M. Rovere, J. Phys. Cond. M at. 15, 7625 (2003).
- [25] J.P. Bouchaud, J. Phys. I 2, 1705 (1992); G.B. Arous,
 A. Bovier, and V. Gayrard, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 087201 (2002); E.M. Bertin and J.P. Bouchaud, Phys. Rev. E 67, 026128 (2003).
- [26] W. R. Schneider and W. W yss, J. M ath. Phys. 30, 134 (1989).
- [27] K.Seki, M.Wojcik, and M.Tachiya, J.Chem. Phys. 119, 2165 (2003).
- [28] S.B.Yuste and L.Acedo, Physica A 336, 334 (2004).
- [29] S.B.Yuste, L.Acedo, and K.Lindenberg, Phys. Rev. E 69, 036126 (2004).
- [30] I.M. Sokolov, M.G.W. Schm idt, and F. Sagues, Phys. Rev. E 73, 031102 (2006).
- [31] A.M. Mathaiand R.K. Saxena, The H-function with Applications in Statistics and O ther D isciplines (John W iley and Sons, New York, 1978).
- [32] R.M etzler and J.K lafter, Phys.Rep. 339, 1 (2000).
- [33] F.G. Tricom i, Integral Equations (Dover, New York, 1985).
- [34] R.Goren o and F.Mainardi, \Integral and Dierential Equations of Fractional Order," in Fractals and Fractional Calculus in Continuum Mechanics, edited by A. Carpinteri and F.Mainardi (Springer Verlag, Wien and New York, 1997) pp. 223-276.
- [35] I. Podlubny, Fractional D i erential Equations, (A cadem ic Press, San D iego, 1999).
- [36] http://functions.wolfram.com/06.19.02.0001.01.
- [37] Handbook of Mathematical Functions, ed. M. Abram ow itz and I. Stegun (Dover, New York, 1972).
- [38] S.B.Yuste, J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo, and K.Lindenberg, in preparation.